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Abstract

*Féminisme Oblige:*
Katharine Susan Anthony and the Birth of Modern Feminist Biography, 1877-1929

By

Anna Simonson

Advisor: David Nasaw

*Féminisme Oblige* examines the life and work of Katharine Susan Anthony (1877-1965), a feminist, socialist, and pacifist whose early publications on working mothers (*Mothers Who Must Earn* [1914]) and women’s movements in Europe (*Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* [1915]) presaged her final chosen vocation as a feminist biographer.

Between 1920 and 1958, Anthony published nine biographies of women, all of which in some way challenged the assumptions behind established gender norms and the status quo. Perhaps most importantly, Anthony’s biographies, grounded in the exciting new theories of Sigmund Freud, challenged women themselves to think differently about their prescribed roles, encouraging them to discard contrived definitions and prejudices in favor of sex emancipation and equality. Anthony’s life studies took seriously “the emancipation of woman both as a human-being and as a sex-being,” as she wrote in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, and evinced a new way to write about women’s lives just as suffrage was coming to an end and feminism and the New Woman were coming under increasing fire.

This dissertation argues that Katharine Anthony was the progenitor of a new form, modern feminist biography, which was both akin to and separate from the development of New Biography in the wake of World War I. While other people and organizations
were producing important histories of women at the same time, no individual or group
was writing the lives of women just as Anthony was writing them—as complex, active,
intelligent, sexual agents and human beings. Anthony’s work is significant to anyone
who seeks to understand the grounding of modern feminism, the development of modern
biography, or the vastly understudied group of women writing history in the first half of
the twentieth century, and contributes an important narrative of feminist action in the
decades between suffrage and the 1960s, the years traditionally believed to be the
“doldrums” of modern feminism.

This dissertation does not cover Anthony’s life and work from cradle to grave, but rather
from cradle to career. The period covered most fully is 1877, the year of her birth in
Roseville, Arkansas, to 1920, the year she published her first biography, Margaret
Fuller: A Psychological Biography, over a decade after she had moved to New York City
with the “urge to write.” While all of Anthony’s biographies deserve individual attention
for their literary, historical, and feminist merit, the birth of modern feminist biography
and the trajectory of Anthony’s career can be understood by ending the discussion with
the conception and completion of her first life study, and with a conclusion that points to
the future.
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Introduction

“[H]er life demands a vindication.”¹

—Katharine Anthony, Margaret Fuller: A Psychological Biography, 1920

“Many are the creative energies and adventures of women that are forgotten in dull poverties of understanding.”²

—Edith Franklin Wyatt, review of Katharine Anthony’s Margaret Fuller, 1920

“For probably the most thrilling and significant feature of these decades wherein so many things are happening, is the discovery of women by themselves.”³

—Olivia Howard Dunbar, “Katharine Anthony—Creative Feminist,” 1927

***

This is the story of a great American biographer who would have been embarrassed by the praise, as she was in 1945 when the popular New York City radio host Mary Margaret McBride referred to her as the most well-known biographer in the world.⁴ Katharine Susan Anthony, reserved, reclusive, and modest, wrote for reasons other than fame.

¹ KA, Margaret Fuller: A Psychological Biography (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920), v. Heretofore MF.
² Edith Franklin Wyatt, review of Margaret Fuller: A Psychological Biography, by KA, in The New Republic (December 1, 1920): 22.
⁴ Mary Margaret McBride interview of Katharine Anthony, March 19, 1945, Cynthia Lowry/Mary Margaret McBride Collection, Broadcast and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress, Washington D.C. Heretofore MMM-LC. MMM was referencing the author bio on the back inside cover of KA’s The Lambs: A Story of Pre-
Nevertheless, her output was impressive, and several of her books sold exceptionally well. She wrote nine biographies, two sociological feminist studies, dozens of articles, and even more book reviews, much of the time while juggling several jobs. In 1927, she was the first person to translate the memoirs of Catherine the Great into English. These accomplishments are all the more astonishing when one considers she was thirty-four before her writing career began, and almost thirty-eight before she published her first individual book. “Aunt Kate was the embodiment of what a woman could do,” Katharine Anthony’s great nephew, Tony Whedon, remarked, and he wasn’t wrong.5

Above all, Katharine Anthony believed in a woman’s right to choose. She celebrated “the ultimate and individual will” and lived by example, “a vindication of her belief” that women could forge a new way forward by earning their own money; moving away from their families of origin, even without the excuse of marriage; obtaining an education; traveling the world; speaking their minds; and, perhaps the biggest affront to early-twentieth-century American society, choosing to remain unmarried at a time when only 10 percent of American women did so.6 It has been suggested that perhaps Anthony wasn’t attractive enough to draw a willing suitor (“[w]hen maids do not marry, of course,” Anthony wrote with obvious sarcasm about the popular

---

5 Tony Whedon (TW), phone interview with the author, September 30, 2013.
opinion of her first biographical subject, Margaret Fuller), or that she was too smart to be appealing (this latter pretext being one of the quintessential 19th century arguments against educating women). But in reality, and as she said about Fuller, “she loved women and knew them, and to the end of her life she served with earnestness and sincerity the world-wide community of her sex.” The married state was “superisolation” for women, Anthony argued; and men, she gibed, were “the wombless sex.”

Her sexuality has been discussed as much as her work, despite—or perhaps because of—her silence on the issue. She has been decisively labeled a lesbian, and less decisively labeled not a lesbian. No one has claimed forthrightly that she was heterosexual, which she wasn’t. Katharine Anthony’s longest and most intimate relationship was with a woman, Elisabeth Irwin (Figure 1.1.), an educator, psychologist, and founder of the Little Red Schoolhouse in Manhattan with whom she adopted several children, some legally and some not, although there is evidence that Anthony wasn’t enthusiastic about becoming a mother. Anthony prized clear thinking and thorough research, both of which came into conflict with the all-consuming task of raising young children. “My domestic problems take a good deal of time as you can imagine with

__________

7 KA, MF, 31.
8 Ibid., 61.
9 KA, FGS, 16, 99.
10 For instance, KA’s niece, Aida Whedon (AW), remembers an argument between KA and EI about adopting children. KA was against it, but EI persisted. See AW to Alden Waitt, Thursday, November 5, probably 1985, Katharine Anthony Papers, unprocessed, Lesbian Herstory Archive, Brooklyn, New York (heretofore LHA). There is also a Christmas card from one of their adopted daughters, Katharine Irwin, to KA postmarked three weeks after KA had died, December 13, 1965 (she died on November 20). The card, found in the Whedon Barn (heretofore WB), has nothing written on it other than a signature: Katharine Irwin Hawkins. TW said simply: “Kate wanted to write. Kids weren’t her thing.” TW, phone interview with the author, September 30, 2013.
young children,” she confided to a friend. But at least “[i]t keeps me from being too theoretical about women’s place in the world.”11

She had strawberry blonde hair, blue eyes, and a subtle, teasing grin. She stood 5’ 5”. She was not a good driver, but what she lacked in skill, she said she made up for in energy. She was thrifty, and “hate[d] like fury to pay interest.”12 Her favorite flowers were daffodils. According to one acquaintance, “she was deliberate and slow of speech, tenacious as a bull dog.”13 Another claimed she was “one of the dangerous, disturbing people who accomplish perfectly whatever they may attempt.”14 She enjoyed the theater, but she had little time for art and music, probably because, as she wrote about her distant relative and eighth biographical subject, Susan B. Anthony, “[s]he had a fine ear and eye for the beauty of ethical conduct, and that was all she asked for aesthetic enjoyment.”15 Perhaps the closest she came to actively participating in the New York City art scene was when she helped establish The Town Hall on W 43rd Street, an egalitarian educational and performance space that did away with boxed sections and gave rise to the phrase “not a bad seat in the house.”16

12 KA to JR, April 28, 1956, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
15 KA, Susan B. Anthony: Her Personal History and Her Era (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1954), viii. Heretofore SBA.
16 The Town Hall was founded in 1921 by The League for Political Education, a feminist organization devoted to educating all people on current events and issues. In 1930, KA
She loved animals and had a cat named Omar, a goat named Shennanigans (called ‘Nanny’ for short), and two disobedient Irish terriers—Patty and Whiskers—that harassed dinner guests underneath the table. “The dogs are just as usual,” she wrote unapologetically to a friend, “a little bad I’m afraid.”\textsuperscript{17} She called one of her reading chairs the “dog and man chair,” because it was too wide for one person to use, but too small for two. It was just right, however, for the addition of a dog.\textsuperscript{18}

Upon meeting her, you probably would have been baffled, as several journalists were, that she had been born and raised in the South, and in the last two decades of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. She despised sentimentalism and rejected Christianity as swiftly and coolly as she rejected men’s power over women, advocating a “post-Christian” ethics, a New Morality.\textsuperscript{19} Genesis was nothing but “masculine literature … full of heaped-up insults against their sex.”\textsuperscript{20} St. Paul was “the first of all anti-feminists.”\textsuperscript{21} The only exodus Katharine Anthony cared about was “[t]he exodus of the unmarried women from the

\textsuperscript{17}KA to ESD, December 13, 1931, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{18}KA to Viola Paradise, July 29, 1954, Box 6, Folder 3, Matthew and Hannah Josephson Collection, American Heritage Center, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming. Heretofore MHJ-AHC.
\textsuperscript{19}KA, FGS, 144.
\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., 241.
home.”

She maintained that “the mother of sin was not the tempter of Adam; she was the betrayer of her sex.” Her “modern sermon on the mount” was a 1915 Norwegian law protecting “illegitimate” children. The Bolshevik Revolution was “the great rainbow after the world flood.” And the biggest lesson people should learn from the virgin birth, she pronounced during one holiday season, is that single working mothers need help.

She hated the heat and kept a large collection of broad-brimmed hats for sunny weather. She lost her southern accent by her thirties and returned home to Arkansas only once that we know of after she moved to New York City in 1908. The only thing “southern” about her, one reporter suggested, was her hospitality. She never seemed in a hurry. Those who knew her well might have seen her southern roots in her habits and preferences: she chewed snuff, drank buttermilk, and chose molasses over marmalade.

Routine was her religion, a daily comfort in times of tragedy, of which there were too many. Both of her parents, Elisabeth, and a son would die horrific deaths. She mourned her losses by surrounding herself with strangers and falling into the predictable and reassuring rhythms of research and writing. “I tackled my book as a kind of an

---

22 KA, *FGS*, 172.
23 Ibid., 248.
24 KA to ESD, March 20, 1917, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL.
25 KA to ESD, January 24, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
27 Pearl Crawford (PC) to KA, July 1932, WB.
29 See for instance KA to JR, October 23, 1942, Reel 8, Folder 165, JR-SL; and KA to JR, January 18, 1943, Reel 8, Folder 165, JR-SL.
opiate, I suppose,” she said after her son killed himself.\textsuperscript{30} She called her “type of research, home-made, hand-made, and self-made, [which] as you know, takes a lot of time”; but the door to her office always opened promptly after five hours of work.\textsuperscript{31} “I do not push myself, nor hurry myself, nor fret,” she said.\textsuperscript{32}

As a child, she read Charles Dickens, Walter Scott, William Thackeray, and the \textit{Encyclopedia Britannica}; but she developed her intellectual legs reading George Bernard Shaw and Henry James, both of whom she credited (along with Sigmund Freud) for her biographical writing later in life. She read novels and especially admired the works of Thomas Mann, Virginia Woolf, Somerset Maugham, Christopher Morley, John Steinbeck, and G.K. Chesterton—the latter with whom she once rode in an elevator and commented approvingly on “his nice fat face and manner. He seems as real as roast beef.”\textsuperscript{33} She liked the more obscure works of G.B. Stern, John Gatsworthy, and Warwick Deeping. She preferred, however, to read history. She wrote poetry and dabbled with fiction. She was fluent in German and French, and she knew enough Russian to get around. She met Lenin, tried on Catherine the Great’s dresses, had her portrait sketched by Katharine Anne Porter (rumored a lover), and got on Willa Cather’s nerves, her neighbor in Greenwich Village.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{30} KA to ESD, February 26, 1951, Box 26, Folder 440, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{31} KA to Blanche Knopf (BK), March 16, 1946, Box 42, Folder 1, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., Collection, Harry Ransom Center, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas. Heretofore AK-HRC.
\textsuperscript{32} Frances L. Garside, “An Arkansas Girl Goes a Long Way: Katharine S. Anthony is Recognized Authority on Russian History,” Box 2, Tom Love Newspaper Clippings Collection, Dean B. Ellis Library, Archives and Special Collections, Arkansas State University, Jonesboro, Arkansas. Heretofore TLN-ASU.
\textsuperscript{33} Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
\textsuperscript{34} TW maintains that a sketch found in his barn was done by Katharine Anne Porter (KAP), and that KAP and KA were lovers.
To be sure, her personality was complicated, full of apparent contradictions. She has been called attentive and detached; impersonal, but not uninterested. A relative remembered her as “ordinary, but somehow you knew there lurking there a hell of a lot she was not letting on to.” She was fiercely independent, yet never rash. She denounced prostitution, and in the same breath, defended the prostitute—a paradox she claimed was “magnificently logical.” She was often self-deprecating; but she upheld the restoration of a woman’s self-respect as the epitome of women’s emancipation. She wrote prodigiously; but if you told her a secret you could be certain it would never get repeated. She advised people to play their cards close to the table. Almost unanimously, people remember her as witty (there is even some suggestion that she was known as “the wit of Greenwich Village”). She was stubborn, but she never held a grudge: when no one remembered her 80th birthday, she “got across the line just the same without help.”

35 “Miss Katharine Susan Anthony Displays Sentiment in Search for Old Relic of Her Family,” 1926, unknown newspaper, Box 7, Folder 1, MHJ-AHC.
36 Letter from Dan Whedon (DW) to Waitt, October 25, 1985, LHA.
37 See, for instance, KA to JR, January 20, 1955, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL: “[D]on’t be rash just because you happen to be independent.”
39 TW, phone interview with the author, September 30, 2013.
40 DW to Waitt, October 25, 1985, LHA.
41 TW, phone interview with the author, September 30, 2013; KA to George Middleton, October 13, 1960, George Middleton Papers, Box 86, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Also, TW remembers an argument between his father, Dan Whedon (DW), and KA in the 1950s over the execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. KA strongly opposed the sentence. The two apparently didn’t speak for a year, which TW remembers as his father’s doing. They reconciled a year later over a bottle of whisky. TW in discussion with author, East Berkshire, Vermont, July 2014.
She was a feminist, socialist, and early Freudian, a devout believer in psychoanalysis without ever having experienced it. She firmly maintained that people could not accurately recount their childhoods. The only time she was asked to write a longer autobiographical piece, she returned her completed work to the editor with the following note: “I trust that the material I send will supply the facts for the article you contemplated.”

She craved facts, a passion that bordered on obsession. She maintained that she could never write a biography about Cleopatra or Pilate’s wife for a lack of sources. Yet she somehow left room for ambiguity and interpretation. “I forget that there are these literal black-and-white minds and one must be on one’s guard against them,” she wrote to a friend. “Myself, I find that few things in life can be judged on this literal basis.” She came closest to herself by writing other women’s lives.

She was strongly political, unapologetically tendentious, a pacifist who believed ardently in revolution, “complete liberalism,” an overhaul of the easy but inefficient “bourgeois” vision of political democracy where “it seems impossible even to get the babies registered as they are born.” But apart from marching in a suffrage parade in New York City, placing anti-conscription cards on vehicles in 1917 (for which she was arrested), and riding in a peace parade in Chicago in 1932, she almost always avoided

42 KA to Stanley J. Kunitz, May 18, 1933, Stanley Kunitz Papers, Box 94, Folder 4, Manuscripts Division of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Heretofore SK-PU.
43 Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.”
44 Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
45 KA to ESD, November 3, 1924, Box 26, Folder 437, ESD-SL.
46 KA to ESD, December 12, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL; KA to ESD, May 1920, Box 26, Folder 434, ESD-SL; KA, “Marriage Laws in Russia,” *The New Republic* 26 (May 4, 1921): 302.
political activism. She chose political sides, she said, by considering “which [one], for the moment, seems to be the most practical way of serving the cause of a civilized life for the greatest number of people.” Her heroes were Fiorello La Guardia, FDR, and Eleanor Roosevelt.

As she grew older, she despised leaving the house on Sundays. She worked on crossword puzzles, went for daily walks, watched the Dodgers religiously, and usually saw at least one movie a week. She flew on an airplane for the first (and only) time when she was eighty-one, and she wasn’t impressed. “So now I have done it and it is nothing at all,” she said. She wrote letters, read Proust, smoked cigarettes, and gained weight. Her closest friend after Elisabeth died, Jeanette Rankin, gave her a scale to combat the fluctuations, and “every Tuesday on the Tuesday I weigh,” she reported. She snored so loud that it shook the house. She was often lonely and conversed primarily with “the radio and the cat,” she told a friend. Sometimes she felt depressed: she painted the walls of her New York City townhouse a blue-gray, because “[t]he color just suits me.” She published her last biography when she was eighty years old, and probably didn’t publish another because she developed arthritis in her wrists.

---

48 See, for example, KA to Marie Mattingly Meloney, January 23, 1930, Box 1, Marie Mattingly Meloney Papers, Rare Books and Special Collections, Columbia University, New York, New York. Heretofore MMM-CU.
49 KA to JR, May 4, 1959, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
50 KA to JR, October 25, 1954, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
51 KA to JR, November 30, 1958, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
52 KA to JR, November 4, 1954, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
53 Marjorie R. Longwell to the Administrator of the Estate of Katharine Anthony, December 6, 1965, WB.
Katharine Anthony died of a heart attack at St. Vincent’s hospital in New York City one week before her 88th birthday, in 1965, and her work was out of print shortly thereafter. “How fast are we forgotten!”, she remarked about Elisabeth Irwin’s legacy, but she could have been talking about any number of women’s lives and work, including her own.54

This is an attempt to restore Katharine Anthony’s life and work to history and memory—at least the first five decades of her long life. There is much left to be done. But this is a beginning: the birth of a biographer.

* * *

What stands out in researching the life and work of Katharine Susan Anthony fifty years after her death are the countless statements attesting to her talent, wit, and notoriety from the first half of the twentieth century and her near-invisibility today. From 1915, the year she published her first individual book-length study, through 1958, the year she published her last, Anthony’s sociological, feminist, and life studies were lauded by the likes of Floyd Dell, Inez Haynes Gillmore, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Henry Holt, Marie Jenney Howe, Matthew Josephson, Blanche Knopf, Mary Margaret McBride, H.L. Mencken, Frances Perkins, Katharine Anne Porter, Jeanette Rankin, and Carl Van Doren.55

---

54 KA to JR, April 25, 1956, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
Katharine Anthony’s biography of Catherine the Great—her second, published in 1925 by literary powerhouse couple Alfred and Blanche Knopf—sold over 100,000 copies; and *Queen Elizabeth*, her third life study, became a Literary Guild selection in 1929, for which she was awarded the significant sum of $5,000.56 “Your writing will go down through the ages as brilliant psychoanalytic biography and most clear interpretation of the various periods and backgrounds of the characters you have chosen to portray,” Chicago philanthropist Ethel Sturges Dummer wrote to Katharine Anthony after reading *Queen Elizabeth*.57

In 1931, when the future Poet Laureate Stanley Kunitz was putting together a biographical compendium of 20th-century authors, he consulted over 400 experts with a list of nearly 3,000 names. Katharine Anthony was among the final 320 to make it into

eyewitness and a participant in the intellectual, political, and business events of the controversial 1930s (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), 38. HLM’s praise is especially notable considering the generally negative opinion he held about Arkansas and its people. The same year that he praised KA’s biography, he referred to Arkansas as “the most shiftless and backward State in the whole galaxy,” and he claimed that the people of Arkansas were “too stupid to see what is the matter with them.” “[T]he Southerner,” HLM wrote, is “a walking sarcophagus of dead ideas.” It’s likely that KA kept quiet about her roots, for HLM said that he didn’t know any New Yorker, “not one,” he claimed, “who has penetrated the miasmatic jungles of Arkansas.” See HLM, “The South Begins to Mutter,” *The Smart Set* 65 (August 1921): 141.

56 KA’s obituary in the *New York Times* states that both *Catherine the Great* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925) and *Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929) sold over 100,000 copies (heretofore *CG* and *QE*.) See also Stanley Kunitz, ed., “Katharine Susan Anthony,” *Authors Today and Yesterday* (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1933), 17, where KA mentions 100,000 as the number of copies sold. *CG* was already in its fourth edition in 1926. In 1954, a representative for Alfred Knopf publishers wrote to KA that it had sold 15,900 copies, presumably in the last year. See Shirley Chidsey to KA, May 3, 1954, Box 42, Folder 1, AK-HRC. The Editor-In-Chief of Doubleday wrote to KA: “We intend to back *Susan B. Anthony* with a promotion that we hope will sell the book to the thousands of people who should read it.” See Ken McCormick to KA, April 9, 1954, WB. In comparison, 9,000 copies of Lytton Strachey’s *Eminent Victorians* were printed in the first year and nine months after its publication in May 1918.

57 ESD to KA, October 17, 1929, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
the book, alongside Herman Hesse, Thomas Hardy, D. H. Lawrence, and Joseph Conrad. In 1943, Anthony was one of the “master” writers invited to speak about her technique for the “Authors Guild Craftsman Series” at New York University. Her biography of Dolly Madison (her seventh), was the answer to one of the popular New York Times double-crostic puzzles in 1949. P.W. Wilson lauded Anthony’s work in the New York Times in the 1940s: “For the full and intimate characterizations in which Miss Anthony attains to the highest standards of the new biography, there can be nothing but praise.” After reading Anthony’s biography of Susan B. Anthony (1958), the Editor-In-Chief of Doubleday overflowed with praise: “My admiration for this book and for you as a biographer is unbounded. I think this is a masterly portrait. … Congratulations on a really brilliant performance.” Her obituary in The New York Times commemorated her life and work with the headline, “Katharine Anthony Dies at 87; Biographer of Famous Women.”

Even one of Katharine Anthony’s negative reviews speaks to her popularity as a biographer. Willa Cather was notorious for dismissing women writers, regardless of their talent. “[S]he did not meet, or admit much interest in, … Edith Wharton or Ellen Glasgow or Gertrude Stein,” Hermione Lee tells us in her biography of Cather.

Although Anthony and Cather were neighbors in Greenwich Village (Anthony lived at 23

---

58 Kunitz, preface to Authors Today and Yesterday, v.
61 P.W. Wilson quoted in the front matter of KA, The Lambs.
62 Ken McCormick to KA, April 9, 1954, WB.
Bank Street and Cather lived at 5 Bank Street), and Anthony supposedly expressed interest in meeting her, they were never introduced. Cather detested the turn to “psychography” after World War I and was especially put off by Anthony’s biography of Louisa May Alcott, published in 1938. “I see the Freud fanatics are getting on your nerves, as they are on mine,” Cather wrote to Henry Seidel Canby, who had reviewed Anthony’s book in the *Saturday Review of Literature*. “Catherine the Great might be called fair game for Miss Anthony’s obsession, but certainly that warm-hearted and very practical New England spinster was not.”

Today, however, Katharine Anthony’s name is usually only familiar to a few readers and writers of early feminism who note her involvement with the radical feminist group Heterodoxy; her relationship with Elisabeth Irwin; or her first individual book, *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* (1915). She is sometimes referenced by scholars of social conditions in progressive-era New York City who rely on her

---


sociological study Mothers Who Must Earn (1914) for its exhaustive statistics and tables. At best, she has been recognized as a “pioneering psycho-biographer.” Her eleven books are out of print, and there has been no serious study published about her life and work, an oversight that led one scholar and friend, Hannah Josephson, to chastise second-wave American feminists in the 1970s: “It is amazing, not to say shameful, that the current liberation movement has not acknowledged [Anthony’s] pioneer work.” Indeed, like so many women’s lives and work, Katharine Anthony has essentially vanished, in C. Van Woodward’s phrase, in that twilight zone between living memory and written history.

But as Katharine Anthony wrote of her first biographical subject, Margaret Fuller, Anthony’s corpus “deserve[s] to be rescued from the dusty attic and classed with some of our newest wisdom.” This is the first systematic book-length study of Katharine Anthony.

---

68 DuBois, “Making Women’s History,” 68.
69 Hannah Josephson (HJ), “Katharine Anthony and Elisabeth Irwin,” unpublished manuscript, Chapter 3, page 1a, LHA. In 1951, only MF was out of print. See KA to BK, April 26, 1951, Box 42, Folder 1, AK-HRC. KA’s first book, Mothers Who Must Earn, is in print through The Michigan Historical Reprint Series, a digital preservation effort; her second book, Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, is in print through ULAN Press, also a digital historical preservation press; and her third book and first biography, Margaret Fuller, can be obtained through The Cornell University Library Digital Collections. All other books can be purchased used, and generally only as first editions. Two articles have been published about KA since her death in 1965: Alden Waitt, “Katharine Anthony: Feminist Biographer with the ‘Warmth of an Advocate’,” Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies 10 (1988): 72-77; and Eleanor Mapes Francis, “Arkansas Lives: Katharine Susan Anthony,” Arkansas Libraries 38 (Fall 1981): 31-36.
71 KA, MF, iv.
Anthony’s life and distinctive contributions to twentieth-century feminism. As Deirdre Bair has argued of her biographical subject, Anaïs Nin, Anthony was a “major minor writer,” deserving of both literary and critical rehabilitation in the twenty-first century.\textsuperscript{72} Her work, from first to last, interacted with American society and exhibited a profound thoughtfulness toward the social and political issues of the day. Before turning to biography in 1918, Anthony fought for “illegitimate” children, working mothers, maternity insurance, mothers’ pensions, prostitution laws, and pacifism, at a time when few American feminists did so, especially in tandem. She courageously sought an international feminism in the midst of World War I—a global network of women who could share ideas and work together toward common goals, overcoming language barriers, cultural differences, and the thousands of miles that separated them because of their shared experiences as women in a world defined by men.

Perhaps most astonishing, Katharine Anthony argued for the complete emancipation of women, putting intellectual, emotional, and psychological reforms on a higher plane than political ones. For Anthony, the “psychological residue of subjection in the individual woman soul” was the single greatest problem facing women in the second decade of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{73} Self-hatred and antipathy between women were pervasive and debilitating, she said. But through an “international machinery of women’s organizations,” women might find “a vast nexus of communication between woman and woman by means of which the new attitude of sex-affirmation is fostered.”\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72} Deirdre Bair, \textit{Anaïs Nin: A Biography} (New York: Putnam, 1995).
\textsuperscript{73} KA, \textit{FGS}, 231.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 233.
Anthony found her niche—and the most effective way to address the largest number of concerns to the greatest number of people—writing women’s lives.

Indeed the overarching argument of this dissertation points to Katharine Anthony as the progenitor of modern feminist biography, a form that took seriously “the emancipation of woman both as a human-being and as a sex-being,” as Anthony put it.\(^\text{75}\) Anthony wrote almost exclusively about women, not only because she thought that she would naturally have more to say about her own sex.\(^\text{76}\) Much like Margaret Fuller, who argued that “[t]he observations of women upon the position of women are always more valuable than those of men,” Anthony believed that “the things that need to be said and done [for feminism] primarily need women to say and do them.”\(^\text{77}\) “It is hard for a man to get the girl’s point of view,” she stated simply.\(^\text{78}\) Only once did she write the biography of a man, in her 1945 dual biography of the siblings Charles and Mary Lamb, and only then because Charles kept butting in. “I started in to write about Mary Lamb,” she told Mary Margaret McBride, “and Charles forced himself into the picture so consistently that I just had to accept him!”\(^\text{79}\)

\(^{75}\) Ibid., 6.
\(^{76}\) KA explains her inclination to write about women in MMM-LC; and Kunitz, ed., *Authors Today and Yesterday*, 17-18.
\(^{77}\) KA, *MF*, 59; KA to ESD, January 17, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL.
\(^{78}\) KA to ESD, September 22, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL. See also KA to ESD, February 22, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL. In 1918, KA was part of a group of women who sought to start a feminist periodical and “thought that a journal which tried to express the point of view of women should be in the hands of women.”
\(^{79}\) MMM-LC. See also Ellen Hart Smith, review of *Dolly Madison: Her Life and Times*, by KA, in *New York Herald Tribune*, January 23, 1949: “Miss Anthony specializes in biography of women (it’s true that in ‘The Lambs’ there was Charles Lamb, but he was firmly tied to his sister Mary’s apron-strings).” Also, in 1942, the wife of the renowned psychoanalyst Smith Ely Jelliffe asked KA to write the life of her husband, but KA had “no intention of doing it.” KA to ESD, December 5, 1942, Box 26, Folder 439, ESD-SL. KA also suggested that men might be better at writing biographies of men. See KA to
After the publication of *Queen Elizabeth* in 1929, Lloyd Morris, a respected author and literary critic in New York City in the first half of the twentieth century, called Katharine Anthony the “Mother of Modern Biography”—a significant, albeit sexist, claim that should give anyone pause who seeks to understand the roots of modern biography, or the grounding of modern feminism, as historian Nancy Cott aptly titled her important study of twentieth-century feminism. Still others believed Anthony to be “the most accomplished exponent of modern biography in America,” presumably either male or female.80

Katharine Anthony’s life and work address several gaps in the history of modern American feminism, as well as the origins of modern biography. To date, very little history of feminism includes the ways in which writers, artists, and other avant-garde individuals and groups contributed to the development of women’s emancipation both before and after suffrage.81 But “if an entire sex is for the first time emerging into a realistic daylight,” as one contemporary wrote in an article about Katharine Anthony in 1927, “a considerable share of responsibility must be attributed, as always, to certain artists; —in this case, to those writers who, not so many years ago, first daringly represented women

---

80 Anonymous quote in Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.”

81 A 1990 article addresses “one of the first collective, ideological, artistic expressions by American women,” which occurred in the name of suffrage, but this was during the campaign for the vote. See Alice Sheppard, “Suffrage Art and Feminism,” *Hypatia* 5 (Summer 1990): 122-136. A 2011 study by Cheryl Higashida focuses on black women writers in the five decades after World War II. See *Black Internationalist Feminism: Women Writers of the Black Left, 1945-1995* (Urbana-Champaign: The University of Illinois Press, 2011).
as adult and competent human beings.”

As Hermione Lee claimed of her biographical subject, Virginia Woolf, Katharine Anthony’s “feminist programme ... [was] above all a literary one,” and contributes significantly to our understanding of women’s lives and women’s work in the decades surrounding the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment.

Furthermore, as historian Judith Allen has argued, feminism in the first two decades of the twentieth century remains “underestimated, warranting firmer location within an array of early twentieth-century reform impulses.” Like Allen’s study of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, an examination of the life and work of Katharine Anthony helps us accomplish this goal. Anthony’s writing career began in the 1910s, and her two book-length publications during this time—Mothers Who Must Earn (1914) and Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia (1915)—were significant contributions to the feminist fight before suffrage.

Katharine Anthony’s work is also important for understanding feminism beyond 1920. Her daring to be and write about women in their full humanity and sexuality, a focus that grew out of her work in the 1910s and began in earnest in 1918, when she started to write the biography of Margaret Fuller, is one way that feminism developed after suffrage, and it is a story that needs to be told. Early histories of the American women’s movement halted their discussions at 1920, inadvertently (or not) making the Nineteenth Amendment the denouement of women’s activism until the 1960s came along and, seemingly out of nowhere, reinvigorated the fight for women’s rights.

—

84 Allen, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 4.
earliest accounts of post-suffrage feminism concluded that, “[t]he women’s rights movement expired in the twenties from ailments that had gone untreated in its glory days.”86 Although this narrative has long been rejected by scholars who have written about working class women, women of color, and the herculean efforts of several remarkable individuals, such as Eleanor Roosevelt and Ellen S. Woodward, Linda Kerber rightly noted as recently as 2002 that “[a] lot of folks are still telling [the] story [of feminism in the 1960s] as though Betty Friedan simply wrote a book.”87 Anthony’s

---

feminist biographical career, which lasted from 1920 to 1958, nearly perfectly encapsulates the years traditionally considered to be the “doldrums” of American feminism and helps to enlarge and complicate the narrative of modern feminism, suggesting significant points of continuity amidst these undoubtedly fraught decades.\(^{88}\)

Historian Ellen Carol DuBois has also noted the “precious little historiography of women’s history before 1970.”\(^ {89}\) Laurel Thatcher Ulrich has similarly drawn attention to the neglect by both feminist historians and feminist literary scholars of women’s early history writing.\(^ {90}\) Several important studies have begun to fill the gap.\(^ {91}\) But still missing

---

88 Estelle Freedman thinks that biography is particularly useful for writing the history of women after suffrage: “[p]erhaps by studying the lives of countless individual women during the 1920s and after scholars will begin to discover patterns of response to both opportunities and discrimination,” Freedman writes. “Only after extensive research has been completed can historians generalize successfully about the new woman.” See Freedman, “The New Woman,” 393.


is an account of modern feminist biography, an important development and feminist tool in the years immediately following the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment that was distinct from both history writing and modern biography, and that Katharine Anthony nearly singlehandedly pushed forward.

The term “modern feminist biography” requires clarification. The genre is not merely a sub-field of “modern biography,” although the two forms are related. They developed out of the same historical moment, and in order to arrive at a genesis narrative for modern feminist biography the history of modern biography is necessary. But modern biography and modern feminist biography were not one and the same.

Modern biography’s most salient characteristic was its departure from the hagiographic portraits of earlier decades in favor of more authentic, relatable, or “real” characters (modern biography is also referred to as “realistic” biography, and “new” biography).92 “The Victorian mind condemned human nature whenever it significantly


92 We would do well here to consider Hermione Lee’s warning about firmly cementing biographical writing into dichotomies like old/new. “Cultural shifts get over-simplified,” she rightly points out; “biography is always spilling out of such neat patterns.” Lee, Biography: A Very Short Introduction (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 72. Likewise, I am not suggesting a strict 19th century/20th century, hagiographic/modern separation in the genre of life writing, but rather a shift that often saw a mixture of methods at work in a single book. “What I see,” Lee writes, and I concur, “is the continual recurrence, in different contexts, of the same questions of definition, value, and
failed to approximate its ideals,” Katharine Anthony conveyed in an interview in the 1920s. “The modern mind is surprised, not by the evidence of failure, but by the persistence of ideals and the occasional approximate success.”93 As early as 1881, George Bernard Shaw joked that what the genre really needed was a biography called Queen Victoria: By a Personal Acquaintance Who Dislikes Her. But it would take another four decades before Shaw’s suggestion was realized.

The catalysts were the First World War and psychoanalysis, although, as Hermione Lee rightly notes, “a surge of factors, great and small, local and global ... all played their part in the shake-up [of biography],” including John Anthony Froude’s shocking tell-all biography of Thomas Carlyle in the 1880s, the trial of Oscar Wilde on charges of homosexuality in 1895, and the death of Queen Victoria in 1901.94 But for Katharine Anthony, it was primarily the first two—the war and Freud—that rattled the genre. The war had made “a graveyard of human lives and human illusions,” she wrote in a 1938 essay titled “Realistic Biography: The Development of a Form of Literature.” “We who had outlived it, entered a world tenanted by a new type of human being; and the introduction to him was not pleasant. We had too many overwhelming shocks and revelations to look on mankind any longer with the same old comforting and trusting idealism. There was no way of reviving the old naïve worship with which we had been

---

93 Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.” This is not a direct quote from KA. Morris is here summarizing KA’s sentiment. Years later, KA attributed the quote to Morris, although in analyzing Morris’s original article, it seems that the former is closer to the truth. See KA, “Writing Biography,” in The Writer’s Book, edited by Helen Hall (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), 220.
94 Lee, Biography, 73.
accustomed to view our former great heroes.” In other words, human nature was on the coroner’s table, and the public demanded a diagnosis.

As it turned out, the coroner had a name. Sigmund Freud, who visited the United States only once—in 1909—but whose ideas produced a “mad epidemic of Freudianism” within a year, provided a new language of analysis to an anxious public. Katharine Anthony called Freud a “prophet,” and psychoanalysis a “vitalizing inflow” to biography, a “vivifying connection,” a way to dissect the mysterious “emotional complexes” of human beings. “I think Freud has given us a tremendous discovery concerning the development of the emotions, the inefficacy of the morality of repression, and the great sanitary value of the mere perception of reality,” she wrote to a friend in 1919, while she was at work on Margaret Fuller. “And when the smoke of the battle has cleared away, I think we shall find that Freud has given us an understanding of the psychic side of sexuality such as we have never had before.” Indeed Freud was so critical to the development of modern biography that Anthony warned “[c]ritics who cry out against the Freudian influence” to “not read modern biography at all.”

The book attributed with inaugurating the field was British author Lytton Strachey’s Eminent Victorians (1918), which toppled Victorian propriety in just over 200

96 Quoted in Buhle, Feminism and Its Discontents, 5.
97 KA, “Realistic Biography,” 296; KA in Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 17.
98 KA to ESD, October 23, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL.
99 KA, “Realistic Biography,” 296.
pages with witty, scandalous, “warts and all” portraits of four previously revered individuals (Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale, Dr. Thomas Arnold, and General Charles Gordon)—a stark departure from the mostly prolix, mostly positive biographies that preceded it. “As a matter of fact,” Katharine Anthony wrote,

the change in this field came with the publication of Strachey’s “Eminent Victorians.” It was a præmaeval experience when readers started to peruse the details of august reputations … and discovered that they were reading about living human beings. It was also a little astonishing to discover that like all living creatures they could not be regarded as saints and angels, totems and Olympians. They developed in their lifelike portraits faults and blemishes which as august reputations they had lacked. But the instinct of the public was somehow on the side of the living replicas instead of the staring idols; and so “Eminent Victorians” became the preferred way of looking at historical figures, and the stimulus of a literary revival.100

Lloyd Morris, however, claimed that it was Katharine Anthony’s Margaret Fuller (1920) that deserved the credit Eminent Victorians usually received: the publication of Fuller was “historic in the sense that it mark[ed] the beginning of modern biography in our literature,” Morris wrote.101 Like Strachey, Anthony sought to create “lifelike portraits” of people who had “faults and blemishes.” But Anthony did not try to emulate Strachey. In fact, she was almost finished with Fuller before she had even read Eminent Victorians. “Long before Strachey had appeared on my horizon,” Anthony revealed in an interview in the early 1930s,

I had been wishing somebody would write interesting biographies. Perhaps some had been written even then, but I had not seen them. Emil Ludwig was still unheard of; E. Keble Chatterton was not even a name to me, and I had not yet seen any of Gamaliel Bradford’s psychographs. The historical biographies I had studied were accurate enough, but they made dull reading. They lacked life, color, movement. The incidents related too often had neither point nor dramatic value, the dates were mere numerals

100 Ibid., 294.
101 Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.”
and the characters had no more life than a wooden Indian before a cigar store. I wanted to read biographies that would give me the facts and that would at the same time have all the fascination of a well written realistic novel. ... There must be some attention paid to dramatic arrangement, and some use of the imagination, or the writing is nothing but a stringing out of hit-or-miss facts, about as interesting as the multiplication table and not nearly so easy to remember. ... But it was years before it ever occurred to me that I might myself be able to write a readable biography.102

After finishing her second biography in 1925, Katharine Anthony confessed in an interview that, “[t]here was a time when I felt that to accomplish anything for myself I must read what others had written, and I read enormously. That is a mistake. If one does creative work, one must not confine one’s self to learning of what others have created. I find I do better work when I read scarcely at all. ... I find more inspiration for work in going into my kitchen and preparing a meal or engaging in any other household task.”103

Thus, Katharine Anthony was disappointed when she learned that Strachey was writing a biography of Queen Elizabeth at the same time as she was, in 1928, but Anthony knew their books would be different enough to keep on with her own work. “I need not begrudge him the field,” she said.104 “It is the author’s hard luck, not the reader’s, when two biographies of the same person appear in the same year.”105 When both books were published—Strachey’s in 1928 and Anthony’s in 1929—one reviewer

102 KA quoted in Maury, “Herald of Queens.” Emil Ludwig was a German-Swiss writer who published his first biography the same year as KA, in 1920. He would go on to publish several more. E. Keble Chatterton was a British writer who began publishing books with (mostly) maritime themes in the 1910s. Gamaliel Bradford was an American writer and pioneer of “psychography” who published his first book in 1912, Lee the American, followed by Portraits of Women (1916) and Damaged Souls (1923). In twenty years, Bradford published 114 biographies.
103 KA quoted in Garside, “Arkansas Girl,” TLN-ASU.
104 KA to ESD, March 23, 1928, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
105 KA, “Realistic Biography,” 297.
tellingly noted that readers “will like Katharine Anthony’s ‘Queen Elizabeth’ (Knopf, $4.00), and this even if they have read Strachey’s ‘Elizabeth and Essex.’”\textsuperscript{106}

Indeed, Lytton Strachey’s Elizabeth was strikingly different from Katharine Anthony’s, which is clearly illustrated in two passages. Strachey’s Elizabeth “succeeded by virtue of all the qualities which every hero should be without—dissimulation, pliability, indecision, procrastination, parsimony.”\textsuperscript{107} There was also, unmistakably, “a touch of the sinister about her.”\textsuperscript{108} Ironically, Strachey concluded, it was Elizabeth’s femininity [that] saved her. ... [H]ad she possessed, according to the approved pattern of the strong man of action, the capacity for taking a line and sticking to it—she would have been lost. ... Only a woman could have shuffled so shamelessly, only a woman could have abandoned with such unscrupulous completeness the last shreds not only of consistency, but of dignity, honour, and common decency, in order to escape the appalling necessity of having, really and truly, to make up her mind. Yes it is true that a woman’s evasiveness was not enough; male courage, male energy were needed, if she were to escape the pressure that came upon her from every side. Those qualities she also possessed; but their value to her—it was the final paradox of her career—was merely that they made her strong enough to turn her back, with an indomitable persistence, upon the ways of strength.\textsuperscript{109}

In sharp contrast, Katharine Anthony’s Elizabeth was “paradoxical and complicated,” a woman who,

\begin{quote}
[t]o the end of her life ... could never decide which of her characters [masculine or feminine] she preferred. She relished her perquisites as a woman and enjoyed those of men which she had usurped. ... In the same breath she would cling, womanlike, to chivalry and would threaten with male aggressiveness. She carried coyness and coquettishness to an unnatural extreme, yet all the men who attracted her were dependent on her bounty and her domination. She flirted like a schoolgirl almost to her death-bed [and] swore like a swaggering stripling to the verge of her
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{106} Emily Newell Blair, “When a Mother Tests a Book,” unknown source, WB.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 12, 16.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 13.
grave. ... [But] [t]hrough all her wavering and inconstancy, her hesitation and uncertainty, there was one faithful element—her sense of responsibility to her position. She never once lost sight of that for at least fifty years. Wherever the thin, unbeautiful, lone woman found the sources for it is a mystery. It remains one of the miracles of human character.\textsuperscript{110}

Clearly, Lytton Strachey did not think it was “his business to be complimentary,” as he wrote in the Preface to \textit{Eminent Victorians}, whereas Katharine Anthony wrote with “the warmth of the advocate,” as she wrote in the Preface to \textit{Margaret Fuller}.\textsuperscript{111}

Nor did Katharine Anthony try to emulate Freud, who had published a biography of Leonardo da Vinci in 1916.\textsuperscript{112} Of \textit{Leonardo} Anthony concluded, “that is diagnosis, a very different treatment from mine in the case of my subject [Margaret Fuller].”\textsuperscript{113} She refuted claims that hers was a “psychoanalytical study,” despite the subtitle of \textit{MF}—A \textit{Psychological Biography}—which was almost certainly chosen by the publishers to increase sales.\textsuperscript{114}

\begin{footnotes}
\item KA, \textit{QE}, 253, 256, 258. It is noteworthy that Strachey put his judgment of Elizabeth’s character at the beginning of \textit{Elizabeth and Essex}, letting his opinion inform the rest of the work; whereas KA revealed hers only at the end. Her comments on Elizabeth’s femininity, psychology, and character comprise the final ten pages of the book, suggesting that KA preferred her readers to come to their own conclusions before learning hers.
\item Strachey, \textit{Eminent Victorians}, 6; KA, \textit{MF}, v. KA criticized Bradford’s work for, like Strachey’s, being too negative. “Gamaliel Bradford took great pains to batter down Louisa Alcott’s reputation,” KA wrote in her biography of Alcott. “She was, in this critic’s opinion, mercenary, erratic, cold in her affections, and didactic. To these harsh strictures he added the further accusation that her work was not original.” See KA, \textit{Louisa May Alcott} (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1938), 292. Heretofore LMA.
\item Willis Steell, “Woman Author Defends Her Book,” \textit{Tampa Sunday Tribune}, September 18, 1921.
\item Ibid. It is also possible that the publisher misunderstood KA’s request for the cover of \textit{Margaret Fuller} to be like that of Barbara Low’s \textit{Psycho-Analysis: A Brief Account of the Freudian Theory}, also published in 1920. See Harcourt, Brace, and Howe (HBH) to KA, August 13, 1920, MHJ-AHC.
\end{footnotes}
While Katharine Anthony applied the two most prevalent characteristics of “modern biography” to her own work—realism and psychoanalysis—she used them not to shock, tarnish, or diagnose her subjects, like Strachey and Freud (she actually decreased the number of lovers Catherine the Great was said to have had, from 300 to 13, “if we count her husband”), but to expose the inner lives of women that had for so long been “overlaid by much gilt and varnish.”115 Anthony was embarking on something new in her biographies that “New Biography” did not address: Woman, in her full, emancipated, sexual, self-respecting state. She “removed all labels from the woman before she began the work of reconstruction,” as one reviewer wrote in the *New York Tribune* about Anthony’s work, and she rebuilt her full of the natural complexities that exist within every human being.116

Psychoanalysis was particularly useful to this endeavor. Although Freud said almost nothing about female sexuality prior to the 1920s—“[i]f anything, Freud tended to minimize the differences between the sexes,” historian Mari Jo Buhle writes in *Feminism and Its Discontents: A Century of Struggle With Psychoanalysis*—American feminists were not dissuaded from filling in the blanks with their own analyses.117 “[T]hey blithely integrated psychoanalytic tenets into the reigning theories of the day to create a potpourri of competing idea systems,” Buhle argues. “Pushing forward their own concern with female sexuality, they also formulated new recipes for emancipation. Through their

---

imaginative synthetic labors these first-wavers provided the inspiration for an all-out overhaul of Freudianism and feminism alike.”118

That both feminism and psychoanalysis reached American shores around the same time is indicative of Katharine Anthony’s developing feminist programme. “[F]eminism and psychoanalysis developed dialogically,” Buhle tells us, “that is, in continuous conversation with each other. ... The two systems occupied a common domain as theories of human liberation, even at subsequent moments of conflict or competition. ... No less than psychoanalysis, feminism heralded a definitive break with past endeavors.”119 Thus Katharine Anthony’s biographies had “all the essentials of a modern portrait,” as one reviewer noted, but there was something else unique about them.120 Critics often noted their singularity without fully explaining it. “You can find elsewhere in greater detail the story of Catherine [the Great’s] achievements, but nowhere will you find the woman Catherine as Miss Anthony has portrayed her,” one wrote.121 Anthony has “her own peculiar method of presentation,” another claimed.122 One reviewer pointed out that Anthony’s “ardent feminism … was expressed in all her biographies.”123 And yet another argued that she “ha[d] illustrated a new type of biography.”124

Perhaps most indicative of Katharine Anthony’s originality and importance as a biographer is an article that appeared in Equal Rights in 1927, the publication of the

118 Ibid., 23.
119 Ibid., 3, 2.
121 “Catherine the Great of Russia, Empress and Woman,” review of CG, by KA, New York Times, December 20, 1925.
122 Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
National Woman’s Party (NWP). Titled “Katharine Anthony—Creative Feminist,” the author, Olivia Howard Dunbar, claimed that Anthony had affected the “feminine imagination” with her unique portraits of women, which “at the moment [is] the most valuable effort toward the understanding of woman’s capacity that can be engaged in.”¹²⁵ Not only did Anthony perform “a gallant service of rescue” in her first biography by bringing “poor flattened out Margaret Fuller back to life,” Dunbar wrote; the book was also, “an important agency in the general coming to life of women of our own day—and this not in the political sense. For probably the most thrilling and significant feature of these decades wherein so many things are happening, is the discovery of women by themselves. ... This is the brilliant service to literature and to Feminism that Katharine Anthony is accomplishing.”¹²⁶

Olivia Howard Dunbar’s praise should not be overlooked or minimized. The articles in Equal Rights were generally keen and discriminating, avoiding hyperbole in favor of veracity. As Cott argues, “[t]he ideas, research, and analyses presented in Equal Rights were often outstandingly acute.”¹²⁷ It is especially significant that Dunbar singled out Katharine Anthony at a time when numerous feminists were working to preserve the legacies of suffrage pioneers by writing histories and biographies that “gave the legacy of woman’s rights a much-needed broadening after 1920, providing models of feminist heroism that extended beyond the outmoded role of the moralizing suffragette to appeal

¹²⁶ Ibid., 101, 102. Emphasis mine.
¹²⁷ Cott, Grounding of Modern Feminism, 79.
to younger women,” as historian Julie Des Jardins writes in Women & the Historical
Enterprise in America: Gender, Race, and the Politics of Memory, 1880-1945.128

Katharine Anthony was distinctive among this group—or rather, these groups.
Unlike the feminists of the more radical NWP who wrote “to relocate the American
suffrage legacy away from the maternalist politics of their conservative counterparts and
closer to a tradition of radical agitation”; and those of the National American Woman
Suffrage Association (NAWSA), renamed the League of Women Voters (LWV) after
1920, who “wrote their histories ... not only to distinguish their suffrage faction as the
most efficacious but also to win public acceptance to attack gender inequalities beyond
suffrage,” Katharine Anthony was concerned with her subject’s inner life and character,
and with the ways she might buttress the psychological emancipation of all women in the
present and future through her interpretation of women in the past.129 In fact, she
distanced herself from feminist organizations by the late 1910s, which she increasingly
viewed as inefficient, internecine, and even oftentimes “backwards”; and she almost
never concerned herself with radical agitation or public acceptance.130 Anthony battled
only against the “tyranny of the norm,” which she argued kept women shackled
regardless of their political victories.131 As one contemporary noted, “success meant less
to [Anthony] than integrity and expression.”132

128 Des Jardins, Women & the Historical Enterprise, 188.
129 Ibid., 189, 192. DuBois points out that NWP and NASAW historians disagreed so intensely about which organization was most responsible for the winning of suffrage “that they read each other out of their factional versions of history.” “Making Women’s History,” 66.
130 KA to ESD, August 26, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
131 KA, FGS, 240-241.
132 Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.”
DuBois has also pointed out the differences between “feminist” histories and “movement” histories. In fact, feminists “reacted against the history associated with this movement,” DuBois argues. “They replaced the ‘master narrative’ of women’s collective advancement with the search for individual women in conflict with social norms, a history which concentrated less on the inevitability of social reform than on the triumph of the individual over narrow social restrictions.”  

Indeed, Katharine Anthony lamented in 1915—three years before she began her first life study—the “feminist circles which have grown too accustomed to the invariable formula of the ‘enslavement of woman.’ It is ethically desirable that women who take a broad interest in the position of their sex—they are, of course, the feminists—should also take a more critical attitude toward its origin.”

The differences between the organization historians and Katharine Anthony is no more apparent than in their various interpretations of Susan B. Anthony. NWP historians determined that the best way to defeat maternalist sentiment in favor of radical feminism was to recast the suffrage icon “as the matron saint of feminist militancy.”  

In Jailed for Freedom (1920), Doris Stevens claimed that SBA “was the first woman to defy the law for the political liberty of her sex. ... In the national election of 1872 she voted in Rochester, New York, her home city, was arrested, tried and convicted of the crime of

134 KA, FGS, 247. A recent study by Lisa Tetrault shows that even the “origin” story of Seneca Falls, created in large part by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony in their History of Woman Suffrage, was constructed out of the conflicts within the women’s movement, as well as the racial dynamics of the late nineteenth century. Tetrault, The Myth of Seneca Falls: Memory and the Women’s Suffrage Movement, 1848-1898 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014).
135 Des Jardins, Women & the Historical Enterprise, 189.
‘voting without having a lawful right to do so.’” Stevens reasoned. Similarly, Rheta Child Dorr emphasized SBA’s “militant spirit” in *Susan B. Anthony: The Woman Who Changed the Mind of a Nation* (1928), and argued that the NWP’s mission was “to carry out the instructions of the great leader.” In contrast, Anna Shaw of the NAWSA portrayed SBA as a “disembodied spirit” who paid almost no attention to things like hunger, cold, privation, or fatigue. She emphasized Anthony’s “selflessness,” “humor,” “sympathy,” and “courage,” and claimed she was “the most wonderful woman I have ever known. ... From Miss Anthony, more than from any one else, I learned to keep cool,” Shaw wrote. Both organizations, however, “apotheosized Anthony, disagreeing only on which faction was her rightful heir,” as DuBois points out. They remained faithful to the “master narrative” and “embraced the notion that the ultimate victory of woman suffrage was a result of its being a ‘single issue’ movement, one which regarded all other causes as competitive with women’s advancement, and all ‘politics’ as male manifestations, equally hostile to the cause of women.”

Consequently, Des Jardins highlights Katharine Anthony’s work among the many feminists writing in the decades after suffrage. Although “[d]ozens of feminists, young and old, worked on projects to preserve [Susan B.] Anthony’s memory in the years following the passing of the Nineteenth Amendment,” Des Jardins writes, “[i]n 1954

---

137 Ibid., 3.
140 Ibid., 191, 159, 196-197.
Katharine Anthony performed the most complete sexual makeover of Susan B. Anthony yet.\textsuperscript{142} Anthony stands out because her work was unique.\textsuperscript{143} Of re-writing the life of Susan B. Anthony, Anthony explained that previous portrayals had cast SBA as, the symbol of her cause, as the official representative of the fifty-odd years of its history with which she was identified. In this somewhat less than human form, the legend has long preserved her. … But behind the name the personality of the woman has continued rather vague and to some extent even distorted. The purpose of this biography is to restore the woman behind the name as nearly as possible from the existing documentary materials. It is not a history of the woman suffrage movement but the history of a woman’s life. … [T]he main effort has been to depict her as a human being with arms and legs, impulses and emotions, experiences and reactions; not as the figurehead of the feminist cause.\textsuperscript{144}

Likewise, although several people had written biographies of Margaret Fuller before Katharine Anthony published hers in 1920, these earlier studies ignored or justified Fuller’s personality and peculiarities in favor of her literary merit. Anthony did no such thing. She confronted Fuller’s sexuality and “neuroses” in clear, convincing language. If she breezed over anything, it was Fuller’s writing. “Margaret was, after all, 

\textsuperscript{142} Des Jardins, \textit{Women & the Historical Enterprise}, 193, 202.

\textsuperscript{143} This is not to say that other feminists were not writing important revisionist histories at the same time, and sometimes similar to the work that KA was doing. The application of psychoanalysis to writing women’s lives in the 1920s in particular led to kindred publications. For instance, Marie Jenney Howe (MJH), KA’s friend and the founder of Heterodoxy, published a biography of George Sand in 1927. To Howe, Sand was “a modern woman born one hundred years too soon,” similar to KA’s Fuller, who “was a modern woman who died in 1850.” Howe, \textit{George Sand: The Search for Love} (Garden City, NY: Garden City City Publishing Co., 1927), xiii-xiv; KA, \textit{MF}, v. And in her biography of Victoria Woodhull, Emanie Sachs sought to expose the flesh-and-blood woman behind the legend by writing Woodhull in all of her manifestations—“brilliant, ignorant, and beautiful,” “a firebrand,” “a tiger,” “a spiritualist,” “a priestess of publicity,” “a hungry creature.” See Emanie Sachs, \textit{‘The Terrible Siren’}: \textit{Victoria Woodhull, 1838-1927} (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928), xi. However, I have not found anyone who wrote as many biographies of women as KA did, or who took writing feminist biography as his or her vocation before or at the same time as KA.

\textsuperscript{144} KA, \textit{SBA}, v-vi.
more interesting as a personality than as a writer,” Anthony reasoned.\textsuperscript{145} As such, Des Jardins again points to Anthony with language that suggests singularity: “[f]inally in 1920 radical feminist Katharine Anthony exposed Fuller, sexuality and all.”\textsuperscript{146} DuBois claims that Anthony’s Margaret Fuller is “[a]n interesting and early example of this new feminist approach to women’s history” that emerged in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{147} I argue that Margaret Fuller marks the beginning of modern feminist biography—the first example of a new feminist approach to writing women’s history.

All of Katharine Anthony’s life writing falls under the category of modern feminist biography. In her nine biographies of women, published between 1920 and 1958, Anthony humanized and sexualized such disparate individuals as Margaret Fuller (remembered as “a strange, lilting, lean old maid”), Catherine the Great (rumored to be a notorious wanton) and Susan B. Anthony (reputed to be an asexual spinster), and developed a new way of writing about women just as organization historians were recasting suffrage pioneers to suit their needs, women’s history was taking shape in the professional historical community, and before archives dedicated to women’s history had been organized.\textsuperscript{148} Historian Susan Ware noted in 2012 that “[o]ne of the hallmarks of recent feminist biography has been the foregrounding of the interplay between the

\textsuperscript{145} KA, MF, iii.
\textsuperscript{146} Des Jardins, Women & the Historical Enterprise, 193.
\textsuperscript{147} DuBois, “Making Women’s History,” 67.
\textsuperscript{148} The historian and biographer Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) is attributed with the quote “a strange, lilting, lean old maid” to describe MF. The first attempt at developing an archive for women’s history was headed by Mary Ritter Beard in 1935: The World Center for Women’s Archives. This lasted only a few years. Later, institutions of higher learning, such as Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore, Duke, Scripps, Vassar, Goucher, Radcliffe, and Smith, made concerted efforts to develop repositories for the history of women. For a more complete discussion of the development of women’s archives, see Des Jardins, Women & the Historical Enterprise, 225ff.
personal and the political in constructing narratives of individual women’s lives.”

But this was also one of the hallmarks of Katharine Anthony’s feminist biographies. Anthony sought to reveal and reconcile “[t]he woman and the Empress,” as she wrote of Catherine the Great, both of which had been “lost beneath the legends”; the “rough sea beneath ... a legend composed of beauty, charm, and supreme social graciousness,” as she wrote about Dolly Madison; the true character of Queen Elizabeth, which “[had] been praised and blamed, exalted and abused, glorified and vilified, but ... never ... explained.”

The rallying cry and sentiment of modern feminist biography is a phrase often overlooked in the Preface to Margaret Fuller. After informing readers that Fuller’s legacy had been distorted by the “unemancipated men” who wrote her story full of “Chivalry and Puritanism,” and even by Julia Ward Howe, who wrote a “magnificently impersonal” biography of the feminist pioneer, Katharine Anthony remonstrates: “[Fuller’s] life demands a vindication ... . Féminisme oblige.” Literally translated, this means “feminism obliges,” and suggests that Anthony felt a moral obligation as a feminist to recast women’s lives as they truly were—full of complexity, humanity, and on their own terms.

As such, “emancipation” was Katharine Anthony’s chosen word when talking about feminism. To Anthony, women’s “rights” left out the crucial component of women’s “duties,” and thus overlooked the inner, emotional, and psychological work

---

150 KA, Preface to Memoirs of Catherine the Great, vi; KA, Dolly Madison: Her Life and Times (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1949), vii (hereafter DM); KA, QE, 250. It is noteworthy here that Strachey wrote in the Preface to Eminent Victorians, v, “[i]t has been my purpose to illustrate rather than to explain.”
151 KA, MF, v.
Feminism meant “the emancipation of woman as a personality,” “[t]he restoration of a woman’s self-respect,” the sloughing off of “the psychological residue of subjection in the individual woman soul”—in sum, “the emancipation of woman both as a human-being and as a sex-being.” As Anthony declared in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, “the new woman must begin where she stands. She must say, with Archimedes, ‘Give me where I stand.’ And seeing that she stands in the midst of arbitrary obstacles and jealous limits, her first duty is to raze the lot.” Anthony actively shaped women’s history and women’s lives—both her subjects’ and her readers’—by “razing the lot” of individual women’s lives. She wrote daring narratives about real women at a time when the future of feminism was uncertain, women’s sexuality was under the microscope, and the genre of biography was experiencing significant revision. None more than Anthony contributed to this imaginative process, this shaping and reshaping of both genre and life.

The field of biography was especially useful for accomplishing the inner work Katharine Anthony thought was critical to women’s emancipation. By performing psychological and emotional makeovers on her subjects, Anthony was exemplifying the work individual women needed to accomplish within themselves. As Dunbar observed, “[n]othing, of course, so helps women to be themselves, even, by some happy chance, to be more than themselves, as to acquire an imaginative understanding of the lives of

---

152 As such, KA is representative of the broader women’s emancipation movement that Gerda Lerner distinguishes from the women’s rights movement, which focused solely on political and legal equality. See Lerner, “Women’s Rights and American Feminism,” *American Scholar* 40 (Spring 1971): 235-48.
154 Ibid., 236.
women, apparently other than they, who may, after all, be akin.”\textsuperscript{155} Anthony herself acknowledged this as one of her goals in writing \textit{Catherine the Great}: “[t]o conceive of her as warm-blooded and human, with like passions to ourselves, with aches and pains, hopes and disappointments, sorrows, triumphs, follies, memories—in short, the kind of being whom we can understand—this alone is a goal worth striving for.”\textsuperscript{156}

Historian Judith P. Zinsser has recently questioned whether “feminist biography” is a contradiction in terms. The tendency of biographers to focus on an exceptional woman, who is “extra-ordinary because of her place within a male-defined framework, thus closing off awareness of all other women’s lives,” is diametrically opposed to the feminist critique of patriarchal society, scholars have argued.\textsuperscript{157} Perhaps today this is true. But the earliest modern feminist biography \textit{required} the writing of “exceptional” lives, or “women worthies,” as they have been referred to, because it was only through \textit{re}-writing that women could be restored to their full human and female selves. The crux was in the revision. Thus “[m]y purpose has been to apply a new method to old matter,” Katharine Anthony wrote in the Preface to \textit{Fuller}. “I have not tried to unearth fresh material or discover unpublished evidence. The sources from which the facts are drawn are well-known volumes given in the bibliography at the end. But the following pages are less concerned with a chronology of facts than with the phases of a complex personality and a manifold life. It is an attempt to analyze the emotional values of an individual existence, the motivation of a career, the social transformation of a woman’s

\textsuperscript{155} Dunbar, “Katharine Anthony—Creative Feminist,” 102.
\textsuperscript{156} KA, “A Letter From Miss Anthony,” \textit{Wings}, 7, WB.
energies.” Indeed, as Marie Jenney Howe wrote in her review of Anthony’s Margaret Fuller, “[i]t is this analysis—the reconstruction of character from old material—which gives distinction to her biography,” which was perhaps more accurate and revealing of Anthony’s feminist programme than even Howe realized when she wrote it.¹⁵⁹

To understand Katharine Anthony the biographer, as she was most famously known in her own time, is necessarily to know Katharine Anthony the New Woman, the independent, creative, and tenacious precursor to Katharine Anthony the Writer of Lives. From her childhood in small-town Arkansas (Chapter 1), to her college education in the United States and Germany (Chapter 2), to her adventurous new life and career in New York City (Chapters 3 and 4), Katharine Anthony developed the building blocks for her work as a biographer of women, which began in earnest in 1918 and lasted for most of the rest of her life (Chapter 5 and Conclusion). In particular, Anthony’s travels in Germany, her New York coterie of feminist women and men, and her 1915 publication, Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, are critical to understanding the philosophy of feminism she brought to her biographical work later on. Without considerations of Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, Anthony has been classified as one of the many women historians who “have virtually nothing to say about the history of women in the wage-labor force,” and misrepresents Anthony’s entire feminist agenda.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ KA, MF, iv.
As such, this dissertation takes as its focus the birth of a biographer, and it makes no attempt to be comprehensive. This is not cradle to grave, but rather, cradle to career. While all of Anthony’s biographies are deserving of individual attention for their literary, historical, and feminist merit, the trajectory and purpose of her life and work can be sufficiently understood by ending with the conception and completion of her first life study. The years covered most fully are 1877 to 1920, with a Conclusion that points to the end of the decade. By 1929, when the New Woman had all but vanished, Katharine Anthony had adopted the lifestyle and vocation she would maintain for the rest of her life—one of intellectualism and quietude, writing lives for and about women—and she was widely recognized as a pioneer and expert in the field. In this way, she embodied the powerful and pertinent message that concludes Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia: “We have talked enough of woman’s emancipation. Let us begin to live it. No philosophy carries such conviction as the personal life.”

A Note on the Sources

In the early 1940s, Katharine Anthony wrote down thirteen rules for writing a biography (Figure 1.2). She divided the process into two discrete tasks, research and writing, and rules three through six outlined the steps and hurdles related to the former. Perhaps the biggest struggle for the biographer occurred during the research phase, Anthony claimed, when he or she was required to spend long, lonely hours amidst piles and miles of books and papers. “[Y]ou are alone with your soul in the library, and your

---

161 Anna Von Nathusius quoted in KA, FGS, 252.
only friend is the library catalogue.”

However, “[o]nce in a while … letters and diaries that have never before been published are discovered to be in the hands of surviving families who are gracious enough to lend them for your use. But these are personal accidents and windfalls and cannot be counted upon.”

I have been the lucky recipient of just such a windfall, and many, if not most, of the sources I used to write this dissertation came from a dusty barn on Dreamers Road in northern Vermont, the property of Tony Whedon, Katharine Anthony’s great nephew and only living relative. Not only did Tony spend time with his aunt as a child in the 1940s and 1950s, providing me with countless memories and anecdotes; he was also in possession of all of Anthony’s extant papers not assigned to archives. In July 2014, I stayed with Tony and his wife Suzanne at their Vermont farm and spent my days sorting through old boxes and suitcases that contained Katharine Anthony’s belongings. At the end of my visit, they were gracious enough to let me take home anything related to Katharine, which included her original book contracts, a research diary, dozens of family letters and photographs, her account book, her last will and testament, and more. This dissertation could not have been written without Tony and Suzanne’s help and generosity.

Katharine Anthony wrote very little about herself, and almost nothing about her childhood. Stripped-down facts are all that we get about her life in Arkansas, and the twenty years that followed her graduation from high school in 1895. The work of

---

163 KA, “13 Rules,” WB.
Hannah Geffen Josephson, a close friend of Anthony’s, has thus been indispensable to this project. Josephson is the only person to have attempted a full-length biography of Anthony (it was actually going to be a dual biography of Anthony and Elisabeth Irwin), which she began in the 1970s. She completed a significant amount of the research and writing before she passed away in 1976, gathering together letters, articles, and various papers on Anthony, including Anthony’s transcript from the University of Chicago, Sue Anthony’s diary from 1900-1902, and various family genealogical notes and letters. Josephson’s manuscript remains unfinished, but it has been nonetheless essential to the writing of Anthony’s life. Two archives house Josephson’s papers: the Lesbian Herstory Archive in Brooklyn, New York, which, incidentally, is the only archive in Katharine Anthony’s name; and the American Heritage Center at the University of Wyoming in Laramie, Wyoming, the latter of which contains the vast majority of Josephson’s work.

The other spate of papers on Katharine Anthony are at the Schlesinger Library of the Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, where the papers for Ethel Sturges Dummer and Jeanette Rankin are housed. The correspondence between Anthony and Dummer spanned the years 1916 to 1954 (Dummer’s death); and those between Anthony and Rankin were primarily written between 1942 (Elisabeth Irwin’s death) and 1965 (Anthony’s death). Rankin’s papers are also held at the Montana Historical Society in Helena, Montana, and Anthony’s name appears there as well.

Various archives throughout the country contain a handful of papers pertaining to Katharine Anthony, although generally not more than one or two items can be found in any one place. The Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas, Austin; the Kislak Center for Special Collections, Rare Books and Manuscripts at the University of
Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; the New York Public Library Archives and Manuscripts Division in New York, New York; the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections at Princeton University in Princeton, New Jersey; the Special Collections and University Archives of Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee; the Special Collections of the University of Chicago in Chicago, Illinois; the Rare Books and Manuscript Library at Columbia University in the City of New York; the Archives and Special Collections of Arkansas State University in Jonesboro, Arkansas; the Fort Smith Public Library in Fort Smith, Arkansas; the Butler Center for Arkansas Studies at the Central Arkansas Library System in Little Rock, Arkansas; and the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division at the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. all contain information relating to Katharine Anthony.

Coming to the end of this long list, it seems appropriate to quote Katharine Anthony, who reminded biographers that “[t]he difficulty of securing the necessary data is only the first of the biographer’s difficulties. The real work begins when he has to weave these into the total picture.”164 The following chapters are a humble attempt at doing just that.

---

164 KA, “Realistic Biography,” 295.
Chapter 1:

“How wonderful to be young”: 1

An Arkansas Childhood,

1877-1895

“No one would think of writing the story of an individual life which was not firmly built up on the foundation of childhood and early experience.” 2

—Katharine Anthony, “Realistic Biography,” 1938

“We are, alas, what our families make us.” 3

—Katharine Anthony, “The Family,” 1922

***

In Roseville, Arkansas, on November 27, 1877, a daughter was born to Susan and Ernest Augustus Anthony. It was their third girl in almost nine years of marriage, and they named her Katharine Susan. As a child, she was called Katie Sue, a sweet, playful nickname for the family’s cherished baby. 4

---

1 KA to JR, May 4, 1959, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
2 KA, “Realistic Biography,” 295.
4 KA’s cousin, Ernest C. Berry (ECB), recalled that she was “a most loved and honored member” of the Anthony family. “Kate was the Baby sister,” he wrote. ECB also refers to KA as “Katie Sue,” as does the 1880 census for Roseville, Arkansas. See ECB to HJ, July 11, 1974, Box 6, Folder 4, MHJ-AHC.
Beyond the date and place we know nothing about Katharine Anthony’s birth, probably because “the taboo against speaking openly [about pregnancy and childbirth] prevailed,” as Katharine wrote about nineteenth-century custom in her biography of Susan B. Anthony. “The popular heroine of 1888, who was ‘within a few weeks of motherhood,’ was still blushing after nine months of pregnancy at the mention of it.”

Sue Anthony very likely responded to her parturiency like most women did in her time: silently and bravely. “During most of American history,” Judith Walzer Leavitt tells us in *Brought to Bed: Childbearing in America, 1750-1950*, “an important part of women’s experience of childbirth was their anticipation of dying or of being permanently injured during the event.”

Ether and chloroform were available in the United States by the 1840s to alleviate women’s pain during labor, but Sue Anthony might have rejected both. The “curse of Eve” weighed heavily on the psyches of the religious, and Katharine’s mother was a god-fearing woman. Katharine, however, would grow out of her Christian roots, choosing rationalism over what she saw as pernicious American sentimentalism, the latter of which almost always negatively impacted women. “If American husbands were less philosophical about the hardships of child-bed—the judgment of Eve and all that sort of thing—and American wives were less philosophical about burying their husbands—the Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken away and so on—it might result in greater health

5 KA, SBA, 20.
and happiness for all concerned,” she reasoned in an essay on the American family she wrote in the early 1920s.7

Such strong statements (of which there would be many) were perhaps surprising to those who knew Katharine Anthony as a child, when she was quiet and demure, erudite, judicious with her emotions—nothing like her two older sisters, Pearl and Blanche, who were seven and six years old when she was born. Katharine captured some of her characteristics well in one of the few autobiographical notes found among her papers: she remembered that she cried silently as a child. Her family knew she was upset only by the visible tears they saw on her cheeks, a sight they apparently found amusing.8

In sharp contrast, the entire family knew when Pearl was displeased. Pearl was an unpleasant combination of demanding, controlling, and vain. “Everybody that doesn’t do as she says she hates,” Sue Anthony remarked to Katharine, calling Pearl “spasmodic” on at least one occasion.9 Pearl found “pleasure in fussing” even as an adult, when she regularly created friction and demanded people take her side: “Pearl got mad ... and insisted that Blanche should too,” Sue told Katharine; but Blanche “didn’t think Pearl should expect her to.”10 Although it’s evident from family letters that Blanche exhibited some of the same characteristics as Pearl—“Blanche has … always for years enjoyed taking me down,” Sue wrote despondently to Katharine around 1910—it seems she was, overall, more agreeable than her older sister.11

8 HJ claims that she found this autobiographical note among KA’s papers. However, the note is now missing. HJ, unpublished manuscript, 6, LHA.
9 SA to KA, June 24, unknown year, WB; SA to KA, August 2, unknown year, WB.
10 SA to KA, June 24, unknown year, WB.
11 SA to KA, August 2, unknown year, WB. See also SA to KA, November 16, 1915, WB; and SA to KA, June 20, 1916 or 1917, WB.
Katharine’s mild temperament was all the more noticeable and probably appreciated next to Pearl’s vanity, which was as remarkable and enduring as her unpalatable personality. Pearl always maintained a wardrobe of “beautiful clothes,” and she was outwardly critical of family members who didn’t keep up with the fashions of the day.\textsuperscript{12} When Sue visited Pearl at her home in St. Louis, Missouri, in the 1910s, she wrote to Katharine dejectedly, “Pearl was just as nice as Pearl can be but I didn’t have clothes to suit her and I was convinced before I left that the rest were [of] the same opinion. Pearl said I simply couldn’t go down town with them if I didn’t look respectable.”\textsuperscript{13}

Sue certainly didn’t ignore appearances. She dressed her daughters well. The only known picture of Katharine prior to her graduation from high school portrays a serious girl, probably around fifteen years old, looking somewhat uncomfortable in a white gown with puffed elbow-sleeves; a fabric belt cinched tightly around her waist in lieu of a corset; and a large, lace rounded collar, all perfectly fashionable for the 1890s.\textsuperscript{14} Sue herself was “always decent, if not up to date.”\textsuperscript{15} Someday she wanted “to have a chiffon vail – either of gray or of dark blue.”\textsuperscript{16} But overall, Sue “d[idn’t] give a flip about the clothes.”\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item SA to KA, November 8, 1915, WB.
\item Ibid.
\item This picture (Figure 5.2) was pasted by KA in “Heterodoxy to Marie,” a gift from the women of Heterodoxy to the group’s founder, Marie Jenney Howe, in 1920. See Inez Haynes Gillmore Papers, 1872-1945, “Heterodoxy to Marie,” 1920, A-25, Box 7, Volume 73, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. Heretofore IHG-SL.
\item SA to KA, November 8, 1915, WB.
\item SA to KA, June 24, unknown year, WB.
\item SA to KA, November 8, 1915, WB.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Katharine took after her mother in this regard, and never placed much emphasis on clothing. She was too responsible, thrifty, and committed to independence to waste her time or her money on such extravagances. In her later years, when she had lost enough weight to “really buy some good-looking clothes now,” she didn’t. “[T]he only luxury I can afford,” Katharine told a friend, is “pay[ing] over $300 to the type-writer for copying my book,” which is what she did.\textsuperscript{18} After the death of her partner, Elisabeth Irwin, in 1942, Katharine refused to be sentimental about Elisabeth’s clothes. It was a tough economy, so she wore them.\textsuperscript{19} Even when she wrote a chapter on dress reform for her 1915 publication, \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}, she admitted that “there is no subject today that interests me less.”\textsuperscript{20} Anthony preferred “self-assertion against the whims of fashion.”\textsuperscript{21} She hated “[h]igh heels, tight waists, long skirts—now narrow and now voluminous—high collars, binding sleeves, and all the rest of the refined torments inflicted in the name of fashion.”\textsuperscript{22}

Differing personalities aside, Pearl and Blanche turned out to be too much older than Katharine—and too near to one another in age—to ever consider Katharine a serious playmate or friend. Katharine was always closer to her younger brother, Mark, born when she was six.\textsuperscript{23}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{18} KA to JR, February 7, 1954, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL. 
\textsuperscript{19} KA to JR, January 16, 1955, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL. 
\textsuperscript{20} KA quoted in Garside, “An Arkansas Girl Goes A Long Way,” TLN-ASU. 
\textsuperscript{21} KA, \textit{FGS}, 78, 77. 
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 63. 
\textsuperscript{23} A letter from Blanche Brown (née Anthony) to Pearl Crawford’s (née Anthony) son, Jim Crawford (JC), portrays Blanche (BB) and Pearl’s (PC) closeness, and their separateness from KA. “Your mother [Pearl] and I were near the same age and we could recall things and people. Kate was younger and does not recall those things that were so important to Pearl and me.” See BB to JC, December 31, 1959, WB. When Mark Anthony (MA) died in 1932, PC wrote to KA, “[y]our flowers were lovely and came
Mark took after Gus (he went by an abbreviation of his middle name) in both temperament and looks. Although Mark was no doubt the longed for and treasured male child—a truism of the nineteenth century—he would never embody the masculine ideals of the late 1800s. Mark was good natured; but he was also fickle, irresponsible, and unambitious. He needed coddling, and Sue was more than happy to oblige, more so as she grew older. Mark worked for the railroad for most of his adult life, and he was almost always in financial trouble. Sue was certain he would “never have anything. He spends his money foolishly,” she wrote with concern to Katharine in 1915.\(^\text{24}\) He bought his wife lavish gifts (jewelry, a kimono, an engagement ring), but “he can never pay his debts. ... Mark will get into something serious I’m afraid.”\(^\text{25}\) On at least one occasion, Mark faced the possibility of jail time for taking “the company’s money [and] then borrow[ing] at an immense interest” to pay it back, “then the same thing over and over.”\(^\text{26}\) Sue rescued him from financial ruin with what little she had on more than one occasion, and Mark never “paid a penny” of it back.\(^\text{27}\) Katharine was disgusted with both

\(^{24}\) SA to KA, November 8, 1915, WB.
\(^{25}\) SA to KA, November 8, 1915, WB; and SA to KA, November 16, 1915, WB.
\(^{26}\) SA to KA, June 24, unknown year, WB. MA also married a woman from a wealthy family who apparently expected to maintain after marriage the lifestyle she was accustomed to in her father’s house. One year, however, when MA was facing financial difficulties, he told his wife that they would have to forego certain luxuries. “He has just told Marie and she has agreed to cut a great many things out,” SA wrote to KA. “She was raised with a cook, a maid to clean house, a butler and all that and had no idea and Mark let his pride blind him to the consequences.” See SA to KA, June 20, 1916 or 1917, WB.
\(^{27}\) SA to KA, November 8, 1915, WB.
of them. Sue begged Katharine not to be mad at Mark, and tried to explain herself: “I’m not as strong as I once was,” she told her daughter.28

As adults, Katharine and Mark were Sue Anthony’s favorite children, a fact that is not hidden in the family letters; and they, in turn, were kinder to their mother than either Pearl or Blanche ever were. But Katharine became increasingly put off by her brother’s irresponsibility. He died before he was fifty years old, most likely of alcoholism, and Katharine didn’t attend the funeral.29

Gus and Sue also had remarkably different temperaments, which is perhaps what attracted them to one another when they met for the first time in 1868, four years after Sue had moved to Arkansas from Mississippi, where she was born in 1845, and approximately twenty years after Gus had moved there, probably from St. Louis, Missouri, where he was born the same year as Sue.30 “My background was very simple,” Katharine Anthony wrote in one of the few statements she ever made about her parents or her childhood. “My parents, both of them, were thrown upon their own resources by the disaster of the Civil War and married soon after its close with almost nothing on which to found a family.”31

In the only known portrait of Katharine’s father, probably taken in the 1890s, Gus sits tall, his full, smooth lips turned down at the corners (Figure 2.1). His wide jaw, shorn clean, matches his shoulders, which are covered by a dark suit. His eyes are startlingly

28 Ibid.
29 TW, interview with the author, February 16, 2014, East Berkshire, Vermont.
30 SA notes, 1916 or 1917, WB.
31 KA quoted in Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 17.
light next to his umber hair, and he looks confident—maybe even arrogant—and in control. In life, however, apart from his physical characteristics, Gus was none of these things. He was soft-spoken, kind, and what we might today call “depressed.” He was also uneducated, and had trouble providing for his family. At his death in 1904, he was remembered as “simple of heart, unostentatious of manner … [and] as gentle as a woman in his ministrations unto those in trouble.” Although Gus’s eulogist almost certainly meant well, these were not compliments at the turn of the twentieth century. In the age of industry, the masculine traits esteemed above almost all else were competitiveness, intelligence, and ambition. In western Arkansas, these characteristics were reinforced with frontier toughness: competitiveness became fierceness, intelligence became fortitude, and ambition became bravery. Gus, as such, did not represent the ideal American man in the East or the West, a fact that Katharine and her parents were all almost certainly aware of.  

32 J. E. Dorente, “Anthony and Batson unveiling ceremony,” undated, MHJ-AHC.  
33 LeeAnn Whites has shown that, in the post-Civil War South, a man’s dominance over his woman became the primary marker of his masculine identity—in other words, because white Southern men had lost their claim to dominance in the public arena, the only arena left to dominate was the domestic one. “As a result,” Whites writes, “the perpetuation and persistence of gender difference and hierarchy in postbellum white society became absolutely pivotal. Somehow, white men’s private relationships to their women had to be made to compensate for their public losses at the hands of other men. … Confederate men looked to the domestic arena as their one remaining location of legitimate domination just as the same war that had defeated them on all other terrains had increased, however painfully, the autonomy of their wives.” GA’s weakness and SA’s strength were thus even more pronounced in the post-Civil War South than they would have been during the antebellum period. See LeeAnn Whites, The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890 (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1995): 136. For further discussion of the ways in which the Civil War complicated and changed ideas about gender, see Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber, eds., Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
In a curious and rare fictional essay composed after she visited Arkansas in 1926, long after her parents had both died, Katharine might have been thinking of her father when she described a Mr. Augustus Trueblood, who possessed strikingly similar characteristics to those we know about Gus, including the same first name. In Katharine’s words, Augustus, was not what the business world regards as successful. ... In his own home, Augustus amounted to nothing. His wife, as she often reminded him, was not born a Trueblood. She implied that her marriage had been a mistake. Augustus said little in his self-defense. ... As living expenses increased more and more, Mr. Trueblood failed steadily to keep up with them. His wife grew ever more irascible. ... Like a burglar, he came and went in his own house.34

Katharine gives no indication that this was an autobiographical essay, other than telling a friend it was “about my trip to the South this winter.”35 But the similarities between Gus Anthony and Augustus Trueblood are worth noting, if not for their truthfulness, then for the emotional reservoir from which they came. Katharine shows remarkable pity for the man who cannot support his family, and whose wife is cruel, perhaps indicative of the heartbreaking scenes she watched as a child.

Katharine adored her father, although her primary emotion was probably pity.36 She matter-of-factly explained her father’s frailty as the natural response to a brutal civil war: “[t]he unsettled conditions made life very difficult for my father who was sensitive and retiring, so that our family was usually struggling and gasping financially,” she wrote

35 KA to ESD, August 2, 1926, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
36 GA was “worshipped by his family,” a cousin remembered years later. The same cousin also said that GA was “a real father – clean, long, high cheeks – quiet.” See ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC. KA’s niece, Aida Anthony Wheldon (AW), stated that, “Katharine loved her father. He was a real gentleman, she told me. He was tall and blue eyed—handsome.” AW, undated notes, LHA.
in the only direct reference she ever made about Gus.37 But for years to come, perhaps remembering her father, Katharine would expose the hypocrisy behind the so-called family wage through research and writing. In one of her more scathing and open attacks on American capitalism, in which she pointed out that less than fifty percent of wage-earning households in America could actually survive on a father’s income alone, Katharine debunked the picturesque breadwinner-homemaker model with characteristic sarcasm. “The record of the American husband as a provider is not uniform for all classes,” she noted.

In Congress it is now and then asserted with appropriate oratory that there are no classes in America. This is more or less true from the point of view of a Cabin Creek vote-getter, who lives in a factitious political world, where economic realities fail to penetrate; to him middle-class and working-class are much the same since they have equal rights not to ‘scratch the ticket.’ But the economist finds it convenient ... to classify the totality of American families in definite income-groups corresponding to the Prussian classes. As one descends the income scale one finds that the American husband no longer fulfils his reputation for being sole provider for his family. ... The earnings of the mother and the children are a necessary supplement to bring the family income up to the subsistence level. Half the workingmen, who have dutifully ‘founded’ families, cannot support them.38

37 KA quoted in Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 17. KA’s niece also said that GA was unable to provide for his family financially. See AW to Waitt, Thursday, November 5, probably 1985, LHA.
38 KA, “The Family,” 325. It is important to note that GA’s reputation was probably less damaged by his financial instability than by his level of education, or even his seemingly fragile persona. David Roediger has shown that after the Civil War southern white men were willing to work for low wages because they received their real compensation via their race. “[T]he pleasures of whiteness could function as a ‘wage’ for white workers,” Roediger writes. “White workers could, and did, define and accept their class positions by fashioning identities as ‘not slaves’ and as ‘not Blacks’.” See The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class (New York: Verso, 1991; revised, New York: Verso, 2007), 13. Roediger was profoundly influenced by the work of W.E.B. DuBois, whose 1935 book Black Reconstruction in the United States, 1860-1880, clearly articulated the connection between whiteness, blackness, and labor after the Civil War. “It must be remembered that the white group of laborers, while they received a low wage, were compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological
Neither was Sue Anthony the perfect picture of American femininity. She was strong, outspoken, driven, and decisive in an era that upheld submissiveness, piety, purity, and domesticity. Sue’s characteristics, however, were probably viewed with less public deference and titles of courtesy because they were white.” See DuBois, *Black Reconstruction* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1935): 700.

negativity after 1865. American men were always expected to be strong (although what it meant to be strong changed over time); but American women were forced to take on new roles during and even after wartime, a trend that did not begin or end with the Civil War. Writing about elite white Southern women in the three decades after Appomattox, Jane Turner Censer notes “the emergence of a new ethic in the South—one that praised economic self-support and independence among women.” For the generation of women born after 1820, Censer explains, the opportunities wrought by the war were often met with enthusiasm.

Even for families in Arkansas, where traditional gender roles remained intact, at least ideally, if not in fact, longer than in other places, there was a rise in women’s independence after the Civil War. A cousin who grew up in Arkansas and “knew Kate Anthony so well and loved her so much” claimed that Sue was a “bright, active, happy,  


40 Censer, *The Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood*, 179-180. Censer’s argument stands in stark contrast to the classic statement on Southern identity, W. J. Cash’s *The Mind of the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941). Cash argues that women’s roles in the South were more rigidly defined after the Civil War. This argument, however, has been almost universally rejected. Cynthia A. Kierner has shown that in the South women’s “sphere” reached “beyond the household” well before the Civil War. “White southern women consistently participated in public life, though the prevailing gender conventions of their society just as consistently imagined them in primarily domestic roles.” See Kierner, *Beyond the Household: Women’s Place in the Early South, 1700-1835* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 3.

41 Janet Allured, “Ozark Women and the Companionate Family in the Arkansas Hills, 1870-1910,” *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 47 (Autumn 1988): 233. Note that Friedman claims, “the Civil War did not substantially change the position of women” in the South, although “it did demand the exercise of women’s managerial and organizational talents. … Traditional attitudes concerning women’s domestic role existed simultaneously with acceptance of women’s religious and social leadership. Thus changes in sexual roles evolved slowly in the South because modernization never fully displaced the traditional southern community.” Friedman, *The Enclosed Garden*, 127.
successful woman with a spark. … Kate got much of her drive and determination and disposition from a wonderful mother.”

Gus’s difficulties—whatever the specifics of his problems might have been—likely accelerated Sue’s independence, and with more permanence than for Southern women whose husbands were not “sensitive and retiring.” While Katharine’s childhood was marked by periods of financial strain and dislocation, Sue kept the family afloat by painting china, making hats, and taking in boarders, the latter being “the tried and true resource of Southern gentlewomen in all ages,” Katharine remarked years later.

So begins the story of a woman who felt the pressures of having a dominant mother and a fragile, failing father in a rough Arkansas border town; who saw the rise and fall of the New Woman, in all of her variations; who witnessed the achievement of suffrage and the disappointment of feminism; and who ultimately found identity writing for and about women. In many ways, writing was an autobiographical pursuit for Katharine Anthony, although personal revelations in her work are rarely clear. She would write her first book-length study on working mothers, a subject that was probably at least partially chosen and enriched by her personal experience with one. And she would pick her first three biographical subjects because of shared childhood experiences: Margaret Fuller, Catherine the Great, and Queen Elizabeth “were women of enormous ambition who had endured great hardship in their youth,” Anthony revealed in an

---

42 ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC.
43 KA, DM, 42. Even C. Van Woodward recognized the presence of the New Woman in the New South. In one of the few examples of women in his book, he describes Irene Langhorne, the original “Gibson Girl.” “Even Southern belles could be brisk and businesslike,” Woodward writes in Origins of the New South, 149.
interview. “And this, she assumed, had unconsciously influenced her determination to write about them; for in this respect her experience had been like theirs.”\textsuperscript{44} Reserved and studious as a young child growing up on the edge of the last American frontier, Katharine Anthony would slowly find her voice, her vocation, and her self, through writing.

Katharine Anthony’s mother, Susan Jane Anthony (née Cathey), had probably learned to subsist by watching her own parents shrivel, and in her mother’s case, die, in the aftermath of the Civil War. John Griffith Cathey, a proud secessionist and Calhoun Democrat born in Tennessee in 1813, was simply “unfit to cope with the reduced circumstances he found himself in” after the war, and Mary Cathey (née Locke), always a frail woman, “soon succumbed to the strenuous times forced on her—and in fact all southern women.”\textsuperscript{45} After reading a book about women in the South, years after moving away from Arkansas, Katharine Anthony noted in the markedly detached tone she often used when touching upon anything that might have been personal, that the entire “economic system of the South before the War was a house built upon the sands,” and that, “[o]ne feels somehow that the people must have realized this and subsisted by a process of self-kidding.”\textsuperscript{46} Whether or not she had her grandparents in mind when she wrote this, she doesn’t say, but it’s not unlikely. Born in Tennessee, Mary died in

\textsuperscript{44} Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.”
\textsuperscript{45} SA notes, 1916 or 1917, WB. See also “Death of Mr. John Cathey,” WB.
Mississippi in 1871 at the age of fifty, twenty-five years before her husband would succumb to illness in Paris, Arkansas, where he moved after her death.47

John and Mary Cathey might not have been wealthy before 1861—“My father was a classics scholar and knew nothing of money making,” Sue claimed—but they certainly weren’t poor.48 They owned a farm in northwestern Mississippi they called “Uplands,” and they probably owned slaves.49 As a point of pride, Katharine Anthony’s maternal grandparents could both trace their lineages to Griffith Rutherford, the Irish-born Brigadier General of the American Revolution most famous for his successful attacks against the Cherokee Indians of western North Carolina in the fall of 1776.50 Katharine’s mother grew up hearing stories about the General: “He marched in the territory [and] destroyed 36 towns and some of their cattle,” Sue recalled being told as a child. “I remember my grandfather telling me when I was a small girl 5 years old about the scars on his Grandfather’s head where the British cut him” after the fateful Battle of Camden, when the General was wounded and taken prisoner.51

---

47 One source claims that JGC moved to Arkansas in 1871. See John Berry Nolan, “John Griffith Cathey,” Logan County Arkansas: Its History and Its People (Paris, AR: Logan County Historical Society, 1987), 118. Two sources found in the WB, however, claim that JGC arrived in 1878 and 1879. Respectively, see JGC, autobiographical note, January 22, 1880, WB; and SA, autobiographical note, May 8, 1902, WB.
48 SA notes, 1916 or 1917, WB. JGC is listed in the 1860 census for DeSoto County, Mississippi, as a “Farmer & Teacher.”
49 ECB said that SA was “born in a slave owning plantation home.” ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC. Efforts to find further information on Uplands have been unsuccessful.
50 For an early history of the Rutherfords, see Jethro Rumple, History of Rowan County, North Carolina, containing sketches of prominent families and distinguished men (Salisbury, N.C.: Elizabeth Maxwell Steele Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1881), 137-139.
51 SA notes, 1916 or 1917, WB.
Sue also heard stories from one of Griffith Rutherford’s slaves, a woman Sue called “Granny” who had been “willed” to her grandfather, Griffith Cathey, after the General’s death. Born around 1764, Granny told Sue that she had seen George Washington when “[h]e ate dinner with Masse Griffith. Masse Griffith was a big man, bigger than General Washington.” When the Civil War broke out, and Confederate soldiers passed through Griffith Cathey’s property, Granny “saw the soldiers dressed in confederate gray and couldn’t understand it. ‘What kind of soldiers are you?’ she would say. ‘You are not a red coat and you are not a blue coat.’ She never could understand [and] if she had perhaps she would have been disgusted that any [of] ‘Masse Griffith’s’ descendants would have fought against the Union.”

In turn, Sue would tell her own children stories about her ancestors. After visiting the Cathey homestead in Mississippi, where nearly every headstone contained a Cathey, a Locke, or a Rutherford, Blanche wrote to Katharine, “[t]he names seem so familiar around there. I had heard them all my life. ... [And] [y]ou have heard Mama tell all of this.” Katharine was almost certainly aware that her great-great-great grandmother, Blanche Rutherford (Locke), and her great-great-great grandmother, Jane Rutherford (Cathey), were the General’s daughters. But Katharine didn’t imbibe the family pride that her mother tried so hard to pass on. Sue, Pearl, and Mark would all apply for memberships in the Daughters and Sons of the American Revolution, but

---

52 Ibid.
54 BB to KA, June 3, 1931, WB.
Katharine never would. Although Katharine’s nephew suspected that “Aunt Kate” wasn’t “interested or maybe she was too busy to be concerned with the D.A.R.,” in reality Katharine abhorred organizations that represented “the stable way of convention and custom” for their inherent sexism and incompatibility with progress.55

“Organizations composed of the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution, of the descendants of the Pilgrims, of Civil War Veterans, of the Scions of the Confederacy, and so on, sprang up and flourished on the abundant soil of family pride,” she wrote in the early 1920s. “All of which means that pioneering brought no spiritual independence or intellectual rebirth, and that new conditions were anxiously reformulated under the sanction of the old. Above all, sanction was important. That incredible institution, the ‘society column’ of the local newspaper, took up the responsibility where the Past laid it down. Stereotyped values of yesterday gave way to stereotyped values of to-day.”56

Spiritual independence was anathema in John and Mary Cathey’s home, where Sue and her three younger sisters were indoctrinated in the Presbyterian faith from early childhood. Their church, called Thyatira, had been founded by John, a brother, and his father in 1843, the same year John and Mary were married.57 Like other evangelical

56 KA, “The Family,” 333.
57 For information about Thyatira, see Lynn A. McMillon, “A History of the Churches of Christ in Tate County, Mississippi, 1836-1965,” (MA Thesis, Harding School of Theology, Memphis, Tennessee, 1966); and Joe K. Alley, Churches of Christ in Mississippi, 1836-1954 (Booneville, Mississippi: Joe K. Alley, 1953), 59-62. On the Catheys, see also the Delk Family Records 1813-1960, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee, which contains a few pages of genealogy and notes about their involvement with the founding of the church. SA’s grandfather, Alexander Cathey, was not the first Cathey to found a church. That honor goes to SA’s great-great grandfather, also named Alexander Cathey, who migrated from Ireland to North Carolina and founded a church in the first half of the 18th century. The church in North Carolina was the original Thyatira. For information on the Cathey migration from Ireland to North
churches in the nineteenth century South, Thyatira had separate entrances and seating for men and women and “a part near the pulpit partitioned off where the negro slaves … sat.” By the time Sue was born, race and religion were enough intertwined that she very likely heard biblical justifications for slavery from the minister. We know she learned a strict adherence to godly conduct through public, written admonishment. The church kept a book of sins where Sue’s name appeared at one point for “dancing,” but she was so ashamed that she tore the page out—a story that Pearl and Blanche made sure to tell Katharine when they heard it. “Mama might have left hers in as it wasn’t so bad,” Blanche wrote to Katharine in the early 1930s, which might suggest that Sue wasn’t as strict with her own children as her parents had been with her.

Nevertheless, as the daughter of a Cathey, Katharine Anthony almost certainly went to church every week as a child, and was very likely one of the grandchildren who brought John Cathey to Sunday services when his eyesight failed him around 1890.

---


58 BB to KA, June 3, 1931, WB.

59 On religious development in the nineteenth-century South, see Christine Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997). Heyrman argues that an acceptance of slavery by ministers was one of the ways evangelical preachers were able to convert Southerners in the nineteenth century.

60 By the 1850s, when SA’s name probably appeared in the book of sins, dancing was just one of the many morally reprehensible activities a person could be reprimanded for in the evangelical South, but this was a fairly recent development. Previously, religious (mostly Anglican) Southerners viewed dancing as “innocent mirth.” It wasn’t until the 1830s that evangelicalism represented half of the adult white population in the South, and with it came firm beliefs against things like dancing. See Heyrman, *Southern Cross*, 5, 8-9. See also Nathan O. Hatch who discusses the spread of evangelicalism in early nineteenth century America in, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

61 BB to KA, June 3, 1931, WB.

Katharine may have even gone to church more often than her mother when she
(Katharine) was in her twenties and living at home and teaching. Sue’s diary suggests as
much.63 In 1902, after Blanche and Pearl were married, and while Katharine was
studying in Germany, where she very likely encountered feminism and socialism for the
first time, Sue was confident that her daughters were “all conscientious good women and
Christians.”64

As an adolescent, Sue Cathey attended one of the best girls’ schools in
Mississippi, the Holly Springs Female Institute, where she received training to be a
teacher.65 “There was simply nothing else a gentlewoman could do,” Sue said much later
about her teaching career, a sentiment Katharine would reiterate about women’s lives and
southern culture when reflecting upon her own graduation from high school and
subsequent enrollment at a teacher’s college in 1895: “[w]hen I was growing up, back in
the eighties and nineties down in Arkansas … the only career open to a woman was
teaching,” Katharine said.66

Sue Cathey moved to Arkansas in 1864 after her uncle, M.F. Locke, who lived in
Van Buren, Arkansas, suggested that she relocate, the same year that Holly Springs was
burned to the ground by the Union Army. “I was pleased with the idea, so I came and

63 SA diary, April 6, 1901, MHJ-AHC.
64 SA, autobiographical note, May 8, 1902, WB.
65 ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC. For information on the Holly Springs
Female Institute, see Olga Reed Pruitt, It happened here: true stories of Holly Springs
(Holly Springs, Mississippi: South Reporter Printing Co., 1950). See also Christine Anne
Farnham, The Education of the Southern Belle: Higher Education and Student
Socialization in the Antebellum South (New York: New York University Press, 1994);
and Anya Jabour, Scarlett’s Sisters: Young Women in the Old South (Chapel Hill: The
66 SA notes, 1916 or 1917, WB; KA quoted in Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
here I am,” she wrote in her journal years later. Locke’s suggestion is curious, considering northwestern Arkansas was still war torn in 1864. In March and April of that year, Confederate forces attacked an important Union post established in Roseville on the Arkansas River, burning at least 133 bales of cotton. But Sue was able to find work as a teacher nonetheless. And in 1868, when she was twenty-three years old, Sue met a tall, handsome man who worked in his uncle’s general store.

Katharine Anthony would never meet her father’s parents, either in person or through stories. They were both dead long before Katharine was born, and Gus told his children only a few scattered memories. “[H]e remembered well his father taking him to the barber shop to have his hair cut; and telling him that he had the same name as his grandfather Anthony,” Blanche wrote in a letter to a nephew in the 1950s. “[But] he was a little boy of seven when they died and could not recall too much.” In reality, however, it was probably a combination of his age, the trauma of losing his mother and at least one sibling to cholera, and the confusion that followed when his father left him with relatives in the wake of his mother’s death.

---

67 SA notes, 1916 or 1917, WB. Sue might have resided with Locke’s family for a time, but she was living in Roseville by 1868. There is no evidence that her move was a direct result of the destruction of Holly Springs, although this might have been the case.
68 See Mark K. Christ, “‘War to the knife’: Union and Confederate Soldiers’ Accounts of the Camden Expedition, 1864,” *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 72 (Winter 2014): 406, n. 100.
69 SA does not say how she met GA, but KA’s cousin claims it was through the Berry family. ECB to HJ, July 11, 1974, MHJ-AHC. SA’s sister would marry James C. Berry, a son of William Martin Berry and sort-of brother to GA, in 1880.
70 BB to JC, December 31, 1959, WB.
71 Ibid.
72 One family genealogy suggests that two Anthony children died of cholera around 1852, one being the fourth and last child born to Henry and Asenath. Besides the personal
Katharine Anthony’s paternal grandfather, Henry Augustus Anthony, was born in Rhode Island around 1811, lived for a time in St. Louis, Missouri, and migrated to Arkansas in the 1840s, around the same time that a down-and-out Alabama cotton merchant named John Berry, his second wife, America Anderson, and their children arrived there.\(^\text{73}\) Not more than three years later, Henry, a tailor by trade, met and married one of Berry’s daughters, Asenath Melissa, a widow nine years his junior who brought three young children to the union.\(^\text{74}\) Henry and Asenath produced at least three more children. Their first, Ernest Augustus, was born just a year after they married, in 1845.

Relatives remembered Henry as a strict father who “tried to teach his children how to speak correctly and behave.”\(^\text{75}\) He was also “the only one [on the Anthony side] with an adventurous spirit,” a trait that Katharine would inherit.\(^\text{76}\) Henry was distinctive, too, for being the sole person in Katharine’s lineage born North of the Mason-Dixon line, “that mythical boundary which I used to hear so much about in my youth but never found on any map,” she wrote in a semi-fictionalized essay she published in the 1920s. “To this day the Mason Dixon line is a mystery to me. I don’t know whether it’s a surveyor’s

genealogy from the WB, however, there is no evidence of this child, who was supposedly named Belle. If she was born after 1850 and died before 1860, she would not have appeared in a census, which she does not.

\(^\text{73}\) JBN, “Our Berrys in Jackson County, Alabama, 1818-1841,” 36, WB.

\(^\text{74}\) Asenath Melissa was the child of John Berry and his first wife, Margaret Sullivan. For the Berry family history, see BB to JC, December 31, 1959, WB; and JBN, “Berry Family Genealogy,” November 6, 1977, WB. Margaret Sullivan died in 1838 during childbirth. Her baby also died. Approximately eight months later, John Berry married America Anderson.

\(^\text{75}\) Family questionnaire written by a grandchild of Henry August Anthony, possibly named Jethro, WB.

\(^\text{76}\) BB to JC, December 31, 1959, WB.
mark or merely a state of mind.” In Katharine’s thoroughly southern family (besides Rhode Island, she had roots in North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas), it was more of the latter. Henry was a “stranger and a Yankee” when he married Asenath in 1844, nearly twenty years before the start of the Civil War.

Tragedy struck around 1852 when Asenath and at least one child died of cholera in or around St. Louis, and Henry, for unknown reasons, returned to Rhode Island without his children, who were raised for a time by John and America Berry, their grandparents. There is no evidence that Henry Anthony ever remarried or saw his children again, and he died around 1860 (not before).

John Berry, who had recovered both his money and his dignity in Arkansas after becoming an esteemed judge and statesman, was dead before his son-in-law. He succumbed in 1856 to either a snake or spider bite, and his grandson, once again, was left

---

77 KA, “Our Gypsy Journey to Georgia,” Woman’s Home Companion (July 1926): 14. See also Sherwood, “Arkansas Biographer,” 2, who writes that, “With the exception of her paternal grandfather, Henry Augustus Anthony, who came from Providence, R. I., and married a Southern girl, all others of the Anthony family were of unmixed Southern lineage, most of whom can be traced to the Colonial settlers of the North Carolina uplands.” Curiously, the author bio on the back jacket of The Lambs claims KA “was born in Arkansas of New England parentage.”

78 Handwritten family notes by cousins of KA, WB. These undated notes were possibly written by a cousin named Jethro.

79 The last census that Asenath Berry appears in is the 1850 census for Huntsville, Arkansas. The last census that Henry A. Anthony appears in is the 1860 census for Providence, Rhode Island. Family records on ancestry.com claim that Henry Anthony died in 1860, but in Arkansas, not Rhode Island. However, private family genealogy notes claim that Henry Anthony died at the same time and place as his wife and child, in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1852. See JBN, “Berry Family Genealogy,” WB. Other family notes written by a cousin of KA’s (unknown name) state only that Asenath and two children died in St. Louis, not Henry. Family genealogy notes about the Berry family were also written by BB, who suggested that Henry died in 1852 with Asenath, which is probably what GA told his children.
on his own.\textsuperscript{80} Where Gus spent the following four years of his life is not known; but when the next federal census was taken in 1860, he was reportedly living with his uncle, William Martin Berry, in Huntsville, Arkansas. None of his siblings lived with him.\textsuperscript{81}

Gus Anthony’s name does not appear in any Civil War records. Yet somehow the family came to believe that he served as a drummer boy for the Confederacy and saw significant fighting in northwestern Arkansas, where, according to family legend, he was nearly killed in the Battle of Pea Ridge when a General was “hit and fell at uncle Gus’s feet.”\textsuperscript{82} Whether or not this is true, by the end of the war Gus was living in Roseville, Arkansas, where William had opened up a general store. Approximately three years later, he met a petite, vivacious teacher from Mississippi.


\textsuperscript{81} There is reason to believe that the children of Henry and Asenath fell out of touch after their mother’s death and father’s desertion. GA’s sister, Susan, did not attend GA’s funeral or contact the family at his death, despite having been informed of the accident. BB said: “I know at the time Papa died I heard Mama say that the Proctors (Uncle D. Proctor who was Papa’s half-brother) would let Susan known, but as far as I know we heard nothing from her.” Susan was, as far as I can tell, the only other living child of Henry Augustus and Asenath Anthony. See BB to JC, December 31, 1959, WB.

\textsuperscript{82} ECB to HJ, July 11, 1974, 2, MHJ-AHC. See also JNB, “William Martin Berry,” 96. There is also no evidence that JGC fought in the Civil War. However, at least one relative maintained that he was a “Confederate soldier at one of the first battles of the Civil War at Wilson’s Creek in Missouri.” See JC to Waitt, October 23, 1984, LHA. For a history of fighting in Roseville and Fort Smith, Arkansas, during the Civil War, see, for instance, Edwin C. Bearrs, “Confederate Action Against Fort Smith Post: Early 1864,” \textit{Arkansas Historical Quarterly} 29 (Autumn 1970): 226-251; and Christ, “‘War to the knife,’” 381-413. Arkansas is an understudied state, but the most concentrated period of historical research and writing has been the Civil War years. See, for example, Thomas DeBlack, \textit{With Fire and Sword: Arkansas, 1861-1874} (Fayetteville, AR: The University of Arkansas Press, 2003); Mark. K. Christ, \textit{Civil War Arkansas, 1863: The Battle for State} (Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 2010); and James R. Knight, \textit{The Battle of Pea Ridge: The Civil War Fight for the Ozarks} (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2012).
At twenty-three years of age in 1868, Sue Cathey was no longer considered young. Writing about the wealthiest planter families in North Carolina before the Civil War, Jane Turner Censer found that the average age for brides at their first marriage was 20.5, and the number was lower for girls in the southwest, who often married for the first time when they were still teenagers.\textsuperscript{83} Ann Williams Boucher, who wrote a dissertation on planter families in nineteenth-century Alabama, shows that, for the thirty-nine marriages she examined in 1860, the average age of women at their first marriage was 18.5.\textsuperscript{84}

Tradition and stigma made finding a husband more difficult the longer one remained unmarried. “As the single woman reached her mid-twenties, spinsterhood became a form of social death,” Bertram Wyatt-Brown writes in \textit{Southern Honor: Ethics & Behavior in the Old South}. “Better to have a husband who ran off with one’s inheritance or drank away the cash from a year’s farming than to be without a husband at all.”\textsuperscript{85} Indeed, “spinsters” were firmly stuck on the bottom rung of the white Southern social ladder, where “[b]eing a widow was considerably less shameful,” as Wyatt-Brown notes.\textsuperscript{86}

The Civil War only made matters worse. The number of eligible men decreased sharply after 1861. In the South, three out of every four white men of military age—

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 240.
\end{flushright}
approximately the same age that deemed someone “marriageable”—fought in the war. Although more Union than Confederate soldiers died between 1861 and 1865, the loss of men of marriageable age was felt more strongly in the South, where, proportionally, it was three times as great. “In these demographic circumstances,” Nancy Cott writes in *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*, “the assumption that every woman would be a wife became questionable, perhaps untenable.” For wealthier women in the South, where “[s]electing a man was the most important decision of a woman’s life,” as Drew Gilpin Faust writes, the loss of suitable men was probably felt the hardest.

For the lucky men who survived the war, their marriage prospects improved significantly after 1865. Gus Anthony might not have won Sue Cathey’s hand had they met before the war; but he was a perfectly acceptable match for an insolvent Southern belle. And so it came to be that on February 1, 1869, no more than a year after they first met, Gus and Sue were married in the front room of John and Mary’s Mississippi home, looking out on a beautiful Crepe Myrtle tree. Back in Roseville, they welcomed their first daughter, Mary Pearl, in 1870. A second, Blanche, arrived two years later.

In 1877, Roseville was a small, prosperous, violent town in northwestern Arkansas, a stopping point for carpetbaggers and outlaws in the ruthless years after the Civil War that “was reached by steamboats which plied the Arkansas River to that point

---

88 Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 140.
89 GA and SA obtained their marriage license on January 29, 1869, and their wedding occurred three days later, on February 1. See the Marriage License for Ernest Augustus Anthony and Susan Jane Cathey, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Archives and Library Division, Jackson, Mississippi.
at that time,” Katharine Anthony remembered. Initially settled in 1806, over two hundred people called Roseville home by 1880. The majority of Roseville’s married women “kept house,” which is what Sue listed as her occupation in the 1880 census. Most of the men were clerks, like Gus, merchants, laborers, farmers, or mechanics, probably for the expanding railroad. There were also two doctors, two ministers, and three law enforcement officers in Roseville; and there was one of almost everything else: one lawyer, one bar tender, one barber, one cobbler, one blacksmith, one music teacher, one schoolteacher, and one postmaster.

Here the Anthony family lived in a house surrounded by tall cedar trees with a knocker on the front door that would follow them from place to place. The Anthony family would move so many times during Katharine’s childhood—“[w]e were rolling stones, moving every year or two,” she said—that it was the knocker that would always remind Katharine of home. When she visited Fort Smith in 1926, she “spent a bit of time and a bit of money procuring [the] family relic,” which she brought to her and Elisabeth’s country home in Connecticut.

Perhaps it was in Roseville that Katharine learned to read, practicing with the family’s collection of Dickens, Scott, Thackeray, and the Encyclopedia Britannica, the

---

90 KA quoted in Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 16.
91 See the 1880 census for Roseville Township.
92 “Miss Katharine Anthony Displays Sentiment in Search for Old Relic of Her Family,” unknown source, 1926, Box 7, Folder 1, MHJ-AHC. For the detail of the cedar trees, see BB to KA, July 28, 1932, WB.
93 KA, “Ella, Babe, and Lizzie sketch,” probably 1926, WB. There are two short sketches by KA about her return to Fort Smith in 1926. One I have titled “Fort Smith sketch,” and the other I have called “Ella, Babe, and Lizzie sketch.” They were probably written at the same time.
94 “Miss Katharine Anthony Displays Sentiment in Search for Old Relic of Her Family,” unknown source, 1926, Box 7, Folder 1, MHJ-AHC.
latter of which was in its Ninth Edition by the 1880s, a landmark version noted for its literary excellence and so nicknamed “the Scholar’s Edition.”95 For the first time, a handful of the contributors were women, and a lengthier article on women—“Law Relating to Women”—was included.96 Only 45,000 copies were produced for the United States, but hundreds of thousands of cheap, bootlegged replicas circulated throughout the country, making it widely available to families who weren’t wealthy, and who lived far outside the large metropolises and publishing centers of New York City and Boston.

Katharine Anthony might also have read books by Louisa May Alcott as a child, who she would choose as a biographical subject in the mid-1930s. After the Civil War, “[t]he new children of America read [Alcott’s] Eight Cousins because it mirrored the living, breathing, moving world around them,” Katharine told her readers in 1938.97 The protagonist of Eight Cousins (1875), a thirteen-year-old orphan named Rose Campbell, takes control of her life and her future through the progressive education she receives from her uncle, a story that might have inspired Katharine if she read it.

Gus still worked in his uncle’s general store in 1880.98 And Sue rented out rooms that year for extra money to a doctor, a schoolteacher, a grocery clerk, and to her father, John Cathey.99 She hired two servants to help, an eighteen-year-old white male from Arkansas, and a forty-five-year-old black woman from Georgia named Missouri Vason,  

95 Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 17. 
96 The Eleventh Edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica is the edition that is noted for its “significant” number of female contributors (35 out of the 1,500 total). Hundreds of women were commissioned to write articles, albeit anonymously. However, few entries about women were included. See Gillian Thomas, A Position to Command Respect: Women and the Eleventh Britannica (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1992). 
97 KA, LMA, 203. 
98 See the 1880 census for Roseville Township. 
99 GA is listed in the 1880 census for Roseville, Arkansas, as a “grocery keeper.”
the latter of whom would live with the Anthony family for at least thirty years, from 1880 until 1910. Katharine said years later that she had been “raised by a black woman called ‘mammy’ who stayed with the family throughout all financial disasters,” which was almost certainly a reference to Vason—a “familial appendage” who was as much a part of Katharine’s childhood and adolescence as her parents and siblings were.

It wasn’t unusual to have servants in Roseville (six families employed help in 1880), but it wasn’t common either. That Gus and Sue could afford to hire help despite their precarious finances, however, is notable. As a daughter from the Old South, Sue very likely had assumptions about housework and childcare, one being that the responsibility did not fall solely on her. Years later, perhaps thinking about her mother, Katharine pointed out the “certain historical and social conditions [that] have contributed especially to sanction the ideal—however obviously it failed to work out in practice—that women should compose the leisure class. One such influence was the institution of slavery which, persisting up until fifty years ago, created a social system in which idleness was a cult. The first generation of Southern women who had to do their own housework suffered keenly from a sense of degradation.”

As a child, Sue probably watched her parents take care of the field and the home with the help of slaves, and the thought of doing everything herself likely seemed demeaning, if not impossible.

---

100 The censuses for 1880, 1900, and 1910 all indicate that Missouri Vason lived with the Anthony family. There is no census for 1890, the result of a fire that occurred on January 10, 1921 in the Commerce Department in Washington, D.C.

101 AW to Waitt, November 5, probably 1987, LHA. In the early 1920s, KA wrote with heavy sarcasm about the glory days of the patriarchal household and the servants they employed. “The faithful servant has been replaced by the faithless one, who never by any chance remains long enough to become a familial appendage, or else she has not been replaced at all.” See KA, “The Family,” 320.

102 KA, FGS, 169.
Even as a grandmother, Sue resented having to care for her infant grandchildren. “I just staid [sic] and tended to the baby as any old fool has to,” she wrote furiously to Katharine after watching Pearl’s child. “I wouldn’t mind tending to the baby if they had acted like I hadn’t just done what any hired girl should.”

Katharine would only live in Roseville for the first six years of her life. By the early 1880s, after railroad developers decided to bypass the town, Roseville had all but disappeared. Gus’s uncle’s shop closed, families packed their belongings, the wharfs deteriorated, and Roseville became a so-called ghost town. “I think it just fell in!” Katharine Anthony only half-jokingly said in reference to Roseville’s fate on the edge of the river. The house where Katharine was born eventually burned down, and soon the only things left were the cedar trees.

1883 marked the first of many moves for the Anthony family, when Gus and Sue relocated their family to Paris, Arkansas, an “anything but ... large” town located seven miles southeast of Roseville, curiously named in honor of the great French city.

103 SA to KA, November 18, unknown year, WB.
106 MMM-LC.
107 BB to KA, July 28, 1932, WB: “Our house where we were born burned down last year but the tall cedar trees that I remember as a child were still standing. Roseville looks like a deserted village all right.”
108 BB to KA, July 28, 1932, WB. A cousin wrote that the Anthony family moved from Roseville to Paris around 1883. See ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC. Most of the information on Paris, Arkansas, came from “Paris,” *Logan County Arkansas: Its History and Its People* (Logan County Historical Society, 1987), 29-34; and
Although we don’t know for sure, it’s possible that Gus moved his family to Paris for new employment opportunities. In 1881, two blacksmiths discovered that the north and west sides of the town sat on a highly desired variety of coal, “a semi-anthracite smokeless” kind. The recent completion of the Cairo and Fulton Railroad meant that coal from Paris could be transported thousands of miles away with ease. Mines were subsequently dug, and the coal industry quickly became one of the largest employers in the state, producing 400,000 tons of coal by 1890, a significant increase from the 14,778 tons they reportedly generated in 1880.

If Gus didn’t work in the mines, other members of Katharine’s extended family did. Katharine’s uncle and cousin tragically died in one in 1900—“[k]illed by foul air”—two years after the United Mine Workers of American had reached western Arkansas, and a year after the UMWA had organized the first strike in the state on behalf of the miners. By 1903, the UMWA required coal miners to register as members, and coal mining briefly became a “closed shop” enterprise in Arkansas. The next year, when Katharine was a teacher in the Fort Smith public schools, labor agitation became an all-

www.encyclopediaofarkansas.net., a project of the Butler Center for Arkansas Studies at the General Arkansas Library System in Little Rock, Arkansas.

109 “Paris,” Logan County Arkansas, 29.

110 Moneyhon, Arkansas and the New South, 32-33. See also C. VanWoodward, Origins of the New South, who argued that the development of the New South was largely in the hands of northern businessmen and native southerners who joined forces to mutually profit from Reconstruction. The development of coal mines and railroads in Arkansas is a good example of this post-Civil War phenomenon. See VanWoodward, Origins of the New South. See also Edward L. Ayers, The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

111 Moneyhon, Arkansas and the New South, 33.

112 SA, autobiographical note, May 8, 1902, WB. The note claims that KA’s uncle and cousin worked in “wells,” but they almost certainly worked in coal mines. Oil and gas did not become a significant enterprise in Arkansas until 1921, when the first oil field was discovered.
out race war when mine operators brought in African American men to replace striking workers in Bonanza, a town just outside of Fort Smith. White miners terrorized black families in what has become known as the Bonanza Race War, until nearly every African American had left the area. Years later, in the 1930s, Blanche visited Paris and reported to Katharine that the town was “dull now, on account of the coal mines closing,” perhaps a reference to the lively atmosphere that existed when they were young, before the miners had been beat down by the dangerous conditions and low wages.

Paris was less than ten years old when the Anthony family arrived in 1883, but the town was already probably larger than Roseville. Established in 1874 as a county seat, 547 people called Paris home by 1890. Although small, churches of a surprising variety had surfaced in and around Paris by the early 1880s. A Baptist church was founded in October of 1874, and a pastor was appointed for a Methodist congregation the next month. Half the lot for the Methodist church was reserved for the Masonic Fraternity, an organization that Katharine’s father and brother both belonged to at some point.

German-speaking immigrants were responsible for the formation of several churches in Arkansas in the late nineteenth century, two of which were in or near Paris. During Katharine Anthony’s childhood, German immigrants played a significant role in Arkansas’s economic development, when the Catholic Church and the railroad

---


114 BB to KA, July 28, 1932, WB.
companies worked cooperatively to employ and recruit German families who had settled on the eastern coast of the United States in the wake of Otto von Bismark’s anti-Catholic *Kulturkampf* campaign, begun in 1873.\textsuperscript{115} The year of Katharine’s birth, German-speaking immigrants founded St. Benedict’s Colony five miles east of Paris, and within a year, 150 families had found a home there. In 1879, they founded St. Joseph’s Catholic Church in Paris.\textsuperscript{116} As such, it might have been in Paris that Katharine initially heard the German language—her first “second language” and the foundation for much of her future work (her first individual book-length publication was on the women’s movements in Germany and Scandinavia, and she would translate Catherine the Great’s memoirs from the German into English in the mid-1920s, the first English translation to appear in print).

Katharine Anthony’s maternal grandfather, John Cathey, also moved to Paris and participated in the wave of church planting. He purchased a plot of land he named Uplands in honor of his Mississippi home, and in 1885, he established the First Christian Church of Paris, where Katharine almost certainly went to services between the ages of seven and eleven.

Two important events in Katharine Anthony’s childhood occurred in Paris. The first happened in the spring of 1884 when Sue gave birth to a son, John Mark Anthony, but who was always called Mark. The second occurred the next year, in 1885, when

\textsuperscript{115} Always predominantly Protestant, Arkansas was a hotbed of anti-Catholicism, which is the subject of Kenneth C. Barnes’s book, *Anti-Catholicism in Arkansas: How Politicians, the Press, the Klan, and Religious Leaders Imagined an Enemy, 1910-1960* (Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 2016). Most German-speaking people in Arkansas were Catholic, and in 1917, when the United States joined World War I, there was a fierce backlash against German immigrants.

Katharine very likely went to school for the first time. The Paris Academy opened that year in a two-story brick building that cost the residents $12,500 to construct.\textsuperscript{117} It was the town’s first school. Very little is known about the Paris Academy. The school year lasted for nine months, four of which were free.\textsuperscript{118} Tuition for the remaining five months cost somewhere between $1.50 and $3.00 a month at a time when “pork was selling for a nickel a pound.”\textsuperscript{119} The standards for acceptable academic performance at the Academy were not especially high: a student had to achieve 75 percent or higher in order to pass.

Indeed, Paris represented a series of “firsts” for Katharine: her first move, her first glimpse at American religion, her first encounter with the German language, the first (and only) time she would experience the birth of a sibling, and probably her first public education. But for some unknown reason, Katharine never mentioned her life there.\textsuperscript{120} It was always Roseville where she was born, and Fort Smith where she would mature, that she referred to as the towns of her youth.

\textsuperscript{117} “Paris,” \textit{Logan County Arkansas}, 30. HJ claims that KA went to school for the first time when she was eight years old. See HJ, manuscript, LHA. The 1880 census for Roseville, Arkansas, indicates that Pearl and Blanche both attended school, but KA, only three years old at the time, did not.

\textsuperscript{118} Despite Paris’s small size, the Paris Academy was considered an “urban” school. Moneyhon tells us that “rural schools generally ran no longer than five months, when town schools already operated for nine.” See Moneyhon, \textit{Arkansas and the New South}, 74.

\textsuperscript{119} “Paris,” in \textit{Logan County Arkansas}, 30.

\textsuperscript{120} I have found only one instance where KA mentioned Paris, in a radio interview with Mary Margaret McBride, and she only did so because MMM brought it up (MMM was from Paris, Missouri, and she pointed out the connection). KA responded briefly, “I lived in Paris when I was a little girl.” See MMM-LC.
In 1889, the Anthony family moved again, this time to Fort Smith, a defunct garrison forty-three miles west of Paris, on the border of the Indian Territory. The population of Fort Smith had more than tripled from the beginning to the end of the 1880s, from 3,000 residents to just over 11,000, making it one of the few urban areas in Arkansas when Katharine arrived, second in size only to Little Rock. Yet she remembered feeling stifled there. When Katharine was engaged in research for a biography of Catherine the Great in 1923, she noticed similarities between the Empress’s hometown of Stettin, in northern Germany, and her own childhood home of Fort Smith. Like Fort Smith, “Stettin had all the grim and rigid characteristics of a frontier post. … It was not a place in which the refinements of society flourished,” she noted. Born of similar environments, Katharine imagined similar feelings between herself and Catherine. “There was in Stettin something of the same feeling I had as a girl in Fort Smith, of being cribbed and confined,” she said. “I imagined that Catherine of Russia, when she was Sophia Augusta Frederica and known as Fike, must have felt very much restricted, curbed and held back from all she wanted to do. Possibly the walls of that old garrison were more or less responsible for her manner of living after she became an empress—but of course that is all mere conjecture.”

---

121 On her 1901 passport application KA wrote that she had lived in Fort Smith for twelve years, making the Anthony’s arrival sometime around 1889.
122 Urban areas in the South developed more slowly than those in the North, so while Fort Smith may have been developing rapidly in the late nineteenth century, it was certainly not a large or modern city at any time when KA lived there. In 1880, the state of Arkansas was 96 percent rural. See Moneyhon, *Arkansas and the New South*, 8.
123 KA, *CG*, 3.
124 Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
The Anthony family lived in several houses in Fort Smith. There was “the low wooden house with the long porch and the two-room addition,” replaced years later by the Elk’s Club, a red brick building with white trim.\(^{125}\) (Was this the house with the “sweet-gum tree near the kitchen door,” from which Katharine learned to make “a wad that will last you all your life,” and underneath which she ate those “luscious red and green watermelon[s]”?)\(^ {126}\) There was also the house supplanted by the St. Charles Hotel; and the one that became the Indiana House near Judge Ingram’s office. And there was the boarding house Sue ran—the one with “[t]he yard with the fine high sycamore tree,” Katharine remembered.\(^ {127}\) In the evenings and on weekends, Sue’s boarding house served as a place of entertainment for Katharine, her siblings, cousins, and her two best friends, Bird Smith and Pearl Steagall. There was “wonderful food,” and comfortable rooms to sit in; and the boarders—occasionally the “young German men of the city”—were often interesting and nice to talk to.\(^ {128}\)

The reputation of northwestern Arkansas, and especially of Fort Smith, was, and is, one of violence and frontier justice. Bowie knives were called Arkansas toothpicks. Fort Smith was nicknamed “hell on the border.” Charles Portis set his rugged and chilling novel, *True Grit* (1968), in and around Fort Smith in the 1880s. One source even claims that in the late 1800s “there was no worse spawning place for Satan’s own on the western frontier” than Fort Smith.\(^ {129}\) If the reputation speaks to the reality, such a place

\(^{125}\) KA, “Ella, Babe, and Lizzie sketch,” WB.

\(^{126}\) KA, “Our Gypsy Journey to Georgia,” 14, 63.

\(^{127}\) KA, “Fort Smith sketch,” WB. See also ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC, who writes that Sue had “ample outside help for cooking and such assignments.”

\(^{128}\) ECB to HJ, August 17, 1975, MHJ-AHC.

would have been great fodder for a young, imaginative, budding writer. But Katharine Anthony never referred to Fort Smith, or even to Arkansas, as a violent place, which begs the question: was it really that violent? Historian Charles Vollan argues that in nineteenth-century boomtowns like Deadwood, South Dakota, and Cheyenne, Wyoming, the latter of which was similarly nicknamed “hell on wheels,” the violence has been greatly exaggerated. In fact, Vollan says, the violence was almost always contained to the lowest socioeconomic groups. “Only in the case of vigilantes do we see sort of a wholesale crossing of class borders,” he said in an interview.  

The denizens of Arkansas in the late nineteenth century were furious with the nicknames. They cost the state money, and, presumably, the residents felt that the accusations weren’t completely fair. There were well known efforts to reform the justice system and make the prisons in Arkansas more humane as early as the 1870s. Hangings were brought indoors by the 1880s. And although Judge Isaac Parker has come down to us as the infamous “Hanging Judge” of Fort Smith, Katharine Anthony only

---

130 http://www.sdstate.edu/news/articles/western-violence.cfm. Accessed on June 15, 2016. Our understanding of the American West has been further challenged by studies such as Peter Boag’s Re-dressing America’s Frontier Past (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), which argues that our image of the tough frontier cowboy is only a small part of the picture. Gender constructions were in flux throughout the nineteenth century, and cross-dressing by both men and women was not uncommon, even on the rugged frontier.


132 Anna Dawes, the daughter of Senator Henry Dawes of Massachusetts, published a scathing critique of the prison in Fort Smith in 1886, “A United States Prison,” which drew attention to the inhumane conditions and prompted reform.
mentioned one judge in town, Judge Ingram, whose law office in a “little triangular house … little larger than the stove which heated it” she passed on a walk one day.\textsuperscript{133}

Presumably, if the reality matched the reputation of the city, Katharine would have had numerous stories to tell—even more than other residents—when her father became the city jailer in 1889.\textsuperscript{134} Fort Smith had become the location of the federal Western District court in 1872, which covered all of western Arkansas and the entire Indian Territory (present day Oklahoma). The former barracks became the federal courthouse, and the basement of the courthouse served as the federal jail until 1888, when a new wing was added onto the south side.\textsuperscript{135} Two hundred marshals were appointed to bring fugitives and outlaws to justice in the Western District, and most were held in the Fort Smith jail before going to trial. But Katharine mentioned only the “small library” that was housed in the courthouse, where, as a young girl she discovered books and authors that transported her far away from Arkansas.\textsuperscript{136} She adored Henry James, whose independent, emancipated heroines, such as Daisy Miller (1879) and Isabel Archer (1881), were famous for shirking cultural expectations in favor of their own happiness. They traveled to Europe, fell in love, made their own decisions.

For unknown reasons, it seems that Gus Anthony’s position as the city jailer didn’t last for more than a year. Around 1890, he became a patrolman in Fort Smith, the job he would hold for the rest of his life. He mostly patrolled the train depots, which

\textsuperscript{133} KA, “Elle, Babe, and Lizzie sketch,” WB.
\textsuperscript{134} GA is listed as a “jailer” in the Court Employee Database for Fort Smith. The site claims that GA “took charge of jailer’s office in absence of Carroll.” <http://fosmcourtdatabase.nps.gov/record.cfm?id=1508>. Accessed on July 21, 2016.
\textsuperscript{136} KA quoted in Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 17.
grew busier and busier as the years passed. Sue Anthony continued to take care of the home with the help of Missouri Vason and three other servants she hired in Fort Smith, Ella, Babe (Ella’s husband), and Lizzie. She also kept a garden, which Katharine remembered years later being told “should be planted ‘in the dark of the moon’ if [it was] to thrive,” a lesson that may or may not have reflected Sue’s gardening preferences.137 The gardens in Fort Smith were under constant attack from hogs, chickens, foxes, rabbits “and an occasional foraging bear”; but perhaps the biggest threat to the “lettuce, radishes, onions, cabbages, beans and peas” that grew in the dark “patch of ground” were the widows’ cows.138 “From my earliest childhood, I can recollect how the town-beautifiers, who wanted to take down the crazy board fences, were utterly routed by the aldermen who said the widow’s cow must range and people must therefore keep up their fences,” Katharine recalled.139

Learning how to plant and grow a garden was just one of the many domestic duties girls were expected to learn in the nineteenth century. Although almost entirely rural with an economy dominated by agriculture in the 1880s and 1890s, Arkansas was little different from other parts of the country in this regard, where the transformation of the market economy led to the creation of gendered spaces, or “separate spheres.” As Janet Allured has argued about post-Civil War Arkansas, “[d]omestic ideology … did not bypass the Ozarks.”140 Indeed, in the 1890s, one Arkansas newspaperman criticized any

---

137 KA to ESD, June 15, 1917, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL.
138 Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
woman who “finds no pleasure in the duties of the home … [or who does not understand] the elements of domestic economy and cleanliness.”

Although a cousin claimed that the Anthony’s “[h]ousework [was] done largely by servants,” Katharine still learned to clean and cook and sew as a part of her womanly duties (she never learned how to knit). We know she cleaned the house regularly—certainly while she was living at home and teaching in the Fort Smith public schools between 1897 and 1907, and probably, too, when she was younger. She was also in charge of cleaning the kerosene lamps, a task she loathed. It was a tedious job. The smoke from burning kerosene left a residue on the glass that needed to be wiped out regularly to prevent fire. And if the chimney wasn’t completely dried after cleaning it, there was the risk of it shattering when the wick was re-lit. “I’ll never forget my delight when my father had the electricity put in,” Katharine told a friend years later. “[W]hat an emancipation it was.”

Although she almost certainly received instruction in cooking, Katharine never excelled in the kitchen. Browning graham loaves remained “a mystery that I never solved,” she humorously remarked. “I could never keep a steady temperature long enough to brown a loaf cake.” She occasionally constructed cupcakes and layer cakes.

---

141 “Some Bad Nurses: Census for Girls Who Are Merely Following a Fad,” The Arkansas Democrat, January 7, 1898, AHC.
142 ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC. ECB also remembered that, “[t]he girls worked at home with the mother in charge.” See ECB to HJ, August 17, 1975, MHJ-AHC. See also KA to ESD, May 8, 1927, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL: “I don’t know how to knit.”
143 SA diary, April 6, 1901, MHJ-AHC.
144 KA to JR, July 26, 1953, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL; and KA to JR, July 21, 1954, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.
But “all of my sustained efforts ended in failure of one kind or another,” she confessed. “Mostly they fell.” She could make plum jam and spiced peaches (she would always remember the “warm, sweet peaches eaten in the middle of the afternoon”). But Katharine’s biggest kitchen success came at the handle of a frying pan, which in Fort Smith usually meant cooking catfish or chicken. “In the ignominious art of frying,” she reported, “I might have made a record for myself.”

For most of her life, however, Katharine hired someone to cook and clean for her. There was little time for such tasks if one was serious about writing books. She didn’t mind sewing. It came in handy when she lost her only nightgown in Kristiana (Oslo), Norway, in 1923, with the majority of her trip left in front of her. “That I had only as many night gowns as I had prospects for the trip was hard for the European Danes to understand,” she wrote in her journal. “Finally took the bull by the horns and bought silk for a new one.” And while working on her fourth biography in the early 1930s (Marie Antoinette), sewing became a part of the daily routine she kept in order to structure her days. “I work four hours every morning without answering the telephone or anything; then I go for a walk, do my chores and my errands, sew, read, and get to bed rather early so that I can be ready for the morrow’s tussle with the Bourbons,” she wrote to a friend.

146 Ibid.  
147 Ibid., 14.  
148 BB to KA, July 28, 1932, WB.  
150 KA to ESD, August 2, 1926, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.  
151 KA, Russian Journal, July 11, 1923, WB.  
152 KA to ESD, Box 26, Folder 438, December 13, 1931, ESD-SL.
But in general, Katharine Anthony rejected the idea of sex-specific work. She outwardly chastised “domestic conscription” for keeping the girls at home while their male siblings were encouraged to pursue other things.\textsuperscript{153} Worst of all was the “dreary retirement to housework and needlework and immurement” that inevitably followed the meager schooling girls were allowed to receive—a fate almost worse than no schooling at all.\textsuperscript{154} She criticized parents for “allowing themselves to be a medium for transmitting the incessant pressure of standards which allow no room for impulse and initiative.”\textsuperscript{155} Being “merely [a] daughter” who obeyed and mimicked her mother horrified Katharine.\textsuperscript{156} “We are so determined to be the kind of people civilization expects us to be,” she wrote with no small amount of familiarity, “that we cannot admit we have these prohibited, barbarous feelings” as teenaged girls of being something other than “dutiful daughters.”\textsuperscript{157} She recalled “that special access of fury which comes to one between the ages of eleven and fourteen … [when one] struggles against the conventional limitations of her sex.”\textsuperscript{158} In a less serious moment, while at work on her second biography, Katharine questioned whether or not to buy an electric iron. “[I]t would be useful,” she

\textsuperscript{153} KA, \textit{FGS}, 48.
\textsuperscript{154} KA, \textit{The Lambs}, 12.
\textsuperscript{155} KA, “The Family,” 335.
\textsuperscript{157} KA, “The Emotional Basis of Individual Character,” 5.
noted; but she wondered what “the lady who wrote ‘Aus dem hager der stummen’ [would] think of [it].”\textsuperscript{159}

Indeed, Katharine Anthony’s relationship with domesticity, and with her mother, was a complicated one. On several occasions, she was clearly critical of Sue’s behavior and beliefs. Examples of this range from small objections to emphatic refutations. For instance, there is some suggestion that Sue was “reluctant” to inform her “children about the facts of reproduction”; and Katharine spent a significant amount of her time in the 1910s and 1920s writing sex hygiene pamphlets for the YWCA.\textsuperscript{160} Katharine’s close friend claimed that Sue Anthony was “disappointed” when Katharine was born a girl, having hoped for a boy; and Katharine argued in one of her most powerful statements in \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia} (1915) that “[t]he final problem of the feminist movement is ... the mother who feels that to bear a son is a prouder lot than to bear a daughter.”\textsuperscript{161} Sue was one of the “first subscribers” to the \textit{Woman’s Home Companion}, a monthly periodical that began in 1873 and quickly became a go-to source for American women looking to read sentimental fiction, keep up on the newest household products, and perfect their roles as mothers and wives; and Katharine detested “the so-called women’s magazines, the commercialized monthly journals which really exploit, with cold-blooded cunning, all the immaturities in woman which feminism is trying so

\textsuperscript{159} KA, Russian Journal, July 2, 1923, WB. The woman KA is referring to is Camilla Collett, the first feminist in Norway and author of the 1877 book \textit{Fra de stummes Leir} (Out of the Camp of the Mute). Collett is discussed in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{160} KA, “The Emotional Life of a Schoolgirl,” 102. In this book review, KA claimed that the book possessed an “emotional authenticity. ... [I]t has the rich and satisfying truth of art. Not even the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin has more reality” (103).

\textsuperscript{161} HJ, unpublished manuscript, LHA; and KA, \textit{FGS}, 231.
laboriously to remove.” In an essay she wrote in the 1920s, Katharine accused the “multitude of home journals and women’s magazines” for trying “to regiment the last detail of home life. ... [T]he perforated patterns, the foods ‘shot from guns,’ and all the rest of the labour-saving ingenuities which came pouring into the home and which were supposed to mean emancipation for mothers and their families, brought little of the real spirit of freedom in their wake. Our materialistic civilization finds it hard to understand that liberty is not achieved through time-saving devices but only through the love of it.”

On the other hand, several sources indicate that Sue Anthony was an early suffragist, which might have been Katharine Anthony’s first exposure to women’s rights. According to one Arkansas newspaper, Sue “was for years one of the most enthusiastic advocates of woman’s suffrage ... [She] claimed the distinction of having been a suffragist longer than any woman in the state. She frequently declared that Susan

---

162 “Miss Katharine Susan Anthony Displays Sentiment,” MHJ-AHC; KA, FGS, 13. It is important to note here that KA published three articles in the Woman’s Home Companion in the 1920s, at which time she “took considerable pleasure [in the fact that] ... my mother’s name is on the records of the publication in the list of ‘first subscribers.’” Finding a publisher was difficult, and the articles she wrote that eventually ended up in the WHC were not her typical style. KA felt “lucky” that the magazine bought them. “I have just written three more like them about my trip to the South this winter, but so far no editor has liked them well enough to buy them.” See KA to ESD, August 2, 1926, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL. By the following May, she still hadn’t sold them. “The three articles that I wrote last winter in the South have not sold very fast. The agent said that they were too high-brow. I don’t think that is true.” See KA to ESD, May 8, 1927, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.


164 For instance, see Sherwood, “Arkansas Biographer,” 2; and “Miss Anthony Dies of Terrible Burns in Gas Explosion,” Southwest American, November 17, 1917, AHC.
B. Anthony had not been a suffragist longer, though she had attracted greater renown through her advocacy of votes for women.”

In Arkansas, the fight for women’s enfranchisement didn’t truly begin until the 1880s, the decade Katharine Anthony referred to as “the bright days of woman suffrage;” and even then, it was never the dominant movement that it became in the North. Southern women wrote no Declaration, and “to the eye of the casual observer,” historian Anne Firor Scott writes, “the southern home and fireside seemed as safe from radical modernism and the dangerous ‘new woman’ in the [eighteen-] eighties as it had been in the [eighteen-] forties.” But Southern women, including those from Arkansas, participated in the suffrage movement all the same.

165 “Miss Anthony Succumbs to Her Injuries,” Fort Smith Times Record, November 16, 1917, AHC.
166 KA, SBA, 375. Little work has been done on suffrage in Arkansas. Still the most thorough and most cited article is from the 1950s, A. Elizabeth Taylor, “The Woman Suffrage Movement in Arkansas,” The Arkansas Historical Quarterly 15 (Spring 1956): 17-52. Other works on Arkansas suffrage include Bernadette Cahill, Arkansas Women and the Right to Vote: The Little Rock Campaigns, 1868-1920 (Little Rock: Butler Center Books, 2015); and Cahill, “‘Young people think women always had the right to vote’: Josephine Miller and the Arkansas Woman Suffrage Campaign,” Pulaski County Historical Review 61 (Spring 2013): 11-15. The website www.encyclopediaofarkansas.net is an excellent resource on Arkansas history, including the suffrage movement in the state. For a full discussion of suffrage in the South, see Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, New Women of the New South: The Leaders of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the Southern States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); and Elna C. Green, Southern Strategies: Southern Women and the Woman Suffrage Question (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997). On women’s increasing visibility in public life and the relationship between suffrage and women’s organizations for moral uplift, see, for example, Peggy Pascoe, Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874-1939 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); and Rebecca Edwards, Angels in the Machinery: Gender in American Party Politics from the Civil War to the Progressive Era (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
In 1884, Arkansas sent its first delegate to the annual convention for the National American Woman Suffrage Association in Washington.\textsuperscript{168} By the end of the decade, in 1889, Arkansas women were enough a part of the national movement that Susan B. Anthony lectured on “what women want” in three Arkansas cities, Helena, Fort Smith, and Little Rock (we don’t know if Sue or Katharine attended).\textsuperscript{169}

By 1893 it looked hopeful that several auxiliary suffrage organizations might form throughout Arkansas, one of which was to be in Fort Smith, where a handful of women had expressed an interest in woman’s suffrage. But the auxiliaries ultimately failed to materialize. “We find here and there a brave, outspoken woman, but not enough such women in one place to elect officers for an auxiliary,” one Arkansan suffragist explained.\textsuperscript{170} Women from all over the state attended the 1893 suffrage convention in Little Rock, including women from Fort Smith, where a resolution favoring a constitutional amendment giving women the right to vote was passed, although it’s unlikely that Sue was one of them.\textsuperscript{171}

We are left wondering what Sue Anthony’s support for women’s suffrage looked like, and what role, if any, she played in her daughter’s feminism.\textsuperscript{172} Did Sue’s influence

\textsuperscript{168} N.A.W.S.A. was formed in 1869 in New York City by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.


\textsuperscript{171} “Arkansas Annual Meeting,” \textit{The Woman’s Journal} (Boston, June 24, 1893): 200.

\textsuperscript{172} PC would also outwardly support suffrage. PC’s son wrote, “My grandmother and mother were both ardent suffragettes. I recall when I was about 9 years old, living in
on Katharine have more to do with Katharine’s rejection of her mother’s life; or was Katharine’s feminism an extension and expansion of the independence (albeit limited) that her mother achieved in the wake of the Civil War?

Many New Women found their identities first and foremost by rejecting the lives of their mothers. For these women, maternal influence often meant examples of what they never wanted to become. Indeed, so different were the feminisms of mothers and daughters like Sue and Katharine that historian Christine Stansell clearly distinguishes between the “politics of the mothers” and the “politics of the daughters” in her sweeping history of feminism, *The Feminist Promise: 1792 to the Present*. “The politics of the mothers … lean toward responsibility, propriety, and pragmatic expectations of what can be done; look to increase the admiration and power that accrue to women in their family roles; accept customary limitations on women’s freedom to act like men; … in short, have sought to enhance women’s power without radically challenging the way things are,” Stansell writes. “The feminism of the daughters has contempt for the status quo. The approach is utopian, flamboyant, defiant, insisting on claiming men’s prerogatives. It batters on the doors to power and demands dramatic rearrangements in marriage, motherhood, sex, and male psychology.”

Pinpointing the roots of Katharine’s feminism thus might mean both recognizing and putting aside family of origin. As

Missouri, our house was the only one on the block that flew the yellow pennant of “Votes for Women.” EC to Waitt, October 23, 1984, LHA. Arkansas was one of only four southern states to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment. The others were Texas, Tennessee, and Kentucky. For a discussion of Southern women after the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, see Anne Firor Scott, “After Suffrage: Southern Women in the Twenties,” *The Journal of Southern History* 30 (August 1964): 298-318. See also *The Arkansas Democrat*, February 28, 1917, AHC.

National Woman’s Party leader Alice Paul once said of her fellow feminists: “Well, they are born feminists and they cannot help themselves; that’s the way they were born, that’s all there is to it.”

Perhaps it wasn’t Sue Anthony’s alleged suffrage activities at all that created in Katharine a longing for something more. Perhaps Sue’s greatest influence on her youngest daughter was her willingness (albeit out of necessity) to work for money at a time and in a place where such was not the ideal, or maybe even the norm in the post-Civil War era. Years later, in a series of essays written by several of Katharine Anthony’s close friends in New York City about the supposed roots and influences of their feminism, there was one commonality highlighted in the concluding remarks. “A striking revelation in these ‘backgrounds,’” Beatrice Hinkle, a psychoanalyst and acquaintance of Katharine Anthony’s, wrote in 1927,

is the overwhelming part played by the mother in the family, and in the majority of cases, in the lives of the daughters. It was the mother on whom many of the families depended for their economic existence and for the education of the children; it was the mother on whom the affection and respect of the daughters were focused. Even though in some of the mother-dominated families the father made an effort to assume economic responsibility, the mother continuously contributed her share to the exchequer. In the cases where the father is especially mentioned with love and preference by the daughter, the mother still remained the gallant figure in the economic life of the family. These mothers are largely of the pioneer type and they present unmistakably the basis for the external freedom and unusual position of importance possessed by women in general in this country.

---


175 The series referenced here was called “These Modern Women” and appeared in The Nation in 1926 and 1927. Seventeen “New Women” contributed essays. This series is discussed further in Chapter 3. Beatrice Hinkle, “Why Feminism?”, in These Modern Women: Autobiographical Essays from the Twenties, edited by Elaine Showalter (New
Whatever the roots of Katharine Anthony’s feminism may have been, there is little doubt that her family environment played a significant role. Katharine herself would have argued as much. “The tremendous influence of the family on the individuals, old and young, composing it is not merely a pious belief,” she later wrote. “We are, alas, what our families make us.”

Perhaps the greatest influence Katharine’s family had on her future life and career was their commitment, from at least as far back as John Cathey, to education. Katharine once referred to her education in Arkansas as a “common garden variety of schooling.” But she also credited her success as a biographer with the exemplary teachers she had there. “Tho little more than a frontier town in those days,” she claimed, “Fort Smith had unusually good public schools owing to a gift of lands which had formerly been a large Indian reservation. Teachers came there from a distance, bringing in the breath of the outside world. The schools of course were perfectly free.”

In 1874 the Arkansas legislature provided for a free public school system. And two years later, the Illinois State Board of Education sent a Professor B. G. Roots to Fort Smith, along with “six experienced teachers,” to transform the educational system. Three recent graduates of a normal college in Illinois arrived in Fort Smith to teach in

---


179 “Fort Smith Linked to Outside World by Railroad,” 20.
And in 1884, President Chester Arthur signed a bill that opened up Reservation land for public schools. The *Fort Smith Elevator* was thus able to report on November 26, 1886, the day before Katharine’s ninth birthday, that “educationally, looking to what has been accomplished, if our great resources, in the shape of school taxes, and generous funds dedicated to education, be used with wisdom and advantage, Fort Smith stands preeminent among her sister cities.”

The Fort Smith high school quickly boasted a varied and rigorous curriculum: “Latin, German, botany, philosophy, literature, rhetoric, algebra and chemistry” were offered. Katharine’s most influential teacher—“the inspiring teacher in my high school days,” she told a journalist years later—was a man by the name of B.W. Torreyson, who “taught me the value of research and sound knowledge in those early and formative days of my life,” she said. It’s not surprising that Katharine mentioned Torreyson. He was a visionary educator who believed that women could affect the future of public schooling in Arkansas as much as anyone. He fought for “a democratic course of study,” a school for continuing education, and “[a] meeting place for women’s social and study clubs, farmers’ clubs, farm demonstrations and exhibits, boys’ corn clubs and

---

182 *Fort Smith Elevator*, November 26, 1886. See also Shirley, *Law West of Fort Smith*, 77. It is important to note that, although Fort Smith was perhaps superior to other schools in Arkansas, the schools there were still significantly behind many of the schools in the North. The national average of state spending per student was twenty-eight dollars at the turn of the twentieth century. In Fort Smith, it was eighteen dollars. See Moneyhon, *Arkansas and the New South*, 74.
183 “Fort Smith Linked to Outside World by Railroad,” 20.
exhibits, cooking and sewing and like demonstrations and exhibits.”185 He wanted a public circulating library for all rural schools, “[a] place for Saturday afternoon athletic games,” “[a] place for nonsectarian religious meetings,” and “[a] place for entertainments of all kinds, lectures on practical and scientific subjects, politics, school exhibitions, debating clubs, moving pictures.”186 This would have been considered a progressive educational program anywhere in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century; but in Arkansas, it was nothing short of revolutionary.

Katharine Anthony’s teachers remembered her long after she left Fort Smith as “a gifted child.”187 She impressed them with her exactitude and determination. “[They] often remarked on how enthusiastically she launched into the subject of a theme, and how completely the story was told,” a popular newspaper columnist wrote after Katharine had made a name for herself in the field of biography. “They noticed a patient, painstaking quality and if, in developing an idea, weeks, even months, were required to assemble the facts she desired, she worked on, with one goal in mind; she would be sure of all she wrote.”188 Her teachers were so sure of her ability, in fact, that they predicted she would one day become a great writer.189

186 Ibid.
187 George M. Moreland, “State Rambles,” unknown date or source, quoted in Sherwood, “Arkansas Biographer,” 2. Despite copious amounts of searching for George Moreland’s article on Katharine Anthony, the source remains a mystery. A small collection of his work is housed in Mississippi State University’s Department of Special Collections, but this particular article is not among those papers.
Chapter 2

“Give knowledge to women and let the world swing on”:¹

Nashville, Heidelberg, Freiburg, Chicago,

1895-1907

“[T]he young woman who wants to earn her living represents an active social danger. She forecasts the twilight of many ancient gods. Beyond her lies a day when even the services of the wife do not belong to the husband but to herself.”²

—Katharine Anthony, Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, 1915

* * *

Katharine Anthony graduated valedictorian from Belle Grove High School in 1895 and earned a scholarship to attend the Peabody Normal College’s two-year Licentiate of Instruction (L.I.) program in Nashville, Tennessee, beginning in the fall.³

Between her graduation from high school, which was probably held in June at the Grand Opera House on Garrison Avenue, “a three-story, yellow brick building, with an unusual rounded tower on the corner,” and boarding a train for Peabody in late September, the only known event in Katharine Anthony’s life was a wedding.⁴ On September 18, 1895, Katharine’s sister, Blanche, wed Edwin G. Brown, a train dispatcher from Indiana. Pearl was already married, to a man named Jim Crawford, and they

¹ KA, FGS, 28.
² Ibid., 51.
³ Twenty-seven students graduated in 1894, and a similar number probably received diplomas in 1895. Neither the schools nor the libraries and archive centers in Fort Smith have records of its high school from the 1890s.
⁴ The Arkansas News (Spring 1887): 4.
welcomed a daughter in 1894. But Katharine was never destined to be a bride, although she very likely had options. She was an attractive teenager, a cousin remembered. She had a “beautiful form”— she was “slender” and “erect,” with “sandy-reddish color hair.”\footnote{ECB to HJ, August 17, 1974, MHJ-AHC.} She was also cheerful and helpful, “the life of the home.”\footnote{Ibid.} By these characteristics, she would have made an excellent wife, and it is almost certain that a respectable young man, the son of a Fort Smith businessman, was romantically interested in her. It was Katharine who did not return the affection.\footnote{KA’s cousin wrote somewhat ambiguously about the unnamed boy, claiming that he and KA “were real serious friends. … His affection for Kate was real … But he was not the ‘Boy Friend’ of her early years.” KA’s cousin believed that it was KA’s increasingly literary and distant life that ultimately led the two to fall out of touch. ECB to HJ, December 29, 1975, Box 6, Correspondence Folder 4, MHJ-AHC.}

Katharine Anthony believed in fate, and perhaps, like she wrote about her third biographical subject, Queen Elizabeth, she recognized as early as 1895 that “[a]bility was her inheritance, her destiny”; that “[s]he was fated to be clever and lived up to her fate”; that she “had preëminently brains.”\footnote{KA, QE, 254, 255.} Or maybe Anthony’s mindset is suggested by what she said about Frances Willard, that her “brief engagement to be married distracted her for a time [from her ideal of independence for women] but, her engagement broken, she returned to this ideal with redoubled zeal.”\footnote{KA, “Frances Willard,” in Dictionary of American Biography, ed. Dumas Malone (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1936), 233.} Maybe to Katharine Anthony, marriage was a \textit{distraction}, and no more. Or perhaps at seventeen Katharine already thought of marriage as an isolating and subordinate state, and she knew that her affections were reserved for women alone. We don’t know for sure. But we do know that women didn’t
choose marriage in the nineteenth century—it was the expected outcome of their lives, an inevitability, the natural course of things. Women did, however, have to choose not to marry.\(^\text{10}\) This was not the normal course of things. It deviated from a woman’s prescribed role, bucking the system and leaving the future of her life open to her own choosing (as far as the law allowed, of course, and “provided that a mere woman can have any advantages whatever,” as Anthony noted sarcastically in her biography of Susan B. Anthony).\(^\text{11}\)

In her biography of Margaret Fuller, Katharine Anthony addressed Fuller’s decision in her late teenaged years to remain at home despite her great desire to travel and be educated, recognizing that, “[i]n those years there were few occupations open to women”; but she still held Fuller accountable for her own life and happiness.\(^\text{12}\) “[I]t seems as if Margaret with her unusual energies might have found something to do even then,” Anthony wrote. “But she stuck at home like any spiritless spinster of her time. … She sat in a prison of her own making.”\(^\text{13}\) Katharine would not do the same. “[E]motional ideals,” she claimed, “however firmly rooted in the instincts, cannot stand up empty any more than mealsacks,” and the notion that all women naturally desired marriage was just that: an empty, weightless ideal.\(^\text{14}\)

We don’t know what Pearl or Blanche did after high school, but there is no evidence that either sister attended a post-secondary school. Their lives, like the lives of

\(^{10}\) Between 1880 and 1900, only 10 percent of all American women did not marry; however, 50 percent of women who went to college remained unmarried. See Faderman, \textit{Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers}, 14.

\(^{11}\) KA, \textit{SBA}, 115.

\(^{12}\) KA, \textit{MF}, 38.

\(^{13}\) Ibid.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 150.
so many women, fade in the historical record after their weddings, Pearl’s at age twenty, and Blanche’s, like her mother’s, at twenty-three.

Katharine Anthony’s young age and love of learning probably made her decision to attend a teachers’ college for two years seem almost normal in 1895. She could put off marriage for at least a few more years before it would provoke comment. “Custom varies enormously, of course, in so polyglot a population,” Anthony wrote in the early 1920s, but “[i]t is generally assumed that twenty-four for women and twenty-nine for men are the usual ages for marriage the country over.”15

Furthermore, education for women had long been an acceptable, even desirable, expectation for the better off families in the South. It was thought that education would buttress tradition by making women better companions for men, and better mothers to their children. As Linda D. Gordon writes in *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era*, before the Civil War, southerners “believed that women’s education would uphold, not subvert, their slaveholding patriarchal culture. … Graduates of southern seminaries returned home to marry, raise children, and assume the duties of running a plantation or urban middle-class household.”16 While the war changed many things, it did not altogether change the deeply rooted notions of southern womanhood. Southern families still embraced traditional ideas, while now claiming to embrace women’s intellectual endeavors as well. “Although they acknowledged the need for women’s higher education,” Gordon points out, “southern parents tried to minimize its

15 KA, “The Family,” 327.
effects. … [M]ost southern families clung to their daughters and to conservative notions of southern womanhood.”\footnote{Ibid., 39.}

Katharine Anthony certainly didn’t view attending Peabody as a radical decision, or as some sort of “feminist” statement (a term not yet in use in the United States), which it wasn’t. As she wrote years later, teaching was “[t]he favourite occupation of genteel spinsterhood,” by which she meant the only occupation.\footnote{KA, \textit{The Lambs}, 161.} Even in the 1840s, “[t]he woman teacher could be justified as someone whose work was like that of a mother,” as Kathleen Barry tells us in her biography of Susan B. Anthony. “Her growing self-determination and personal autonomy, considered unfeminine at this time, actually mingled easily in her character with the traditional virtues of ‘feminine morality’.”\footnote{Kathleen Barry, \textit{Susan B. Anthony: A Biography of a Singular Feminist} (New York: Ballantine Books, 1988), 38-39.}

Enrolling at Peabody was also very likely the only option for Katharine Anthony outside of marriage or dependence on her father in 1895; but it was a first step towards achieving true independence. It should not be overlooked that this was Katharine’s first major decision. She would spend a significant portion of her adult life criticizing the institution of marriage for placing women in inferior, subordinate positions, and exposing the sexist expectation that unmarried daughters remain in the household of a male family member until they could be properly transferred to another man, the husband. Perhaps as a teenager she noticed that Sue Anthony’s independence came primarily from Gus Anthony’s weakness—an independence born of dependence, which was something akin to autonomy, but not exactly the same thing. If she wanted to live independently, if she
wanted to have a career, if she wanted to live her life, not vicariously, or in absentia, as
wives were wont to do, but just as she wished to live it, she had no choice but to attend a
teacher’s college.

Almost certainly reassuring to Gus and Sue was the fact that Peabody was a
southern normal college, committed to bettering southern education. It was probably an
unspoken assumption that Katharine would return to Arkansas after graduation and teach
until she started a family of her own—or in perpetuity if she never married.20 Even
Peabody upheld this vision. The expressed mission of the school was “to affect the state
of public education in the South,” and scholarship students like Katharine Anthony had to
“make a pledge of intent to teach for at least two years after graduation.”21

20 More and more women were heading off to colleges in the late nineteenth and early
twentieth centuries (in 1870, women comprised 21 percent of all college students in the
country, and by 1910, they represented 40 percent), although it was still uncommon to
attend college at all. At the turn of the twentieth century, only five percent of all college-aged
citizens actually went to college, and that number was lower for women specifically. In 1870, 0.7 percent of women ages 18-21 went to college. In 1910, it was
3.8 percent. In the South, it was even more unusual for women to attend a college after
high school. See Gordon, Gender and Higher Education, 39; Patricia Albjerg Graham,
German-Speaking Universities, 1868-1915 (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers,
2003), 4; Barbara Miller Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women: A History of
Women and Higher Education in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985),
63-64; Mabel Newcomer, A Century of Higher Education for American Women (New
York: Harper & Bros., 1959), 46; and Catherine Clinton and Christine Lunardini, eds.,
The Columbia Guide to American Women in the Nineteenth Century (New York:
Columbia University Press, 2000), 96. For a concise summary of scholarship on
women’s higher education before 1920, see Patricia A. Palmieri, “From Republican
Motherhood to Race Suicide: Arguments on the Higher Education of Women in the
United States, 1820-1920,” in Educating Men and Women Together, edited by Carol
Lasser (Urbana: University of Illinois Press in conjunction with Oberlin College, 1987),
49-64.

21 Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1896-1897, 15, Vanderbilt
University, Special Collections and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee. (Heretofore
VUSCA). And Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1895-1896, 25,
Indeed, the most radical thing about Katharine Anthony’s departure was probably the departure itself. There is no indication that she, or any of her siblings, had ever left Arkansas before she boarded a train for Nashville in late September, and there is some suggestion that she was apprehensive about her new life far away from home, and in a much larger city. 1895 marked the beginning of Katharine Anthony’s college education, an adventure that would last over a decade, cross an ocean, and span three states: Tennessee, Illinois, and the historical German state of Baden. From 1895 to 1907, she was, above all else, a student. Even during the four years she taught secondary school in Fort Smith (1897-1901), she spent her free time in the pursuit of knowledge. “[A]ll that time I studied, too,” she said, “history, mostly dry-as-dust history, but I liked finding out things I did not know, and supplying myself with characters to dream

VUSCA. Peabody Normal College became a four-year institution in 1894, making an L.I. degree the equivalent of a junior college degree by the time KA enrolled in 1895. See Paul K. Conkin, Peabody College: From a Frontier Academy to the Frontiers of Teaching and Learning (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002), 145. The first state normal school opened in 1839 in Lexington, Massachusetts. It was considered a high school education, and it trained students solely for teaching. Gradually and for a variety of reasons, the normal school transformed into a college program, albeit still training students solely for the purpose of teaching. In the twentieth century, however, these schools began adopting a broader liberal arts curriculum and changing their names from “Normal School,” to “Normal College,” and finally, to “State University.” Peabody, for example, began as the Peabody State Normal School in 1875, changed to Peabody Normal College in 1889, and finally to George Peabody College for Teachers in 1909. For a history of the state normal school, see Christine A. Ogren, The American State Normal School: “An Instrument of Great Good” (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005).

22 AW claimed that KA told her she was somewhat resentful of her mother for not traveling to Nashville with her, as this was her first time away from home. See HJ, unpublished ms., LHA.

23 The historical territory of Baden existed from 1806 to 1918, when it became part of the Weimar Republic. Both Freiburg and Heidelberg, where KA studied in 1901-1902, were located in Baden.
about.” She was a formal student for seven of the twelve years that bookend this chapter, but she was reading, dreaming, and planning during all of them. These were the years upon which her future would turn.

When Katharine Anthony joined the nearly five hundred other students attending Peabody in the fall of 1895, the city of Nashville was vibrant and growing. With a population approaching 80,000 in 1890, Nashville was the 38th largest city in the country (the biggest city in 1890 was New York City, with over a million and a half people, followed by Chicago). Men with their hopes set on making their careers as merchants flocked to Nashville in the late nineteenth century, where a sophisticated and elaborate railroad system fashioned the city as “a gateway between the Deep South and the Midwest.”

Culturally, the town flowered in the 1890s. Schools for music opened, racetracks drew thousands, and by 1895, several ladies’ organizations were active in Nashville, including the Central Literary Club, the Query Club, the Review Club, the Magazine Club, and the Wednesday Morning Musicale. Nashville’s burgeoning educational system was also a draw, earning it the nickname “Athens of the South” as early as the

24 Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
1850s. By the time Katharine Anthony started her first semester of college, the city boasted four medical schools, two universities that would eventually garner national prominence (Vanderbilt and Fisk), and several local colleges, including David Lipscomb University, the all black Roger Williams University, and the all women’s Ward-Belmont College.\textsuperscript{27}

In the 1890s, admission to Peabody required two things. Non-scholarship students had to be at least sixteen years old to apply, and scholarship students like Katharine Anthony had to be between seventeen and thirty. Prospective non-scholarship students were required to arrive at the school a week before the term began to take entrance examinations in English grammar and composition, United States History, Geography, Mathematics, and Latin. For part of the English exam, students were tested on their knowledge of two books, chosen anew every year. During Katharine’s two years at Peabody, the texts assigned were, in 1895, Joseph Addison’s \textit{Deoverly Papers} and Washington Irving’s \textit{Sketch Book}; and in 1896, Shakespeare’s \textit{Merchant of Venice} and Ralph Waldo Emerson’s \textit{American Scholar}.\textsuperscript{28} If a student passed all the exams, he or she was allowed to begin classes on the first day of the fall term, which was always the first Wednesday in October.

The catalogue does not explicitly state what the exams for scholarship students consisted of, but it was known that “[w]hen Scholarship students reach[ed] the College they [would] not be re-examined for admission.”\textsuperscript{29} Presumably they too had to prove competency in English, History, Geography, Mathematics, and Latin before beginning

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 18-22.
\item Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1895-1896, 20-21, VUSCA.
\item Ibid., 26.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
classes, and it’s possible that other subjects were added to the list as well. Requirements for scholarship students also extended to their disposition and physical well-being. They had to be “of irreproachable moral character; in good health; with no physical defects, habits, or eccentricities, which would interfere with success in teaching” later on.\textsuperscript{30} The list of ailments that precluded a person from receiving a scholarship to Peabody in the 1890s was lengthy. “Any candidate who has any chronic affection, such as weak lungs, or weak eyes, should be rejected at once.”\textsuperscript{31} Further disqualifications included a “sluggish or indolent temperament ... slovenly habits ... [and a] vicious disposition.”\textsuperscript{32} However, “[g]ood breeding, politeness, and a pleasant manner” were all to be “counted in a candidate’s favor.”\textsuperscript{33}

In 1895, Katharine Anthony was just the kind of scholarship student that Peabody sought—smart, driven, polite, and healthy. She was awarded the significant sum of $100 per year, to be disbursed in $25 increments at the ends of October, December, February, and April. She was also allotted railroad fare from Fort Smith to Nashville, “and return by the most direct route.”\textsuperscript{34} Notably, Katharine Anthony was the first girl from Fort Smith to receive a scholarship to Peabody, and in 1895, she was also one of only seventeen students from Arkansas to be included among the 204 scholarship recipients.

As a woman, Katharine Anthony had to outperform enough men on the entrance examination to even gain admission to Peabody, which is indicative not only of the cultural stigmas still attached to women’s education in the 1890s, but also of Katharine’s

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 25.
\textsuperscript{31} Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1896-1897, 24, VUSCA.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1895-1896, 26, VUSCA.
\textsuperscript{34} Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1896-1897, 22, VUSCA.
remarkable mind. Unfortunately, the questions and results of the admissions exams were not preserved; but since 1887, when fifty-year-old William Payne, a Quaker from New York, became the President of Peabody, a tie on the exam always worked in favor of men. “When a choice must be made between a young man and a young woman whose examination papers are of equal merit,” the school informed potential applicants via the catalogue, “the young man should be preferred. This is not intended to discriminate against young women as such; but it is thought that young men will be more likely to continue the vocation of teaching.”

This was a stark departure from the school’s founding in 1875. Under Eben Stearns, Peabody’s first president, the majority of students had always been women. Even during Stearns’ last year as president, 1886-1887, when male enrollment was at its peak, men comprised only one-third of the students at the school. As an outcome of Payne’s policies, however, “[b]y 1891, men slightly outnumbered women among Peabody scholars, women still outnumbered men in the L.I. [Licentiate of Instruction] program, and men who earned bachelor’s degrees outnumbered women.”

Whether they agreed with Payne’s policies or not, the faculty knew better than to challenge him. He had made it clear early on that he would tolerate “no dissent once he had adopted a policy,” and for a while, that was the status quo at Peabody. Payne controlled the school almost unilaterally while Katharine Anthony was a student there

37 Conkin, Peabody College, 119.
38 Ibid., 136.
39 Ibid., 148.
and was able to discriminate against women in several ways during his tenure, which lasted until 1901. He not only tried to do away with the L.I. degree completely—a program that had always included more women than men—but he also discouraged women from pursuing any of the three bachelor’s degrees the college offered, presumably because of the short time it was expected women would work until they married and had children.40

Unsurprisingly, Payne’s discrimination against women at Peabody extended to female faculty members as well. Whereas Stearns brought two female teachers with him when he became the first president of the school in 1875, Payne rarely hired women. But it seems he couldn’t suppress the influence female faculty members had, albeit small in number, on their students, especially their female L.I. students.41 The female teachers Katharine Anthony studied with at Peabody were some of the first examples she had of unmarried professional women. Although this might have been in part the result of a general resistance by school boards to hire married women (a discrimination that lasted well into the twentieth century), none of the women who taught long-term at Peabody ever married. Likewise, almost none of the female graduates of Peabody who remained in education wed.42 It would be a long time before married women could “keep on with their professional life while their children are growing up” without facing criticism—a component of sex equality that Katharine championed in the 1910s.43

40 Ibid., 136.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid., 136-137.
43 KA quoted in anonymous review of SBA, by KA, unknown source, LHA.
To obtain the Licentiate of Instruction degree in two years, Katharine Anthony had to complete sixty-nine credits in four semesters. This required careful planning, as classes were offered only once a year. Consequently, Katharine’s two years at Peabody were packed full of courses in a wide range of subjects: she had to complete four courses in Latin, one in philosophy, five in pedagogy, three in mathematics, two in English language, two in English literature, two in history, one in chemistry, one in physics, one in biology, one in geography, two in art, and two in music. The diversity of coursework was meant to produce teachers with vast abilities who would be able to serve their southern communities and schools, struggling in the wake of the Civil War and the end of Reconstruction, in whatever capacity needed.

The varied coursework might have had another, unintended effect in the life and mind of Katharine Anthony. One of the mandatory courses in philosophy was an introductory class in psychology, to be taken in the fall semester. In 1895, psychology had not yet made its mark on America as it would after Sigmund Freud’s visit to Clark University in Massachusetts in 1909—the Austrian psychiatrist’s only visit to the United States—so the inclusion of psychology in the curriculum at Peabody is somewhat surprising. The class, titled simply “Psychology,” focused on the texts of Gabriel Compayré (1843-1913), a French Professor of Education who published widely on pedagogy, psychology, and the history of education, and who President Payne particularly liked. Payne translated several of Compayré’s books for use at Peabody, most notably *The Elements of Psychology* (1887) and *Psychology Applied to Education*...
According to Payne, he chose Compayré as the basis for the psychology course at Peabody because of the author’s simplistic approach and easy style. Psychology for teachers (i.e., for women), Payne believed, “should contain only the essentials … should not be a work of erudition or learned research … should be written in terms readily intelligible by ordinary readers … [and should be] in accord with the Christian spirit.”

Katharine Anthony’s psychology class met for three hours every week and was taught by a man named Wickliffe Rose, a handsome, young, accomplished professor from Saulsbury, Tennessee. Rose had earned degrees from three universities by the time he arrived at Peabody—the University of Nashville, the University of Mississippi, and Harvard University—and he was dedicated to education in the South, later serving on the Southern Education Board for five years, from 1910 to 1915.

Significantly, Compayré and Rose not only introduced Katharine Anthony to the field of psychology, but may have also alerted her to its potential application in the field of biography. History devoid of people’s “inner motives, ideas, sentiments, and passions,” Compayré argued, was “an incoherent succession of facts, an enigmatic procession of characters whose parts are not understood.” In other words, personalities and emotions were needed to write clear history. Without knowing it (because it didn’t yet exist), Compayré defined the essence of New Biography as it would develop in the years after World War I: flesh and blood characters, with their successes and failures

---

45 Compayré, The Elements of Psychology, iii, iv.
46 Ibid., 2.
presented side by side. Historical writing that privileged agency. Portraits that removed from the shadows a person’s flaws deemed too shameful to name in Victorian America.

For Katharine Anthony, Compayré’s critique of an “incoherent succession of facts” became a critique of “dates [as] mere numerals ... a stringing out of hit-or-miss facts, about as interesting as the multiplication table and not nearly so easy to remember”; his “enigmatic procession of characters” were, in Anthony’s words, characters with “no more life than a wooden Indian before a cigar store.”47 She had been looking for this kind of lively, vibrant biography, one “that would give me the facts and that would at the same time have all the fascination of a well written realistic novel. ... But it was years before it ever occurred to me that I might myself be able to write a readable biography.”48

During her two years at Peabody, Katharine Anthony published two short articles in *The Peabody Record*, a literary magazine created in April of 1892 “by the students themselves, who felt the need of such a publication.”49 According to one source, Katharine had “always wanted to write.”50 According to another, she began writing “to please her father.”51 It is also possible that she started writing because her ability finally met with opportunity. Peabody graduates were encouraged not only to teach, but to contribute worthy research to their fields as well, and the *Record* became an outlet for students to practice the kind of scholarship they should later produce as full-time teachers.

47 KA quoted in Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
48 Ibid.
49 *Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1896-1897*, 66, VUSCA.
51 “Introducing Katharine Anthony,” *Wings*, 3, WB.
Her first published work was a short essay titled “Mignon,” a reference to the nymph in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s second novel, *Wilhelm Meister’s Apprenticeship* (1795-96). It is evident from the start of the essay that the book was assigned for a course, that the students spent the better part of the semester reading it, and that Katharine Anthony was deeply impressed by it. The tone of the piece is whimsical, and the style, not unusual to young scholars, is bombastic and flowery; but it also shows a capability for balance and control, wandering only occasionally to let the reader in on the author’s knowledge of literature beyond the text at hand. In several places, it is to Christianity and the Bible that Katharine Anthony deviates, perhaps suggesting that at this time in her life she was still to some degree intellectually committed to the religion of her upbringing.

The ornamental language of the essay might be interpreted as expressing Katharine Anthony’s poetic inclinations. Several times in her life, Katharine wrote poetry, although none of it survives, and she often toyed with the idea of writing a novel (she was even asked by a publisher to write a novel once). Undoubtedly, her romantic, fantastical imagination was strong. But her need for reality—for facts—would always win out. We might say that, in “Mignon,” Anthony played with boundaries and genres, walking the line between art and scholarship and often falling somewhere in between.

---

52 Goethe was also influential to the intellectual development of Margaret Fuller, KA’s first biographical subject. See, for instance, KA, *MF*, 212.
53 See, for instance, ESD to KA, July 31, 1926, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL: “Have you written any more poetry lately?” And regarding novels, see KA to ESD, March 23, 1923, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL; and ESD to KA, March 29, 1923, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
We don’t know which professor assigned Goethe; but according to Katharine, he or she was a “great teacher” who skillfully led her to the truths buried within the text. She began the essay with a reference to her own intellectual eagerness, and to the New Testament, Luke 12:19: “[w]hen a seeker of truth and a lover of knowledge comes to spend for the first time a few months with Goethe’s *Meister*,” Anthony wrote, “he might possibly say to his desire, ‘Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease.’”

As the title of the essay indicates, Mignon was Katharine’s focus, in particular the “‘boundless yearning’ for the home of [Mignon’s] childhood and her entire lack of harmony with her surroundings,” a phase of life Katharine almost certainly associated with the transformation from adolescence to adulthood she was currently experiencing. It takes no stretch of the imagination to replace Mignon’s trials with Katharine’s own situation, and view “Mignon” as the work of a homesick teenager, lost in the “foreign” land of Tennessee, struggling to make sense of her new life and feelings by identifying with a character in a book. This was not an uncommon outlet for college students in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who were living away from home for the first time. Gordon has shown that “[s]hort stories by southern college women [during the Progressive Era] stressed themes of separation; often a fictional family member became ill or died when the daughter went to college.” In like fashion, “Mignon” emphasized both separation and home, that internal tug-of-war between being consumed (independence) and being abandoned (safety and belonging). In what would become a

---

55 KA, “Mignon,” 272
familiar process in Katharine Anthony’s life, she turned to books to both ease and explain her duress.

“[T]he most significant fact in the character of Mignon,” Katharine Anthony wrote, “is the deep yearning which she expresses in all her being. … Nothing can be more beautifully expressed than that longing of a soul in a strange land for its home as Goethe has expressed it in the words of Mignon, ‘For I am too cold here.’ … She, like each lonely human being, was ‘An infant crying in the night / An infant crying for the light / And with no language but a cry.’ … In Mignon, Goethe has sought to give expression to that which thousands have felt.”

No letters or journals survive from Katharine’s two years at Peabody, but “Mignon” suggests that she was experiencing the typical teenaged feelings of homesickness and bewilderment.

Classes for the fall semester of 1896 began on Wednesday, October 7. As a second-year student, Katharine joined the Students’ Lecture Association (SLA), a group “organized for the purpose of providing the College with a series of lectures and entertainments of a high order.” A list of the lectures and entertainments Katharine Anthony helped arrange does not exist; but we do know that she served as both the SLA’s Treasurer and Committee Member. Also during her second year, she wrote one more article for the Peabody Record, “The Poetry of Edgar Allen Poe (A Critical Study).”

---
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In 1895, a widely discussed new edition of the complete works of Poe appeared. Printed in ten volumes and edited by Edmund Clarence Stedman and George Edward Woodberry, the new collection was the brainchild of two recent Harvard University graduates, Herbert Stone (who, incidentally, would die on the Lusitania in 1915), and Hannibal Kimball. The last of the ten books, completed in December of 1895, was a compilation of Poe’s poetry. In its entirety, Stone and Kimball’s edition was hailed as a crowning achievement, the definitive work to replace R. W. Griswold’s four-volume set from the 1850s.

Katharine Anthony—if she took English Literature with Professor Albert P. Bourland in the first semester of her second year, which she almost certainly did—was assigned to read Poe’s “Raven” and “Other Poems” during the semester. That Bourland assigned Poe’s poetry rather than his prose is worth noting. Although Poe had regained popularity in the 1890s—as one contemporary put it, he was part and parcel of “old authors who have now a new vogue”—it is no secret that Poe’s poetry had a rough reception in America from the middle of the nineteenth century onward.


For comments about the new collected works of Poe, see, for example, “The New Poe,” Outlook 3 (August 1895): 183; and “Notes,” New York Critic (10 March 1894): 174.

Catalogue of the Peabody Normal College for the Year 1896-1897, 37, VUSCA.

The Publishers’ Circular (14 March 1896), 295.
Emerson famously and derogatorily referred to Poe the poet as “the jingle man.” Henry James, Katharine Anthony’s favorite novelist, commented in 1878 that, “an enthusiasm for [the poetry of] Poe is the mark of a decidedly primitive state of reflection.” Whether or not Bourland asked students to read Poe’s poetry in its entirety is not known; but Anthony read it all. With his complete poetic corpus digested, Anthony sympathized with Emerson and James and wrote her article, in much the same flowery language of “Mignon,” on what she saw as Poe’s poetic shortcomings.

She criticized first Poe’s overall theory of poetry, which he laid out most clearly in his posthumously published essay, “The Poetic Principle” (1850), and with which Katharine began her essay. In it, Poe defined “poetry of words” as “the rhythmical creation of beauty” whose “sole arbiter is taste.” As such, Poe concluded, poetry “has no concern whatever either with duty or with truth.” Katharine Anthony, “a seeker of truth” (and one of the few feminists in the 1910s who would emphasize one’s “duty” over one’s “rights”), found this troubling. “We cannot consent to having poetry limited to rhythm and image, its means of expression,” she began her argument; “[for] if we do, where shall we stop short of designating as poetry some such euphonious rhythmical combination as ‘Onry icky ickery Ann / Phyllus and Phollus and / Nicholas John. /
Queevy Quavy, English Navy / Stinklum, stanklum, Borum Buck.”’”67 “Meaningless sound,” Anthony concluded, was not poetry.68

She also critiqued Poe for his fascination with “sorrow, despair, and death. Joy, hope, life, have no attractions for him,” she wrote. “Many of his poems spring from morbid thoughts of death and while one critic says that they constitute a commentary on death, they are by no means a complete commentary. The horror, the hopelessness of some of these poems I find unhealthful in the extreme.”69 Interesting here is that Anthony might have let Poe’s morbidity escape criticism but for his failure to provide a “complete commentary” on death. This lack of thoroughness was an offense almost as great as Poe’s lack of universal insight and application.

But it was the self-centeredness of Poe’s poetry that irked Katharine Anthony the most. “Although Poe was an American in the nineteenth century, his writings express not the least sympathy with the issues of social problems of his day,” she wrote. “Liberty, to whom so many peans [sic] have been sung, did not draw a single line of enthusiasm from his pen. He gave his time to self-contemplation and as a result he was not able to contemplate mankind as a race in its sorrows and hopes.”70 A sole focus on one’s self did nothing to explain or uplift humankind and was thus all but useless according to Anthony. Whereas Goethe gave “expression to that which thousands have felt,” Poe gave expression only to his own limited and morbid mind, thus reaching only a limited audience. “The reader finds Poe extremely narrow in his sympathies,” Katharine
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concluded. “Most of us are very seldom in the mood to read his poems with interest and some of us never appreciate them.”

Here Anthony refers again to the phases of human life. Unlike Goethe, Poe’s poems “are in sympathy with only a few phases of human life,” a fault Anthony attributed to his obsession with the past. “[Poe] lived with his thoughts ‘turned back upon the past’ and allowed his soul to become a ‘stagnant tide.’”

Only two of Poe’s poems received complimentary remarks from Anthony, “To Helen” and “A Dream Within a Dream,” the first for its “strain of consolation that runs through,” and the second for its “expression of the universal moan of mankind beneath the pitiless crushing hand of fate.” But ultimately Anthony concluded that Poe’s poetry left only a fleeting “impress on human character,” which to her was a violation of the essential point of writing. Already in 1897, Katharine Anthony believed that writing should be useful, purposeful, moving. It was a means by which one could deeply affect humanity, perhaps uprooting arbitrary customs and replacing them with modern insights. Already in the 1897, it seems that Anthony viewed writing as a medium through which new ideas could find keen expression.

One curious detail about the article requires a final comment. Rather than attributing the article to herself, as she did with “Mignon,” Katharine Anthony wrote the name of her mother, before her mother was married, in the byline. “Susan Cathey,” it reads in quotation marks. Why did Katharine do this? Was this some hidden message that only Sue would understand? Did Sue read the article? Was this nineteen-year-old
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Katharine’s way of subtly undermining patriarchal society? If so, this might be her first public (albeit enigmatic) feminist statement. Years later, Katharine would overtly criticize the customary changing of a woman’s name after marriage and join the Lucy Stone League. “A last vestige of the patriarchal family remains,” she lamented in an article in 1921, “in the odd provision that husband and wife shall possess a common surname.”75 Perhaps twenty-five years earlier, Katharine Anthony already saw the sexism in the custom.

Katharine Anthony graduated from Peabody Normal College on Wednesday, May 26, 1897, and returned home to Fort Smith to put her two years of training to use. She got a job teaching fourth grade at Belle Point School. Her friend, Pearl Stegall, was also teaching in Fort Smith, and Bird Smith worked in town as a stenographer.

Although not nearly the size of Nashville, Fort Smith had also flourished in the 1890s. A variety of stores had opened by the end of the decade, including the Southern Tea and Coffee Company, Tony Marre’s Toy and Confectionaries, J.K. Jones Liquors, Kelley’s Meat Market, A.A. Post Sewing Machines, a barber shop, several groceries, a shoe store, and a second-hand furniture store. According to the Fort Smith Directory for 1898, the Anthony family lived at 809 n. A Street, in between 8th and 9th Streets and just one block off of Fort Smith’s busiest street, Garrison Avenue, where most of the stores were located.76 Katharine’s grandfather, John Cathey, had passed away by the time she returned home. Pearl was also gone, having moved with her family to Canada. But
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Blanche was still in town. In December 1897, Blanche gave birth to a baby girl in Fort Smith she named Dorothy Blanche Brown, making Katharine an aunt for a second time.

By 1900 the Anthony family had moved to 115 N 21st Street, further away from the center of town and very likely prompted by a devastating tornado that tore through the city on the night of January 11, 1898, killing over fifty people and injuring dozens more. Still today the Fort Smith tornado of 1898 is one of the deadliest tornados in the history of the United States.

The tornado’s initial touchdown occurred roughly 600 meters away from the Anthony’s home, in the Fort Smith National Cemetery, but some of the worst destruction occurred within one block of their house. “A cyclone struck the city last night at 11 ... crossing Garrison avenue east on Ninth street, laying everything flat for a path 100 yards wide, killing thirty-five persons, and more to hear from,” one newspaper reported. “A hundred homes are a total ruin. The dead are mostly those who lived over stores on the avenue.” Downtown Fort Smith was designed as a grid of nearly perfect squares, and city blocks were roughly 100 meters long and wide. When the storm reached Garrison and 9th, it was approximately 100 meters away from Katharine Anthony’s house. “The tornado made a clean sweep on Garrison avenue from Ninth [Street] to Texas [Corner],” a newspaper informed readers. “The city is wrapped in sorrow the most profound.”

The signpost at the intersection of Garrison and Thirteenth Street was found twenty-two

77 Fort Smith Directory for 1900, FSPL. According to the Fort Smith Public Library, there is no directory for Fort Smith for 1899.
78 See, for instance, The Arkansas Democrat, January 12, 1898; The Arkansas Democrat, January 13, 1898; and The Arkansas Democrat, January 14, 1898.
79 The Arkansas Democrat, January 12, 1898.
80 Ibid. The Democrat is quoting the Fort Smith Sun from Thursday, January 13, 1898. The only records for the Sun are for February 6 and April 13, 1898.
miles away in the town of Belmont. Booklets of photographs taken in the aftermath of the storm—crowds of people on foot and in horse-drawn buggies waiting outside of Birnie Brothers Undertakers to hear news of relatives and friends; heaps of broken lumber between houses miraculously left standing; a dead horse in the middle of a dirt street; a grand piano, still in one piece, resting on the floor of a home with no walls and no ceiling; a map of the city with what looked to be a red river of blood weaving its way through the town that marked the storm’s path—sold for 25 cents.

The storm disrupted the school year. The new high school building was destroyed. But like many things about her childhood, Katharine Anthony never mentioned the tornado, although she was almost certainly at home when it happened. Sue Anthony, however, would remember the storm long afterward, noting its eighteenth anniversary in her diary on January 11, 1916.  

Besides the devastating tornado, and as far as we can tell, Katharine Anthony’s life in the late 1890s was busy, but mostly uneventful. She taught school, cleaned the house, read books, went to the opera with Mark, and took German lessons with the local Lutheran minister, a thirty-year-old man named John K. Horst whose parents had migrated to America from Germany. The inspiration for these lessons, according to Katharine, came from “one of my teachers,” presumably at Peabody. She probably had some opportunity to practice her German outside of the Lutheran church as well.  
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the railroad between Little Rock and Fort Smith was nearly completed in the late 1870s, the railroad company offered 100 acres and $2,500 to a group of Benedictine sisters if they would move to Fort Smith and build a church and a school, hopefully drawing German immigrants to the area. The sisters accepted, and St. Scholastica began operating in 1879. One-third of its members came directly from Germany and Switzerland.  

Overall, these were peaceful years for Katharine Anthony and the rest of her family. Sue was happy to have her daughter at home and began keeping a diary in December of 1900. “And my Kate,” she wrote on December 30, “God never blessed a mother more in a child.” Mark was showing signs of “sobriety and goodness.” And Gus “is more considerate of me than ever before,” Sue wrote. Katharine’s resistance to reveal anything personal about her life is evident even now, when she apparently disapproved of her mother’s new hobby. “I think Kate doesn’t think I’m doing just as I should to write here but maybe I am not but we’re all a little pigheaded and I enjoy it,” Sue wrote on January 5.

A photograph of the Anthony family taken December 28, 1898, shows Gus in a suit, clean-shaven, hair swept to the left, sitting tall (Figure 3.2). He is neither smiling nor frowning, and his granddaughter, Pearl, is seated in his lap. Sitting to Gus’s right is Sue, holding their other granddaughter, Dorothy. Sue is clad in a dark, ornate dress with puffed sleeves and a large brooch at her throat. She has the hint of a smile on her face.
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All four children stand behind their parents. Mark, fourteen at the time, looks awkward, unsure of where to place his hands, and wearing a bowtie too large for his body. Pearl and Blanche are in the center, and, indicative of their closeness, are leaning just slightly towards one another. Pearl has a teasing, almost coquettish grin on her face. Blanche looks feminine, perhaps diffident. Katharine stands just behind her father’s left shoulder, dressed similar to her mother and sisters. But she is neither awkward, nor teasing, nor shy. There is an intensity to her expression. She stands taller than all of her siblings and looks confident, perhaps amused, and certainly distinct.90

Until 1901, Katharine Anthony’s life unfolded as it was expected to. She had obtained just the right amount of education—not too much, and in the proper field—to keep her parents and the town busybodies quiet; and she was at home, living once again under her father’s roof, an inferior but acceptable alternative to marriage. The first indication that something might disrupt the Anthony’s peaceful and regular life appears in Sue’s diary entry for January 9, 1901. “Kate got a letter from Mr. Rose yesterday advising her about her German trip.”91 Discord ensued. “Kate her father and I had quite a discussion about Kate’s trip to Europe this evening,” Sue wrote on January 17. “Papa can’t see why she will go and really I think she might wait till I’m dead before she goes. … [I]t is just causing us to be lonesome in our old age left alone—and I will be so

90 Anthony family portrait, December 28, 1898, WB.
91 SA diary, January 9, 1901, MHJ-AHC. HJ transcribed SA’s diary and questioned the name of the person who wrote the letter. HJ wrote “Mr. Ross (?)” This is almost certainly Mr. Rose from Peabody, and I have replaced it as such.
lonely.”

Katharine was twenty-three-years-old, and her proposed trip to Germany was to last two years, until 1903. Very likely Gus and Sue feared for their daughter’s future, and perhaps also for their own. Katharine would be giving up two crucial years of her life to go to Germany, facing the possibility of spinsterhood when she returned home at the late age of twenty-five. Probably even more unsettling was the fear that Katharine might not return at all.

Until well into the twentieth century, the choice presented to women was “vocation or marriage,” Katharine Anthony commented years later, and she chose vocation. By traveling to Europe, Anthony was following in the footsteps of several well-known American “feminists” who crossed the ocean in the nineteenth century in search of a life for which they had no language and few examples. Margaret Fuller, Jane Addams, Florence Kelley, M. Carey Thomas, Harriot Stanton Blatch (the daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton), and even some of the heroines dreamed up by Anthony’s favorite author, Henry James, all traveled to Europe in the nineteenth century to find answers to their varied questions: What should I do with my life? What do I believe? What is most important to me? And even, Who am I? The oldest of these women, Margaret Fuller, was a precursor to the “New Woman,” a phrase coined by James and embodied in women like Addams, Kelley, Thomas, and Blatch, four examples of the first

92 SA diary, January 17, 1901, MHJ-AHC. A sentence in the transcription of SA’s diary is uncertain and therefore I have not included it in the quote. It pertains in some way to Katharine’s education.
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generation of the feminist archetype, who placed education before marriage and a career before motherhood.

Katharine Anthony was of the second generation of New Women, educated in the 1890s, and different from the first in significant ways. But all of them were born in an age—the “Victorian Era”—that taught women to be submissive, dutiful, pious, and pure. The New Woman, in many ways the feminist antidote to the Victorian lady, was autonomous both socially and economically. She rejected the prescribed female role and demanded a new script. Traveling to Europe on her own was one way she created and embraced new opportunities for herself and other women at the dawn of the twentieth century. A historical coincidence serves as a fitting illustration for this moment in Katharine Anthony’s life: less than a week after fighting with her parents about her trip to Europe, on January 22, 1901, Queen Victoria, the monarch whose sixty-three-year reign encompassed over half of the nineteenth century and carried stronger cultural connotations than political ones, died. Katharine Anthony would sail for Europe, silently announcing her freedom from Victorian standards, as the monarch for whom the standards were named was being interred.

Katharine Anthony’s struggle with her parents is also a good example of the tensions created among early twentieth-century families when daughters, and even sons, expressed their intent to move away from home to one of the growing metropolises in the age of industry. The urban environment of the modern world did not sit well in the imaginations of rural parents, who feared for their children’s safety and morality. “The world of large cities, threatening to its own inhabitants, assumed monstrous proportions when viewed from afar by small-town Americans,” Carol Smith-Rosenberg writes. “The
giant cities seemed to violate every small-town value. Sodoms and Gomorrah of sexual excess and sybaritic indulgence, Babels of conflicting languages, religions, and customs, chaotic, ungovernable, the great cities epitomized the foreign, the unknown, and the dangerous. Plutocracy and anarchy became, in the imagination of rural and small-town America, the warring deities of a new world.”

Books like Theodore Dreiser’s *Sister Carrie* (1900), the tale of an eighteen-year-old country girl who heads to the big city of Chicago and falls unsuitably into prostitution after being seduced by a traveling salesman, didn’t help quell parents’ fears. Doubly disconcerting to Gus and Sue was probably the fact that Katharine would be traveling to a large city in a foreign country. The population of Berlin in 1900 was only slightly smaller than the population of New York City the same year, with Berlin almost reaching 1.9 million people and NYC just exceeding 2 million.

Over the objections of her parents, and despite developing a severe sinus infection that spring, Katharine continued planning her trip. Sue continued journaling. “Kate read a letter from our consul at Zurich and he thinks anyone that has a catarrhal affection shouldn’t try Zurich, so I guess she will go to Berlin.”

Katharine Anthony’s expressed reasons for traveling to Germany were to perfect her German and audit courses at the Universities of Freiburg and Heidelberg. She joked that the only German word she knew before she left was the word for potato dumplings,
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but “she got tired of them very soon and learned more German fast.” It seems she was tracking the progress of co-education in Europe before she left. Several American women who had studied at German-speaking universities in the 1890s had published articles about their experiences, and it’s possible that Katharine read them. The University of Zurich was the first German-speaking institution of higher learning to open its doors to women, which it did in 1868. In 1891, the University of Heidelberg admitted women as Hörerinnen (guests). But only in 1900 did the first two German universities—the University of Freiburg and the University of Heidelberg—decide to admit women with “all the rights of full matriculation.” This was, however, only the start. “Even after the beginning had been made by Heidelberg and Freiburg,” Katharine Anthony wrote years later, “it took almost a decade for all the other German universities to fall into line.”

In 1901, Katharine Anthony was a part of an educational movement in which hundreds of women from North America flocked to German-speaking universities from the late 1860s to World War I. Between 1868, when the first North American woman enrolled at a German-speaking university—the University of Zurich—and 1915, when enrollment decreased substantially with the outbreak of war, women from the United States and Canada converged in European institutions of higher education as both
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graduate students and auditors.\textsuperscript{101} Women from North America were some of the first women to be admitted to German-speaking universities at all.\textsuperscript{102} And the women who took classes at universities in Germany specifically before 1908, like Katharine Anthony, paved the way for women who matriculated after 1908. In fact, “[o]nly in Germany did North American women play a critical role in opening up the universities to all female students,” Sandra L. Singer writes in her book \textit{Adventures Abroad: North American Women at German-Speaking Universities}, still one of the only scholarly works on the subject.\textsuperscript{103}

By late March, Pearl Stegall was considering joining Katharine on her trip, which relieved Sue.\textsuperscript{104} But Katharine refused to see a doctor about her sinus infection before departing, which caused her mother more worry.\textsuperscript{105} Pearl (sister) advised Katharine to take extra shoes and corsets.\textsuperscript{106} Sue made Katharine several items of clothing, including

\textsuperscript{101} Singer thus uses these dates to book-end her study, \textit{Adventures Abroad: North American Women at German-Speaking Universities, 1868-1915}. Very few studies have been written on this topic. On American women in German Universities, see also James C. Albisetti, “German Influence on the Higher Education of American Women, 1865-1914,” in \textit{German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917}, edited by Henry Geitz, et al., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 227-244. Albisetti argues that the German influence on American women’s higher education is understudied because American universities that adopted German university models often effected women’s education negatively in America. On women’s admission to German universities, see Albisetti, \textit{Schooling German Girls and Women: Secondary and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988); Patricia M. Mazón, \textit{Gender and the Modern Research University: The Admission of Women to German Higher Education, 1865-1914} (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003); and Katharina Rowald, \textit{The Educated Woman: Minds, Bodies, and Women’s Higher Education in Britain, Germany, and Spain, 1865-1914} (New York: Routledge, 2010).
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\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., May 17, 1901.
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a shawl, an Eton jacket, and undershirts. And the family showered her with gifts that included a travel diary—“an elegantly bound white book” that she would write in, albeit infrequently, for the first month of her trip.107

On May 26, Katharine Anthony began packing, and Sue’s anxiety worsened.108 “The time draws near for parting … such a heart wrench to give up my Kate. She is my companion and comfort,” Sue wrote.109 On May 28 Katharine swore her oath of allegiance to the United States, and her passport was sent to the U.S. Consulate in Berlin.

Katharine Anthony and Pearl Stegall departed Arkansas on May 30, 1901, and Sue was somehow able to “bid her [daughter] ‘good-bye’ with dry eyes.”110 Their ship, the Borkam, set sail on June 9, 1901. When they arrived in Bremerhaven in northwestern Germany in late June, the captain, who had miscalculated the tide, hit a sandbank and stranded the group until high tide the next day.111 But the two girls were seemingly unfazed and debarked in high spirits. They toured the Bremen Ratskeller, a five-hundred-year-old wine cellar beneath the historic town hall; and they took note, “not always favorably,” of the German police officers.112 Katharine sent a reassuring letter to her parents before leaving Bremen on July 4 for Berlin. “She is all right,” Sue wrote with relief in her diary entry for July 3.113
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Katharine Anthony was introduced to the German “Woman Question” almost immediately in Berlin. Although Katharine and Pearl purportedly remained in Berlin for one month, only one day of their sojourn survives in the records. The anecdote is rich and telling. It was a nice enough day for them to spend it outdoors. Pearl drew in her sketchbook (which she sometimes also did in Katharine’s journal), and Katharine sat on a bench in the Großer Tiergarten, where statues of Prussian royalty had lined the walkways since 1895. An elderly German man sat next to Katharine, and, discovering that she was an American, began speaking to her (either in German or English, we don’t know) about the American military.

The American military was, of course, on many people’s minds at the dawn of the twentieth century. America had spent the last years of the 1800s flexing its military muscles wrestling territories from Spain. By the end of 1898, the United States had acquired Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines, and the world watched anxiously to see what was next. Colonel Theodore Roosevelt and his “Rough Riders” famously personified American manhood and military might. Under the new U.S. Secretary of War, Elihu Root (1899-1904)—a man Katharine Anthony would later slight as an “ex-
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officio anti-feminist”—the United States’ military grew in both size and efficiency.116

When Roosevelt became President of the United States in the wake of William McKinley’s assassination in September 1901, the future was clear. The twentieth century was going to be an American century.

Katharine Anthony recorded in her journal the conversation she had with the old man on the bench, and for the first time we get a clear sense of Anthony’s feminist personality. We are also brought right to the heart of the German women’s movement at the turn of the twentieth century.117 “I told him the standing army was being increased, a fact which I regretted very much,” Anthony wrote.

He looked extraordinary sympathetic and remarked that it was indeed bad for the young men to go to war in such large numbers. So many were shot and then the maids must remain unmarried. I was no little surprised at this interpretation of my regret and suggested as a means of relieving the feminine surplus that the women also go to war and get shot. “No, no!” he said, quite horrified at the idea. “Then,” I suggested, “you don’t believe it is better to be shot than to remain unmarried?” “By no means, Fraulein,” he replied earnestly. “I would only say it is a great misfortune.”118

If Anthony had a trademark, this is it: the ability to make sexist notions and customs seem absurd by flipping the argument on its head with derision, humor, and charm—a
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tactic she would use regularly in her future work, most obviously in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* (1915).

If the tone of the anecdote points to Katharine Anthony’s feminism and personality, the substance points to a demographic crisis that occurred in Germany between 1871 and 1914, referred to as *Frauenüberschuss* (surplus of women), and that played a central role in the German “Woman Question” at the dawn of the twentieth century.¹¹⁹ From the unification of the German Empire to the outbreak of World War I, “[t]he female surfeit served as both discourse and demographic concern in considerations of the female role in society and culture,” Catherine Leota Dollard writes in her dissertation, “The Female Surplus: Constructing the Unmarried Woman in Imperial Germany, 1871-1914.” “Thus, the female surplus emerged as a central theme of the German *Frauenfrage* [Woman Question] at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries.”¹²⁰

With marriage and motherhood deemed the highest calling for women, a surplus of single women introduced a perplexing problem. What was a woman’s role in society to be if marriage and motherhood weren’t options? In a country where “marital status mattered greatly in defining womanhood,” as Dollard argues was the case for Germany, single women were social pariahs any way you looked at them: they were both the disgraceful *alte Jungfer* (the German version of the “old maid”), and the strident modern
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woman who rejected matrimony for autonomy. On the streets of Germany in 1901, Katharine Anthony probably looked like just one more redundant woman, already too old to be considered single because of her age. But she defended herself and all single women against the German man’s traditional outlook, perhaps because she already knew that “spinster” and “old maid” were in her near future, and that within a matter of years she would very likely be viewed as both disgraceful and strident.

Regardless, at the age of twenty-three or twenty-four, it is clear that Katharine Anthony was already poised to emancipate women from sexist stereotypes. Years later, possibly remembering her trip to Germany in 1901, she would highlight the sexist “form of address” used by the German man on the bench: “Fraulein,” the German title for an unmarried woman, as opposed to “Frauen,” the title for a married woman. Such things are “a measure of popular feeling,” Anthony wrote, “and the separate title custom is intimately bound up with the double standard of morals. It is part of the same deeply suggestive nomenclature according to which the words ‘honor’ and ‘virtue’ have one meaning for men and another for women.” Anthony’s interpretation of feminism, articulated fully in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* in 1915, was informed by the things she read and saw in Germany in 1901 and 1902. “The task of feminism is to capture and, if necessary, to remold for woman’s use the ordinary symbols of society,” she argued. She would credit the “surplus women” in Germany with the “more
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aggressive self-expression” of their women’s movement, a feature she admired. That women were in the majority in Germany gave a “great impetus” to their cause, Anthony argued. And “[t]he impetus thus given to the woman movement will be no less powerful because it is not of their own seeking. The industrial revolution also gave a great impetus to the woman movement, which was not of its own seeking, but the impetus is none the less powerful and cumulative.”

Hopefully, she wrote in 1915, “[t]he exodus of the unmarried woman from the home is almost complete.”

We can speculate about the origins of Anthony’s feminism, evident already in 1901—her family environment, her voracious reading, her high school teachers, her professors, classes, and classmates at Peabody—but we can only say with certainty that, before Katharine Anthony had pursued higher education any further than her two years in Nashville, she was articulating her feminist ideologies with confidence and humor.

From Berlin Katharine and Pearl headed southwest to Heidelberg, where, for unknown reasons, Katharine discontinued writing in her journal. The order and specifics of her travels become difficult to recount with certainty at this point. We know that she regularly wrote home while she was in Germany (approximately twice a month, and sometimes more), but none of these letters survives. We know that she audited classes in both Heidelberg and Freiburg, but we don’t know exactly when she was at each
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university. On May 8, 1902, Sue wrote that Katharine was “now in Germany at the University of Heidelberg, attending it.”

We also don’t know what specific classes Katharine Anthony took at each university. There are no matriculation records for Katharine Anthony at any German-speaking university. The University of Leipzig is missing its records for auditors between 1890 and 1903, and Anthony doesn’t appear as an auditor in the records at the University of Heidelberg, which isn’t unusual. Katharine herself claimed only that, besides bettering her grasp of the German language, her “sojourn in Germany … added to my knowledge of psychology and philosophy with which I now supplemented my novel-reading.”

Neither does Katharine Anthony tell us what she read in Germany. Later in life, she acknowledged the influence of several German authors on her thinking and writing: the historians Leopold von Ranke and Heinrich von Treitschke; the poet Heinrich Heine; novelists Gustav Freytag, Hermann Sudermann, Jakob Wassermann, and Thomas Mann;
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playwright Gerhart Hauptmann; and the philosophers Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Nietzsche, the latter being one of the most well-known German philosophers at the end of the century, and whose declaration in the 1880s that “God is dead” both foreshadowed and represented the sudden and sweeping secularization of Germany in the latter half of the century.\textsuperscript{131} Nietzsche’s death in 1900 only increased his renown. Anthony would later reference Nietzsche’s 1886 book \textit{Beyond Good and Evil (Jenseits von Gut und Böse)}.\textsuperscript{132} She would also credit Nietzsche as the author of the “first commandment of the New Ethics,” a theory to which Anthony subscribed.\textsuperscript{133} But, like the book of Genesis, Anthony concluded, Nietzsche’s work was ultimately just “masculine literature … full of heaped-up insults against their [women’s] sex.”\textsuperscript{134}

So was Jean Jacques Rousseau’s, who Katharine Anthony referred to as “[t]he original evil genius of the segregated girls’ schools” in Europe), and who she may have also read while in Germany in 1901-1902.\textsuperscript{135} In an interview in 1925, Anthony revealed that “[i]t was during her German university days that she first became interested in the history of eighteenth-century Europe and the figures who dominated it,” which would in

\textsuperscript{131} This list is given in Maury, “Herald of Queens.” See also Frederick C. Beiser for a discussion of German philosophy in the late nineteenth century, \textit{After Hegel: German Philosophy, 1840-1900} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 6. “[C]ontrary to its reputation, it is difficult to imagine a more rich and revolutionary age for philosophy than the second half of the nineteenth century,” Beiser writes. “We do well to remind ourselves that, in the modern movement toward secularization, Germany was in the very forefront of modern Europe.”


\textsuperscript{133} KA, \textit{FGS}, 94.

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 241.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 41.
turn lead to the publication of one of her most read biographies, *Catherine the Great* (1925).136

Although we don’t know with certainty what, or who, Katharine Anthony read in Germany in 1901 and 1902, we are on firmer ground imagining her experience as an auditor in the German universities. From the writings of several women who took courses there at the turn of the twentieth century, we can piece together what auditing courses for an American woman entailed. For instance, the first thing she would have needed to do at each university was obtain permission from the professors whose lectures she wanted to attend. This she almost certainly did in person. “A proxy or even a letter is almost sure to be fatal to her hopes, whereas the application in person is almost sure to succeed,” one American student wrote about her experience auditing courses in Germany. “Alone with the professor, the affair is simple enough. She states her errand in the best German she can command, and if she have her mother wit about her, as well as sufficient of his mother tongue—he seldom speaks hers—she may even add that she has crossed the sea for the sole purpose of hearing him, or some such phrase, which is very apt to make him look flattered and give his consent without more ado.”137

Male or female, to reach the philosophy classrooms in Freiburg students had to pass through the same “dark, little entry, into which one descended abruptly from a narrow, crooked street into the quaint old building which had been built for a Jesuit college, with rows of low-ceiled rooms on either side of a dim corridor, the whole arranged about a park-like quadrangle.”138 Once there, the lectures themselves required

---

136 “Among our Contributors,” *The Century Magazine* 110 (September 1925), WB.
137 Sherzer, “Women at the German Universities,” 116.
138 Hartshorn, “A Student in Freiburg,” 206.
no small amount of courage on the part of the female auditor. “[T]he first two or three
[lectures] are a test for the woman student,” one student reported of her experience.
“They [the male students] could have her ejected if they chose, but they do not. They
simply stare, some aghast, some in wrath, some in ridicule. Then they observe her
critically: if she takes notes, those who are near her look over her page. But by the third
or fourth lecture they have made up their various minds about her, and she is generally
left for the rest of the term unnoticed and in peace.”¹³⁹

One female student recalled the humiliation women experienced in the classroom
in Heidelberg with one particularly memorable story. “Though the university is open to
women, each professor may bar or admit them as he chooses, and they tell the true story
of one woman, who sat in the lecture room awaiting the professor’s arrival. He finally
came, greeted with the usual tramping of the students, and began his lecture. Catching
sight of the woman he stopped short in the middle of a sentence, walked down to her,
offered his arm and escorted her down the aisle to the door amid the cheers of the young
men.”¹⁴⁰

Katharine Anthony almost certainly experienced some sort of sex discrimination
as an auditor in Germany. As Singer also tells us, most female “auditors and graduate
students … faced humiliation, rejection, prejudice and hostility from male students,
faculty members and administrators to earn the right to study. Women [were] forced to
sit in corners or on the stage or behind curtains to keep them from having direct contact
with male students. Women [were] denied entrance to laboratories and lectures. Some

¹³⁹ Ibid.
¹⁴⁰ Mabel Dunbar, “Das Deutsche Fräulein,” Scarlet and Black (Grinnell) (March 14,
1906), quoted in Singer, Adventures Abroad, 10.
were barred from campus and had to take private lessons with professors.”

Years later Anthony wrote with the confidence of experience that “the giving of knowledge to women has proceeded by such slow and reluctant installments that the process can scarcely be called ‘giving’ in any real sense of the term. The masculine half of civilization has guarded with the same degree of jealously its triple possessions: property, franchise, and education. The knowledge-hungry woman has been compelled to overcome the most stubborn resistance at every step. Her present footing in the schools of the world has cost her many an arduous and bitter struggle.”

Katharine Anthony once claimed “that she became interested in feminism” during her first trip abroad “through association with the pioneers who were working for the higher education of women,” although she doesn’t provide us with any names. In her chapter on co-education in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, Anthony mentions several German feminists who she may or may not have met during her first trip abroad: Helene Lange, Gertrud Bäumer, Paula Schlodtmann, Lydia Stöcker, Marie Martin. We know Anthony was greatly impressed by an unnamed Prussian woman who, on only eight hundred dollars a year, “maintained an apartment of two rooms, bath, and kitchen; kept a part-time maid; bought two new suits a year; drove out in a hired carriage on Sunday; and contributed generously to a society which stirred up women to call themselves Frau instead of Fraulein. Any ‘single woman’ in an American city of equal

---

143 Lockwood, “A Literary Arkansan Finds a Future in the Past.” Later in her life, KA corresponded with Helene Stöcker (ESD to KA, February 24, 1925, Box 26, Folder 437, ESD-SL), so she may have met her in 1901-1902.
size who could have managed as much in those days on fifteen hundred a year would certainly have deserved a thumping thrift-prize.”

Whoever these women specifically were, they almost certainly radicalized Anthony’s ideas about their sex, society, education, labor, economics, and politics, as studying and living in Germany did for many American women at the turn of the twentieth century. As Singer writes, “[i]t exposed many of them to socialism for the first time.”

Katharine Anthony planned to stay in Germany for two years, but she ran out of money. Her family sent her funds, and Sue arranged a teaching position for her at the local high school. But Katharine wasn’t home long before she decided that she wanted to finish her bachelor’s degree by taking summer classes at the University of Chicago. Several female graduates of the University of Chicago had studied in Germany before, during, and after Katharine Anthony, and it’s possible that she heard about the school’s pioneering efforts in coeducation since its founding in 1892 from one of them. The University of Chicago’s Articles of Incorporation informed prospective students that

144 KA, “The Family,” 323.
145 Singer, Adventures Abroad, 132.
there would be “opportunities from all departments of higher education to persons of both sexes on equal terms,” and by the end of the decade, more women than men had been elected to the University’s Phi Beta Kappa honor society, and the numbers continued to grow.\textsuperscript{147}

The city of Chicago had also garnered a remarkable pro-woman reputation by 1893. Chicago already had a rich history of charity work by the 1890s, but the city became a focal point of progressive reform during the Panic of 1893, which lasted from May of 1893 to November of 1897, when women such as Jane Addams, Ellen Gates Starr, Edith Abbott, Grace Abbott, Florence Kelley, Sophonisba Breckenridge, Alice Hamilton, Mary McDowell, Julia Lathrop, and Ethel Sturges Dummer worked in a variety of ways to alleviate the widening gap between rich and poor, and the poverty wrought by industrialization and the failing railroad companies.\textsuperscript{148} As Rosalind Rosenberg tells us in \textit{Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism}, in the 1890s, “women came in increasing numbers to the university [of Chicago], to the social sciences, and to reform work. The social turmoil of the city during these years, fed by the depression of 1893 and the violence surrounding the Pullman Strike of 1894, created a receptiveness to new ideas and new speakers among a public anxious for answers to the pressing problems of poverty and labor unrest. The chief beneficiaries of

\textsuperscript{147} Articles of Incorporation in “An Historical Sketch,” \textit{President’s Report}, 1892-1902, 503-505, quoted in Rosenberg, \textit{Beyond Separate Spheres}, 31; Gordon, \textit{Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era}, 112.

this receptivity were the women students and reformers who in less turbulent times would have had less opportunity to speak out.”

Katharine Anthony began taking summer classes at the University of Chicago in July of 1903, nine years after the school offered its first Summer Quarter, a wholly new kind of education geared towards teachers like Anthony who had a summer vacation. Having just been to Germany, she enrolled in two German courses, one on Lessing’s Theory of Drama, and another in Germanic Gothic, receiving a B in Lessing and an A in the latter. Katharine also took a Philosophy course entitled “Organic and Mental Evolution,” which she “passed” (a “p” appears on her transcript), another on “Genetic and Social Psychology” (another “p”), and a class on Literary Tragedy, for which she received her lowest grades—a B for her coursework, and a C for her exam.

One of Katharine Anthony’s closest friends during her tenure in Chicago was a man by the name of Robert Morss Lovett, an associate professor of English and Dean of Chicago’s junior college. He was seven years older than Anthony, and he was deeply concerned with the social problems he saw in America, which were only magnified in a large city like Chicago. He was well connected in both the literary and social circles of the day, counting Herbert Croly, Bernard Berenson, Robert Herrick, William Vaughn Moody, John Manly, Charles Eliot, and Jane Addams as close acquaintances. Beginning in 1919, Lovett would serve as an editor for two leftist publications in New York City,

---

149 Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres*, 35.
150 All of KA’s coursework comes from her transcript, obtained by HJ and held in the MHJ-AHC.
151 See KA to ESD, January 17, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL.
first for the *Dial*, and then for *The New Republic* from 1921 until the early 1940s, in both of which Anthony would publish several pieces.

There is no hard evidence that Katharine Anthony was connected in any way to Jane Addams and her Hull House coterie while studying in Chicago, but it’s not unlikely that she was.¹⁵² One source indicates that Anthony “studied social problems in Chicago.”¹⁵³ And according to historian Kathryn Kish Sklar, the women of Hull House “knew the University of Chicago well. For example, they contributed repeatedly to Albion Small’s newly founded *American Journal of Sociology*, [Florence] Kelley placing articles in the second through fifth volumes, between 1896 and 1899. They knew Marion Talbot (dean of women and assistant professor of Sanitary Science in the Department of Social Science and Anthropology) and the university’s growing coterie of talented graduate students, especially Sophonisba Breckinridge, who later codirected the

---

¹⁵² In 1932, KA rode in a peace parade in Chicago that was led by Jane Addams. See “Women from all States Ride in a Peace Parade at Chicago,” *New York Times* (June 15, 1932): 10. There is some suggestion that KA roomed with Edith Abbott when both were teaching at Wellesley College during the 1907-1908 academic year. See Waitt, “Katharine Anthony,” 72. Abbott completed her PhD in economics at the University of Chicago in 1905, the same year that KA finished her undergraduate degree, and so perhaps they knew each other there. Whether at Chicago or Wellesley, it seems at some point KA was introduced to both Breckinridge and Edith Abbott. KA wrote to ESD in 1941: “I suppose the University is going on as usual, and that Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge are still carrying on. Or has Miss Breckinridge retired?” KA to ESD, July 12, 1941, Box 26, Folder 439, ESD-SL. In the 1950s, after she published her biography of Susan B. Anthony and was looking for a new topic, KA first thought that she would write about Jane Addams. “She is about the only American woman left who is worth all the time and trouble that I put into a book,” KA wrote to JR. See KA to JR, January 16, 1955, Reel 9, Folder 174, JR-SL.

university’s School of Social Service Administration.” At the very least, Anthony was almost certainly aware of, if not a participant in, the rich and varied progressive women’s culture in Chicago in the early twentieth century.

Katharine Anthony returned to Fort Smith to teach in the fall of 1903 and was probably happily anticipating her return to Chicago the next summer when tragedy struck on May 13, 1904. While patrolling the rail yard that day, Gus Anthony saw a tired mother with a sick child and went in search of something for the child to eat. He was crossing the tracks when he was hit and killed by an oncoming train. The funeral was arranged quickly and took place the next day, on May 14. Mark organized the details with the Birnie Brothers Funeral Home. A cloth casket was chosen, a canopy was rented, and crepe and gloves were ordered.

Katharine never mentioned her father’s death. Rather than changing her plans, she registered for more courses at Chicago to begin in July. Her grades didn’t suffer for her loss. She took French, for which she earned an A; a German course, entitled, “Nature Sense in Ger. Fr. & England,” for which she received a B; and an English class, for which she was given another A. In her final undergraduate Summer Quarter, completed

155 Birnie Brothers Funeral Home, Gus Anthony funeral details, Fort Smith Public Library, Fort Smith, Arkansas. We have only one detail pertaining to KA and her father’s death. A cousin claimed that, after the funeral, KA walked down a street in Fort Smith, “looked up at the bright full moon and said, ‘See the moon and tomorrow the sun will shine. ... His going, while hard to take, we must go on.’” ECB to HJ, August 1974, Box 6, Correspondence Folder 4, MHJ-AHC.
in 1905, her grades were nearly perfect. She took French, English Composition, the
History of Elizabethan Literature, and Pre-Raphaelite Literature, and on September 1,
1905, she was awarded a Ph.B. with Honorable Mention for Excellence in Senior College
work from the University of Chicago.

Her success in the undergraduate program allowed her to continue on at the
graduate level, which she did for the next two summers. In 1906 she took English
Composition, a class on Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, and another class in the English
department. By the next summer, however, her heart wasn’t in it. She took only English
Composition in the summer of 1907. When she received an offer to teach at Wellesley
College in Massachusetts for the 1907-1908 academic year—an all-women’s college
established in 1875 and unique in its pledge to keep an all-female faculty and female
presidents—she accepted.

Ultimately, however, even that did not satisfy Katharine Anthony. “[T]eaching
was not writing,” as she told a reporter years later. “It had served ... as a stepping stone
toward her goal and she felt that she must take the step now,” in 1908.156 In the early
twentieth century, there was no better place to break into writing than New York City.

---

Chapter 3:
“A most interesting woman in America:”

The Years of Preparation,
1908-1914

“Books have to do with life. ... The woman writer who, lacking genius—
as most of us do—must depend upon her education and her hard work,
should certainly do something else for a while before she begins to write.”

—Katharine Anthony, 1931

* * *

In the late fall of 1908, the Jamaican-born English sculptor John Frederick
Mowbray-Clarke attended a dinner party in New York City. “Some liberal group” was
said to be hosting the affair, which in the early years of the twentieth century could have
been any number of formal or informal organizations. It’s very possible that, in this case,
the “liberal group” was in fact “The Liberal Club,” founded in 1907 by the Socialist and
Episcopal priest Stickney Grant that regularly made dining a part of its agenda. It would
have come as no surprise to anyone that Mowbray-Clarke, a “sculptor of revolt” who
would help organize the controversial Armory Show in New York City in 1913, was on
the guest list.2 Radicals such as he were the progenitors and pith of the various salons

1 KA quoted in Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
and intellectual clubs that proliferated in New York City—especially Greenwich Village—in the first and second decades of the twentieth century.

Mowbray-Clarke’s companion for the evening was the equally radical Joel Elias Spingarn, a professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia University who would serve as chairman of the NAACP from 1913 until his death in 1939, and who would help to found the publishing powerhouse Harcourt, Brace and Company in 1919. It must have been a lively affair. Crawling into bed that evening in his farmhouse in Rockland County, New York, John told his wife, Mary, an equally influential artist and intellectual who had stayed at home with the baby, that he had just “met two of the most interesting women in America—sat between them in fact. I wrote down their names in my note-book—Madge Jenison and Katharine Anthony. We must get them up here.”

Found in the journals of Mary Mowbray-Clarke, what stands out in this anecdote is not so much Katharine Anthony’s early activities in New York City, where she moved

---

3 In 1921, KA and Spingarn were two of the individuals who collaborated on a group book entitled Civilization in the United States: An Inquiry by Thirty Americans. See KA to ESD, March 20, 1921, Box 26, Folder 435, ESD-SL. Other contributors included H. L. Mencken, Elsie Clews Parsons (the only other woman), Lewis Mumford, Van Wyck Brooks, and Frederic C. Howe.

4 This quote comes from a journal entry that Mary Mowbray-Clarke wrote after learning of Madge Jenison’s death in 1960. The full passage reads as follows: “I remember the first word of her [Madge]: from Mowbray who had gone to a public dinner of some liberal group with Joel Elias Spingarn. I couldn’t go because of the baby. He said when we got to bed—‘I met two of the most interesting women in America—sat between them in fact. I wrote down their names in my note-book—Madge Jenison and Katharine Anthony. We must get them up here.’ They came for a week-end soon after, and Madge came again in another week or so and stayed in one of our tents for the summer and brought many of her friends who were mostly writers—as ours were mostly painters or sculptors.” Sunwise Turn/Mary Mowbray Clarke Papers, Folder 19.7, “Journal notes, 1928-61,” Harry Ransom Center, The University of Texas at Austin. Heretofore ST/MMC-HRC. Special thanks go to librarian Bob Taylor who first drew my attention to this reference and then provided me with a transcription.
in 1908 “with the urge to write,” but that even before she had made her mark as a writer of repute with her first individual book-length publication, *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* (1915), she was considered by a person of no small influence to be one of “the most interesting women in America.” To be sure, Anthony’s childhood, education, travels, and personality combined to create a woman of extraordinary talent and intellect by 1908, and John Mowbray-Clarke was no fool. Anthony and Jenison would both go on to write and publish a significant number of books and articles in the next two decades alone, effectively participating in the literary and activist milieu of Progressive-era New York City along with the likes of more well-remembered women such as Djuna Barnes, Willa Cather, Mabel Dodge Luhan, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Emma Goldman, Crystal Eastman, Margaret Sanger, Fannie Hurst, and Marie Jenney Howe.

By the end of the period under consideration here, Katharine Anthony was more than just “interesting”—she was an active and original feminist with a strong and clear vision for the future of women’s emancipation. To use a familiar but fitting metaphor, if the years between 1895 and 1908 planted the seeds for Katharine Anthony’s identity, politics, and vocation, it was her early years in New York City that saw them sprout. The New York City suffrage movement, her work with various progressive, charitable, and feminist organizations, and the milieu of the city all contributed to the development of Katharine Anthony’s mind, which flowered in 1915.

The period and place have been much studied. Less studied are the ways in which the environment of New York City helped women channel their feminist ideologies into unique enterprises that outlasted the “heyday” of Greenwich Village and launched “the early struggle of modern feminism,” as Cott refers to the years immediately following the
Nineteenth Amendment. “That struggle was, and is, to find language, organization, and goals adequate to the paradoxical situation of modern women, diverse individuals and subgroups … who inhabit the same worlds as men, not in the same way.”\footnote{Cott, \textit{The Grounding of Modern Feminism}, 10.} Katharine Anthony found her powerful post-suffrage feminist language in biography; her early years in New York were crucial to that discovery.

When Katharine Anthony arrived in New York City in 1908, it is no surprise that she chose to live on 116th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, the focal point of Columbia University since 1897, when the university moved from E 49th Street and Madison Avenue to its current location in Morningside Heights.\footnote{It should be noted that the 1910 census for Fort Smith, Arkansas, lists KA as a teacher living in the household of Susan Anthony. However, nothing else suggests KA lived in Arkansas past 1908. KA herself writes that, “[s]ince 1908, I have lived continuously in New York.” See Kunitz, ed., \textit{Authors Today and Yesterday}, 17.} In the early twentieth century, Columbia was a hub of intellectualism and innovation. Avant-garde individuals such as Charles Beard, John Dewey, Franz Boas, and Edward Thorndike joined the faculty; and Randolph Bourne, the radical socialist, syndicalist, and brilliant social commentator who would become a good friend of Anthony’s, enrolled as a student there in 1909.\footnote{KA to ESD, February 18, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL.}

Public lectures organized and hosted by the university formed an exciting meeting place for quizzical minds, both inside and outside of academia. When a Columbia professor spoke at one of the many New York City “salons” about poverty, education, art, war, or sometimes “holding forth enthusiastically on Freud’s theory of psychoanalysis,” philanthropist, writer, and Greenwich Village resident Mabel Dodge
Luhan recalled, the room filled to capacity. Indeed “[t]here seem[ed] to be a magic in the phrase, ‘Columbia Fellow,’” as Bourne wrote during his travels in England in 1913, a few weeks after meeting Anthony in London.

Katharine Anthony worked as a tutor her first year in the city, although we don’t know where, or for whom. The New York School of Philanthropy opened its doors in 1904 (later to be called the Columbia University School of Social Work), where Jeanette Rankin, Frances Perkins, Elisabeth Irwin, Alice Paul, and (very likely) Katharine Anthony took classes at some point between 1907 and 1912. And the New York College for the Training of Teachers, which opened in 1887, became a part of Columbia in the 1890s and relocated to 119th Street, just three blocks north of where Anthony would live.

Katharine Anthony was lucky to find work at all in New York City in 1908. In the fall of 1907, the New York Stock Exchange collapsed, production sank, imports halted, and unemployment soared, with no central banking system to stave off bankruptcies. Anthony arrived “during the panic,” she said, and she “heard a great deal of talk about poverty and the prevention of poverty that year, which sounded very novel and stimulating to my ears.” This was the “Progressive Era,” a time when educated, middle class, mostly white men and women fought to highlight, control, and, in their minds, improve the conditions wrought by rapid industrialization in the lives of the working class through research and writing. By the time Anthony arrived in New York,

---


9 Randolph Bourne to Henry W. Elsasser, November 21, 1913, Randolph Sillman Bourne Papers, Box 3, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Library. Columbia. Heretofore RSB-CU.

10 KA quoted in Kunitz, ed., *Authors Today and Yesterday*, 17.
there was a “craze for investigation into social and industrial conditions,” Anthony’s soon-to-be close friend, Crystal Eastman, said. In 1909 there was even founded a journal titled The Survey, a “social, charitable, [and] civic” periodical where Anthony would find a home for her first several publications.

By 1909 Katharine Anthony had found steady employment with “the Russell Sage Foundation [RSF] and other social uplift organizations, analyzing statistics, drawing up reports, writing lectures and so forth,” she said. Established in 1907 by the widow of the namesake, Olivia Sage, the RSF aimed to improve the “social and living conditions in the United States of America” through “research, publication, [and] education.”

Much of the Foundation’s money went toward surveying labor and women’s issues in these early years, and Anthony participated in and even led some of this early research.

Whether Katharine Anthony took a position with the RSF because she already cared deeply about women and the working class, or whether her work with the organization prompted the compassionate attitude she showed throughout the rest of her life, is difficult to say. One journalist who interviewed Anthony in the early 1930s

12 “Social, charitable, civic” was the subtitle of The Survey.
13 KA quoted in Kunitz, ed., Authors Today and Yesterday, 17. See also SA to “My dear dear Mrs. Adler,” 1911, WB. SA writes: “Kate is with the Russell Sage Foundation NY School of Philanthropy 105 West 40th St NY. She is very busy all the time. Has a nice position with them and has been there now this is the second year.”
15 It is important to note that, “from a beginning that emphasized women, the Russell Sage Foundation virtually ignored women after World War II. … [From then on] ‘masculine’ values and concerns took predominance over ‘feminine’ concerns.” See Carol Brown, “Sexism and the Russell Sage Foundation,” Feminist Studies 1 (Summer 1972): 25.
claimed “[i]t was while [Anthony] was with the Russell Sage Foundation that she became very deeply interested in social problems, especially in the problem of working mothers.”¹⁶ Her article at Peabody, however, hints at an earlier thoughtfulness; but she didn’t articulate in any clear way before moving to New York City what exactly she thought about the social problems of her day, or how they related to women’s work, both of which she would do through her work with the RSF.

Jobs in social work were more readily available to middle class, educated, white women like Katharine Anthony in the first decade of the twentieth century. As one journalist wrote about Anthony’s early years in New York City, “the door open to writers at that time led through social work,” and she took it.¹⁷ It was not for nothing. The exacting nature of the job, Anthony later said, was “excellent training.” It was no easy task “to put the data and statistics secured by others into readable form. My first independent writing was done along this line.”¹⁸

In addition to the widespread and methodical examinations into the causes of poverty, the suffrage movement was “in the up-swing” in 1908, Anthony said, “and I threw myself into both causes with enthusiasm.”¹⁹ Indeed, by the 1910s—and only in the 1910s—“woman suffrage commanded a mass movement,” Cott tells us, “in which working-class women, black women, women on the radical left, the young, and the upper

---

¹⁶ Maury, “Herald of Queens.”
class joined in force; rich and poor, socialist and capitalist, occasionally even black and white could be seen taking the same platform.”

If suffrage was thriving in any state in 1908, it was New York, “then the home of the two most dynamic women in the movement,” as historians Eleanor Flexner and Ellen Fitzpatrick wrote about Carrie Chapman Catt and Harriot Stanton Blatch, the latter the daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Blatch’s Equality League of Self-Supporting Women, formed in 1907, was the primary and certainly the most radical suffrage organization in New York City when Katharine Anthony arrived. From two decades of living in England, where she was a prominent member of the British Fabian Society, the newest development in British socialism that drew a significant number of women into its ranks, Blatch’s theory of women’s emancipation prioritized the plight of working class women, which would also become crucial to Anthony’s philosophy of feminism. (In 1916, Anthony even sought to organize “a permanent women’s group [that would] do research work similar to the Fabian Women’s Group.”)

By October of 1908, the Equality League had approximately 19,000 members, including several of Anthony’s close acquaintances:

---

22 Whether or not KA knew Blatch personally is not known, but it’s not unlikely. There is only one source that puts them definitely together, however, a 1921 article in the *New York Tribune* about raising funds for Ireland. KA and Blatch are listed among the roughly thirty “women who are especially interested in the work.” See “Fund for Irish Relief Under Way To-Morrow,” *New York Tribune*, March 16, 1921.
23 KA to ESD, May 9, 1916, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL. See also KA to William Dummer, April 19, 1917, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL, where she again praises the work of the Fabian Women’s Group.
Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Florence Kelley, Inez Milholland, Leonora O’Reilly, and Rose Schneiderman.24

The year Katharine Anthony arrived in the city, the Equality League invited the militant English “suffragette” Anne Cobden-Sanderson to speak in New York. Emmeline Pankhurst, the “mother” of militant suffragism in Britain and the founder of the Woman’s Social and Political Union (WSPU), visited New York City in 1909, where she spoke at Carnegie Hall in late October. The New York Times reported that, “the big house which seats 3,000 people was packed to the doors. … Eventually the line extended from 57th down to 59th Street, four abreast.”25 Pankhurst’s speech drew an enormous crowd, and it’s likely that Katharine Anthony was in the audience. When Pankhurst returned to NYC in 1910, she was “delighted to find a thoroughly alive and progressive suffrage movement. … Street meetings, I found, were now daily occurrences in New York.”26

At the same time, newly created suffrage organizations in America were strategically moving into urban centers, and the national movement for women’s suffrage was centralizing in New York City. On October 30, 1909, five days after Pankhurst’s speech, one thousand women met at Carnegie Hall and launched the New York City

24 See the Equality League List of Self-Supporting Women, list of candidates for 1909-1910, Miller NAWSA Suffrage Scrapbooks, 1897-1911, Scrapbook 7, page 116, Rare Books and Special Collections Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; Flexner and Fitzpatrick, Century of Struggle, 245. KA probably met CPG, Kelley, and Milholland through the suffrage movement, but she also worked with Kelley at the RSF, and later at the National Consumer’s League, which Kelley chaired; and both CPG and Milholland were early members of the feminist group Heterodoxy, formed in 1912, which KA joined. Heterodoxy is discussed below.
26 Pankhurst, My Own Story (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1914), 185.
Woman Suffrage Party (NYC-WSP), nominally led by Catt but carried out by women like Jeanette Rankin and Mary Beard, the latter of whom would also become a close friend (and neighbor in Connecticut) of Anthony’s. The NYC-WSP and Blatch’s Equality League (renamed the Woman’s Political Union in 1910) were often at odds, as would be the two national suffrage organizations—the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), which moved its headquarters to Manhattan in 1909, and the militant Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage (CU), formed by Alice Paul and Lucy Burns in 1913, and renamed the National Woman’s Party (NWP) in 1916.

Katharine Anthony never tells us which suffrage organization(s) she aligned with, and she doesn’t appear in any membership lists. All we know is that, in February 1917, she “resigned” from the New York State Woman Suffrage Party (NY-WSP) after Vira Boarman Whitehouse, the head of the state organization, offered up the labor of 500,000 suffragists “in the event of war.” Knowing what we do about Anthony’s personality, it’s likely that she moved freely between many groups—at least until 1917, when pro-war

27 KA does not appear in either of the Indexes for the National Woman’s Party Records at the Library of Congress, which is almost certainly the suffrage organization she would have joined and participated in if she joined any one officially at all. These records are extensive, and the Indexes do not necessarily include every name that appears in the collection, especially if the name appears only once or twice. It’s therefore possible that she would show up elsewhere. KA wrote four articles on feminism abroad for The Suffragist in 1920-1921, and her drafts appear in the NWP papers, Reel 90, LC. Thanks go to Jamie Langseth, who tirelessly searched through the microfiche reels of the NWP for me in search of KA. KA also does not appear in the NYC-WSP Papers held at the Rare Book & Manuscript Library at Columbia University, New York, New York. Special thanks go to Thai Jones, the Herbert H. Lehman Curator for U.S. History in the Rare Book & Manuscript Library at Columbia University, for looking through this collection for me; and Carolyn K. Smith who also provided helpful information regarding these papers. KA also does not appear in the card files at Columbia University for any of their other suffrage-related collections. She appears only in the papers of Randolph Bourne and Marie Mattingly Meloney.

sentiment and the Bolshevik Revolution established the NAWSA firmly as a bourgeois organization, opposed to both socialism and pacifism, and the NWP “became a magnet for socialist suffragists,” as Cott puts it.\textsuperscript{29} Like her friend Crystal Eastman, however, Anthony very likely sided with the Woman’s Peace Party (WPP) over the NWP when the latter “[came] out in support of the President” in 1917.\textsuperscript{30}

According to at least one contemporary who knew Katharine Anthony well, Anthony was a “militant suffragette,” although we have very little actual information regarding her suffrage activities.\textsuperscript{31} Anthony’s most radical (and only) known suffrage activity—which also happened to be one of her most “thrilling memories” later in life—was marching in a suffrage parade “right up Fifth Avenue.”\textsuperscript{32} Women’s parades in the United States were born of militancy, and Anthony’s theory of women’s emancipation developed in tandem with the changing nature of the suffrage movement in New York City. Parades “not only allowed [suffragists] to claim the streets as women’s terrain,” Holly J. McCammon writes in her article, “'Out of the Parlors and into the Streets',” “but the parades also permitted women to lay symbolic claim to the polity as they demanded the right to vote.”\textsuperscript{33} The first organized, successful suffrage parade in the nation occurred in New York City in May 1910, largely inspired by the British

\textsuperscript{29} Cott, \textit{The Grounding of Modern Feminism}, 61.
\textsuperscript{31} Matthew Josephson, \textit{Life Among the Surrealists} (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), 42. Matthew Josephson was the husband of Hannah Josephson.
\textsuperscript{32} KA quoted in Sherwood, “Arkansas Biographer,” 2. Note that KA’s obituary in the \textit{New York Herald Tribune} states that “she had marched in innumerable suffragette parades,” but there is no evidence to support this claim. See “Katharine Anthony wrote Biographies with Feminist Zeal,” \textit{New York Herald Tribune}, unknown date, pg. 26, Box 40, Folder 30, MH-PU.
suffragettes. In March of that year, when the New York legislature denied suffrage to women despite all signs pointing towards a favorable outcome—Senator Robert Wagner of New York was one of the most outspoken opponents of enfranchising women, despite his usually progressive politics—suffragists in New York City planned “a march of protest against the failure of the legislature to pass the woman suffrage amendment.”

It occurred on Saturday, May 4, 1912, and it was spectacular. “[T]en thousand women and men … swung up Fifth Avenue from Washington Square toward Carnegie Hall in a springtime of hyacinthine bloom,” Katharine Anthony’s lifelong friend, Mary Alden Hopkins, wrote in the aftermath of the parade. “Have you ever seen a crocus bed five women wide and two hours long?”

35 KA never tells us specifically which parade she marched in, and most sources claim she marched in the “first” one. However, she almost certainly marched in the third one. KA said that she “marched right up Fifth Avenue” with men and women carrying banners that proclaimed “Votes for Women.” Only beginning in 1912 did marchers walk up Fifth Avenue. Previously, they marched down, from 57th street to Union Square. But in 1912 Blatch pushed for the parade to switch directions. Marching down, Blatch said, “was not good for there was no place for an indoor meeting … [so in 1912] we marched up Fifth Avenue and had our big meeting at the end of the parade at Carnegie Hall.” See Blatch and Lutz, Challenging Years, 198. KA’s good friend Mary Alden Hopkins also wrote an article about the 1912 march, which lends support to the theory that KA marched in May 1912. Heterodoxy, a feminist group that KA would be a part of for many years, had also formed in the first two months of 1912, and many of the members marched in the parade.
36 Blatch quoted in Ellen Carol Dubois Harriot Stanton Blatch and the Winning of Woman Suffrage (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 140.
To be sure, New York City around 1910 was an exciting and turbulent place and time to be a woman, when equality seemed possible, and women, perhaps for the first time, felt like they might have enough support to control the outcome. Katharine Anthony had found her niche in a city and community that suited her personality, and in a job that was compatible with her core beliefs. She no longer had to worry about the “new problem” that unmarried women faced in the twentieth century: “the isolation of the economically independent woman and her want of human contacts.”

By 1910, Anthony had no intention of ever leaving New York.

Sue Anthony suspected as much. Widowed and in declining health, Sue had grown increasingly critical of the direction of her daughter’s life. It seems the problem for Sue wasn’t so much Katharine’s decision to live in NYC as it was her decision to not live in Arkansas. Sue was lonely, and she still clung to the notion that single daughters should remain at home. “I have been filled with bitter thoughts,” she wrote to Katharine in December 1910.

I can’t see why one soul or heart is worth more because it lives in New York – But … you want to live there and be with the people there you don’t want to be here. … What does it matter one old woman more or less contented or miserable. Only I happen to be I and know my misery and heart aches. But what right have I to a heart? Or for the like of that a stomach? … I’ve gone over it and shed tears till positively I must quit or my eyes will go out. And I’m so deaf. Maybe it’s better for me to be alone. It would be such a blessing if I could die or go insane. But no I’ve got to live & know and feel.

More of the same would follow. None of Katharine’s letters to her mother survive, but it’s clear from Sue’s responses that Katharine was fed up with her mother’s

---

38 KA, *FGS*, 238.
39 SA to KA, December 14, 1910, WB.
self-pity and cajoling at least once: “Blanche told me that you said you didn’t intend to be bothered with me or not in those words but the same in effect. I would not believe it. But now I’ve found out. … Don’t know when I’ll annoy you again. I can’t think but you will be relieved that I’ve seen things as they are.”

What Sue Anthony probably didn’t realize—or what she realized fully and feared—was that Katharine Anthony’s resolve to live independently was almost certainly strengthened in a metropolis like New York City, where she was surrounded by women who were just as independent as she was, and who also had to deal with the disapproval of their families. “New Women”—single, independent, educated, and middle class—moved to New York City in droves in the early twentieth century where they found community through shared ideas, shared experiences, and perhaps most powerful, shared rejections. More than the women who came before or after them, over ten percent of the women born between 1860 and 1880 never married. In New York City, and especially in the Bohemian enclave of Greenwich Village, the percentage of unmarried people was significantly higher. By 1930, 48.2% of the men and 40% of the women who lived in the Village were unmarried. Many of these New Women lived, worked, and socialized in communities of women. As Katharine Anthony astutely recognized, “skill in coquetry,

40 SA to KA, undated, WB.
43 Cook, “Female Support Networks and Political Activism,” 412-444.
success in marriage, and the early satisfaction of the impulse toward the opposite sex do not tend to develop the emotional alignment with the members of one’s own sex.”

The first feminist group Katharine Anthony joined was very likely started between July 1910 and February 1911, when Elisabeth Irwin and Elizabeth Westwood, two Smith College graduates (1903) known affectionately as “the two Elizabeths,” moved to 1 Patchin Place in Greenwich Village, a quaint cul-de-sac that later gained notoriety for its famous residents, including e.e. cummings, Theodore Dreiser, Randolph Bourne, and Djuna Barnes. Irwin proposed a dinner club, and soon it was a regular Village “salon,” full of “the most delightful … young women,” Bourne, one of the two regular male attendees, wrote to a friend.

Three or four of them live together in an old house down in the Greenwich section, while the rest have rooms in the neighborhood and come to the house for meals. They are all social workers, or magazine writers in a small way. They are decidedly emancipated and advanced, and so thoroughly healthy and zestful, or at least it seems so to my unsophisticated masculine sense. They shock you constantly, or would if you didn’t, as I am afraid I do, judge things and people by other standards than their predictability and good form. They have an amazing combination of wisdom and youthfulness, of humor and ability, and innocence and self-reliance, which absolutely belies everything you will read in the story-books or any other descriptions of womankind. They are of course all self-supporting and independent, and they enjoy the adventure of life; the full, reliant, audacious way in which they go about makes you wonder if the new woman isn’t to be a very splendid sort of person. … They talk much about the ‘Human Sex,’ which they claim to have invented, and which is simply a generic name for those whose masculine brutalities and egotisms and feminine pettinesses and stupidities have been purged away so that there is left stuff for a genuine comradeship and healthy frank regard and understanding. … [I]t may be I like them because I put so high a value on irony and such a low one on conventionality. … My salon says that their object is to restore ‘charm’ to life, and that is one of the greatest revolutions that could be

45 I am indebted to Nicholas O’Han for this timeframe, who is at work on a biography of Elisabeth Irwin. O’Han, e-mail message to author, July 1, 2016.
accomplished.  

We don’t know for sure when or how Katharine Anthony met Elisabeth Irwin; but according to Jeanette Rankin, she (Rankin) was brought to a dinner club at 1 Patchin Place “in 1910, ’11, or ’12” where she met both Anthony and Irwin. Rankin also claimed that she met Anthony and Irwin “[i]n the suffrage movement,” and it’s just as well. The women who attended “Patchin” were also suffragists, and they met through a variety of overlapping jobs and activities, often too varied and interconnected to track.

Katharine Anthony became a regular at Patchin, as did the social worker and writer Mary Alden Hopkins, militant pacifist Martha Gruening, social workers Lucille Deming and Helen Boardman, and novelist Florence King. The group was small because the space was small, but the conversation was always big. “[T]here was no strong cohesive principle to bind its members, merely a loosely-held attitude towards women’s rights,” Carl Zigrosser, Bourne’s roommate at Columbia University and the only other regular male attendee, wrote about the group. “One could air serious as well as amusing opinions, provided they were treated lightly and deftly. Wit and repartee and pungent point of view added zest to the conversation.”

46 RB to Prudence Winterrowd, April 28, 1913, Box 3, RSB-CU. See also Leslie J. Vaughan, Randolph Bourne and the Politics of Cultural Radicalism (Lawrence, KS: The University Press of Kansas, 1997), 81-82, who writes about Bourne: “[m]ore than any other, this group of feminists symbolized to him the great hope of the modern revolution. Not only would feminized/ist culture ‘soften’ the ‘crudities’ of masculine civilization, but it also would place personal relations on a different plane, more cooperative, more egalitarian, and more responsive to personal needs and differences.”
47 O’Han claims that the meeting between Rankin, Anthony, and Irwin at Patchin probably occurred sometime between May and September of 1911.
48 The quotes from Jeanette Rankin come from the Suffragist Oral History Project, The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.
49 Zigrosser, My Own Shall Come to Me, 102, 101.
Dinners at Patchin were had by candlelight; coffee followed dinner; and conversation, too lively to be put to bed, often continued well after their cups were empty. For fun, members sometimes brought in vocabulary tests (Zigrosser recalls that he had the best vocabulary in the group). And every once in a while, “a group of us would adjourn to the Women’s Night Court at Jefferson Market around the corner to watch a poor unfortunate who had been accosted by a detective in plain clothes and then arrested by him, being arraigned.”

Patchin usually discussed the issues of the day (the group is often referred to in this way, anthropomorphically, and as a singular entity), including “the gains or losses in the fight for women’s rights,” psychology, socialism, free love, and birth control. They also regularly invited guests to speak. University professors, writers, and labor administrators, including Frances Perkins, all addressed Patchin. A leader from the Finnish woman’s movement spoke. And one evening they heard from “the keeper of a house of prostitution” who referred to women who slept freely with men as “nothing but scabs [who] … undermine the profession.”

Perhaps the most memorable visit occurred in 1912, when the psychoanalyst Carl Jung visited Patchin, the same year he published The Psychology of the Unconscious challenging several of Freud’s foundational tenets. In order to relieve the room of its formal atmosphere, no doubt due to the venerated doctor’s presence, Jung reportedly joked about “a pet dog who was misbehaving with his leg: Come, come, be reasonable; I’m not a female.”

50 Ibid., 100-101.
It is telling of Katharine Anthony’s coterie that several of her closest New York City friends were later among the seventeen contributors to a series that appeared in *The Nation* called “These Modern Women,” the brainchild of thirty-two-year-Freda Kirchwey, the managing editor who “typified the upper-middle-class emancipated woman of this century.”51 “Our object,” the editors explained in the first issue on December 1, 1926, “is to discover the origin of their modern point of view toward men, marriage, children, and jobs. Do spirited ancestors explain their rebellion? Or is it due to thwarted ambition or distaste for domestic drudgery?”52 Crystal Eastman, Alice Mary Kimball, and Mary Alden Hopkins all wrote essays about their feminism for “These Modern Women”—where it came from, how it withstood the realities of modern America, and so forth—and Professional psychologists were asked to comment on their answers.

The seventeen contributors had at least three important things in common that were also true for Katharine Anthony. They had all come to New York from small towns, and thus had all in some way rejected familial and societal expectations of their sex in favor of independence; they nearly all rejected motherhood (only five of the seventeen had children); and they were all working professionals, which in the 1920s represented only a small portion of women in America—“about fourteen percent of a female labor force which included less than a quarter of all women between the ages of twenty and sixty-four,” Elaine Showalter writes.53

52 “These Modern Women,” *The Nation* 123 (December 1, 1926): 553.
53 Showalter, introduction to *These Modern Women*, 7.
It is also revealing of Katharine Anthony’s circle that, of all of the “New Women” who supplied essays for the series, the autobiographical works of Hopkins and Kimball—the two women who Anthony would remain friends with for the rest of her life (Eastman died in 1928)—were the most distressing to Joseph Collins, one of the three psychologists who wrote concluding remarks. “These women would be my last choice [for a companion],” Collins wrote in his final “meditation.”

Hopkins and Kimball were radical feminists who “renounced allegiance to ready-made codes” (Hopkins), and who were increasingly disappointed with the intellectual capacities of men (Kimball). Since Collins believed that women should concern themselves only with “being fruitful and multiplying,” such sentiments were anathema to him.

It’s possible that Katharine Anthony wasn’t asked to contribute to the series because Kirchwey had made a similar request of her just two years earlier, in 1924, for a proposed symposium on morality (“Our Changing Morality”), and although Anthony “told her that [she] could not take on any extra articles before the end of the year,” Kirchwey went ahead and printed Anthony’s name in advance in a list of contributors. “Now I am not sure just what I ought to do about it,” Anthony wrote to a friend. She had recently returned from a research trip to Europe, and her list of tasks and errands was overwhelming. “I find that my note-book is full of chores that I have undertaken, all the way from Moscow to London,” she wrote. “A librarian in the Moscow library wants a

57 KA to ESD, May 10, 1924, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
58 Ibid.
copy of a document edited by James Harvey Robinson for her shelves; Klara Zetkin wants information on the status of women in America according [to] a questionnaire asking for statistics and so forth; several struggling authors in Moscow want me to place for them some articles on conditions in Russia; Wm. Henry Chamberlin sends a sable tippet to his mother; and so on.”^59 In the end, Anthony did not write the article for Kirchwey; but the two remained friendly for decades nonetheless.^60

When Katharine Anthony was in London in the summer of 1927, in search of a new biographical subject—“[w]hether I write about Queen Elizabeth or Harriet Martineau, or in fact on any subject, the British Museum is an ideal place in which to make my preparation”—she had dinner with Kirchwey, Eastman, and Margaret Goldsmith, an American journalist, novelist, and translator.^61 At some point during the meal, they discussed “These Modern Women,” and Kirchwey wrote to Oswald Garrison Villard, the owner of the *New York Evening Post* and *The Nation*, to let him know that Anthony’s two companions were “boiling with deep rage at the *Nation*. Crystal’s ‘confession’ had been changed at the end to add a note of vigor and optimism, and she was outraged. She said her personality had been altered to suit the whim of the *Nation*. ... I couldn’t remember what was done to her old story anyhow. But I warn you: she’s coming to America next month; keep out of her path!”^62 Although Anthony was apparently not visibly angry over the editing of Eastman’s contribution, she was well
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^59 KA to ESD, February 5, 1924, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
^60 See, for instance, KA to ESD, February 28, 1949, Box 26, Folder 440, ESD-SL.
^61 KA to ESD, May 8, 1927, Box 26, Folder 438, ESD-SL.
^62 Freda Kirchwey to Oswald Garrison Villard, July 26, 1927, Oswald Garrison Villard Papers, MS Am 1323, Folder 2073, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
aware that Villard “ha[d] no sympathy” for the woman movement, and that he was “especially shy of anything that relates to the sex-problem.”

Of the three essays written by Katharine Anthony’s friends, Mary Hopkins’s “Why I Earn My Own Living” stands out as remarkably akin to Anthony’s own story. Born in Maine just a year before Anthony, Hopkins was a “feminist to the core,” pacifist, and writer who was racked with a sense of guilt for the first thirty years of her life for being different, for wanting what her mother never had, and for making her parents miserable by not wholeheartedly adopting their lifestyle and beliefs—“monogamous, Republican, and Protestant.” College at Wellesley and Columbia helped emancipate her both intellectually and geographically; but it wasn’t until a failed engagement left Hopkins distraught that she finally relinquished the “family claim.” She left her hometown, became self-supporting, and, as she writes, “experimented conscientiously with being ‘wicked.’” She “read about anarchy, sex, votes-for-women, education, divorce, and similar topics.” And she developed a new code of ethics: “decide what

63 KA to ESD, December 12, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
65 Hopkins, “Why I Earn My Own Living,” in These Modern Women, 44.
66 Ibid.
one wants, whether one can get it, whether or not it is worth the price that must be paid, and then go after it.”67

During her first years in New York City, Hopkins took on a variety of work—“a little teaching, a little settlement work, a little writing, and a position with a publishing house.” Her frenzied employment was, at least in part, the result of fear: she knew that she was “living on a crust that might at any moment break and precipitate her on the intolerable ease of her dutifully loving family.”68 By 1912, Katharine Anthony was also working fast and hard, and “trying to figure out at starvation prices [how] to stay [in New York] two more years,” as Sue explained it to Pearl.69

1912 turned out to be a surprisingly remarkable year for Katharine Anthony, despite her scanty income and her mother’s discouraging letters. Several important things happened that year to help wed Anthony’s life to the city, and to the women with whom she shared it. By February, Katharine Anthony had moved with Madge Jenison to 82 Washington Place West in Greenwich Village, the neighborhood she would call home for the rest of her life.70 This was the year “the Village became ‘The Village,’” and its apartments and row houses filled with artists and writers, anarchists and socialists, feminists and divorcees who didn’t fit in (and perhaps didn’t want to fit in) anywhere else.71 Randolph Bourne, an outcast of mainstream American society for both his radical
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67 Ibid., 45.
68 RB, “Sophronisba,” 42.
69 SA to PC, August 5, 1912, WB.
70 It is unclear when exactly KA moved to Greenwich Village. In a letter from Madge Jenison to her mother, dated February 12, 1912, she writes, “Expect Katharine home tomorrow. She has been in the country a week and a half.” The return address is 82 Washington Place. Madge Jenison Papers, New York Public Library.
ideas and his startling physical appearance—he was unusually small, hunchbacked, and wore a cape—referred to “the four boundaries of my intellectual world” as the New York Public Library, The New Republic, the Russell Sage Foundation, and Greenwich Village, and Katharine Anthony could have said the same.72

Bohemians, they were called, signifying a whole new kind of rebel, one who dressed how she wanted, drank what she wanted, worked where she wanted, wrote what she wanted, and slept with whomever she wanted. The Greenwich Village New Woman talked about sex, equality, birth control, and psychoanalysis. No topic was off limits. For Katharine Anthony, the Village was physically small enough to feel like home (she even once likened it to Fort Smith), but intellectually vast enough for her to feel like staying put.73 Even Sue Anthony had to admit that, “Greenwich Village suits her [Katharine’s] work.”74

At the same time, in the early months of 1912 (probably in January or February), the feminist, suffrage organizer, and Unitarian minister Marie Jenney Howe formed another group in the Village that Katharine Anthony began attending.75 It was called

73 KA told reporter Diana Sherwood in the late 1940s: “I live in a small side street, all very quiet and home-like in its character, and much resembling the small town life in which I grew up … You would be surprised, perhaps, to know that Greenwich Village, famed for its Bohemian life in newspaper stories, actual approximates the atmosphere of the Ft. Smith of my youth. It is the residence of quiet and domestic inhabitants who are but little touched by the reputation the Village has for gaiety and extravagance, but this is the real village about which nobody ever hears.” KA quoted in Sherwood, “Arkansas Biographer,” 2.
74 SA to “My Dear dear old friend,” January 14, 1917, WB.
75 Heterodoxy probably formed shortly before March 11, 1912. Schwartz writes that the first public event organized by the group was the “Twenty-Five Answers to Antis” forum held at the Metropolitan Temple, which took place on March 11. See Schwarz, Heterodoxy, 27.
Heterodoxy, a feminist club for “free-willed, self-willed women.” They referred to themselves jokingly “as a little band of willful women, the most unruly and individualistic females you ever fell among.” But “[t]he real Heterodoxy,” they claimed, “is a warm and friendly and staunch spirit, in which our conglomerate personalities all have a share.”

They were a diverse group, but their differences were trumped by their sex: the women of Heterodoxy came together under Feminism, a new term with broad, inclusive capabilities. In 1912 no one quite knew what feminism meant. Almost nonexistent in the United States before 1910, there was a “very rapid and intense gravitation toward the term Feminism about 1913,” Cott tells us, which “suggests that it was not merely convenient but marked a new phase in thinking about women’s emancipation.”

Perhaps the most prominent marker of this “new phase” of feminism was Freudianism. “Heterodoxy feminists were intrigued almost uniformly by Freudianism,” historian Kate Wittenstein argues in “The Feminist Uses of Psychoanalysis.” “The influence of psychoanalytic theory, particularly in its popularized incarnations, informed the Heterodoxy’s definition of feminism and its members’ self-conceptions in numerous ways.” Although Katharine Anthony was very likely “a Feminist before she was a Freudian,” as one contemporary wrote about her, the blending of feminism and
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Freudianism, in whatever order, was crucial to Anthony’s entire theory of women’s emancipation, and it was in large part formed by her involvement with Heterodoxy.\textsuperscript{80}

In 1914, Howe defined feminism as more than “a changed world. It means a changed psychology, the creation of a new consciousness in women,” much like Katharine Anthony described it the next year: “[t]he struggle for self-consciousness is the essence of the feminist movement,” she wrote in \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}.\textsuperscript{81} When Heterodoxite and psychoanalyst Beatrice Hinkle was asked to comment on the feminist essays of “These Modern Women,” many of which were written by Heterodoxy members, she noted that “in not one of these cases is the feminism of the women based on principle but in each instance it was born directly from the necessities of their personal life.”\textsuperscript{82} Thus women’s lives, made ever clearer by Freudianism, informed their feminism—not the other way around.

The women of Heterodoxy met every other Saturday for lunch, followed by a two-hour discussion on topics like psychoanalysis, sex hygiene, birth control, education, socialism, and pacifism.\textsuperscript{83} “What did we discuss?” Heterodoxite Rheta Child Dorr wrote in her memoir, \textit{Woman of Fifty} (1924). “That is just the point. We thought we covered the whole field, but really we discussed ourselves. Not ourselves personally, but the feminine half of creation, subjectively and objectively. The topics ranged from politics to books of the hour, the theater, art, music, psychoanalysis, and all social problems. But boiled down those topics always concerned women. We invited as guests all kinds of
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thinking women. … We particularly enjoyed entertaining distinguished women from overseas, that we might get a foreign point of view on all these absorbing topics.”

Katharine Anthony’s interest in German and Scandinavian feminism was very likely informed by these talks, although she never tells us for sure. One of the rules of Heterodoxy was that they weren’t supposed to discuss their meetings in public.

We know that Dorr’s recollection isn’t entirely accurate, however. Heterodoxy members did discuss their personal stories. Inez Haynes Irwin recalled that, “[s]prinkled among meetings came a series of what we called background talks. A member told whatever she chose to reveal about her childhood, girlhood, or young womanhood. … I have never listened to such talks as those backgrounds.” This was very likely Katharine Anthony’s first venture into the field of psychology as it worked both practically and personally, when the women of Heterodoxy applied the new psychological theories of Freud to their own lives and to their own feminism in front of the group. As Showalter writes, “[t]he interest in family background in the Nation essays owes something to Heterodoxy, as well as to the tradition of autobiography in American feminism and to the new popularity of psychology.” Ultimately, and in large part due to her involvement with Heterodoxy, Anthony’s definition of feminism focused more on a woman’s inner emancipation than on her outward political victories.

But it wasn’t just Freudianism that influenced Katharine Anthony’s definition of feminism in the early 1910s. Because of the pervasiveness of the two ideologies, “neither

86 Showalter, introduction to *These Modern Women*, 7.
feminism nor Freudianism advanced without stirring up a nest of angry critics,” as Buhle tells us. “The formidable Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1860–1935) stepped forward to defend the old ways.” Gilman, who has come down to us as the author of “The Yellow Wallpaper” (to the chagrin of her biographers), was one of the most famous members of Heterodoxy. She rejected the entire concept of selfhood—and thus psychoanalysis as a useful tool for feminism—viewing it as antithetical to the idea of women as productive members of society. She also rejected sex distinctions, and argued for women’s equality on the basis of human rights, not women’s rights. Gilman found a worthy opponent in the Swedish writer Ellen Key, the “prophet of Feminism,” with whom she debated in various journals over the definition and purpose of feminism between 1912 and 1914.

Most American feminists knew of Gilman. But Key wasn’t read with any frequency in America until 1910, when a variety of European influences reached American shores. Key’s groundbreaking book Century of the Child was translated into English in 1910, followed by Love and Marriage (1911); The Woman Movement (1912), (which Katharine Anthony reviewed); and The Renaissance of Motherhood (1914), all with a preface by the renowned British sexologist Havelock Ellis, who Anthony and other feminists also turned to for new ideas regarding women’s sexuality (Anthony and Ellis would even correspond about Anthony’s first biography). By 1912, “everybody who used to read Charlotte Perkins Gilman was now reading Ellen Key,” Rheta Child Dorr recalled. Buhle argues that their public intellectual sparring “introduced many literate

87 Buhle, Feminism and Its Discontents, 46.
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Americans to the basic tenets of modern feminism,” which it certainly did for Katharine Anthony.  

It wasn’t Gilman who impressed Katharine Anthony the most, however. Ellen Key, who was purportedly “anathema to most suffragists,” transformed Anthony’s conception of feminism arguably more than any other individual. Even in her home country, Key was initially “denounced as a seducer and corrupter of youth,” Anthony pointed out. “For a long time opinion wavered between the hemlock cup and laurel crown. Eventually, however, the crown was extended and she was honored by the Swedish government with the gift of the beautiful stretch of seaside land which is now her home.” Anthony was not uncritical of Key; but she was overall impressed and baffled by “the extremely platonic attitude of English and American feminists toward the whole Ellen Key program.” Anthony has been called Key’s “chief American publicist,” as well as one of Key’s most outspoken critics. Both conclusions are partially right. Anthony was a critical supporter of Ellen Key, and much of Anthony’s philosophy of feminism drew from Key’s ideas surrounding motherhood.

The differences between Gilman and Key rested on what came to be called “Human Feminism” (Gilman) and “Female Feminism” (Key), also referred to with derogatory underpinnings as “amaternal feminism” (Gilman) and “maternal feminism”
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(Key). “We have been so taken up with the phenomena of masculinity and femininity,” Gilman lamented, “that our common humanity has largely escaped notice.” In contrast, Key emphasized the “pronounced difference between the feminine and masculine soul.” True emancipation for women would happen, Key asserted, only when the individual woman “attained so fully developed a humanity that she cannot even dream of a desire to be ‘liberated’ from the foremost essential quality of her womanhood—motherliness.” To which Gilman famously quipped: “You may observe mother instinct at its height in a fond hen sitting on china eggs—instinct, but no brains.”

Several feminists tried to reconcile the theories of Gilman and Key in the 1910s, generally by artificially conflating them, or by choosing only complementary lines of thought from either woman’s work, both of which irked Gilman. “Being lumped together with Key, as if their causes were the same, vexed her [Gilman] considerably,” as did a “piecemeal acceptance of her ideas.” Katharine Anthony, however, managed to avoid Gilman’s ire, very likely because she adopted some of Gilman’s ideas (most
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importantly, Anthony championed an “economic renaissance” for women), and she was critical of Key. She also never directly engaged with Gilman as she did with Key. Although Anthony frowned upon “insipid unanimity and thoughtless agreement,” she also knew that confrontation often diverted the focus from the real goal.\textsuperscript{102} Anthony was a keen observer of human nature. She avoided “logically unnecessary” debates.\textsuperscript{103} Thus apart from lightly criticizing Gilman in 1921 for rejecting the label feminist and thereby adding “general vagueness and confusion” to an already crumbling movement, Anthony never mentioned her by name—even when Gilman spoke out against mothers’ pensions, a cause Anthony ardently and actively championed.\textsuperscript{104}

It is beneficial to understanding the roots of Katharine Anthony’s philosophy of feminism to extrapolate direct moments in which she engaged with both Gilman and Key. Anthony was very likely introduced to Key before the 1910s, when she was studying in Germany in 1901 and 1902, just three years after Key’s influential and controversial essay, “The Misuse of Women’s Energy” (1898)—which Anthony translated as “The Abuse of Woman’s Strength”—was published in Germany. This was the same year Gilman published \textit{Women and Economics}, and Key’s essay immediately generated “bitter dissensions” that would reverberate for more than two decades among European feminists.\textsuperscript{105} Key argued that a woman’s energy was best reserved for the home, and in
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particular, for the important task of motherhood. According to the Swedish writer, women who were compelled to work outside of the home, or pursue higher education, or even to vote, were not really free; rather, they were simply imitating the lives of men, and imitation was not emancipation. Anthony agreed that feminism should and did mean more than masculinism—“[t]he program of feminism is not the mere imitation of masculine gestures and motions,” she argued—but she would use this essay to roundly critique Key.

Key’s essay and the subsequent fallout among feminists “was the unfortunate result of the inconsistent thinking and deficient powers of correlation which make up the liberal percentage of dross in Ellen Key’s purest inspirations,” Anthony explained. Her service to continental feminism was that she helped to crystallize a new and necessary thought which had been too long obscured and evaded. Her disservice was her failure to realize that the emancipation of woman as a sex-being could only be achieved together with her political enfranchisement and economic independence. … [Key thus] helped to retard the progress of woman’s enfranchisement in Germany and, through this, the progress of the entire woman’s movement. … [H]er lack of associative discipline is reflected in the impractical quality of many of her ideas. Her genius and her incompetence together have made her the ‘wise fool’ of the woman movement.

Key was far from the “old-fashioned, almost reactionary” woman many of her critics painted her out to be, and Katharine Anthony championed her more liberal reforms. Key was an ardent pacifist and accurately predicted in 1900 a century of unprecedented bloodshed. She denounced the idea of “illegitimate” children and upheld
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the morality of unwed mothers. She recognized a woman’s (heterosexual) sexuality: “In every strong maternal feeling there is also a strong sensuous feeling of pleasure,” Key argued.\footnote{EK, “Motherliness,” 565.} She promoted love in marriage, and even believed that a woman should be able to divorce her husband for a lack of sexual satisfaction, and vice versa, all of which Anthony would adopt into her own definition of feminism.

Katharine Anthony clearly engaged with Gilman as well. Most obviously, she disagreed with Gilman’s rejection of a motherhood endowment. When Gilman warned of the dangers of “marketable motherhood,” suggesting that it would “appeal to the business sense” of women and lead to “trickery and bargaining,” Anthony called her bluff. “[N]o one could seriously believe that the small sums squeezed out of the government in the form of maternity insurance would be any inducement to young working girls to commit maternity,” Anthony assured skeptical readers.\footnote{CPG, “Paid Motherhood,” 77; KA, FGS, 136.} When Gilman pressed on, and argued that “[m]otherhood is not an economic function; it is physiologic and psychologic. It is not, or should not be, for sale or for hire,” Anthony responded in turn.\footnote{CPG, “Pensions for ‘Mothers’ and ‘Widows,’” The Forerunner 5 (January 1914): 7.}

\textit{[M]any people, women especially, dislike the thought that child-bearing and child-rearing should be associated with any schedule of money payments. The mother’s care of her child is something whose psychological and spiritual value is inestimable; it is, admittedly, one of the greatest cultural influences. It is a tremendous contribution, but it cannot be bought. All this, of course, is very true. But if we consider the number of paid vocations to-day which were once their own reward,—the paid minister of the gospel, the paid teacher, the paid social worker,—we almost wonder why paid maternity was not long ago the rule in civilized states. Certainly a state which professes to place as high a value on its cultural influences as Germany professes to do, should see to it that the}
natural guardians of infancy should be protected from want. After all, we live in an economic world and not in a Paul-and-Virginia paradise.\textsuperscript{113}

Like Gilman, however, Katharine Anthony believed that the root of women’s subordination was their economic dependence on men. “[T]he original enslavement of woman resulted from her weakness and defenselessness at childbirth,” Anthony argued, and she celebrated women’s growing presence as wage earners in society.\textsuperscript{114} Anthony also thought that childrearing was a productive contribution to society and should be paid as such. She didn’t think the problem could be solved simply by socializing childcare, however, which Gilman suggested. Human nature had to be considered. Overall, Anthony sought a “practical feminist movement,” which she didn’t find fully in either Gilman or Key.\textsuperscript{115} It was not practical to gird a movement with the assumption that all women were going to be wage earners: “[w]omen like marriage and children far too well to give them up easily,” Anthony noted, “it is a mark of the foolish to believe the contrary.”\textsuperscript{116} It was equally impractical to assume that all women were going to be mothers. Anthony abhorred “stereotyped values” and the “public mania for standardization,” arguing instead that, progress feeds upon variability. … No single woman is bound to be any particular type of personality, but all women taken together are bound to be all sorts of people. … It is only the artificial arrangements of society which place these things before her as irreconcilable conflicts; which teach her to see in each of the stages of her life a reversal of the one that went before; which refuse to permit her any outlook upon a unified, self-directed development. Through the influence of the woman movement she is learning to repudiate economic arrangements which forbid her to love work, love love, and love children all at the same time. It is the
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common task of women to mold new economic arrangements which permit her to have all three.\textsuperscript{117}

As such, Katharine Anthony was one of a handful of feminists who “could appreciate Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s contributions without endorsing her vision,” as Buhle writes, and “admire Key while quietly ignoring the larger logic (or illogic) of her conclusions.”\textsuperscript{118} Most feminists in the Progressive Era were not so flexible with their ideologies. They “wanted women to be able to choose with dignity between marriage or career,” historian Molly Ladd-Taylor tells us in \textit{Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare, and the State, 1890-1930}. “They did not think women could choose both.”\textsuperscript{119} In this way, Anthony was well ahead of her time. Foreshadowing the debates to come with uncanny premonition, Anthony knew that true equality meant having “all the privileges of all the sexes,” and that anything less would never work.\textsuperscript{120}

In 1912, Katharine Anthony’s “urge to write” met with opportunity when, on Tuesday, May 7, three days after the third annual suffrage parade in New York City, waiters at the Belmont Hotel on 42\textsuperscript{nd} Street near Grand Central Station walked out of the restaurant at noon to the blowing of a whistle, officially starting the first organized, large-scale strike for waiters and hotel employees in New York City history. Waiters marched to the streets with busboys, cooks, dishwashers, bellmen, and housekeepers, carrying
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signs that announced their demands: “Sanitary Lockers,” “Ten Dollars a Week for Waiters—Seven Dollars for Busboys,” and “One Day Off in Seven.” Housekeepers wanted paid vacations, a limited number of rooms to clean, lunch breaks, and wage increases. Within two weeks, approximately 18,000 hotel employees had joined the strike; and on May 25, Katharine Anthony published her first article, “The Waiters’ Strike,” a sympathetic description of one waiter’s difficult experience at the Belmont. Two similar articles followed.

In the late spring and summer of 1912, however, Katharine Anthony was primarily busy conducting fieldwork on Manhattan’s west side for the Bureau of Social Research of the New York School of Philanthropy, for what would become her first book-length publication. The assignment, collectively titled West Side Studies, was funded and published by the RSF; but the chosen investigators like Anthony were individuals who had been awarded fellowships by the School of Philanthropy. Junior fellows were required to devote part of their time to taking classes and specialized readings. Katharine Anthony was awarded a senior fellowship, given to “more advanced students who devoted full time to investigation,” and who had presumably already taken the prerequisite coursework.

---

Katharine Anthony’s knowledge of German almost certainly helped her secure a higher position. Personal qualifications mattered to the Bureau, and the district chosen for the studies—a “strangely detached” section of Manhattan that covered eighty blocks along the Hudson River (the area south of Fifty-fourth Street, west of Eighth Avenue, and north of Thirty-fourth Street)—was almost exclusively comprised of Irish and German immigrants by 1910, or descendants of the same. The neighborhood was especially impoverished by the early 1910s, in large part due to the exodus of immigrants who miraculously happened to succeed in the brutal, industrial environment to better neighborhoods. “In each generation the bolder spirits moved away to more prosperous parts of the city,” the Bureau explained. “This left behind the less ambitious and in many cases the wrecks of the population. Hence in this ‘backset’ from the main current of the city’s life may be seen some of the most acute social problems of modern urban life—not the readjustment and amalgamation of sturdy immigrant groups, but the discouragement and deterioration of an indigenous American community.”125

Overcrowding, poor ventilation, and a shoddy drainage system were just a few of the problems facing the west side neighborhood that Katharine Anthony canvassed during the summer of 1912. There were two hundred saloons for the roughly 110,000 people who called this area home. Forty-six slaughter houses drained their waste into the gutters of the streets where children gathered to play. Cholera and dysentery were unavoidable. Death and serious injury were common. Few families escaped one or both.

Katharine Anthony’s particular assignment was to investigate the lives of working mothers—widowed, married, divorced, and never married—in the district, “with respect
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to wages, hours, regularity of work, and the effect of these upon health and family
life.”

The overarching questions that animated the study were: “Why were these
women wage-earners?” and “How many of them worked because they must and how
many for other reasons?”

Around 1912 the United States was experiencing a sudden
interest in public pensions for widows with children, and Anthony’s study was a part of
this momentum. The *New York Times* reported in May of 1913 that thirteen states had
adopted some sort of pension system for widows since 1911: Illinois, California,
Colorado, Washington, Utah, South Dakota, Idaho, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio,
New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In the summer of 1912, while Anthony was canvassing
the Middle West Side, New York was also considering a widows’ pension law.

As such, on August 1, 1912, the RSF hired Dr. C. C. Carstens, a lifelong advocate
for child welfare, to study the outcomes of the pension system in the various states over
the next three months, paying close attention to Chicago, the city closest in size to New
York City. Carstens’s findings were grim. The pension, which was intended to provide
support to mothers so that they could stay at home with their children, was often used
“recklessly or foolishly,” he said. 13% of the mothers did not remain at home with their
children regardless of the help they received from the state; and in over half of the cases,
there was witnessed a marked decrease in help from other relatives, the churches, friends,
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and various charitable societies when the state stepped in.\textsuperscript{129} Carstens’s conclusions went one step further by suggesting a “more logical way” to deal with single mothers and their children. Some of the states with widows’ pensions had “discovered that deaths from accident and from industrial and other preventable diseases constitute a considerable proportion of the total number.”\textsuperscript{130} Thus, a better way to help women and children, Carstens reasoned, would be to prevent them from being without a husband or father in the first place: implement workmen’s compensation laws, and laws that would hold employers responsible for workplace accidents. On this point, at least, Katharine Anthony agreed. “One aspect of widowhood is seldom touched upon and that is its prevention,” Anthony noted in the early 1920s.\textsuperscript{131}

However, Katharine Anthony didn’t agree with Carstens on much more than that. In fact, sentiments such as those held by Carstens about mothers’ pensions would be denounced by Katharine Anthony until the passage of the Sheppard-Towner Act in 1921 as just another support for the “masculine hegemony.”\textsuperscript{132} She accused “[s]ome of those who are most zealous for the betterment of the family” with being “perfectly content that the father shall control it absolutely.”\textsuperscript{133} As such, Anthony’s study of working mothers, published in 1914, might be viewed as a feminist response to arguments such as those put forth by Carstens.
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Katharine Anthony’s project for the RSF required extensive fieldwork, as well as the completion of several statistical tables, including a list of the causes of death of the husband or father of widowed mothers. Anthony was assigned seven research assistants, and Jessie Tarbox Beals, the first professional female photographer in America, took photographs of the neighborhood to be included in the book, similar to those that Dorothea Lange would take in California twenty years later.

Katharine Anthony or one of her researchers visited eighteen different agencies in 1912 to obtain information on the neighborhood, including the Children’s Aid Society, the Special Employment Bureau of the Young Women’s Christian Association, the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, the Child Labor Committee, day nurseries, schools, church clubs, and settlement houses. In total, 370 wage-earning mothers were studied, of which 237 were visited at least once. “The information desired could be supplied only by the women themselves,” Anthony wrote, “and the collection of all the facts needed meant the expenditure of a great deal of time in visiting. About 50 of the women were seen from time to time for more than a year. … Besides the interviews held in the homes and with the families, calls were made at many of the places of employment.”

The project was enormous, and Katharine Anthony had difficulty scheduling time off because of it. Over the fourth of July, she took a short break and traveled to Massachusetts and Maine with a friend (we don’t know who). But she had to disappoint Mary Mowbray-Claarke, who invited her to her home in upstate New York. “I’m all tied
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up with work and can’t break away until my actual vacation begins, August 1.”\(^{135}\) The fall of 1912 was consumed with finishing the study for the RSF, but by the new year it was nearly finished, and things were looking up.

The year 1913 began on a positive note for the women of New York, and especially for Katharine Anthony. On January 27, 1913, both the Senate and the Assembly accepted a bill that proposed an amendment to the state constitution. The word “male” was to be removed, and “every citizen of the age of twenty-one years” was given the right to vote, “provided that a citizen by marriage shall have been an inhabitant of the United states for five years.”\(^{136}\) In the spring, Anthony was busy finishing *Mothers Who Must Earn*, the chosen title for the RSF’s West Side Studies survey (“To describe them as the ‘gainfully employed’ would have implied a discrimination against labor in the home as productive work, which married housekeepers who do not receive wages justly resent,” Anthony explained); and she was excitedly planning for her second trip to Europe.\(^{137}\)

At the end of May, with the book complete and with the publishers, Katharine Anthony and Mary Hopkins sailed for Europe.\(^{138}\) Their first stop was Germany, where Anthony was intent on visiting places she missed in 1901—“old castles, churches, barracks, little half forgotten cities, industrial centres [sic]. She saw the real Germany as it was just before the war,” one newspaper reported about her trip.\(^{139}\) But Anthony was
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impressed with more than just Germany’s castles. By the time Anthony and Hopkins arrived in Zurich, Switzerland (at one point “the Mecca of the rebellious,” according to Anthony), Anthony was contemplating several possible articles—something on German feminism; something, perhaps, about Margaret Fuller, “inspired by an article of appreciation by a German writer”; or maybe an article about Catherine the Great, born in the small village of Stettin in northern Germany.  

Much had changed in the German woman’s movement since Katharine Anthony had been there in 1901. In 1910 Havelock Ellis announced that the German women “are awaking from a long period of quiescence, are inaugurating a new phase of the woman movement, based on the demands of woman as mother, and directed to the end of securing for her the right to control and regulate the personal and social relations which spring from her nature as mother or possible mother.” Indeed, motherhood as a feminist issue came to light in Germany in the last decade of the 19th century out of concern for declining birthrates, and an increase in illegitimate births, “indirectly encouraged by the number of surplus women in Europe,” Katharine Anthony pointed out. As historian Ann Taylor Allen argues in *Feminism and Motherhood in Germany, 1800-1914*, “The debate on declining birthrates affected both feminist ideology and strategies. Motherhood in relation to the state became the central issue in German
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feminist ideology and activism during these years, far surpassing suffrage in importance.”

Most significantly, an international group of women and men had organized the Bund für Mutterschutz (the League for the Protection of Motherhood/BfM) in Berlin in 1905, which Katharine Anthony believed was “the most important historical event in the history of the woman movement since the American Woman’s Rights Convention at Seneca Falls in 1848.” The primary thinkers behind the movement were Ruth Bré and Lily Braun from Germany, and Ellen Key. The ideas and rhetoric of the BfM would influence Anthony’s feminism in profound ways.

The BfM organized around two issues: the perceived need for a new sexual code of ethics (the recent surplus of women meant that more children would inevitably be born out of wedlock), and the protection of motherhood (an increase in children born out of wedlock naturally meant an increase in another vulnerable class of citizen, single mothers). As Katharine Anthony summarized the BfM’s position, sexual ethics “could not be settled once for all, but must be revised from age to age by the light of human and social experience.” They called their system the New Ethics (Die Neue Ethik), although “it is not so much a proclamation of an actual new ethics as it is a questioning and criticism of the old ethics,” Anthony explained. The New Ethics reached American shores around 1910, and Anthony was one of the earliest converts, even giving lectures on it at one point to a philosophy class at Columbia and the Rand School of
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Socialism. There were no comparable organizations in America. In fact, according to Allen, “the specifically maternal issues that occupied the center of German feminist programs during these years were given comparatively little attention by American feminist organizations such as the NAWSA.” Constructive discussions about “illegitimacy” and “unmarried mothers” in America were few and far between, which Anthony blamed on American austerity and squeamishness. Americans were “handicapped by prudishness,” Anthony explained to the Central Council of Social Agencies in Chicago in 1916. Widows’ pensions made headway during the Civil war, but maternity insurance was hard to win: “With us the obstacle seems to be prudishness rather than capitalism,” Anthony wrote; “it makes a legislator blush to hear childbirth spoken of in public while it only makes him cry to hear of widowhood.”

The old ethics were certainly old. They dated to the time of Martin Luther, who criticized celibacy—then the highest ideal of sexual ethics—and inadvertently replaced it with Lutheran marriage. Unmarried mothers and illegitimate children subsequently became a specifically targeted blight on society until the Mutterschutz idea appeared over three hundred years later as “the natural historical corrective of an exclusively theological and proprietary marriage,” Katharine Anthony wrote.

Lack of chastity may degrade the legalized union as well as the unequalized one and chastity may justify the sex union which the state and church have not sanctioned. Ethically, there is nothing to choose between
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the conscience-marriage of a George Eliot and Henry Lewes and the legal marriage of an Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning. Although many of the followers of the New Ethics (all of them in fact so far as I have been able to follow their writings) believe that the monogamous union is the highest ideal of marriage, they protest against its exclusive adoption as an ethical standard. This is the kernel of the New Ethics.  

Here Anthony drew on Key, who defined chastity as “the harmony between the soul and the senses,” and painted marriage as the bridge between Catholic celibacy and the “Individualistic Monist.” 

“[B]ridges are made to go over,” Key argued, “not to stand upon.”

In this way, the New Ethics bled into the protection of motherhood when the latter materialized in the Bund für Mutterschutz as a “defense of the right to motherhood.” According to Katharine Anthony, the right for women to have children outside of marriage, and the right for married women to limit the size of their families, were not revolutionary claims. They were,

evidence of a natural and healthy revolt of the child-bearing sex. It is the direct effort of the maternal instinct to find its own way between compulsory sterility and enforced over-breeding. And I may say here that I mean an inward maternal imperative, which women, as yet, can scarcely account for to themselves and of which men, with all their lip-worship of the maternal instinct, can have no idea. For men are, after all, the wombless sex. To those women, on the other hand, who believe in the future of their sex the ultimate triumph of volitional motherhood over sex slavery is one of the indispensable conditions of that future.

The Bund für Mutterschutz, with its two-pronged commitment to sexual ethics and motherhood, struck Katharine Anthony as particularly important for the
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emancipation of women in the twentieth century, a conviction she almost certainly learned from the time she spent in Europe both in 1901-1902 and 1913. At a time when few American feminist organizations were paying attention to the maternal arguments being waged in Europe, and especially in Germany and Scandinavia, Anthony found it essential.157

The history of feminism in Germany is uniquely bound to ideas surrounding motherhood. As Allen writes, “[m]otherhood—private, public, biological, and social—was the center of a feminist discourse [in Germany] that, although constantly developing, was also continuous from the first feminist writings in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries until the twentieth century.”158 Before the 1890s, German women used their personal experiences as mothers, understood in strictly moral and spiritual terms, to claim certain rights in the public realm, similar to the American conception of “Republican Motherhood” in the first decades of the nineteenth century. Although there were definite shifts in the conversation throughout the nineteenth century—particularly after 1848 and 1871—broadly speaking, the idea of “public motherhood” dominated the feminist agenda in Germany until the 1890s.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the emergence of radical feminism and medical professionalism shifted the maternal language from a moral and spiritual discourse to a biological and medical one. “It was during this period [1890-1914] that issues concerning private life—family structure, child health and welfare, and reproductive rights—briefly became central to feminist theory and practice,” Allen
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argues. In Germany, maternalist language did not indicate the level of radicalism or conservativism of German feminists. In fact, “the example of the German radicals shows that maternalist arguments may by no means simply be correlated to political conservatism, conformity, and caution. Motherhood, in its medical, biological, ethical, and social implications, was a much more conspicuous issue on the far left than on the right of the German bourgeois feminist movement during this period.”

Significantly, the 1890s is also when the term “feminism” came into general use in Germany, more than a decade before it would reach American shores. Katharine Anthony was thus almost certainly exposed to both the inclusion of motherhood in arguments for women’s rights and the new inclusive term “feminism” in Germany, long before either was apparent in United States.

The woman movement in America also shifted in the 1890s, albeit in a far different direction. Although Elizabeth Cady Stanton argued for the rights of mothers, child welfare, and marriage reform as early as the 1860s, the sexual scandal unleashed by Victoria Woodhull in 1872, who was that year the first woman candidate for President of the United States and a loud proponent of “free love,” temporarily postponed calls for “equal rights” and ushered in a more conservative and single minded period of women’s rights in America. When the two major suffrage organizations—the American Woman Suffrage Association and the National Woman Suffrage Association—united in 1890 to form the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), it was agreed that
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controversial ideas that touched on religion, sex, or the like, would be pushed aside for suffrage alone.\textsuperscript{162}

Ironically, what American feminists later perceived as a weakness in the German women’s movement—their lack of focus on suffrage and a concentration on motherhood—was actually what made space for radicalism.\textsuperscript{163} This misperception on the part of American feminists, grounded in the changes of the 1890s, would be one impetus for Katharine Anthony to pen \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}. “For want of adequate accounts and specific reports of feminist activities abroad,” Anthony wrote in the Preface to her 1915 study, “there is a mistaken impression in this country that the German woman, for instance, still sleeps silently in a home-spun cocoon. The belief exists, even in enlightened suffrage circles, that the German women are a leaderless and hopelessly domesticated group and are content to remain so. This impression is due to our meager knowledge.”\textsuperscript{164}

Katharine Anthony was attuned to the differences between German and American feminism, which she explained were in large part a product of situations beyond the feminists’ control. The presence of universal male suffrage in the United States, for instance, encouraged American women to also demand the vote; whereas in Germany, where a universal male franchise did not exist until 1871 (and even then it wasn’t a “one-man, one-vote” system), the women looked in different directions. Thus, “before

\textsuperscript{162} See Allen, \textit{Feminism and Motherhood in Germany}, 147-148, for a discussion on the different trajectories of the German and American women’s movements in the 1890s. See also DuBois, who explains how the leaders of NAWSA, “[f]rom the 1890s on ... had become set in the habit of denying any sexual unconventionality in or around their movement.” DuBois, “Making Women’s History,” 71.

\textsuperscript{163} Allen, \textit{Feminism and Motherhood in Germany}, 148.

\textsuperscript{164} KA, \textit{FGS}, iii.
scolding the German suffragists for being backward with their propaganda,” Anthony argued, “one should call to mind the peculiar political medium in which these women have had to work. Compared with the general backwardness of democratic government in their country, they are not much farther ‘behind the game’ than the American suffragists are in their own commonwealth. The German law which refuses all franchise rights to women also refuses equal franchise rights to men.”165 Rather than viewing one right and one wrong, Anthony ultimately determined that the melding together of European and American feminism was the best way to achieve the fullest version of women’s rights.

We don’t know if Katharine Anthony met personally with any German feminists while she was in the country. Dorr was there just a few months prior and met with Helene Lange, Anita Augsberg, Lili Braun, Marie Stritt, and Alice Solomon (Dorr also visited Ellen Key in Sweden).166 In Switzerland, however, Anthony went to visit the well-known psychiatrist, August Forel. His new edition of The Sexual Question had just hit newsstands “costing but two marks eighty pfennings,” or roughly seventy cents, and Anthony was pleased that “even the workingman could own it.”167 It seems she had been corresponding with Forel about her writing, and “it was his generous suggestion that I should come to him for help, and use his library for my studies,” Anthony recalled.168

165 KA, FGS, 207-208. See also Allen, Feminism and Motherhood in Germany, 77, where she writes about the different emphases on suffrage in Germany and the United States. “[T]he fact that all white American men already possessed the franchise encouraged their female fellow-citizens to demand it,” Allen writes. And Ellen Carol DuBois, Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women’s Movement in America, 1848-1969 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), 21-52.
166 Dorr, Woman of Fifty, 232-233.
168 Ibid., 14.
a day in early October, Anthony left Zurich by train for Forel’s home, La Fournmilière, nestled in the southwestern part of Switzerland, in the French-speaking, vine-growing village of Yvorne. To Anthony’s delight, she found La Fournmilière to be “a haven of peace and contemplation, a ‘Jenseits von Gut und Boese,’ an ideal retreat for a retired soldier in the war for the liberation of humanity,” and she happily set to work “in the quiet library on the Rhone.”

We never learn what Anthony read in Forel’s library (although Forel did suggest to her the difficult work of Richard Semon at one point); but at the end of the day, Anthony and Forel had “a long twilight conversation in the library” that Anthony recorded and published the next year. Anthony lauded Forel’s “rational system of ethics,” which was some combination of socialism, evolutionary biology, and the New Ethics. “[H]e declares unreservedly that humanity can only be saved by socialism,” Anthony wrote. “‘Man is the most terrible beast of prey in the world,’ he said to me. ‘All his instincts are predatory. One need only look at the subjection of women, the institution of human slavery, and now at the crushing power of capital. Only by the growing habit of association, organization, can this primal zest to destroy be overcome.’”

“Salvation through organization” was the overall theme of their conversation, but August Forel was critical of organizations and people who were all talk and no action.

______________________________

169 Ibid.
170 Ibid., 15. Jenseits von Gut und Boese is the title of Nietzsche’s 1886 book, translated into English as Beyond Good and Evil.
171 Richard Semon (1859-1918) was a German evolutionary biologist and memory scientist whose work on the Mneme, or the “muse of memory,” Forel suggested to Anthony. Wrapped in the German Imperial flag, Semon committed suicide in 1918.
172 KA, “August Forel,” 15.
“‘I am an old man, and I can not say it too strongly—we talk too much. … The great need for progress is of people who are willing to work in silence. The forces of exploitation rule the world while the forces of liberation waste their time matching theories. Chatterers! Schweitzer!’”

Forel’s “rational system of ethics” and his criticism of organizations would both appear in Katharine Anthony’s later work.

Perhaps most of all, Katharine Anthony admired Forel’s consistency, an attribute she called “that most rare form of human genius.” “The secret to Forel’s power as an ethical teacher,” she concluded, “is not alone that some system of applied evolution has come to be the only form of ethics relevant to modern life. It is to be found in his own life and history. With Forel the word and the deed are one. All his acts express himself. The higher sexual ethics which he advocates for men he has practiced in his own life.”

This would become a consistent theme in Anthony’s work, praising those whose actions aligned with their words, and criticizing those whose didn’t. It was, to Anthony, the highest ideal. She would conclude Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia with this thought in mind.

We do know one thing Katharine Anthony read in Europe that is significant to our story. The Russian government had released Catherine the Great’s memoirs in 1909, but with “some nine or ten judicious cuts … passages in which the intrepid Catherine rather too frankly discloses the real eugenics of the Romanoff family,” Anthony noted. The first German translation, however, restored the cut passages to their rightful place and

---
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scandalized and captivated German-speaking intellectuals the year it appeared, in 1913. “The memoirs were the talk of literary Germany during the year before the war,” Anthony recalled, “and Bernard Shaw, who was staying in Hellerau that summer learning to dance, caught the fever also.” Shaw quickly wrote a play, “Great Catherine,” started and finished between July 29 and August 13, and which premiered in London in November to a shocked audience. Shaw’s Catherine was far too fickle a woman for the Londoners, and “it seemed like carrying the joke altogether too far when the play implied, as it certainly did, that the Empress, who was no better than she should be, was after all not so funny as the British Ambassador, who was so much better than the circumstances required,” Anthony remarked. “In short, the play was sufficiently true to the realities to be highly unflattering to all concerned.”

In the midst of the Catherine craze of 1913, Katharine Anthony read the German translation of the memoirs, probably saw the play in London, and began contemplating a biography of the Empress that proceeded from Shaw's portrait. “From that time on I was haunted by the picture of the little Lutheran princess and her dramatic career as a Russianized monarch,” Anthony said.

Katharine Anthony and Mary Hopkins were planning to leave Zurich for London as soon as they could, probably in mid-October. Randolph Bourne, who was residing in London and eager for the company of his New York friends, was happy to learn in the
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meantime that Elizabeth Westwood was staying just outside of London, in the small town of Rickmansworth. Westwood was ill when Bourne arrived, and he stayed with her for a week. “[W]e were mutually delighted,” Bourne wrote to a friend. “She has all sorts of valuable points to give me about the people of London, radicals and students, that I will find congenial, and which I would not know how to find; she knows some of them and will give me cards.” Bourne left Rickmansworth for London on September 18, where, not long after, he was happy to receive a letter from Katharine Anthony informing him about her and Mary Hopkins’ plans to come to London. “I am glad to know that you will be in London during October,” Anthony wrote to Bourne.

Mary Hopkins and I expect to make a dash for London as soon as we can leave here. But at present we are both sitting with our noses to the typewriter (a German one, by the way, which can write umlauts) and trying our best to finish off an article a piece before we leave. … In order to wean her away from Zürich, where she was threatening to spend the winter, I have been talking about London as if every inhabitant were a Bernard Shaw. And now you write a phrase about perfunctory Britishers! She almost blacksid on me, because of course I thoughtlessly showed her your note, and thought more kindly of serious Zürich. But I believe after all she sticks. We shall probably be in London about October 15. We have already engaged our reading places in the British Museum for that date by letter. We did that because it was such a comfort to know that London expected us. We had to do something and didn’t want to commit ourselves as to a lodging place. I am so glad to know where we can look you up when we arrive.

Katharine Anthony and Mary Hopkins presumably arrived in England sometime in October. They were at least there before November 3, when Randolph Bourne wrote to Carl Zigrosser: “My situation has immensely improved since I wrote you; it is now
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rather that I have too many acquaintances to get much work done. Two of my New York woman friends have been here and that has made it very pleasant, and I have met a number of congenial people through the Sociological Society.”

We never learn from Anthony what she did in England, apart from visiting the British Museum. But Bourne’s activities, which he recorded with vigor, might suggest Anthony’s movements as well.

The fall of 1913 was a particularly turbulent period in the British women’s fight for the vote. Civil disobedience, championed by the Pankhursts, was at full throttle, although when Anthony was in London, Emmeline Pankhurst was again on a speaking tour in the U.S.

Women were conducting hunger strikes in prison, which resulted in their being brutally force-fed by the jailers. The Prisoners Act of 1913—nicknamed the Cat-and-Mouse Act—was a retaliation against the hunger strikes, making it legal to release the starving women from prison only to arrest them again once they had regained their strength.

“The only live thing [in England] is the militant suffrage movement,” Bourne wrote to Zigrosser in early November, “and that of course is superb, epic; perhaps this indomitable spirit of the women will save the country yet.” To another friend, Bourne described the militant suffrage movement in the fall of 1913 as “tremendously thrilling. … [I]t is a sort of guerilla revolution against the Liberal Government, and the passion and enthusiasm that is excited in hosts of women quite outdoes anything I have seen before. I
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went to a meeting of the W. S. P. U. this afternoon; the big hall was crowded with women. … You can hardly go to church without having a woman make a speech in the most solemn part of the proceedings.”

Katharine Anthony almost certainly witnessed the same “guerilla revolution” as Bourne, and probably also visited the WSPU. As a result, Bourne said, “London has … immensely strengthened my radicalism,” and it probably did Katharine Anthony’s too.\footnote{RB to Prudence Winterrowd, November 3, 1913, Box 3, RSB-CU. See also Pankhurst, \textit{My Own Story}, 280: “It was at this time, February 1913, less than two years ago as I write these words, that militancy, as it is now generally understood by the public began—militancy in the sense of continued, destructive, guerilla warfare against the Government through injury to private property.”} When Britain granted certain women the right to vote at the end of World War I (women didn’t achieve full enfranchisement in Britain until 1928), Anthony credited the militant suffragettes in Britain with the partial victory. But, Anthony asked, “what will they do with it?” Again Anthony looked beyond the franchise. Sex specific issues needed to be addressed in order for full freedom to be achieved. “Since militancy passed on in England,” she wrote in 1918, “we have waited with expectancy for the next incarnation of feminist striving among the Island women. One dared to hope that the goal might now move up one step nearer reality than the beloved franchise itself. One longed for the Anglo-Saxon feminist who would at last boldly attack the sex problem in the open.”\footnote{RB to Alyse Gregory, November 1, 1913, in Sandeen, ed., \textit{The Letters of Randolph Bourne}, 165.}

The primary sex specific problem Anthony was referring to in 1918 was motherhood—an issue that German and Scandinavian feminists were so articulately and forcefully addressing in 1913. Until mothers were recognized for their contribution to the state, and

\footnote{KA, review of \textit{Women and the Sovereign State}, by Maude Royden, in \textit{The New Republic} (June 29, 1918): 268.}
ideally paid for that contribution by the government, she believed the full emancipation of women would never be realized. Just how Katharine Anthony might contribute to this cause was yet to be seen.

When Katharine Anthony returned from her trip to Europe in December of 1913, she was greeted by warmer than usual weather; the “wildest” New Year’s Eve in New York City’s history; and a fresh urgency to define feminism, once and for all. The latter manifested in the early months of 1914 in the first ever feminist mass meetings, led by members of Heterodoxy, and scores of newspaper columns attempting to explain what exactly “feminism” meant. On February 17, 1914, a meeting was held at Cooper Union with a proposed topic of, “What feminism means to me.” Marie Jenney Howe served as “chairman,” and ten minute speeches were delivered by several of Katharine Anthony’s friends and close acquaintances—Frances Perkins, Crystal Eastman, Max Eastman, Henrietta Rodman, Rose Young, Floyd Dell. Less than a week later, on February 20, there was a symposium on “Breaking into the Human Race,” with speeches by Rheta Childe Dorr (“The Right to Work”), Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale (“The Right of the Mother to her Profession”), Mary Shaw (“The Right to Her Convictions”), Fola La Follette (“The Right to Her Name”), Rose Schneiderman (“The Right to Organize”), Nina Wilcox Putnam (“The Right to Ignore Fashion”), and Charlotte Perkins Gilman (“The Right to Specialize in Home Industries”).

---

In April, *Century* magazine declared that, “[t]he time has come to define feminism; it is no longer possible to ignore it. ... The word is daily in the pages of our newspapers. The doctrine and its corollaries are on every tongue.”\(^{190}\) That same month, Katharine Anthony wrote to the editor of *Century*, Mr. Yard, with the hopes of publishing a piece on feminism in Germany. “I shall be very glad to come into the office next Monday to go over the article on German Feminism with you,” Anthony wrote to Yard. “I am sure that with the help of your criticism I shall be able to improve it a great deal.”\(^{191}\) By April, Anthony had also moved to 1 Patchin Place with “the two Elizabeths and various other friends,” where they had “a joint kitchen and dining room with a real cook and excellent food and think they have solved the problem of life in a big city,” Elisabeth Irwin wrote playfully for the Smith College Alumni Bulletin.\(^{192}\)

Katharine Anthony briefly put aside her focus on German feminism to write an article on Mary Beard, who, with her husband, Charles Beard, had published a book on American citizenship in the spring of 1914. They were already at work on another. Anthony visited Beard at her country home in Connecticut in the summer of 1914, where she “first heard from Beard of her plans for revising history for women.”\(^{193}\) Beard was fed up with histories that discounted—or, more likely, completely ignored—women and

\(^{190}\) "The Revolt of the Women," *Century* 87 (April 1914): 964.
their contributions to society, and it was women’s responsibility, Beard argued, to set the record straight. “Women must cease to be the anonymous sex,” she told Anthony. “It seems about time that we should discover that there are girls in the schools and women in the state.”

Historian Ellen DuBois rightly points out that Mary Beard has too often “been examined in isolation, rather than as a part of a larger group of former activists who were making women’s history in the same years.” Indeed, Katharine Anthony was a part of this “larger group,” and in many ways, Anthony’s work complimented Beard’s, and vice versa. *Mothers Who Must Earn* was the first of many books Anthony wrote that sought “to render some account of women’s work,” as Beard put it. The invisibility of women’s labor was one of the things that irked Anthony the most, and which she sought to correct through research and writing. “The conditions of domestic labor for wages are almost wholly ignored in our regulation of industry,” Anthony pointed out in *Mothers Who Must Earn*.

When everybody praises the smart appearance of the street cleaners in their white suits, who thinks of the wives of these men who must wash the coarse, heavy garments at least twice a week? ... When we speak of the
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hours of work of laboring people, we presuppose some hours of leisure. ... But the wife of the workingman who goes out daily to earn has not even this brief hour of freedom. To speak of her “hours of work” is misleading. There is no hour of her day but has its duty, no day of her week but has its labors.  

This theme would resurface in almost all of Katharine Anthony’s biographies. For instance, Anthony chose Margaret Fuller as her first biographical subject in part because Fuller “studied the conditions of women’s lives and recorded her observations with the accuracy and objectivity which belongs to modern social research. ... Everywhere she commented on the character of women’s work.” In her 1945 biography of Charles and Mary Lamb, Anthony began Chapter VIII, “Women Must Work,” by pointing out Mary’s significant but overlooked contribution to history. “Few people realize today what a large part women played in the English scene of the early nineteenth century; how restless, how independent, how important they were. Mary Lamb was far from being the single swallow which partially foretells the summer; she was one of the flock which fully heralds it. ... If Mary Lamb’s name were listed along with those of all the famous women of her time, it would be found in a numerically imposing company.” And again, in her 1958 biography of Mercy Otis Warren, Anthony singled out the disconcerting “fact that the name of Mercy Otis Warren strikes a responsive chord in so few living and breathing Americans. ... The originality of this woman was of startling, almost Shakespearean proportions. ... In another age, in another clime, her literary talent might have shaped her into an ivory tower character.”
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Mothers Who Must Earn received positive reviews, most notably because of Katharine Anthony’s moving, smart prose that made reading a book filled with charts and statistics surprisingly enjoyable. “The graphic portrayal of a community’s needs is already awakening interest in a long neglected section of New York,” one reviewer noted about the book and its reception.202 Another called Mothers Who Must Earn an “intimate study” that “throws much light upon certain aspects of the great and growing problem of women at work.”203

The review that stands out the most was written by a reporter named Gail West, who interviewed Katharine Anthony at Patchin Place and was struck by Anthony’s “genuine human sympathy.”204 West “was not surprised that this well-known social worker chose to live in the milieu of her work[,] ... [unlike] [y]our average society ‘slummer’ who descends among the poor from the heights of Riverside or upper Fifth Avenue and vanishes thence again to tango or bridge.”205

205 West’s comment speaks to the history of philanthropy in America. Unlike the antebellum charity workers, who were “self-abnegating servants of the poor,” as historian Kathleen McCarthy writes, “Gilded Age stewards were reluctant to venture into the slums as casually as their predecessors had. Such work was deemed unpleasant, dangerous, and time consuming. Moreover, those dauntless souls who continued to personally minister to the needy often found that they had little practical advice to render. Unlike the hearty pioneers who used their household talents to run asylums, the pampered ladies of the 1880s had little experience with household drudgery, and when they tried to inculcate skills they themselves had failed to master, the results were often ludicrous.” McCarthy, Noblesse Oblige, 27-28. These were the social workers who “descended” and “vanished.” Progressive era social workers like KA, however, sought to “reforg[e] a network of personal ties with the poor,” and build a new kind of system altogether—one that valued “decentralization, research rather than impulse, flexibility, a working partnership between donors and professionals, and de-institutionalization.” McCarthy,
West also noted Katharine Anthony’s “patient thoroughness, [and] sound common sense.”²⁰⁶ But it was Anthony’s prose that received the most exuberant praise. Anthony’s *Mothers Who Must Earn* was “instinct with vital human interest from the first page to the last,” West gushed, “in a way that would make the fame of a ‘best seller,’ and is written, moreover, with a restraint … that ‘best sellers’ often lack. It is more interesting than a novel and as good as a play.”²⁰⁷ Albeit hyperbolic, West’s praise is indicative of the quality of Anthony’s writing, which is indeed not only clear, but also entertaining. In roughly 200 pages, Anthony brings to life the working mothers of Manhattan’s West Side so that ironing, sweeping, and cooking become topics of great interest. In many ways, it’s obvious that Anthony was honing her craft. Although it was a joint, statistical publication, Anthony was solely responsible for the writing, and her personality and biases are almost impossible to miss. She was not concerned with being a disinterested reporter, but rather a straightforward and passionate one, just as she would later write her first biography with “the warmth of the advocate.”²⁰⁸

Katharine Anthony praised the women in the study for working while also raising children. This alone, she said, “qualified them at once for respect. They had had the enterprise to find work and the industry to keep it. They had not ‘put their children
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*Noblesse Oblige*, 99. Their efforts were in line with a broader change that was taking place in society as a whole. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the Social Darwinist mentality that a wealthy man was by definition also a virtuous man crumbled in the face of Muckrakers, who were eager to point out the wealthy’s flaws in books and articles, and the newly founded Populist Party, that criticized everything from a national banking system to the cost of silver, and highlighted the growing and unjust distance between the wealthy and the poor.
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away,’ but were making every effort to keep up a home.” Anthony defended the women against the critiques of society. “Too often we hear these women spoken of as if some perversity of instinct drove them to neglect their homes and go to work at the expense of their homes and children,” Anthony stated. “It is for the sake of their children that they work, as mothers have done from time immemorial. The last penny of their earnings is absorbed by their homes.”

Katharine Anthony pointed out, too, the embedded, structural sexism of America’s economic system that kept women frozen in jobs of drudgery. “The scrubbing is done in the most primitive fashion, and as long as the women’s labor is as cheap as it is, there is little incentive for employers to adopt improved methods of work. There is also a general belief that women do this sort of work more thoroughly than men—a fact which has served to prolong their tenure.”

The importance of Mothers Who Must Earn is apparent when one tries to find information about working mothers in the first two decades of the twentieth century without it. Between 1900 and 1930, the number of married women who were employed doubled (married women comprised roughly 30% of all employed women), but censuses from these years distort the numbers in one significant way: they do not distinguish between married women whose husbands were present, and previously married women who very likely had children to take care of. A sole category is given for those who were unmarried, widowed, divorced, or separated. Katharine Anthony, however, took
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marital status into consideration only insofar as it affected the kind and amount of work a mother had to do. Motherhood and employment were the only two requirements for inclusion.

Of the 370 wage-earning mothers in Katharine Anthony’s study, 44.1% were wives with husbands who also worked, 33.8% were widows, 10.8% had been deserted, 5.7% had incapacitated husbands, 3.2% had idle husbands, and 2.4% were separated.\textsuperscript{213} The top six causes of death or incapacitation of the husbands were tuberculosis (35.4%), pneumonia (13%), work accident (11%), heart disease (4.8%), insanity (3.4%), and alcoholism (2%).\textsuperscript{214} “Divorce is unknown on the West Side,” Anthony stated.\textsuperscript{215} Perhaps somewhat surprising was Anthony’s finding that “[t]he women were not as a rule inclined … to look forward to marriage as a means of escaping work. Experience had taught them better. They were more likely to marry for companionship.”\textsuperscript{216}

In reading Mothers Who Must Earn, there is some indication that Katharine Anthony was already reasonably well versed in psychoanalysis by 1913 (by 1919, she had “gone as far as I can with books”).\textsuperscript{217} In a discussion of family income, for instance, Anthony writes about “the peculiar misfortune of these over-large families that they so often contain a loafer. ... He is what the psychologist would call an ‘infantile personality,’ which, under any given set of conditions, will always choose the easiest way to exist. He
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is the foe of healthy co-operation in the family and in society.” Anthony also noted that the women who scrubbed the floors of “[t]he great office buildings, the churches, clubs, hospitals, theaters, and schools,” were not just damaging their knees and backs at work: “the psychological effect of constantly dealing with dirt is unwholesome.”

It is also clear from *Mothers Who Must Earn* that Katharine Anthony was already interested in biography—and a different kind of biography at that. In the last chapter of the study, titled “The Human Side,” which is arguably the most entertaining, Anthony explains that, “[w]ithout consideration of the human factor, our study of conditions would be incomplete.” The “personalities and homes” of these women required comment, and “[t]he life story of any one of ... [them] might easily fill a volume and would certainly be a valuable biography.” Anthony was constricted by page limits, but she still hoped “to give the reader a glimpse beyond the economic elements and to make more real the flesh and blood underlying the facts upon which the statistical tables of the foregoing chapters have been built.” The result was lively, colorful portraits of women, with titles such as, “A Home Where Nobody Sits Down”; “The Blind Baker’s Family”; “One Family that Has Not Failed”; and “How Mrs. Westrich Earned $11 A Week.”

In Katharine Anthony’s mind, there was only one problem with *Mothers Who Must Earn*: “[i]t was not writing on my own, and I wanted to write on my very own.”
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With Beard’s admonishment in her mind, and her own natural curiosity in biography, psychology, and history pushing her forward, the seed for writing women’s lives was planted. Influenced by her trip to Europe, her work with the Russell Sage Foundation, and her New York coterie, Anthony’s ideology of feminism had crystallized by the end of 1914. The outbreak of war in Europe in the summer of 1914 added urgency to her work on German feminism, but perhaps she could weave her personal philosophy of feminism into her larger examination of the German Woman Movement. She would spend the first six months of 1915 trying to do just that.
Chapter 4:

Toward “a new science of womanhood”:

_Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia_

and the Translation of American Feminism,

1915-1917

“[T]he new woman must begin where she stands. She must say, with Archimedes, ‘Give me where I stand.’ And seeing that she stands in the midst of arbitrary obstacles and jealous limits, her first duty is to raze the lot.”

—Katharine Anthony, _Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia_, 1915

* * *

In the early months of 1915, Katharine Anthony thought of Virgil. “Arma virumque cano,” the Roman poet began his epic war poem, _The Aeneid_; “I sing of arms and the man.” Just six months after fighting had broken out in Europe, it didn’t take a far stretch of the imagination to find parallels between the Trojan War, three thousand years past, and the modern war-torn era. On January 19, 1915, the German military launched its first zeppelin air raid against England, targeting civilians from the sky and announcing a new kind of warfare altogether. Twelve days later, on January 31, the bloodshed took on new horrific proportions when chemical gas was used to kill Russian troops in modern day Poland. As early as February, one could probably predict that 1915
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would turn out to be the deadliest year of World War I. “[D]espite the passage of centuries and the supposed advance of civilization,” Katharine Anthony lamented, “the modern war correspondent is still harping away on the same old theme.”

In 1915, Katharine Anthony saw only one corrective to the carnage. “[F]ortunately for the hopes of civilization, there are other departments of modern life which are essentially unfriendly to the vaunt of force,” she wrote. “[W]omen, who exalt life-giving above life-taking, are the natural allies of the present era.” Men possessed a “hereditary faith in arms,” but women, Anthony argued, possessed a “hereditary faith in peace.” Even the German women were natural peace-makers, Anthony said. “Since the very beginning of the war the women have been preparing for peace,” she wrote in an article for *Outlook* titled “The New Brunhilda: German Women and the War.” “While the old Siegfried is still hacking his way through the forest of the past the new Brunhilda is advancing uninterruptedly along the highroad of the future.”

Even “humanists” like Charlotte Perkins Gilman recognized men’s specific role in war, calling armed combat “masculism at its worst.” Katharine Anthony called it “the most ancient of all immoralities,” and worried that, in addition to the senseless deaths of millions upon millions of children, women, and men, the war might also tragically and unwittingly kill the momentum of the woman movement, and just as a successful

---

3 Ibid.
conclusion could been seen on the horizon. “[P]rogress without peace is impossible,” Anthony stated simply.⁶

Although generally opposed to essentialist arguments—she called the collective belief in a “woman’s intuition” a “superstition” and “convenient fiction”—Katharine Anthony and many other feminists appealed to women’s natural roles as peacemakers and life-givers to advance the “fight” for women’s rights during WWI.⁷ During the war years many feminists prioritized peace over feminism—Woodrow Wilson received the majority of feminists’ votes in 1916 despite his anti-suffrage stance because he campaigned as the president who “kept us out of war.” But feminists viewed their peace work “as part of their larger conception of feminism. If feminism meant a new culture with more emphasis on human liberty and development, then pacifism was a necessary preface to its accomplishment,” as June Sochen writes in her book on New Women in Greenwich Village in the 1910s.⁸

This was none the more evident than on January 10, 1915, when roughly three thousand women met in the Grand Ballroom of the New Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., to form the Woman’s Peace Party (WPP). Katharine Anthony was probably not in attendance at the inaugural meeting in Washington; but she would be a prominent member of the New York City branch (NYC-WPP), formed on February 4, 1915, in the

---

⁶ KA, FGS, 138, 28. See also KA to ESD, August 26, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL; and KA to ESD, November 6, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
⁷ KA, FGS, 230.
Blue Room of the new and extravagant McAlpin Hotel on 34th Street and Broadway. 9

Carrie Chapman Catt served as the “chairman” of the meeting, Charlotte Perkins Gilman read the agenda, and roughly twenty women volunteered to serve on the Executive Committee, including Catt, Marie Jenney Howe, Crystal Eastman, and Beatrice Forbes-Roberson Hale.

9 For the founding of the NYC-WPP, see “New York Women Join Peace Party,” New York Times, February 5, 1915. KA is not listed as a charter member in the WPP records, so it’s unlikely that she was at the inaugural meeting in Washington, D.C. See “Charter Members of the Woman’s Peace Party,” Reel 12.1, Folder 3, Woman’s Peace Party Records, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. Heretofore SCPC. She is also not listed on the stationary for the NYC-WPP, where the names of roughly two dozen women appear underneath their roles in the party (i.e., Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, Executive Board). I found only two mentions of KA in the WPP collection at Swarthmore College. First is a reference to her article, “The Sister Susie Peril” (discussed below) that appeared in the July 1917 issue of the WPP’s publication Four Lights, and which caused a large amount of dissension. See reel 12:4, folder 13, SCPC. And second, KA is listed as a presenter at the Woman’s Freedom Conference in New York City, Saturday, March 1, 1919. See reel 12:4, folder 5, SCPC. However, Blanche Wiesen Cook, who edited Crystal Eastman’s collected works, On Women & Revolution, writes that “[t]he leadership of New York’s WPP was comprised largely of Crystal’s closest friends—suffragists, socialists, militant feminists. … [It] was dominated by women like Margaret Lane, Anne Herendeen, Freda Kirchwey, Katharine Anthony, Madeleine Doty, Marie Jennie Howe, Agnes Brown Leach,” which suggests that official titles weren’t a prerequisite for leadership. See Cook, introduction to On Women & Revolution, 13. For a history of the WPP and/or women’s involvement and leadership in peace work, see Marie Louise Degen, The History of the Woman’s Peace Party (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1939); Linda Kay Schott, “The Woman’s Peace Party and the Moral Basis for Women’s Pacifism,” Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies 8 (1985): 18-24; Harriet Hyman Alonso, Peace as a Woman’s Issue: A History of the U.S. Movement for World Peace and Women’s Rights (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1993); Carrie A. Foster, The Woman and the Warriors: The U.S. Section of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1946 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995); Erika Kuhlman, “‘Women’s Ways in War’: The Feminist Pacifism of the New York City Woman’s Peace Party,” Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies 18 (1997): 80-100; Linda Schott, Reconstructing Women’s Thoughts: The Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom Before World War II (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997); and Joyce Blackwell, No Peace Without Freedom: Race and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1975 (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004).
The objectives of the WPP were straightforward: “to stop the war in Europe; to organize the world for peace at the close of the war; and to guard democracy (or such beginnings of democracy as we have in America) against the subtle dangers of militarism.”\(^{10}\) Regardless of their marital or childbearing status, the women of the WPP appealed to their singular roles as mothers of humanity to make their case. “From the beginning,” Eastman wrote, “it seemed to me that the only reason for having a Woman’s Peace Party is that women are mothers, or potential mothers, therefore have a more intimate sense of the value of human life and that, therefore, there can be more meaning and passion in the determination of a woman’s organization to end war than in an organization of men and women with the same aim.”\(^{11}\) (There were reportedly only two men at the inaugural NYC-WPP meeting—one who claimed “he had gotten in by accident but was deeply interested,” and another who “professed to have come with a purpose, but the woman with him said he had been brought by his wife.”)\(^{12}\)

Although motherhood had been central to the feminist struggle in Europe for decades, it wasn’t until the 1910s, and particularly during WWI, that motherhood was taken up in any significant numbers by feminists in America. Because of her experience in Germany, none more than Katharine Anthony understood the fundamental relationship between motherhood and women’s emancipation. She drew heavily for inspiration on the BfM and concluded that “the ultimate triumph of volitional motherhood over sex slavery [was] one of the indispensable conditions” of women’s emancipation, and


\(^{11}\) CE to Jane Addams, June 28, 1917, “NYC Branch, 1917,” Reel 12:15, Box 9, SCPC.

American feminists would do well to recognize the importance of childbearing and childrearing to women’s economic equality.\textsuperscript{13}

Katharine Anthony intensified her feminist work in 1915, using the war as a foil for her feminist concerns. She capitalized on people’s heightened sensitivities: “many people … can now see clearly what they could not even dimly perceive before the war began.”\textsuperscript{14} And she used the bloodshed of WWI as a sort of proof to the public and lawmakers that the reforms she was requesting were not radical, so much as they were \textit{logical}. The advance of civilization required the balancing out of “masculine” energy, Anthony argued, and the war was ample evidence for this. She zeroed in on reforms that were brought into relief by the war, such as maternity insurance and “illegitimacy,” and she provocatively praised Germany for its advanced attitude towards women, thereby hoping to spur the American government into action. By the end of October, she would see the fruits of her labor come together in the publication of \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}.

Apart from a book review she published in \textit{The Survey} in February on Beatrice Forbes-Roberson Hale’s \textit{What Women Want}, in which she emphasized the author’s timely definition of feminism—“The part of women in evolution is to try and hasten humanity beyond the rule of force”—Katharine Anthony spent the majority of the spring and summer writing \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}.\textsuperscript{15} The first announcement

\textsuperscript{13} KA, \textit{FGS}, 99.
for her forthcoming book appeared in the *New York Tribune* on July 23, 1915, beneath a picture of the author, a book open in her lap, her hair pulled back and encircling a thoughtful countenance. Above the photograph, in bold black letters, the headline read: “Feminist Propaganda Approved by Men’s Conference—At Least This Has Been Done for German Women by the War.”16

It was a provocative headline and clever marketing. Just two and a half months earlier, on May 7, a German U-boat torpedoed a British ocean liner carrying 159 Americans as it entered the waters south of Ireland. The *Lusitania* sank in less than twenty minutes, along with many Americans’ opinions of Germany. Yet the headline implied that Germany, the unequivocal “enemy” of the modern world, might be more advanced on the Woman Question than the United States, the land of the free and the titular home of the emancipated woman. At the most recent meeting of the charity organizations of Germany, where German men discussed a variety of “social problems” confronting the country, Anthony pointed out, “[t]he women of Germany ... scored a most significant triumph. ... [I]t was moved that illegitimate children of soldiers killed in war receive equal pensions to those born of legal marriages, ... and it was urged that all social workers should help to make conditions for working mothers easier, relieving them as far as possible by simplifying their domestic problems, thus giving them sufficient leisure.”17

16 Alissa Franc, “Feminist Propaganda Approved by Men’s Conference—At Least This Has Been Done for German Women by the War,” *New York Herald Tribune*, July 23, 1915.
Katharine Anthony, who was particularly attuned to the plight of working mothers after publishing *Mothers Who Must Earn* the year before, called mothers in America “the unchartered servant[s] of the future,” and lamented that America hadn’t fallen in line with Germany, where “[f]eminism and social work are allies.” The momentum of the mothers’ pension fight in America was at its peak in the 1910s, such that just one year after the first state enacted a law favoring aid (Illinois, 1911), critics of mothers’ pensions were “entirely on the defensive.” But most of the advocates of mothers’ aid in America were not feminist-socialists like Katharine Anthony, who wanted a full economic upheaval of the system and implementation of a motherhood endowment and maternity insurance; rather, they were charity and social workers, juvenile court justices, and maternalists who maintained fairly traditional views on the family, and efforts to extend aid to either “illegitimate” children or single mothers were consistently fraught with moralistic arguments.

In New York state, the issue of mothers’ pensions climaxed between 1913 and 1915, while Katharine Anthony was writing *Mothers Who Must Earn* and traveling in

---

20 It is important to note that KA was not a “maternalist.” According to historian Molly Ladd-Taylor, “maternalists cannot properly be called feminists. Maternalists were wedded to an ideology rooted in the nineteenth-century doctrine of separate spheres and to a presumption of women’s economic and social dependence on men. ... [E]ven though feminists used motherhood rhetoric during the 1910s, they were not maternalists because they asserted women’s individual right to economic independence and thereby challenged the maternalist concept of the family. ... Nevertheless, maternalism and feminism coexisted and at times overlapped during the Progressive era; it was only in the 1920s, with the bitter debate over the Equal Rights Amendment, that they clearly diverged.” Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*, 3, 7, 3. See also Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*, 145.
Germany. In this two-year span, no less than six bills for widows’ pensions had been introduced to the New York State Legislature, and every one of them had failed. The secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society (NYCOS), Edward Devine, argued against mothers’ pensions in favor of the “personal responsibility of the individual for his own welfare and for that of those who ... are naturally dependent upon him.” Mothers’ aid, he scolded, was “an insidious attack upon the family, inimical to the welfare of children and injurious to the character of parents.”

The vice president of the NYCOS, Otto Barnard, saw mothers’ pensions as fundamentally un-American. It smacked of socialism and simply “is not American;” he stated, “it is not virile.” Mary Richmond, the director of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation while Katharine Anthony was at work on Mothers Who Must Earn, objected to mothers’ pensions on the grounds that such “relief measures” for the poor were “miscalled mothers’ pension bills” and were intended by supporters to create “another and quite different social policy” altogether—namely, a socialist one.

“Will the feminists, in the end, recede from their standpoint of extreme individualism and consent to resume the world-old duties of motherhood?,” the New York Times asked in 1913. “Or will a growing and widening social conviction as to the economic value of that motherhood finally lead the State to pay all mothers for the time and effort they spend in the rearing of their children?”

When New York finally passed a mothers’ pension law in April of 1915, it included several stipulations, unsurprisingly
moralistic in nature. After nine months of research into the issue, the state legislature determined that “a system of direct governmental aid to the widowed mother with children” was most desirable. To Katharine Anthony’s disgust, all other single mothers were excluded. “The legislatures were in no position to resist an appeal on behalf of the poor widow,” and the lawmakers themselves were “so nicely narcotized ... by their traditional tender-heartedness that they failed to perceive the socialistic basis of this new kind of widow’s pensions,” Anthony criticized the conservative decision. “For generations after the Civil War, the Republican Party throve on a pension-system which gathered in the youngest widow of the oldest veteran, and Tammany has always understood how to profit from its ostentatious alms-giving to widows and orphans. ... The widow enjoys great honour in American public life.”

But not just any widow could get funds from the state. According to the New York law, for a widowed mother to receive aid, she also had to be “a proper person

26 KA, “The Family,” 329, 328. Interestingly, one of the sociology professors at the University of Chicago during KA’s tenure was Charles Richmond Henderson, who argued that the expansion of Civil War pensions in the 1870s and 1880s actually hindered the expansion of like reforms during the Progressive Era. Henderson and other Progressives, like KA and Henry Rodgers Seager, a professor at Columbia University, were critical of the political corruption they saw embedded in these post-Civil War policies. Historian Theda Skocpol has shown that the political issues tied to these policies “might have helped to prevent Americans during the early twentieth century from adopting European-style old-age pensions and social insurance.” Furthermore, Skocpol argues that the headway made towards mothers’ pensions in the 1910s was led in large part by women’s volunteer associations, not by, as she originally suspected, juvenile court justices and nascent governmental agencies, like the federal Children’s Bureau, founded in 1912. Reactions against nineteenth-century “patronage democracy” and the significant role of women’s voluntary organizations (before women could even vote) “was part of a fundamental reorganization of U.S. government and politics.” See Skocpol, Protecting Soldiers and Mothers, viii, ix.
mentally, morally, and physically.”27 The funds were not charity, the state clarified, but rather “an indemnity for the earning capacity of the husband, so that the mother may be enabled to bring up her children as they would have been brought up had their father lived and worked for them.”28 In other words, this was not the creation of a maternal welfare state, but the cornerstone for a new kind of paternalist state that would replace the absent breadwinner.29

The New York law went into effect in July of 1915, the same month Katharine Anthony was interviewed by a journalist for the New York Tribune about Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, and the same month she composed the Preface to the book from her summer retreat in New Fairfield, Connecticut. “Let the women of America not forget that the women of Europe look upon them as the standard bearers of freedom,” Anthony reminded her fellow feminists and American lawmakers.30 The U.S. had an obligation to not only match the advancements made in Germany, Anthony all but stated directly, but to surpass them. Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia would thus be just as much informative history as it would be a potential handbook for U.S. lawmakers.

Alissa Franc, the reporter for the New York Tribune, had but one query for Katharine Anthony in closing: “By what means could the women of Scandinavia [and Germany] be brought into closer contact with the women of England and America?”, she asked, and Anthony replied with a single word, “translations.” Without “[t]ranslations of

27 Quoted in Hopkins, Harry Hopkins, 107.
28 Ibid., 98.
29 Ibid., 100.
articles on feminism in other languages” there could be no global network of women.\textsuperscript{31} And to Anthony, only a shared movement could bring about full emancipation. Women in America were leading the fight for political change; but women in Europe looked to social and cultural reforms that Anthony viewed as critical to true emancipation. Anthony would take the first step towards forming an international alliance by introducing the women of America to their German and Scandinavian sisters, whose struggle, she hoped, would map the future for American feminists.

Four days after the article on Katharine Anthony and Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia appeared in the \textit{New York Tribune}, the same newspaper announced the death of Elizabeth Westwood, aged thirty-five, and the “two Elizabeths” abruptly came to an end.\textsuperscript{32} Katharine Anthony and Elisabeth Irwin remained at Patchin Place until the fall of 1916, when they moved together to 36 Grove Street, roughly half a mile away.\textsuperscript{33} From Grove Street they relocated to 3 Bank Street; then 270 West 11\textsuperscript{th} Street; and finally, in 1920, to 23 Bank Street, where both women would live for the rest of their lives.\textsuperscript{34} The

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid. Significantly, this remains an issue. In 2009, historian Margot Canaday wrote about the limits to a transnational understanding of the history of sexuality: “The most profound issue we face is perhaps one of translation. ... [L]anguage poses one of the most significant barriers to our ability to know sexuality in the past or to move back and forth between linguistically diverse societies. While language specialization is necessary for research ... it is also ‘insularizing’—it has contributed, for example, to the neglect of the Middle East in comparative and transnational studies.” See Canaday, “Thinking Sex in the Transnational Turn: An Introduction,” \textit{The American Historical Review} (December 2009): 1254.


\textsuperscript{33} KA and EI moved from 1 Patchin Place to 36 Grove Street sometime between mid-September and late November. See KA to ESD, September 16, 1916, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL; and KA to ESD, November 29, 1916, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL.

\textsuperscript{34} KA and EI moved from 36 Grove Street to 3 Bank Street sometime between June 15, 1917, and November 6, 1917 (see the corresponding letters in ESD-SL). In June 1919,
death of Elisabeth in 1942 after a long battle with cancer ended a relationship that lasted nearly thirty years.

Katharine Anthony’s partnership with Elisabeth Irwin was undoubtedly the most enduring and intimate relationship of her life. They lived together for three decades; adopted several children together (some legally and some not); and together bought a house in New York City and a country home in Connecticut. Still, despite their frequent absences from one another, no letters between Anthony and Irwin are known to exist. Aida Anthony Whedon, a niece who lived with Katharine and Elisabeth in the 1930s, believed the letters were “destroyed I am sure – because she [Katharine] did not want to have anyone know of this close relationship.” But it’s evident that people did know of this close relationship. Anthony and Irwin were a well-known couple in

the owner of 3 Bank Street informed all tenants that they were to vacate the building by July 1. See KA to ESD, June 26, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL. By October 1919, KA and EI were living at 270 West 11th Street. See KA to ESD, October 11, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL. In May 1920, KA and EI had moved to 23 Bank street. See KA to ESD, May 26, 1920, Box 26, Folder 434, ESD-SL.

35 There are two stories about KA’s sexuality that cannot be verified, both of which involve men. The first is a family story, related by KA’s niece, Aida Anthony Whedon, to her son, TW, that KA was in love with a married professor at one of the colleges she either attended or taught at. Which college it was is not certain—Peabody, Chicago, Freiburg, Heidelberg, or Wellesley—but KA was apparently heartbroken when it didn’t work out. The one professor it seems KA kept in touch was Wycliffe Rose from Peabody, but Rose’s papers, housed at the Churchill Archive Center in Cambridge, England, where over forty boxes of his papers are held, including his diaries and personal correspondence during and after the time that KA was his student, are closed until 2022. The second story comes from HJ, who claims that while KA was researching her biography of Catherine the Great, she felt unqualified to write about the Empress’s sex life because she herself had never slept with a man. Supposedly a friend, Alice Mary Kimball, offered up her husband for KA’s research purposes. The two apparently met, but what happened between them was never revealed to either HJ or AMK.

36 EI already had an adopted son when she met KA, Luigi Balestro, born in 1899. See the Smith College Alumnae Association Biographical Register, 1891-1935, unknown page, MHJ-AHC.

37 AW, notes to Waitt, November 5, probably 1985, LHA.
Greenwich Village in the 1910s, ‘20s, and ‘30s; and there is no evidence that Anthony tried to hide or downplay her relationship with Irwin in any way. When they are mentioned in the books and papers (primarily memoirs) of their contemporaries, it is almost always alongside one another.

One of the earliest references to Anthony and Irwin together comes just a few months after Westwood’s death, in the late fall of 1915, when Madge Jenison and Mary Mowbray-Clarke were deciding whether or not to open a bookshop in Manhattan. Jenison ran the idea by Anthony and Irwin, who are presented as something of a united front in Jenison’s memoir. “Katharine Anthony and Elisabeth Irwin caught up the idea on the finger-tips of their wit on the afternoon when I presented it breathlessly to them and passed it back and forth between them,” Jenison wrote. “They egged me on and begged me, whatever I did, not to call it Ye Little Bookie Shoppie.”

Heterodoxy member Inez Haynes Irwin included a description of Anthony and Irwin in her unpublished autobiography, Adventures of Yesterday. “They kept house together,” she stated simply. “Katherine was the author of a generous line of brilliant biographies; a wise woman with a philosophic outlook and a delicious sense of humor. Elisabeth was a live, warm earthy type with the fine trained mind of an educator. She was an iconoclast.”

If people hid their relationships from anyone, it was very often from their families. But Katharine Anthony’s letters to and from friends and family between 1915

---

and 1942 regularly reference Elisabeth: “Elisabeth sends her love,” or “Give Elisabeth a warm hello.” Without needing to explain it, Katharine could write “we” instead of “I.”

She wrote to her mother and sisters about Elisabeth. In December 1915, Sue Anthony closed a letter to Katharine, “Love to Elisabeth Irwin and Madge Jenison.” Later, probably the next year, Sue wrote more directly, “Give my love to Elisabeth. Tell her I’ve tried over and again to hear from her through you but have failed.” One summer, Sue made Elisabeth a collar, which Sue hoped would please Katharine.

By the 1920s, after purchasing a country home in Gaylordsville, Connecticut, Katharine Anthony and Elisabeth Irwin were calling themselves “the gay ladies of Gaylordsville.” A curious pencil drawing of Anthony and Irwin’s living room in Connecticut hangs on Tony Whedon’s wall in Vermont. An angel flies near the fireplace, above a caption that reads, “The Gay Ladies of Gaylordsville.” It was drawn with distorted dimensions, producing something of a three-dimensional optical illusion—a dream-like sensation wrought by an unrealistic sense of space. One almost feels the need to peek sideways in order to capture the full scope of the drawing.

The artist is unknown. But the drawing was displayed at the Paris Exhibition of 1936, one of the famous art shows dedicated to the post-war artistic, literary, and intellectual movement dubbed Surrealism. Like the practitioners of modern biography, Surrealist artists were influenced by Freud and the First World War. They sought to

---

40 See, for instance, KA to ESD, May 26, 1920, Box 26, Folder 434, ESD-SL.
41 SA to KA, December 20, 1915, WB. A “Dr. Nancy” is also mentioned, although it’s unclear who this is.
42 SA to KA, undated fragment, probably 1916, WB. See also PC to KA, September 26, unknown year, WB: “Love to Elisabeth.”
43 SA to KA, June 20, 1916 or 1917, WB. “I thought it would please you to make Elisabeth a collar. Glad you liked it.”
challenge traditional social values by creating art that represented the unconscious, irrational aspects of human nature and the world (think Salvador Dali.) “Surrealism ... asserts our complete nonconformism,” André Breton wrote in his 1924 Surrealist Manifesto.44 Women were often the subjects and inspiration for this work, serving as examples of “the actual functioning of thought ... in the absence of any control exercised by reason, exempt from any aesthetic or moral concern,” Breton explained.45 Perhaps this is what Anthony and Irwin represented to the artist. As women who loved each other without society’s “permission,” and despite society’s condemnation, they embodied this exemption, this nonconformism, this freedom of expression to be and love exactly who they wanted. They were displayed in 1936 for all the world to see.

Of course, it’s possible that “The Gay Ladies of Gaylordsville” was simply a play on the word “Gaylordsville.” George Chauncey explains in Gay New York that “gay” did not usually indicate a person’s sexuality until after World War II. Homosexual argot changed over time, from common references to gay men as “fairies” and “queers” in the first half of the twentieth century, to “gay” after 1945.46 Occasionally in the 1920s and 1930s, “gay” was used as “a code word” by gay men “to identify themselves to other gays without revealing their identity to those not in the wise, for not everyone … knew that it implied a specifically sexual preference.”47 “Gay” did not usually refer to homosexual women, who were typically called lesbians, if they were called anything at

45 Ibid.
47 Ibid., 17.
all, or less often “bull daggers,” in the 1920s. Yet the fact that Anthony and Irwin referred to themselves as “the gay ladies of Gaylordsville,” regardless of intent, is indicative of their closeness, their intimacy, their partnership, as well as of other people’s awareness of their relationship.

Unsurprisingly, Katharine Anthony never discussed her sexuality outright. The inner circles of Greenwich Village aside, most people didn’t. Publicly, she referred to herself as “unmarried,” which was true. Until the turn of the twentieth century, when sexologists turned their attention to women’s love for other women and men’s love for other men, labeling homosexual romantic unions “abnormal,” the sexualities of unmarried women were typically viewed as either nonexistent (the asexual “spinster”) or “deviant” (prostitutes and witches). Katharine Anthony lived on the “historical cusp” of acknowledged—albeit not accepted—female sexuality, and Elisabeth Irwin passed away before language caught up to reality. Although Freudianism had brought the discussion of women’s sexuality into the foreground, despite Freud’s reticence on the issue until the 1920s, it was heterosexuality that remained the “norm.” There was no widely understood and unprejudiced term in the first decades of the twentieth century with which to describe women’s affectionate relationships with other women. Just a few

——

48 Ibid., 15.
49 Margot Canaday has written an important study on homosexuality and the development of the American “state.” “Unlike comparable European states, which were well established before sexologists ‘discovered’ the homosexual in the late nineteenth century, the American bureaucracy matured during the same years that scientific and popular awareness of the pervert exploded on the American continent,” Canaday writes. This phenomenon, Canaday argues, explains the extreme persecution of homosexual men and women in the United States. See Canaday, *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 2.
decades earlier, Anthony and Irwin probably would have been described as “romantic friends,” a part of the rich and vibrant “female world of love and ritual” Carol Smith-Rosenberg uncovered in the 1970s.51 By the second half of the twentieth century they would have very likely been considered “lesbians.”52 But for women who loved other women in the first decades of the 1900s, “the former term would have been anachronistic and the latter unacceptable,” as Faderman explains.53

We would do well here to consider the words of Blanche Wiesen Cook, who has written powerfully about the historical denial of lesbianism. About women such as Katharine Anthony and Elisabeth Irwin, Cook writes, “[e]ven if they did renounce all physical contact we can still argue that they were lesbians: they chose each other, and they loved each other. Women who love women, who choose women to nurture and support and to form a living environment in which to work creatively and independently are lesbians.”54 Katharine Anthony chose to love, work, live and adopt children with one woman, Elisabeth Irwin, for the majority of her adult life. Anthony recognized and paid tribute to “a great hunger of the human heart for the one beloved companion,” and

---

52 Canaday points out that the policing of homosexual women happened at a slower pace than the policing of homosexual men, in large part because women mattered less to the state than men did until “women were more completely drawn into citizenship ... most visibly, when they were permanently integrated into the military during the early years of the cold war.” See Canaday, The Straight State, 13. The broad and widely understood application of the label “lesbian” happened within this transformation.  
53 Faderman, Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers, 15.  
Elisabeth was hers. Elisabeth was “my darling Elisabeth,” Katharine’s emotional and intellectual support for nearly three decades. “When Elisabeth was with me I could just sit down in her presence and gain strength for the next day,” Anthony wrote to Jeanette Rankin two months after Elisabeth had died. “Elisabeth manufactured optimism for me for thirty years.” Anthony dedicated her third life study, *Queen Elizabeth*, to her own dear Elisabeth. They waited anxiously for one another at the train station after being separated by travel and work. They held hands when they went to the movies. They shared their most intimate feelings with one another, and were “able to help each other a good deal in over-coming our mutual self-deceptions and the like,” Katharine said. A photograph of Katharine and Patty, their dog, found in the Whedon Barn is inscribed “To Elisabeth with love” (Figure 4.1). When she died in 1942, Elisabeth left Katharine “all of my estate whatsoever its nature or kind.” “We always knew,” a close relative said about Katharine and Elisabeth’s love for one another. Tony Whedon was more direct about his great-aunt’s relationship: “Those who say they weren’t sexual aren’t right. That’s bogus.”

Perhaps most important to our discussion is the fact that Katharine Anthony viewed her love for other women as inseparable from her feminism. Her clearest

---

55 KA, “Emotional Basis of Individual Character,” Box 26, Folder 434, ESD-SL.
56 KA to JR, Tuesday, 1943, Reel 8, Folder 165, JR-SL.
57 KA to JR, January 18, 1943, Reel 8, Folder 165, JR-SL.
58 KA to JR, June 9, 1943, Reel 8, Folder 165, JR-SL.
59 TW interview with the author, February 16, 2014, East Berkshire, Vermont.
60 KA to ESD, November 3, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL.
61 “The Last Will and Testament of Elisabeth Irwin,” Box 7, Folder “Katharine Anthony and Elisabeth Antoinette Irwin Notes,” MHJ-AHC.
62 DW to Waitt, October 25, 1985, LHA.
63 TW phone interview with the author, September 30, 2013.
statement of this comes from her biography of Margaret Fuller, published in 1920. Although it might be an overstatement to assume that Margaret Fuller “can be read profitably as both biography and autobiography,” as one scholar has argued, there are moments when Anthony clearly steps away from her subject to express her personal beliefs. This is one of them. “The feminism of women, like the corresponding form of sex-solidarity among men, is based on a social impulse which is in turn, rooted in an erotic impulse towards others of one’s own sex,” Anthony wrote. “The destruction of this impulse is neither possible nor desirable.” There is little interpretation needed here. Anthony’s feminism was intricately bound to her sexuality. In fact, she believed that an erotic desire for other women normally preceded one’s feminism. This was the natural state of being. She all but claimed outright that heterosexuality was the divergent sexuality.

For the twenty-three years that Katharine Anthony lived after Elisabeth Irwin’s death, her closest relationship was with Jeanette Rankin, the first woman elected to the United States Congress. They met in New York, sometime around 1910. Anthony and
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Irwin visited Rankin at her home in Georgia, which Anthony fictionalized and published in a series for the *Woman’s Home Companion* in the mid-1920s. Perhaps tellingly, Anthony referred to Rankin as “Aspasia” in the articles, the name of an educated Greek woman who was remembered for “corrupting the women of Athens by means of intellectual orgies.”\(^{67}\) To be sure, Rankin was Anthony’s intellectual and emotional intimate for the last twenty years of Anthony’s life. They never lived together (in fact, they were usually at least several states apart); but they wrote to one another regularly and affectionately from 1942 until Katharine’s death in 1965. Anthony was drawn to Rankin’s intelligence, and Rankin was drawn to hers. Anthony confided in Rankin, and Rankin in her. Rankin was devastated when Anthony died.

If, as the saying goes, a picture is worth a thousand words, perhaps it is appropriate here to end with a photograph of Katharine and Elisabeth, whose profound, enduring love could embody endless language, or, like an artist who puts her heart and soul into a painting, no words at all. There is a striking picture of Katharine and Elisabeth that indicates not only their intimacy, but their *confidence* in that intimacy. Originally two photographs, someone photocopied them, one next to the other, onto a single sheet of paper. On the left-hand side is Elisabeth, naked and astride a horse, looking directly at the camera. On the right-hand side is Katharine, also naked and on a horse, looking slightly down. Both women appear comfortable, peaceful, playful. There is no date given, but the pictures were very likely taken in Connecticut at some time in the 1920s, Katharine’s by Elisabeth, and Elisabeth’s by Katharine. It is the perfect memento to remember Katharine and Elisabeth as they were: independent, sexual,
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carefree women who loved life and loved each other and were proud enough of these things to sit exposed on a bare-backed horse.

* * *

Katharine Anthony completed *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* in six months, although she confessed that the subject had occupied her “odd time” for over ten years.68 She was proud of the finished product and would always regard *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* as her first book.69

It was published on October 30, 1915, and hailed by the publisher, Henry Holt & Co., as “the first book published in English containing a definite exposition of the significance of the feminist movement on the European continent,” although this wasn’t exactly true.70 At least two other books might have qualified for this description. Ellen Key’s *The Woman Movement*, a commentary on the woman movement in Europe, particularly in Sweden, had been translated into English and published in the U.S. in 1912. And the English-born New York City transplant Beatrice Forbes-Roberson Hale published *What Women Want: An Interpretation of the Feminist Movement* in 1914, which focused on England and America, but occasionally turned a glance toward non-English-speaking countries. Katharine Anthony positively reviewed them both.

But whereas Key’s work was “a personal interpretation of the external achievements of the [woman] movement and its influence on the spiritual nature of the
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modern woman;” and Hale’s was “an interpretation of the present, rather than a history of the past;” Katharine Anthony’s Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia was “an attempt to bring some of the main aspects of German and Scandinavian feminism into closer touch with the woman movement of the English-speaking countries.”

It was the first book originally published in English that took as its focus the feminist movements of countries not native to the author, and, apart from the final chapter, it was grounded in history as opposed to philosophy.

Katharine Anthony had four primary goals in mind when she sat down to write Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia in the winter of 1914-1915. It was going to be an informative corrective; a comparative critique; an incitement; and a rapprochement.

First, as Anthony explained in the Preface of the book, because of “our meager knowledge ... [t]he belief exists, even in enlightened suffrage circles, that the German women are a leaderless and hopelessly domesticated group and are content to remain so.” The only accounts of German feminism readily available were “obviously misrepresentative,” Anthony pointed out, “such as, what the German Emperor regards as woman’s sphere, what the German Empress thinks of woman suffrage, and what Schopenhauer has written against the sex.” Comparatively, Anthony suggested, this would be like the Germans learning about American feminism from Elihu Root or Senator Bowdle. (Elihu Root was the U.S. Secretary of War under Theodore Roosevelt; and on January 12, 1915, Senator Stanley Bowdle of Ohio delivered a particularly
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obnoxious speech to the House of Representatives on the proposed suffrage bill: “The women of this smart capital are beautiful,” Bowdle declared. “Their beauty is disturbing to business; their feet are beautiful; their ankles are beautiful, but here I must pause—for they are not interested in the state.”)74 It’s unlikely that many people would have contested Anthony’s claim that Root and Bowdle weren’t representative of the American women’s movement. “It therefore seems desirable,” Anthony concluded, “that the opinions of these ex-officio anti-feminists should at least be balanced by some account of the feminist movement abroad according to representative sources.”75

Wartime jingoism only intensified Americans’ urgency to proclaim that Germany was less advanced than the United States, and they used Germany’s treatment of women to prove their point. In an article entitled “Germany Hates Feminism” that ran in the New York Times during WWI, the author emphasized a growing “interest, if not equal importance, in the fact that America, reputed throughout the world as the land of feminism, the land of privileged womanhood, is at war with the country in which the claims of feminism are most universally and violently detested and the aims of masculinism most loudly asserted and generally accepted.”76 Almost certainly read by Anthony and her ilk as an irony as comical as it was revolting, the article continued: “No other land [than Germany] could ever make a creed of subjecting to constant insult and cruelty the helpless and the wounded. The masculinism of America is of a different sort ... [and] [w]e prefer our own variety.”77
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Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia was thus also going to be a dual-focused comparative critique. Under the guise of writing a history of feminism in Germany and Scandinavia, Katharine Anthony found several opportunities to compare the male-governed “dictatorships” of Germany and the United States, and in none of them did the U.S. come out on top. Primarily, however, Anthony sought to point out the differences between the women movements in the various countries, often as a way to criticize American feminist organizations for their myopia and discord. “Teuto-Scandinavian” groups were actively concerned “with revolutionary educational and moral ideas,” Anthony stated, and this was no small task, as “[h]abits are even harder to change than laws.”78 In comparison, the “Anglo-American” countries “are just now beginning to discover that feminism means more than suffragism; that the ballot for the ballot’s sake is not the whole meaning of the suffrage agitation; that the political demands of women are inseparable from the social, educational, and economic demands of the whole feminist movement.”79 Not only was Anthony suggesting that the effectiveness of the German woman movement had been underestimated, but that the gains which the German women were making were equally as important (if not more important) as winning the vote. “Certainly we have as much to learn from the European feminists as they have to learn from us,” Anthony wrote; “they have, for many years, set the bad example of giving us more praise than we deserve.”80

Additionally, Katharine Anthony argued, the German women cooperated with one another, and American feminists could learn a thing or two by observing and adopting
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their esprit de corps. This was not “insipid unanimity and thoughtless agreement” on the part of the German women, but a deep-seated love for women in general and the future of their sex, despite the inevitable differences among them. They did not “truck[e] to narrow-minded criticism,” (implying here without saying so that American women did); but rather, the various kinds of feminists—Anthony lists socialist-feminists, bourgeois-feminists, conservative feminists, moderate feminists, radical feminists, Christian-feminists, neutral-feminists, “Old Feminists,” “Young Feminists,” suffrage-feminists, and feminist-feminists—maintained “a lively flow of internal discussion, and a multitude of mutually corrective attacks” that represented “the growing pains of a healthy coalescence.”

Cooperation, a love for women in general, and a broader understanding of emancipation would, in short, do the American feminists well. Anything else would not only be a disservice to feminism, but would in actuality be supportive of the patriarchal society that feminism sought to dismantle.

Third, Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia was going to be an incitement, an ideological map of the way forward. The victory of the New York women in January 1913, when both the Senate and the Assembly accepted a bill that proposed an amendment to sex-based voting restrictions in the state constitution, was approaching the scheduled referendum in November 1915. Women were confident of a favorable outcome. On a national level, things were also looking up. Eleven states had granted women the right to vote by 1915; and a remarkable forty thousand people had marched in the New York City suffrage parade in May of that year. Katharine Anthony could
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reasonably and confidently write in the Preface to her book that, “[t]he suffrage movement in this country is approaching a successful climax; the hourglass must be turned promptly. Otherwise the continuity of the feminist advance will be broken and the acquired momentum squandered.”\(^83\) She suggested that American feminists look to the work of women in Germany and Scandinavia to determine “the activities which should engage the collective attention of the American woman movement when it has at last been released from the long struggle for political rights. ... The way in which German feminism faces all its tasks is a model for the more one-sided endeavors of the Anglo-Saxon propaganda.”\(^84\)

Katharine Anthony couldn’t have foreseen the great irony that was to occur within a week of the book’s publication, when the New York State Legislature would once again deny women the vote. But the timing was still auspicious. While the war ripped countries apart and stressed the differences between them, Anthony’s book looked “[b]eyond all superficial differences and incidental forms” toward the “unconscious internationalism” that was, until now, latent within women “throughout the civilized world.”\(^85\) To Anthony, women’s common oppression was more powerful than their language or cultural differences. “The woman movement of the civilized world wants much the same things in whatever language its demands are expressed,” Anthony argued. “[T]he vision of the emancipated woman wears the same features, whether she be hailed as *frau, fru*, or *woman*.”\(^86\)
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The first chapter of *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, “The Coalescence of the European Women,” serves somewhat as the book’s Introduction (there is only the two-page Preface prior to Chapter I), and introduces Katharine Anthony’s fourth purpose for writing: rapprochement. Katharine Anthony cleverly began the chapter by highlighting the “definite division of labor” between continental feminism and Anglo-American feminism, “most strikingly brought out,” she determined, “in the two most famous slogans of twentieth century feminism”: “Votes for Women” in England, and “Mutterschutz” (“the protection of motherhood”) in Germany.\(^87\) The slogans were indicative, Anthony argued, of the fundamental differences between the movements—the one focused on “political liberty” and the other on “moral autonomy”—which culminated, respectively, in the militancy of the English suffragettes and the advocacy of a “new morality” in Europe (*Die Neue Ethik*).\(^88\) However (and this was Anthony’s main point), there was actually “no real conflict” between them, and she posited a memorable analogy to prove her point: “[t]heir relation is supplementary. They function together like the right eye and the left eye in a single act of vision. ... [They] are each incomplete without the other.”\(^89\)

As such, *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* was supposed to be a unification of sorts. Taken together, Katharine Anthony concluded, “Votes for Women” and “Mutterschutz” represented “the twin campaigns of the modern woman’s movement,” and their inventors “have proved to be the most powerful carriers of the dominating ideas of the modern woman’s movement—*the emancipation of woman both as a human-being*
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and as a sex-being.”

It is here that readers learn why Anthony chose Germany and Scandinavia for a comparative study with England and America. The two slogans, ostensibly created by Emmeline Pankhurst from England and Ruth Bré from Germany in 1905 and 1904 respectively, actually had their roots elsewhere, Anthony said. Both Pankhurst and Bré were “handed the torch by a foreign hand,” the former by an American, and the latter by a Scandinavian. Susan B. Anthony visited England in 1902 and “aroused Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughters,” Anthony wrote, which led to the significant awakening of the English woman’s movement that appeared shortly thereafter. And Ellen Key, whose work was read in Germany “by the hundred thousand,” particularly the German edition of Love and Marriage (1904), was “the timely stimulus” to the Mutterschutz movement.

Thus America, England, Germany, and Sweden were particularly enmeshed in the modern fight for women’s emancipation according to Katharine Anthony; yet she did not call her book Feminism in Germany and Sweden, almost certainly for two reasons: Anthony owed no small debt for her philosophy of feminism to Bernard Shaw; but Shaw, Anthony reasoned, owed no small debt to “the first great feminist of Norway,” Camilla Collett—in particular, to Collett’s 1877 book Fra de stummes Leir (Out of the Camp of the Mute). Like Fredrika Bremer of Sweden, Collett “opened the gates to the woman’s revolt in their respective countries by their criticisms of family relationships and
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Collett influenced Henrik Ibsen, who in turn created “the remote source of the feminist philosophy distilled by G.B.S.” Anthony thus found the roots of her own theory of women’s emancipation in the work of Camilla Collett, and in this way, understood feminism as, ideally, an international alliance of women and men devoted to a common cause. Collett focused on several things that American feminists had yet to broach in any sustained way, and that Anthony believed were crucial to feminism: motherhood, marriage, family. Therefore, only when the work from other countries had been translated into multiple languages could the broadest definition of feminism realized.

Second, since 1909, reformers in Norway had pushed for a law protecting children born out of wedlock, and in March 1915, the Norwegian Storthing accepted the proposal. Nicknamed the “Castberg Law” in honor of the Norwegian Minister of Justice Johan Castberg, Katharine Anthony praised the achievement as a critical moment in the fight for women’s emancipation, and quickly published an article in *The New Republic*, “Norway’s Treatment of the Illegitimate Child.” “The Norwegian law sets a high standard of justice for other countries,” Anthony argued. “Whatever view one may hold of the parents’ conduct in such cases, there is only one possible attitude toward the child.” She dedicated an entire chapter of *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*
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(Chapter VI, discussed below) to the issue of illegitimate children—an issue that Anthony saw as crucial to all women.

The reconciliatory purpose of Katharine Anthony’s work was not solely aimed at bridging the international gap, however. It was also an attempt to bridge the gap between woman and woman. In fact, it could reasonably be argued that this, most of all, was Anthony’s goal. “In the history of the development of human sympathies, the long indifference of women, of the feminist movement, and of the so-called ‘good’ women in the movement and out of it, to the conditions under which the so-called ‘bad’ woman, whose ‘badness’ partly consists in having a child without having a legal refuge, will be the hardest of all to explain. Of all woman’s inhumanities to woman, this is without doubt the most inhuman,” Anthony argued.97 But she didn’t blame women for their animosity towards one another. “History shows that the sense of cohesion is a thing of slow growth even among the men of the human race,” she wrote. “How much slower and more difficult must it be among women, the unsocialized sex, individuals who dwell in the superisolation of married life. ‘He has enslaved them well: they will not even hear of freedom; he has separated them well: they are angry with the strong ones of their own sex.’”98 (In her first biography, Margaret Fuller (1920), Anthony would go so far as to claim that “[w]omen who are unfriendly and unsympathetic toward the mass problems of their own sex are defective.”)99 If women had animosity towards one another, they were in fact acting out the conditions imposed upon them by men, which was in turn rooted in the “mental stagnation” that resulted from their constant subjection to “the tyranny of the
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norm.” “[O]nly the most elastic individualities continue to hold their own against the repressive terrors of taboo and ostracism,” Anthony maintained. 100 Reconciliation was therefore the only feminist attitude one could have.

The final six pages of Chapter I are important for understanding Katharine Anthony’s philosophy of feminism (saved for the final chapter of the book), as well as the organization of *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* as a whole. According to Anthony, the most comprehensive and significant statement on women’s emancipation in the world came from Germany. Formed in 1894, the General Woman’s Union (*Allgemeiner Deutscher Frauenverein*) put forth a program in 1905 that “fixe[d] the threshold of European feminism.” 101 Anthony was not shy about endorsing their platform. “[The GWU’s] demands are the minimum demands of the twentieth century woman movement,” she argued. “Anything less than this program would be something less than feminism, just as anything more would be pioneerism, and pioneerism requires no platform.” 102

To Katharine Anthony, the genius and value of the GWU’s program was their ability to generously include and discard ideologies according to the overall needs of the movement, and thus to the overall needs of women. A disagreement with one aspect of a theorist’s program did not preclude them from incorporating other tenets of the same theorist’s agenda into their philosophy. Hence the GWU “took over the political demands of the nineteenth century feminists but rejected their insistent emphasis on woman solely as a human being. They adopted Ellen Key’s idea of total sex
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differentiation but rejected the matriarchal program which she built upon it.” 103 This is the core of Katharine Anthony’s most famous statement: “the emancipation of woman both as a human-being and as a sex-being.” She might have had Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Ellen Key in mind when she wrote this; but more likely, she was thinking of the GWU, “a self-conscious, self-directing organization for the furtherance of all the aims of the woman movement,” Anthony said. 104

Taken together, Katharine Anthony argued, “[t]he practical demands of the [GWU’s] declaration ... are the groundwork of the practical feminist movement of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and are valid, on whatever basis of abstract theory, always and everywhere, until they shall have been canceled by the necessary social reforms.” 105 In order for feminism to be relevant to the modern world, Anthony maintained, it had to be practical—an idea that crops up in nearly all of her work, and especially in the preceding chapters of *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*. It also had to be applicable to as many women as possible. The GWU “work[ed] for the women of all classes and parties.” 106 As such, the women of Germany were “the metaphysicians of the woman movement,” Anthony wrote. “Their belief in the power of ideas, their respect for clear thinking, and their appreciation of scientific leadership” were powerful contributors to feminism. 107 Making a slight jab at the women (and men) who refused to adapt or expand their ideas, Anthony praised the German women for their persistence, ingenuity, and commitment. “There is no disposition on the part of these feminist writers
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to take out a patent on a new idea and thereafter to live on the proceeds. They go right on thinking,” she wrote.\textsuperscript{108}

In brief, the 1905 program of the GWU consisted of four “fields” of concern: 1) Education; 2) Economic Life; 3) Marriage and the Family; and 4) Public Life in Community and State. The stated “goals and tasks” of the organization were “[t]o bring the cultural influence of women to its complete development and free social effectiveness” by a “transformation of ideas and conditions” in these four areas.\textsuperscript{109} They demanded equal education; equal pay for equal work; equal standards for both men and women with regard to marriage and family life, that included considerations of children born to unmarried parents, divorce, and monogamy; and “the enlistment of women in the duties and rights of communal and political citizenship,” such as the right (and duty) of women to serve as jurors and vote in their churches and communities.\textsuperscript{110}

Although the GWU “regard[ed] as the primary and immediate occupation of the married woman the sphere of duties involved in marriage and motherhood,” they tempered their claim with the reasonable demand that “[t]he work of women in the performance of this vocation shall be valued, economically and legally, as a competent cultural service.” They were realistic about the significant number of women who never married, as well as the significant number of women whose husbands’ wages could not support a family. “[T]he vocational work of women is an economic and moral necessity,” they concluded. With regards to marriage, the GWU sought to dismantle the “double standard of morals.” They denounced prostitution, called for “the same share in
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parental authority,” and demanded “statutory reforms ... which shall lay upon the illegitimate father greater responsibilities toward mother and child.”\textsuperscript{111} In essence, the GWU reconciled Gilman and Key ten years before their conflict had even begun.

It is worth pointing out that the topics of the GWU neatly parallel the chapters in \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}. In comparison, the nine chapters that make up \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia} are: I. The Coalescence of the European Women; II. Schools and the Woman; III. Some Realizations in Dress Reform; IV. The Mutterschutz Idea; V. State Maternity Insurance; VI. Reclaiming the Illegitimate Child in Norway; VII. The Economic Renaissance of the German Women; VIII. The Valkyrie Vote; and IX. The Philosophy of Feminism.

The crux of Katharine Anthony’s argument lies in Chapters IV-VII, some of which have been previously discussed. Certainly Anthony saw education and dress reform as critical to women’s emancipation (Chapters I and II). Anthony believed that “[a]ll the problems of the feminist movement hang together.”\textsuperscript{112} Education was “the basic problem of feminism,” she said.\textsuperscript{113} If women were going to advance beyond “domestic conscription” and “enforced parasitism” (her term for the situation of married women with “no other vocation”), they needed first and foremost an education.\textsuperscript{114} The ideals of the New Woman aside, demographic changes during wartime meant that more women needed to work, and more women would remain unmarried, making education a critical issue to Anthony in the 1910s.
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Likewise dress reform was necessary not only to “combat[] the excesses of style and the evils of corset-worship,” and to put forth “a program of physical culture,” but also to accommodate working women.\(^{115}\) “The main want of the woman to-day is a practical street dress and a ‘business’ dress,” Katharine Anthony argued. “The woman who is busy earning her living or caring for her family finds in the orthodox fashion magazines a strange and irrelevant picture of life.”\(^{116}\)

But most pressing to Katharine Anthony were the economic and familial issues put forth by the GWU. In the 1910s, Anthony was one of the loudest American voices to champion a motherhood endowment, maternity insurance, marriage reform, and the rights of illegitimate children, and consequently, to link all classes of women together in the fight for women’s emancipation. Anthony knew that “the back-bone of the woman movement could and should be strengthened by greater knowledge of the principles of economic justice,” and \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia} was, in many ways, the manifestation of this belief.\(^{117}\)

Katharine Anthony critiqued labor leaders like Helen Marot who didn’t deal with the woman problem, and feminists like Alice Paul who didn’t deal with class issues. She pointed out the discrepancies in seemingly progressive books like Jacob Hollander’s \textit{Abolition of Poverty} (1914) for “not mak[ing] the special application to women of the various principles involved. After all, poverty among the male population and poverty among the female population are not invariably parallel, or due to the same causes, or followed by the same results.” She criticized anyone who fought only for a political
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democracy, with limited considerations of the social and economic aspects of full freedom. Anthony was always more interested in women’s emancipation than she was in the labor movement or the prevention of poverty; but her feminism was born of a critique of social conditions in America and inseparable from the plight of working women.

“There ought to be a book very much like Professor Hollander’s which would analyze the cause and prevention of poverty in such a way as to take account of possible differences of this sort,” she wrote to the friend who had sent her Hollander’s book. “You see, almost thou persuadest me to go to work on the abolition of poverty. It is not that I love that vision less, but that I love the vision of the abolition of sex subjection more! Not that the two are separate and distinct, for of course they are not.”

Historian Leslie Fishbein argues that the disintegration of Village feminism, already apparent before World War I, was in large part due to the “failure to create a feminism relevant to the masses of working women in society at large.” In *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, however, Katharine Anthony clearly pinned the future of women’s emancipation to the economic conditions they faced. “With the trend of women to the factories the woman question was born,” Anthony argued.

This concentration of production created a growing class of women whose income could be measured. The factory which enslaved them endowed them with a new independence in relation to the family. It struck at the roots of the patriarchal home. ... Thus industry brought with it a slight relief from male domination, and in this respect it furthered the cause of women’s solidarity. But it also brought the factor of capitalistic domination which had just the contrary effect. From the resulting economic inequality arose the strong class prejudice which divided woman from woman. Between the soft-handed and hard-handed woman a gulf of misunderstanding opened up and forced the development of the
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feminist movement into two separate channels: the woman’s movement ... and the working-woman’s movement. ... Sometimes converging, and sometimes diverging, they have continued as separate movements down to the present time.120

For this, Nancy Cott calls Katharine Anthony one of “[t]he most acute analysts” of the economic problems facing women in the United States in the early twentieth century.121 It wasn’t that other feminists ignored economic considerations. Even in the nineteenth century, women’s rights advocates pointed out the economic conditions that kept women from achieving political equality with men. They adopted the slogans of the post-Civil War labor movement: the “right to labor” and “equal wages for equal work,” for example, were repeatedly linked to women’s rights. But “[f]eminists in the 1910s, perhaps too unreflectingly, connected women’s independence with independent wage-earning,” Cott points out. “[T]he exploitation of female service and industrial workers at cheap wages cruelly parodied the feminist notion that gainful employment represented an assertion of independence.”122 On the other hand, as historian Christine Stansell argues, “[t]he language of feminism subsumed working-class women’s experience into categories of victimization, and the language of class struggle blurred the particularities of their lives into the unified interests of the working-class family. ... Only with the historic rising of the daughters in the great women’s strike of shirtwaist makers in 1909 did the possibilities of a distinct working women’s feminism in New York, so briefly kindled in the 1830s, take fire.”123
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These tensions, which Katharine Anthony pointed out in 1915, unsurprisingly resurfaced in the feminist clashes over equal rights in the 1920s and beyond, when women trade unionists criticized the equal rights amendment for serving bourgeois class interests, and the NWP argued that sex-based labor legislation was antithetical to the message of equality they were trying so hard to turn into law. The conflict would ultimately prove insurmountable.

Katharine Anthony went even further than this, however, and connected women’s economic equality to their roles and wives and mothers. She argued that considerations of motherhood mattered for the emancipation of all women, regardless of one’s marital or childbearing status, because “the original enslavement of woman resulted from her weakness and defenselessness at childbirth. It is one of the deepest ironies of our civilization,” Anthony stated, “that the woman in childbed has for her sole economic shield and protector the being who once used just this occasion to conquer and rob her.” Maternity insurance was thus critical to the foundation of women’s emancipation. It would help abolish women’s dependence on men, proclaim motherhood an “economic valuation,” and might also “lay the axe at the root of prostitution.” “It is a measure on which the most womanly woman and the most radical feminist need not be divided, a cause for which the various women’s camps might be expected to consolidate,” Anthony reasoned in an article she wrote on maternity insurance for *The New Republic* in May 1916. For this, Jeanette Rankin’s biographers credit Anthony
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for Rankin’s “intellectual underpinnings. It was Anthony’s systematic scholarship,” they argue, “that led [Rankin] to assert that women would be freed from ‘economic dependency on husbands or the fathers of their children’ only when ‘society recognized maternity as a service to the state deserving of government support.’” Anthony’s thought was undoubtedly fundamental to Rankin: Anthony became Rankin’s ghostwriter shortly after Rankin was elected as the first woman to the House of Representatives in 1916.128

Laws protecting children born out of wedlock (specifically, laws requiring a father to take financial responsibility for his offspring regardless of his legal relationship to the mother) would ease the economic burdens placed on women as well, Katharine Anthony argued. “[T]he upkeep of the children comes out of the mother chiefly,” she wrote, and pointed out that one didn’t need to be a feminist to hold this view. It was an observable fact. Laws made to alleviate single mothers by protecting their offspring would thus “plant[] a grain of mustard seed for feminism.”129

The same was true of a motherhood endowment. “The married woman who has no other vocation constitutes the most difficult problem of the woman movement,” Katharine Anthony argued. “She stands between ‘two worlds, the one dead, the other powerless to be born.’”130 Anthony saw a reciprocal relationship between married and unmarried women’s economic positions in society: “[b]ecause women’s work in the
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home and for the family is not valued in terms of money-wages,” she wrote, “their work outside the home is poorly paid.”\textsuperscript{131} This, in turn, stymied the economic freedom of all women. The “legalized humiliation of the married woman is the humiliation of all women, and until the economic position of the married woman is improved the subjection of women will continue to endure. ... The economic independence of the unmarried woman is constantly hampered and impeded by the economic dependence of the married woman.”\textsuperscript{132} Indeed, “American business loves the housewife for the same reason that it loves China,” Anthony quipped; “that is, for her economic backwardness.”\textsuperscript{133}

As such, Katharine Anthony conceived of a feminism big enough to emancipate all women, regardless of race, class, or creed. Nevertheless, her focus on class above all else privileged whiteness, despite whether or not she subscribed to the racist worldview that permeated feminism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. “[M]ost white feminists shared the racial prejudices common among whites in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,” as Peter Kolchin points out; but unlike the feminists who made it clear they were talking only about white women’s rights, Anthony’s prejudices seem to have surfaced in the form of neglect.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 200.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., 202, 201.
\textsuperscript{133} KA, “The Family,” 325.
Katharine Anthony only ever made two overt statements regarding race. In 1922, she chastised the growing hysteria among white Americans who feared that their “Anglo-Saxon stock” was dwindling due to birth control and immigration. Six years after Margaret Sanger’s first birth control clinic opened in New York City (1916), and two years before the Johnson-Reed Act severely limited the number of immigrants coming into America from certain countries (1924), Anthony caustically reassured the “panicky theorists” who warned of “a possible day when the last 100 per cent. American Adam and the last 100 per cent. American Eve will take their departure from our immigrationized stage.”\footnote{KA, “The Family,” 320.} This was not a real problem, Anthony sarcastically soothed: “the Anglo-Saxon strain enjoys a prestige out of all proportion to its population quota. ... The strain may derive what comfort it can from the reflection that the exit of the Indian was probably not due to birth control.”\footnote{Ibid.}

In the same discussion, Katharine Anthony referred to President Theodore Roosevelt’s crusade against “race suicide” as “the egoistic error of regarding his own familial situation as the only proper and desirable example.”\footnote{Ibid., 322.} It is important to note

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
here that, in the first two decades of the twentieth century, the definition of “whiteness” was not settled. Historian Matthew Frye Jacobson has shown that between the 1840s and 1920s, “racial” differences between “white ethnics,” especially Irish, Italian, and German immigrants, who were not considered “white,” carried significant weight. In fact, in the Index to *Mothers Who Must Earn*, race is cross-referenced with nationality, and the two terms are often used interchangeably. As Louise Michele Newman explains in *White Women’s Rights: The Racial Origins of Feminism in the United States*, “[n]ineteenth-century discourses conflated race, class, culture, religion, and geographic origin, so that ‘Anglo-Saxon,’ ‘American,’ ‘white,’ ‘civilized,’ ‘Caucasian,’ ‘Christian,’ and ‘Protestant’ frequently served as interchangeable terms, with each of these categories encompassing the others.”

To be sure, Katharine Anthony’s championing of German and Irish women in *Mothers Who Must Earn*, as well as her reference to the genocide of Native Americans, was more radical than hindsight affords. But her omission of African American women from discussions of women’s emancipation speaks to the inherent racism of the early twentieth century, and possibly to Anthony’s own prejudices—especially because we know that black women (and men) were busy crafting histories that brought their


139 For example, KA notes that the families studied in *MWME* “were principally Americans, Americanized or German and Irish, with homogenous social ideals. All these circumstances emphasize the fact that the primary reason why the women worked was not moral or racial, but economic. They were the wives and widows of under-employed and under-paid men and were compelled to contribute to the family whatever earning value their labor possessed.” KA, *MWME*, 56.

struggles to the forefront of American history as early as the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{141} Although all women writing histories were constrained by the deep-seated chauvinism of American institutions of higher learning, African American women were doubly restricted by the scientific racism that prevailed in the late nineteenth century United States. Katharine Anthony might have pointed this out in her critique of the sexist policies of universities and colleges in America and Europe, but she didn’t. Her silence is especially stark given Anthony’s obvious exposure to the violence and oppression African American women and men faced in the South in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

Poor women, working women, married women, single women, married mothers, single mothers, and even prostitutes were of great concern to Anthony. But while black women and men faced mob violence and lynching in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Anthony fought only against “the present state of public opinion” in which “women who openly had children out of marriage and deliberately [were] socially Ku-Kluxed.”\textsuperscript{142} By the early 1910s, Anthony’s historical understanding and ideology of women’s emancipation began and ended with considerations of economic justice. “No sex solidarity is possible unless the interests of all classes of women are represented,” she

\textsuperscript{141} See Des Jardins, \textit{Women & the Historical Enterprise in America}, 118ff. See also Gilmore, \textit{Gender and Jim Crow}, which details the resistance of white women to accept black women as their equals in the fight for women’s rights in the early twentieth century. “White women rarely followed their own reasoning to its logical conclusion,” Gilmore points out. “They began to identify with black women’s efforts as wives, mothers, and community leaders to better their race, but they never advocated abolishing segregation, even if a tiny number of white women began to realize that Jim Crow caused substandard conditions for both blacks and whites.” Gilmore, \textit{Gender and Jim Crow}, 178.

\textsuperscript{142} KA to ESD, November 6, 1917, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL.
argued. “The economic dependence of the married woman, the economic exploitation of the factory worker, and the economic helplessness of the child-bearer [are bound together in the emancipation of the] whole sex.”

Indeed, Katharine Anthony’s philosophy of feminism was arguably among the most inclusive, articulated philosophies of women’s emancipation to be put forth in the 1910s, despite her obvious blind spots, which speaks to the deeply embedded racism and prejudice in the women’s movement. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of Anthony’s feminism, however, had nothing to do with her socialist worldview. In the last chapter of *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, “The Philosophy of Feminism,” Anthony put forth a final frontier that women needed to conquer in order to be truly emancipated, that is, a psychological one. This was the component that “gave Feminism its singly modern connotation,” as Mari Jo Buhle writes.

Katharine Anthony’s understanding of women’s emancipation was two-fold: it involved political, economic, and cultural victories, which she argued were the “objective achievements” of freedom, such as the vote, equal education, maternity insurance, motherhood endowment, and marriage reform. But the emancipation of women in the twentieth century was also necessarily an inner process. The long history of women’s subjection could not be wiped away with laws alone. Full emancipation, Anthony claimed, required “raz[ing] the lot,” the repudiation of “taboo and ostracism,” “self-defense,” “self-assertion,” “the emancipation of woman as a personality,” “the restoration
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of a woman’s self-respect,” “a new attitude of sex affirmation”—in sum, “the development of a new science of womanhood.” As Anthony explained it,

It is not placing the cart before the horse to say that the conquest of the political franchise and of economic rights is a valuable means toward the creation of a more independent state of mind in the individual woman. These things are merely way stations in the process of her inner emancipation. ... When the whole tale of objective achievements has been complete, when the schools have been opened to women, the dress fetich banished, state maternity insurance introduced, the legal protection of motherhood and childhood within marriage and outside of it guaranteed, the economic independence of women assured, and their political enfranchisement accomplished,—the sum of all these cultural victories will be more than needed to wipe out the psychological residue of subjection in the individual woman soul.

Part of this “psychological residue” was the result of long-established cultural assumptions, like the existence of a so-called “woman’s intuition,” Katharine Anthony argued. She rejected this notion, probably drawing on Bernard Shaw’s critique of society’s artificial construction of “The Womanly Woman,” an 1891 article by Shaw that Anthony referred to in Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia. “Now of all the idealist abominations that make society pestiferous, I doubt if there be any so mean as that of forcing self-sacrifice on a woman under pretence that she likes it,” Shaw wrote; “and, if she ventures to contradict the pretence, declaring her no true woman. ... The domestic career is no more natural to all women than the military career is natural to all men.”
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Likewise, Katharine Anthony chastised “[t]he convenient fiction that women’s knowledge is based on instinct, intuition, and divination [which] deprives her even of the power to control her own mental life. She is stripped of her last autonomous function and regarded as the instrument of supernatural wisdom. Instead of the natural rights with which men were endowed by eighteenth century philosophy, women were endowed with unnatural privileges.”¹⁴⁹ She would bring this theme into her future work, choosing subjects who would emphasize her feminist convictions. Margaret Fuller was not “a womanly woman”—she was “a woman’s woman.”¹⁵⁰ Queen Elizabeth “was not one who, at any age or by any standards, could be called a womanly woman. She was too masculine for that. Her sexual and emotional disposition is a great enigma, and the reason for the enigma is that she combined too well the qualities of both sexes.”¹⁵¹

Similarly, Katharine Anthony’s interpretation of Catherine the Great was an important lesson in “sex-differentiation.” As Olivia Howard Dunbar wrote in her 1927 article on Anthony in Equal Rights, “[w]omen are not by nature acquiescent and deferential to men. Women do not by nature lack certain crude attributes such as zest in power, through the exercise of which men have maintained their ascendency. If these generalizations were true, there would have been no Great Catherine and this biography would therefore never have been conceived.”¹⁵² Indeed, in Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia Anthony celebrated feminism’s tangible results in this regard: “the soul of a

¹⁴⁹ KA, FGS, 230-231.
¹⁵⁰ KA, MF, 57.
¹⁵¹ KA, QE, 256.
sex is emerging from the dim chamber of instinct and feeling,” she wrote, “into the strong sunshine of reason and will.”  

Katharine Anthony also probably drew on Shaw for one of her most insightful and powerful observations about the emancipation of the modern woman in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*. Shaw criticized the popular notion of the “ideal wife,” the self-sacrificing, self-effacing, self-defying woman who lived her life for her husband and children. “Now to treat a person as a means instead of an end is to deny that person’s right to live,” Shaw argued. “And to be treated as a means to such an end as sexual intercourse with those who deny one’s right to live is insufferable to any human being. Woman, if she dares face the fact that she is being so treated, must either loathe herself or else rebel.”  

Anthony agreed. “The individual woman is required, not thrice but a thousand times a day, to assume the attitude and the behavior of an inferior being,” Anthony pointed out. Every woman, every day, “must choose either to accept her appointed role and thereby rescue her good disposition out of the wreckage of her self-respect, or else to follow an independent line of behavior and rescue her self-respect out of the wreckage of her good disposition.” In other words, a woman who was self-aware of her state could respond in only one of two ways to her subjection: she could either “loathe herself” for choosing obedience to the norm over self-respect, or she could “rebel,” which meant discarding her “good disposition” and the acceptance of society in
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favor of autonomy, and thus achieving self-respect. Anthony astutely recognized that emancipation for the modern woman meant rejecting “the idea of obedience” entirely. “The idea of obedience can have no moral validity for women for a long time to come,” she wrote. “Women have to demand a great many things which may not necessarily be good in themselves simply because these things are forbidden. They have also to reject many things which may not necessarily be evil in themselves simply because they are prescribed.”  

This, and nothing less, was what it meant to “raze the lot.”

For Katharine Anthony, the future of feminism ultimately rested upon whether women loved or loathed themselves and one another. “The final problem of the feminist movement is the woman who ‘wishes that she were a man,’” Anthony wrote, “the mother who feels that to bear a son is a prouder lot than to bear a daughter. Every time she thus depreciates her sex in her private soul, she does a subtle injury to all women by giving personal assent to the idea of the essential inferiority of the mother-sex to the father-sex of the world.” Anthony thusly and unwittingly predicted the pitfall of feminism in the 1920s: “[t]he program of feminism is not the mere imitation of masculine gestures and motions,” she warned. “It is true that an important part of the program is the reinstatement of woman as a human being, and the pattern of the human being as we know him has been cut to fit the masculine personality. ... But there is every need that women should not follow blindly in the path of their brothers but should test the way ahead of them as they go. This can only be done by ordered thought and research.”

Women could not deny their womanhood any more than they could deny their humanity.
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And they needed to come together in order for women’s emancipation to become more than an abstract, impersonal ideology.

Indeed, feminism was more than a philosophy to Katharine Anthony; it was a program, a plan of action, a new way of thinking and being in the world. It involved not just women’s rights, but women’s duties as well. It was an inner and outer transformation, and her final statement in Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia spoke to this point. Quoting Anna Von Nathasius, Anthony wrote: “[w]e have talked enough of women’s emancipation. Let us begin to live it. No philosophy carries such conviction as the personal life.”

_Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia_ received significant attention, and both positive and negative reviews. In October, the _New York Times_ published a lengthy article summarizing Katharine Anthony’s book, titled, “Feminist Movements Are Different Abroad: The Efforts on the Continent of Europe to Change Woman’s Condition Are More Outspoken and Aggressive than Those in This Country and England.”

Charlotte Perkins Gilman wrote a favorable review in _The Forerunner_: “Quite outside of the value of the careful study and wide information here shown, there remains that wholly desirable addition, a most pleasing and stimulating style. Guarded and scholarly as it is, there continually gleams through it the sparkle of an admirable wit, and the
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strength of solid well-based conviction.”162 Mary Alden Hopkins praised the book in *Publisher’s Weekly.*163 Sidney Williams lauded Anthony in the *Boston Herald* for making “an important contribution to the literature of the cause.”164 *The Bookman* announced that “Anthony has done a real service for American readers in thus collecting and putting into readable shape a reasonably complete account of the feminist movement of Continental Europe.”165 The novelist Edith Wyatt was particularly pleased with it. Katharine Anthony “is so keen and forward –looking; and her enthusiasm is tempered with so much common sense (all on the side of kindness, and without a trace of miserable caution) that everything she says about women has a tonic quality.”166 Prominent feminists such as Rheta Child Dorr would draw on *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* when looking back on the feminist movement of the 1910s in their memoirs.167 And as late as 1923, feminists abroad remembered Anthony’s work seemingly fondly. When Anthony was in Norway, the editor of the feminist periodical “Nylænde” (The New Ground), Fredrikke Mørck, “asked for [a copy of] ‘Feminism’. ... [She also] graciously accepted a copy of Margaret Fuller.”168
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A particularly hostile review of *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* appeared in the *Springfield Republican*, notorious for its anti-feminist, reactionary bent. The book was called “both nauseous and ill-reasoned. ... [a] petulant rehash of continental free love ... [an] attempt to indoctrinate American women with a ‘new morality’ that is nothing but the negation of morality.” 169 Another reviewer accused Anthony of being “better informed, apparently, of feminist progress in Europe than in the United States.” 170 The *Mount Vernon Signal* charged Anthony with propagating the “wholly anti-Christian” ideologies of feminism and socialism. 171

Apparently Sue Anthony also read her daughter’s book and, concerned for Katharine’s future, sent a letter on January 2, 1916. “You have got to have a living and there is no money in your kind of writing,” she wrote. “Not enough informed people in the world.” 172 This was also an attempt to get Katharine to move home. Sue was lonely, and she told Katharine that, “[i]f you will come home I will deed you my lots on N. 20th that with a home to live in at my death will support you. ... You could attend to things and we could have some chickens and a garden. ... Really I think one can do more good being a king among cats than a cat among kings.” 173

The most important review Katharine Anthony received arrived in her mailbox in the spring of 1916. It would change the course of Anthony’s life.
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On March 10, 1916, Chicago philanthropist Ethel Sturges Dummer wrote to the Henry Holt Publishing Company on West 33rd Street in New York City requesting the home address of the author of *Feminism in Scandinavia and Germany*. The company promptly replied—“The address of Miss Katharine Anthony ... is 1 Patchin Place”—and Dummer sent a note.174 “My dear Miss Anthony,” she wrote from her part-time home in Coronado, California on March 31, 1916,

May I thank you for so ably giving to us the development of Feminism in Scandinavia and Germany. Returning from Europe in the spring of 1914 I considered organizing an American branch of the “Bund für Mutterschutz”, but the intention remains a stone in my path to Hades. It is my pleasure to give and loan your book rather generally, and on my return to Chicago I shall see that the Woman’s City Club disseminates information concerning the Castberg bill. Settlement workers, probation officers and all interested in Juvenile Court work are surely ready to accept such legislation here in America, and I believe a strong body of public opinion favorable to it could be easily developed. Do you lecture upon the subject? I would deem it a great privilege to meet you should you come to Chicago.175

Dummer couldn’t have known the long and fruitful friendship her initial letter would establish, but with Katharine Anthony’s reply less than two weeks later, a nearly forty-year correspondence was begun.

“I want to thank you for your letter from California,” Anthony wrote on April 10.

I believe thoroughly that the work of the “Bund für Mutterschutz” could be duplicated in this country and I hope that you will carry out your original intention of organizing an American branch. ... I hope very much that the Chicago Woman’s City Club will take an interest in the problem. We are just by way of getting a committee together here to do research work on a number of questions concerning the position of women and children, and the condition of illegitimate children is one of the things which we hope to go into. I am sending you a copy of the Evening Post

174 ESD to KA, March 15, 1916, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL.
which has an article containing some rather recent steps taken in Germany. I am trying to keep up with all developments along this line abroad and should be delighted to have any opportunity of speaking on the subject. The idea needs discussion and currency. Thanking you again for your heartening letter.  

These letters, numbering in the hundreds by the time of Dummer’s death in 1954, provide us with the most (and nearly the only, besides those to and from Jeanette Rankin that began in 1942) intimate portrait of Katharine Anthony between 1916 and the 1950s. Most significantly, Dummer would offer to fund Anthony’s first two biographies (Margaret Fuller and Catherine the Great) so that Anthony could write uninterrupted, and without the pressure of having to scramble together several jobs in order to live. The relationship between Dummer and Anthony is an example of the female support networks of women that historians Blanche Weisen Cook, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and others have written about. As such, the role of Ethel Sturges Dummer in Katharine Anthony’s biographical career cannot be overemphasized. Anthony told Dummer in no uncertain terms, “I owe ‘Margaret’ to you, a hundred times over.” On one occasion, she referred to Dummer as her “Fairy Godmother.”

176 KSA to ESD, April 10, 1916, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD Papers, SL.
178 KA to ESD, October 23, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL. See also KA to ESD, March 23, 1922, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
179 KA to ESD, November 29, 1916, Box 26, Folder 431, ESD-SL. HJ also tellingly referred to ESD as a “one-woman Guggenheim Foundation.” See Josephson ms., LHA.
Dummer thought Anthony was brilliant, and she encouraged her biographical work from 1916 until her death in 1954. It’s probably not coincidental then that in June of 1916, just two months after initially corresponding with Dummer, Katharine Anthony published her first biographical work of sorts, a short article on Catherine the Great, entitled “Catherine Herself,” in *The New Republic*. Since her trip to Europe in 1913, when she bought a copy of the Empress’s newly released memoirs, the idea had been in the back of Anthony’s mind, but she hadn’t found the time to write it. After publishing *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, she not only had the time, but perhaps also the confidence to take on an unfamiliar project. Most of the article is, in fact, a transcription of the Empress’s memoirs, and is not Anthony’s original work. Except for one sentence, the article might easily be written off. Anthony interpreted Catherine the Great’s infamous sexuality as “the only means by which the woman who might otherwise have ossified through sheer dominion and power was able to keep alive the human being within her.”180 This was a moment of revelation, not only of a new Catherine the Great, one who “was willing to go down to posterity as a light woman,” but who “hoped also to be remembered as the monarch who had driven the Turks out of Europe”; but also of Katharine Anthony, a woman who would write women as she perceived herself—as a living, breathing, flawed, sexual, complex human being, and as such, would successfully “keep alive the human being within her.”181

180 KA, “Catherine Herself,” 114.
181 KA, *CG*, 231.
The close of 1916 brought hope and excitement for the new year. Two weeks after Woodrow Wilson’s victory, Katharine Anthony traveled by train to Chicago and spoke before the Central Council of Social Agencies about maternity insurance and the protection of children born out of wedlock.182 “I can hardly tell you how much encouragement and stimulus I have received from my trip to Chicago and my visit with you,” Anthony wrote to Dummer.183 Back in New York City, Anthony’s partnership with Irwin took on new, more permanent dimensions when “I found in my flat on my return ... a perfect little flower of a girl aged four. She is one of the most charming babies that I have ever seen. She came from the Municipal Lodging House, I am told, and her mother is a prostitute.”184 This child set the precedent that Anthony and Irwin would together care for children who had nobody else to love them. Although Irwin was undoubtedly the more eager of the two about adopting children (she had already adopted a son by the time she met Anthony in the early 1910s), they were nonetheless united in their future.

Katharine Anthony began 1917 with two publications she felt good about: an article on “Outlawed Children” in The New Republic in February; and an easy-to-read compilation of the labor laws of New York in March, meant to encourage better industrial conditions by informing the public of the current laws and their implications.185
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But between April and December of 1917, Katharine Anthony’s world would crumble, personally, politically, and to some degree, professionally.

On April 2, 1917, the day President Wilson asked Congress for a declaration of war, Katharine Anthony was in Washington D.C. to speak at the inauguration of Jeanette Rankin, who had just been elected the first woman to the House of Representatives. Less than a week later, Rankin was one of fifty House members to vote against war (she would be the sole opposing voice twenty-four years later when the United States entered World War II). On April 16, 1917, ten days after the United States officially declared war on Germany, the NYC-WPP gathered to reaffirm their purpose and constitution. First and foremost, they were uniformly opposed to the limiting of free speech and conscription. Katharine Anthony was very likely at this meeting, because just one week later, on April 22, Anthony was arrested, along with social worker Helen Boardman, for placing anti-conscription cards on vehicles in Greenwich Village. A newspaper announced that,

Miss Katharine Anthony, a writer, of No. 36 Grove Street, and Miss Helen Boardman, a social worker, of No. 23 Grove Street, were arrested last night by Patrolman Bown on complaint of Patrick Daly, a salesman, living at the Hotel St. Denis. Mr. Daly told the patrolman that women were pasting placards on windows along Broadway between Eleventh and Thirteenth Streets and giving away buttons. On the placards was printed: ‘No Conscription! Thou Shalt Not Kill!’ The buttons bore the inscription: ‘Not a Man for War!’ The women were arraigned before Magistrate Cobb, charged with disorderly conduct and when they said they wanted counsel, were held in $200 bail each for examination to-night.
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Despite valiant efforts by pacifists, the first registration for universal conscription in American history occurred in June 1917. That same month the United States government invoked the Espionage Act, a legislative measure of suppression that would culminate in the Red Scare of 1919-1920. Katharine Anthony was “oppressed by the war,” she wrote to Dummer on June 15, the day the Espionage Act took effect, “so much so, that I can see no way out of or around the horror of it. ... I can find no reconciling thoughts about this slaughter of young men and this awful reversal to a fatalistic attitude toward war in young men’s minds.”

Feminists divided over the war. Asked whether or not she thought “the war broke up the women’s movement,” Jeanette Rankin responded unequivocally, “Yes, I know it did.” A headline in the *New York Times* on February 9, 1917, less than a month before the United States entered World War I, announced unambiguously, “Pacifists Drop Suffrage.” Although Katharine Anthony almost certainly did not attend the “great demonstration in Washington Monday, February 12,” organized by an Emergency Peace Federation in New York City to protest preparedness, she was among the group of women who signed and sent a letter to Vira Boarman Whitehouse, the head of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party, denouncing Boarman’s plan to provide the state with the free labor of 500,000 suffragists if the U.S. joined the war. “As members of the Woman Suffrage Party,” the letter began, we protest emphatically against such an offer. ... If you are correctly quoted, and you have not denied the report, you have misrepresented the position of a large number of suffragists. You have exceeded your 
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authority to speak for the members of the party, whose chosen leader you are only as a suffragist, and you have not, apparently, made the slightest effort to find out what any part of the membership thought or felt about the war. You have simply promised to hand over to the Government services which are not yours to give. ... We, the undersigned, protest against your reported action as high-handed, undemocratic, and misrepresentative ... and we hereby resign from the Woman Suffrage Party until such time as it shall again be a Woman Suffrage Party.

Other signatures included Martha Gruening, Freda Kirchwey, Margaret Lane, Olivia Howard Dunbar, Helen Boardman, and Mary Alden Hopkins. “The revolt in the suffrage ranks against preparedness for war is threatening to spread” the article continued. “The action of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt in pledging the National Association to stand by President Wilson is resented by many suffragists who are members of the Women’s Peace Party and similar organizations.” Anthony very likely attended the mass meeting of women pacifists held the next day, on February 10, in the Stuyvesant High School auditorium to “discuss war as it relates to the interests of women.”

Heterodoxy crumbled for a time in 1917. The women were horrified by Germany’s aggression, but many saw the answer in defending the country militarily, rather than in the pursuit of peace. “Heterodoxy in 1917 was just about what the American Colonies were, according to John Quincy Adams, when the Revolutionary War was at its height—one-third fighting, one-third indifferent, and one-third Tory,” Rheta Child Dorr recalled. “I remained an ardent and devoted member of Heterodoxy until the World War came to shake mankind as nothing else has done for two thousand years.”
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Patchin also broke up in 1917. Although the full story of Patchin’s dissolve is not known, one theory stands out. According to Carl Zigrosser, Katharine Anthony’s arrest and arraignment had the unintended consequence of creating a rift at Patchin when, Zigrosser claims, Anthony “refused to take a stand for pacifism, and was let off, I believe, with a fine and an apology. … [T]he self-justification of Irwin and Anthony, and Irwin’s insinuations against Gruening and Boardman that they were indulging in cheap heroics, started a feud during the summer which broke up their association, and marked the end of the Patchin group in the autumn.” Whether or not Anthony really did refuse to stand up for pacifism in court is complicated by what we know about Anthony’s personality and strong anti-war convictions. It seems more likely that other factors were involved. Zigrosser also claimed that the group “had been disintegrating ever since Westwood’s death” in the summer of 1915. The differing personalities of Westwood and Irwin were partly to blame—“W[estwood] had such a zest for life yet she had no illusion and balance of subjective and objective,” Zigrosser wrote. “[She also] had a sense of form which has been absent since her death. Irwin’s rather sloppy.”

If Katharine Anthony actually did refuse to take a stand for pacifism in court, she did not cease her pacifist work elsewhere. In July 1917, three months after her arrest, Anthony published an incendiary article in the publication of the Woman’s Peace Party, *Four Lights*, entitled “The ‘Sister Susie’ Peril.” The journal was already under investigation by George Creel, head of the United States Committee on Public Information, for “three distinct lies” in its June 30 issue (Randolph Bourne was the
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Anthony’s article, which appeared just two weeks later, and in which she accused women who did volunteer work for the war of a “peculiarly infantile form of patriotism” that in reality hurt working women in America, only made things worse. Anthony didn’t mince words. “One can only hope that the productive capacity of this sentimental army of knitters will not amount to a great deal,” she wrote; “otherwise, in the interest of the thousands of women massed in the garment factories and knitting mills, they ought to be legally restrained.”

According to historian Erika Kuhlman, Katharine Anthony’s article was the “most inflammatory piece” ever published in Four Lights, a periodical known for its ultra-inflammatory pieces. Indeed, it was so scandalous that the July 14 issue has been referred to as “The Sister Susie Number.” Just a few days after Anthony’s article in Four Lights came out, the journal was accused of violating the Espionage Act. “FOUR LIGHTS is being honored by an investigation from the Department of Justice,” Executive Secretary of the journal Margaret Lane wrote on July 20. “An agent from that department spent an hour in our office the other day—especially wishing to know whether any alien enemies are helping to edit FOUR LIGHTS.”

A private letter was also sent to Margaret Lane in August about Katharine Anthony’s article. “I hope you will understand that what I am going to say now about
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Four Lights is offered as suggestion, namely from interest in the little venture, and in the cause,” the letter writer began.

I have hesitated to send some of the recent numbers to friends lest certain articles might seem to them unjust and cast discredit on the whole movement. For instance, the “sister Susie” article seemed to discredit all the voluntary work of women. It seems to me that all free service and even small sacrifices are fine things, even when I don’t admire their object, and should be treated with respect and consideration. The point of the article was interesting to me, yet I could not see that it applied to all the voluntary work, because much of it is now work which was not done before, and when there is a shortage of calm? It would seem that all should work, and to a person who was actively engaged in such work, such an article might seem terribly unfair and lead her to say, “Well, if that’s the way they talk, I’ll have no more to do with them.” So we might lose a friend through an article which is really not on the subject we are standing for at all. … In general, my suggestion is to try to be absolutely fair in any criticism … without a trace of bitterness or scorn or ridicule.  

The editors of Four Lights tried to defend Anthony’s article, but to no avail. The publication lost its funding and went under before the year was over.

Three events occurred in November of 1917 that cheered Katharine Anthony up, albeit to varying degrees. First, the women of New York were finally granted the right to vote, nearly seventy years after Seneca Falls. In the midst of WWI, however, these sorts of achievements seemed to Anthony “immeasurably small in comparison with the debacle of civilization.” In fact, on November 6, 1917, the day women won the right to vote in state elections in New York, Anthony wrote a letter to Dummer and didn’t mention it. She did, however, bring up the recent lecture she attended at the People’s Council, given by English journalist Normal Angell. The topic was the “democratic
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terms of peace,” and Anthony felt a sliver of hope that Angell was even allowed to speak during the jingoistic war years—“though perhaps I am snatching at a straw.”

The next day, on November 7, 1917, the Bolsheviks seized power in Petrograd (St. Petersburg), Russia, which Anthony referred to as “nothing less than the great rainbow after the world flood.” However, the drastic response of the United States against suspected communists quickly quelled any hopes that a new economic system could be organized in America. The Revolution widened the rift among feminists. With a constitutional amendment granting women suffrage so seemingly close, many suffragists felt that they couldn’t afford to risk respectability by associating with socialist-feminists like Anthony.

1917 would get much worse for Katharine Anthony.

Sue Anthony’s letters to her daughter had grown increasingly desperate over the years. Money was always an issue. Although Sue and Gus never had much, Gus’s death in 1904 had exacerbated Sue’s financial problems. She painted china and sold it for a meager income. She continued taking in boarders, as much now for the company as for the cash. Katharine sent her mother money and clothes on more than one occasion, but it was never enough to cover everything. Sue had lived on practically nothing for two years, she said, but she still owed “taxes & incidentals.” She told Katharine that
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she wished she “could just die and get out of it. But I certainly don’t want a long spell of sickness and live to face the doctor’s bill.”

To make matters worse, Sue was finally told that she had to “put [her] cow in ... and ever since it is such an expense and no income. I put $200 in curbing and sidewalks ... 220 feet of fence up ... [and] had to keep the grass cut.” Katharine and Mark tried to help by purchasing another house in Fort Smith that Sue could rent out for money. (In her last will and testament, dated January 12, 1911, Sue instructed that the bank notes be returned to Katharine and Mark upon her death. “The reason I give these notes back to my daughter Katharine S. Anthony and my son J Mark Anthony is that they have been unusually kind to me and have allowed me to collect and use the rent on the house which they built by money which I loaned on said notes on South 21st St in the city of Fort Smith.”) But in general, Mark only caused Sue more anguish. He borrowed money with the promise to pay it back, but he never “paid a penny ... and [he] doesn’t intend to.” When Sue mortgaged a plot of land to get Mark out of trouble, “he told me ... he would pay it back in 6 months, [that] he could do it easily with his increased salary,” but instead Mark “spent $400 on it which I didn’t know till long afterwards.”

Sue Anthony’s depression worsened. “Well I’m about heart broken,” she wrote to Katharine in November of 1915. “If I ... have enough, I would turn on the gas. I’m still alone in the house. The woman that lives here is gone to be with her mother who is sick — if I get sick how would it be with me? … Life looks pretty blue to me now. Of course

______________________________
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you will not come, No — I’ve just cried my eyes about out.”

Only a few months later, Sue told Katharine, “[i]t seems sometimes I had better give up and end it all.”

By 1917, Sue Anthony had almost completely lost her hearing, and she suffered from vertigo and frequent stomachaches. She felt that Pearl and Blanche “care nothing for me,” and she was adamant that Katharine “keep about my and Mark’s business to yourself till I’m dead — which I hope won’t be long.” “I would rather depend on Mark for help than either Pearl or Blanche — and I would rather end it all than have either one know it. And I will if they do. That is all.”

The explosion occurred around 7:30 A.M. on Thursday morning, November 15, 1917. Katharine Anthony’s high school friend, Bird Smith (now Johnson), immediately wired telegrams to Katharine, Blanche, Pearl, and Mark, all residing in different states. Blanche, who lived with her family in Pueblo, Colorado, was the first to respond, before 11 A.M. She was on a train headed for Fort Smith within hours. Pearl wired a reply from her home in Webster Grove, Missouri, and was on her way by early afternoon. Mark, who was stationed at Camp McClellan in Alabama, where he worked as a stevedore, and whose wife, Marie Heloise Delery, had given birth to their third child just five days earlier, responded next. He was frantic. The delivery had been a difficult
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one, and Marie was in poor health. “Under orders prohibiting leaving camp. wire quick doctors report as to time I have to see mother. Tell her again my love for her and that I am doing and loving just the way she wants me to and will continue to do so. Marie’s condition critical.”218 Just before 7:30 P.M., Bird Smith received a telegram from Katharine: “[w]ire condition on receipt of this without fail. would like latest news before starting.”219 Katharine boarded a train headed for Arkansas early the next morning.

The exact details of the explosion remain a mystery. It occurred shortly after Sue Anthony awoke. Fort Smith could be chilly in the mornings in November, and that particular Thursday, temperatures were predicted to be near freezing by evening.220 “[I]t is supposed she struck a match to light an open gas stove,” the Fort Smith Times reported.221 Perhaps Sue Anthony did this every morning when she got out of bed—walked from her bedroom to the sitting room and lit the stove. But on this day, “[i]t is supposed that the gas stove or a gas jet in the sitting room had been left open by some accident, for the attic and the upper portion of the rooms were filled with gas.” When the match lit, there was an immediate and immense explosion. The house was destroyed. “The front of the sitting room was blown out, and the roof of the two rooms, which are on the south side of the building, was almost torn off,” the paper read. “The ceiling was torn off in both rooms.”
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Sue Anthony’s injuries were horrific, and ultimately fatal. The newspaper described in gruesome detail how her “clothing was ignited and she was immediately wrapped in a sheet of flame. … Mrs. Anthony crawled out into the hall with all of her clothing ablaze. … Physicians who attended Mrs. Anthony stated there was no hope for her recovery.” Sue didn’t survive another twenty-four hours. She died around 3 A.M. on Friday, November 16, 1917, before any of her children had arrived. Just three days earlier, she had earned the distinction of being the oldest female voter in Fort Smith.

We will never know if Sue Anthony’s death was suicide or accident. Apart from the telegrams sent to and from Bird Smith, there is no mention of Sue Anthony’s tragic death anywhere in Katharine’s papers. Sue was undoubtedly depressed,lonely, and physically uncomfortable. And upon inspection of Sue’s home after the explosion, it was noted “that all of the service pipes were in good order.”

Judging from her letters, Sue Anthony may have been the happiest on her deathbed, when a string of visitors came to see her in the hours before she passed: “Mrs. Anthony remained conscious until late Thursday evening, and appreciated the visits of her numerous friends who called at the hospital, requesting that all of them be brought to her room,” a newspaper announced.

The evidence suggests that Katharine Anthony never arrived in Fort Smith, that she got on a train heading east before ever reaching Arkansas. There is a not-unusual blank in Anthony’s papers between November 6, 1917 and January 24, 1918. The only
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thing we know with certainty is that, on November 27, 1917, eleven days after the death of her mother, Katharine Anthony turned forty years old.

* * *

In her last known letter of 1917, written ten days before her mother’s death, Katharine Anthony thanked Ethel Dummer for her “encouragement on my Margaret Fuller idea. I have been thinking of what you were saying when you were here about the marriage of young officers and the emotions released by war and it occurred to me that just the same war-time atmosphere attended Margaret’s marriage in Rome and her baby and all the rest of that strange adventure which so astounded her New England friends. The circumstances could be used as a peg on which to hang a discussion of the subject. I might try to think that out.”226 She would spend most of 1918 and 1919 doing just that.

---
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Chapter 5

“[A]n experience in happiness and the sense of freedom”:¹

*Margaret Fuller* and the Birth of Modern Feminist Biography,

1918-1920

“It took many years at work that was not the work I wanted to do, to make me independent, and only when one is independent may one do one’s best creative work. I am quite sure, favorite fiction to the contrary, that the howling of the wolf at the door is a disturbing and damaging accompaniment to the flow of a writer’s thoughts.”²

—Katharine Anthony, 1926

“A woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write.”³

—Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own*, 1929

***

Katharine Anthony spent the first weeks of 1918 looking for work. “Jobs of my kind have been very skittish,” she wrote to Ethel Sturges Dummer on January 24; “that is, only people with flaming patriotism have been persona grata in most quarters.”⁴ She had earned some money writing sex hygiene pamphlets for the YWCA.⁵ But Katharine
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⁵ KA to ESD, February 22, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL. KA’s work related to prostitution and sex hygiene deserves more attention than it receives here. Prostitution was a central issue for social reformers in the 1910s, and especially during WWI, when the problem of venereal disease was more apparent and the health of the troops was a priority. The prevalence of vd among soldiers had been well documented before the
Anthony, who lauded the Russian Revolution; praised Leon Trotsky for his ability “[t]o match diplomacy with the truth”; was “thrilled by the English Labor Party”; lampooned “patriotic” women for doing volunteer war work and thereby taking jobs away from women who worked for wages; compiled and published the “Labor Laws of New York” (1917) in order to point out their “lax enforcement”; and criticized the “thoroughly Gomperized” labor unions of the eastern United States for their “anti-socialist” stance, was probably as far from “patriotic” as an American could get in 1918.6

Great War; but the American government was pressured anew in 1917 to keep its soldiers away from prostitutes—“loose,” “immoral” women who were said to be corrupting America’s innocent “boys” in uniform. Within days of entering the war, President Wilson created the Commission on Training Camp Activities (CTCA), which was tasked with protecting American soldiers from vd. The YWCA’s Bureau of Social Morality, formed in 1913 and renamed the Bureau of Social Education during the war, trained speakers who delivered more than 2,000 lectures in 1917 and 1918 alone. KA was deeply troubled by the increased persecution of prostitutes during the war, who were arrested by the thousands and subjected to forced exams (in New York City, there was an obvious surge in arrests as early as June 1917). KA was particularly disturbed by society’s double standard: until WWI, prostitutes were largely seen as a necessary evil (men’s health was attached to notions of virility and masculinity at the turn of the twentieth century, and sex was thus a necessary component to maintaining healthy soldiers); “[y]et for her supposed red cross service in preventing neuroses among the male population, the prostitute is rewarded with stripes and a prison sentence,” KA wrote. See KA, “Any Feminist to Any State,” review of Women and the Sovereign State, by A. Maude Royden, in The New Republic (June 29, 1918): 269. See also KA to ESD, August 26, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL; and KA to ESD, May 10, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL. On changing ideas surrounding prostitution and the regulation of sexuality in the U.S. in the first half of the twentieth century, see Ruth Rosen, The Lost Sisterhood: Prostitution in America, 1900-1918 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982); Allan Brandt, No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States since 1880 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Mary E. Odem, Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Nancy K. Bristow, Making Men Moral: Social Engineering During the Great War (New York: New York University Press, 1996); and Elizabeth Alice Clement, Love For Sale: Courting, Treating, and Prostitution in New York City, 1900-1945 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
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After January 8, 1918, when President Wilson outlined a clear path to peace in “Fourteen Points,” and ten days later, when the Bolsheviks forcibly dissolved the Russian Constituent Assembly (the popularly elected body that met in Petrograd on January 18, 1918 to draft a new, democratic constitution), Katharine Anthony’s position seemed all the more oppositional and dangerous. The American government had wasted no time enacting and enforcing laws that identified and punished “dissident” citizens—which in large part meant socialist-pacifists like Anthony—after the U.S. entered WWI in April 1917. The Espionage Act of June 1917 and the Sedition Act of May 1918 were used to not only quell anti-war propagators by suppressing speech and imprisoning those who didn’t comply, but also to control labor radicalism across the United States, which threatened the war effort by encouraging strikes and advocating worker-friendly policies that, in the minds of government bureaucrats and wealthy industrialists, would undermine production and thus America’s capitalist economy.

After her shocking “Sister Susie” article appeared in *Four Lights* in July 1917, Katharine Anthony’s writing career was on the line. These were jingoistic years, and writers who in any way impugned “flaming patriotism” were deemed enemies of the state. Anthony considered “the possibility of starting a feminist periodical.” This potentially would have solved two problems at once: she might earn a steady income; and she would be able to write about the things she valued the most for a living. But the
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7 KA to ESD, February 22, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
“small committee” that met to discuss a feminist journal that winter “finally disbanded as we were all agreed that nothing could be done in war time.”

Adding to Katharine Anthony’s troubles was “the Margaret Fuller book—that has been receding all winter into the distance.” With most of her waking hours spent searching for employment, Anthony simply didn’t have time to work on it. “The pursuit of work ... is sometimes more absorbing than actually doing it,” Anthony wrote to Dummer in January. “What a precious commodity it is, this ‘time’. It strikes me that it isn’t so much a medium in which things transpire as a tool by means of which one makes things transpire.”

There was, however, a small glimmer of hope. At some point in their nearly two-year correspondence, but probably between November 1917 and January 1918, Ethel Sturges Dummer had offered to supplement Katharine Anthony’s income so that Anthony could write a biography—a proposal that Anthony found “altogether too wonderful.” But Anthony worried that it would take her too long to finish the book (“I work slowly”), and that Dummer would be stuck financing a significantly lengthier project than she had anticipated (“The size of the slice which I should need to do justice to Margaret is perhaps too big ... . I can keep going on a budget of eighty dollars a month, but the thing which I most need is a feeling that I have enough time for the work to mature properly.”) Anthony predicted that it would take her roughly six months to
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research and write the book—“[m]y other book was written in six months”—and Dummer agreed to the terms without hesitation.  

In the end, it took Katharine Anthony eighteen months to complete Margaret Fuller—roughly six months for research, and twelve months for writing. She received the first check from Dummer in early May 1918, and despite experiencing a “bout with tonsillitis,” she had started her research work at the library. By November 1, 1919, she had finished “that longed for final page.”

There were many reasons that Katharine Anthony chose biography as the medium with which to promote her feminist program after 1917, and Margaret Fuller as her first subject. First, Anthony’s interest in biography reached beyond her feminism. “I like to know what makes people tick ... and biography is the best field to satisfy that kind of curiosity,” was her reply to Mary Margaret McBride in 1945 when McBride asked her why she began writing biographies in the late 1910s.

Katharine Anthony also looked to Bernard Shaw, who skillfully “turned his Fabian principles into plays.” “[O]nly by such means,” Anthony observed, “[c]an social reforms ... become popular. Diluted with a little melodrama, the idea can make its way.” Otherwise the result tended to be “either too academic or too childishly
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popular,” which meant a reduced readership. Historians were generally “too intellectual and too technical for popular reading,” Anthony said. And academics and other members of the “intelligentsia” weren’t going to waste their time reading “childish” literature. “Something that combines sincerity with simplicity and seriousness is hard to find.” A biography that had “all the fascination of a well written realistic novel,” “with a little more imagination,” seemed like the perfect blending of the reality and creativity that Anthony thought necessary to reach a wide audience.

After Shaw came Freud, Katharine Anthony said, “to focus my interest in emotional complexes and such things, in all of which I saw the possibility of turning a new light on the understanding of character.”
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long lost Holy Grail for which there was suddenly discovered a map in the theories of
Sigmund Freud. Previous biographies “lacked life, color, movement. The incidents
related too often had neither point nor dramatic value, the dates were mere numerals and
the characters had no more life than a wooden Indian before a cigar store.” But Freud
provided a new vocabulary with which to explore biographical subjects, who naturally
developed a sort of agency—or “life,” “color,” and “movement”—through the unveiling
of their inner motives. But who would make for a good first subject?

Katharine Anthony had two criteria in mind (besides sex) when she was deciding
on a subject. First, her goal was “to apply a new method to old matter”—in other words,
to overlay a well-trod subject with the new theories of Freud. And second, she wanted
to write a “timely” book that would help the modern fight for women’s emancipation.
Looking back to Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia (1915), Anthony sought a
subject that could provide insight into “the activities which should engage the collective
attention of the American woman movement when it has at last been released from the
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Oblige, 14. Similarly, Nina Baym has argued that writing women’s history through
biography in the nineteenth century may have been what allowed writers to include
women in the historical narrative at all, as it was deemed more acceptable to cast women
as “objects to be contemplated rather than subjects of activity.” Baym, American Women
Writers, 222.
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23 KA never wavered from this conviction. While at work on her sixth biography, The
Lambs (1945), she still maintained that “[t]he main end and purpose of all biography is
characterization, and whatever else, including history, that does not contribute to this
purpose throws the whole work out of focus.” KA, “13 Rules for Writing Biography,”
WB.
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September 18, 1921. NOTE: It is unclear where this article first appeared. It was printed
in more than one newspaper. Steell was a well-known writer by the 1920s, having begun
his literary career working for the New York Herald Tribune in the 1880s.
long struggle for political rights.” She needed a historical woman who held a “broader view of feminism”; a woman whose “views of life represented what we need now”; a woman who “anticipated all the ideals of which the contemporary feminist movement was losing sight.” And she needed all of this wrapped up in a woman people thought they knew. If Anthony’s subject was a well-respected woman, all the better. By taking a revered woman’s life and exposing the long-hidden realities of her ambition, sexuality, and psychology—or as Anthony put it, “the emotional values of an individual existence, the motivation of a career, the social transformation of a woman’s energies”—Anthony could argue that respectable, successful women were also complex human beings. Their humanness did not undermine their womanliness; it rather helped to create it.

Margaret Fuller had been a popular choice for life writers from the time of her tragic drowning off of Fire Island in 1850 to the late nineteenth century. Just two years after Fuller’s death, Fuller’s three close friends, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Henry Channing, and James Freeman Clarke, joined forces to edit (and write) the Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli (1859). In 1860, Caroline W. Dall’s Historical Pictures: Margaret Fuller appeared. And twenty years later, Julia Ward Howe tackled Fuller’s life, publishing Margaret Fuller (Marchesa Ossoli) in 1883.

Katharine Anthony had “read all the biographies of this woman,” in which Fuller’s literary career had been examined, as well as her “pioneer work for the emancipation of women”; but in all of them Fuller’s “sex side” had been “left

26 KA, FGS, iv-v.
27 KA quoted in Steell, “Psychoanalyzing the Dead,” 47; Morris, “Mother of Modern Biography.”
28 KA, MF, iv.
mysterious,” a gap Anthony claimed had been intentional.29 “A realistic interpretation of [Fuller’s] life and character has not only not been attempted but has rather been positively avoided,” she argued. “A mood of evasion has marked almost all that has been written about her.”30

Howe’s book was “magnificently impersonal,” Katharine Anthony said.31 “[S]he leaves us more in the dark than ever as to what manner of woman this really was who was so startling and upsetting to her own generation.”32 Using Freud was useful in this regard, Anthony reasoned, because “[s]o far as Margaret’s case is concerned, Sigmund Freud’s theory of hysteria is a perfect fit.”33 Thus Fuller’s “neurotic childhood” wouldn’t be the “stumbling stone” it had been for her previous biographers; Anthony would be able to easily avoid the impersonal by using psychological analysis.34

29 KA quoted in Steell, “Psychoanalyzing the Dead,” 47; KA, MF, iii.
30 KA, MF, iv.
31 Ibid., iii.
32 Ibid.
33 KA, MF, 23. No texts specifically on hysteria appear in the bibliography for MF, despite the fact that Freud and Breuer’s classic Studies in Hysteria had appeared twenty-five years earlier, in 1895, with all female subjects. And Freud’s case history of “Dora” was published in 1905. Instead, there are Freud’s Delusion and Dream (1917), The Interpretation of Dreams (1912), and Leonardo da Vinci (1916); Horace Westlake Frink’s Morbid Fears and Compulsions (1918); Ernest Jones Papers on Psychoanalysis (1913); C. G. Jung’s Psychology of the Unconscious (1916); Lilian Whiting’s The Brownings, Their Life and Art (1911); and S. Ferenczi’s Contributions to Psychoanalysis (1916). Perhaps this shouldn’t be surprising. KA knew that “[t]he psychological aspects of the sex-impulse have been all too little handled,” and this was none the more evident than in Freud and Breuer’s Studies in Hysteria. KA to ESD, October 7, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL. As Rachel Bowlby writes in her Introduction to Studies in Hysteria, “[f]emale sexuality ... seems to be there and not there, appearing for a moment only to be quickly tidied away again.” See Bowlby, “Never Done, Never to Return,” introduction to Studies in Hysteria, by Sigmund Freud and Joseph Breuer (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), xxi. Indeed, Bowlby writes, the women in Hysteria “appear retrospectively as buried anticipations of later theories.” Bowlby, “Never Done, Never to Return,” xix.
34 KA, MF, 22.
But worst of all, Katharine Anthony thought, was that the overall picture of Margaret Fuller’s life had been “created mainly by unemancipated men; Chivalry and Puritanism combined to distort the picture.” The result was a, contradictory and pretentious caricature. ... The truth is that the men who made the book about Margaret gave a better portrait of themselves in that volume than they did of its subject. For instance, they created a legend about her having a neck like a serpent, which she ‘would wind about and make as serpentine as possible.’ Several of them dwelt upon this serpentine association with great enthusiasm, and seemed to think it quite an original inspiration. Woman—wisdom—serpent:—it is a combination to which the long road of man’s memory seems easily to lead. ... The conscious memory of the Puritan is short, but his unconscious memory endureth forever.

Here again, Anthony saw the pernicious and stunting effect religion had on women’s past, present, and future, and her biography was going to expose both men and religion for their myopic, jejune, unenlightened views on women.

Margaret Fuller was also “a modern woman who died in 1850,” Katharine Anthony explained. [She] studied the conditions of women’s lives and recorded her observations with the accuracy and objectivity which belongs to modern social research. ... [She] emphasized the effect of economic, much more than the effect of political, subjection [on her sex]. ... [H]er relation to the European crisis of 1848 gives her also a relation to the second chapter of those revolutionary processes through which we are living today. ... [And her] plea was for the broadest possible development of women, for the realization of their destiny as human beings.

Fuller’s “ideals” were suddenly relevant—and perhaps now more than ever. For suffragists in the late nineteenth century who were “engaged in the intense and single-minded propaganda for the ballot,” Fuller’s “philosophical feminism became

35 Ibid., v.
36 Ibid., 82.
37 Ibid., v, 181, 59, 81.
indigestible,’” Anthony claimed. “[But] now that suffrage is out of the way, there is a great need for the broader kind of feminism that Margaret Fuller represented.”

It didn’t hurt that Katharine Anthony also “admired [Fuller] very much, and ... was very much interested in her.” Fuller had written “much good criticism, good feminism, and good psychology,” Anthony noted, “which deserve to be rescued from the dusty attic and classed with some of our newest wisdom.” Anthony also “sympathize[d] with [Fuller’s] struggles and affirm[ed] her ideals,” and would naturally write Fuller’s life with “the warmth of the advocate.” This was going to be a personal biography of America’s first feminist, written by a second generation feminist, for the third generation and beyond. It was not an impartial study, and Anthony never claimed that it was. For the false biographies written by men and women in the nineteenth century, for the modern ideals that Fuller held, for the work that Fuller accomplished on behalf of women, and for her current relatability, “[Fuller’s] life demands a vindication,” Katharine Anthony proclaimed. “Féminisme oblige.”

***

Katharine Anthony spent the summer of 1918 “reading and mulling” over Fuller. From August 6 to September 3, she was in Princess Point, Yarmouth, Maine,
where she finished some necessary “‘background’ reading.” She had recently decided that “New England Transcendentalism,” “New York Horace Greeleyism (which was Socialism),” “George Sandism in Paris,” and “Mazzini and the Italian Revolution” would all have to be studied before she could start writing, and she hoped the combination of work and seashore would help her determine the best approach to her book. Should “the individual Margaret [be] ‘the whole thing,’ and with all this background only shadowed forth behind her”? Or should Margaret be “a moving finger writing upon this wonderful background”? Anthony wasn’t sure. “My mind feels at present like a gummed-up chaos and I only hope and pray that the bracing breezes of Maine will clarify it a bit,” she wrote to Dummer, shortly before her departure in early August.

Whether she brought these books to Maine or not we don’t know; but ultimately, the following monographs on the above subjects made it into the bibliography for Margaret Fuller: Octavius B. Frothingham’s *Transcendentalism in New England* (1876); Horace Greeley’s *Recollections of a Busy Life* (1869); Greeley and H. J. Raymond’s *Association Discussed, or the Socialism of the Tribune Examined* (1847); James Parton’s *Life of Horace Greeley* (1869); Charles Sotheran’s *Horace Greeley and other Pioneers of American Socialism* (1892); Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson’s *Correspondence* (1883); Giuseppe Mazzini’s “George Sand” (1891) and *Letters to the Italian Working Class* (1891); Bolton King’s *Mazzini* (1902) and *History of Italian Unity* (1899).

---
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Katharine Anthony also brought along some “leisurely reading,” a book by Irving Pond, *The Meaning of Architecture: An Essay in Constructive Criticism* (1918). Pond was a friend of the Dummies in Chicago (Dummer sent Anthony the book), and was, along with his brother, Allen Pond, the architect responsible for building Hull House. Some of the sections of Hull House—for instance, the Woman’s Club, with a circulating library of 1,000 books and an auditorium that could seat 750—had been constructed while Katharine Anthony was a student at the University of Chicago, between 1903 and 1906. But what stands out about Pond’s book at this time in Anthony’s life has little to do with Pond himself, but rather with his central thesis. Although Pond was literally talking about architecture, he was really speaking to a deeper artistic principle: “the relationship ... between the form and the spirit in art.” Put another way, Pond’s book was a reflection on the artist, the ideals the artist held, and the ways in which his or her ideals manifested in, and defined, the art itself, which very likely resonated with Katharine Anthony that summer as she struggled to find her way as a biographer.

It was the structure of the Margaret Fuller book that held Katharine Anthony back—namely, the way she should structure her book to best illustrate her (both her own and her subject’s) ideals. Pond argued that art was “the ordered and unified expression of an ideal which life holds,” which required careful planning. “A building ... is not

---
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architecture just because structural laws have been obeyed, but because underlying and directing its structural expression is an ideal."\textsuperscript{49}

The ideals that Katharine Anthony held above all else were the natural equality of women with men, and women’s value to society as women. As she wrote in \textit{Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia}, “the dominating ideals of the modern woman’s movement [are] the emancipation of woman both as a human-being and as a sex-being.”\textsuperscript{50} Applying Pond to these convictions, Anthony was reaffirmed that the structure of her book—the final “ordered and unified expression” of her work—was crucial to the feminist message she was trying so hard to convey. It was not going to be a “feminist biography” simply because she chose a woman as her subject. Her ideals had to both gird and propel the book’s narrative structure. Put another way, Margaret Fuller had to become both the means and the message for the book to serve a feminist end. Anthony had to show Fuller’s humanity and sexuality, her femininity and masculinity, her lived life and her desired life, her actual world and her ideal world, all as multiple parts of a complex whole. And she had to do it with no examples to draw from.

Katharine Anthony would know if her work was successful—if her art had been built upon strong ideals—if it made people re-think what they thought they knew, question traditional values and texts that defined women as inferior to men, changed the way women began to discuss and fight for their future. Pond could have been talking about the art of biography when he concluded that, “one small human figure, symbolizing life in terms of structural force, carved into the portal of a building would be of greater

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 23-24.
\textsuperscript{50} KA, \textit{FGS}, 6.
moral and aesthetic worth to the people today than would many square yards of festoons, functionless moldings, shields, and cartouches, even when the reason or excuse given for these latter is that they function for beauty. ... The sculptor as against the carver, that is, as against the mechanical repeater of the designs of another, will add a source of strength and beauty and interest to a modern expression." Anthony, writing for and about feminism through the life of Margaret Fuller, was no different from the sculptor, bringing forth “one small human figure” who might, if she wrote her well, contribute “moral and aesthetic worth” to society, “a source of strength and beauty and interest” to modern feminism. This was, by any standard, no easy task, and Katharine Anthony wrestled with the work.

Katharine Anthony returned to New York City in early September 1918 with a sense of “physical well-being and mental content,” and she had at least tentatively decided on a structure for her book. By late September, she was outlining “Margaret.” But applying Freud to Fuller’s life had proven to be more difficult than Anthony originally anticipated. Fuller was “very angular,” Anthony told Dummer, “even as she is said to have been in real life! Her hysteria has made me no end of trouble, so much reading and whatnot. Her case was similar to that of Elisabeth Barrett Browning, but by no means so severe, as E.B.B. was practically bed-ridden for twenty-four years. Fortunately, the tyrannical father is not such a familiar institution as he once was!"
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By October, the month Katharine Anthony had originally assumed she would write “finis” on Fuller, she realized instead that she would “have to put the winter into it.”

Unlike *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, for which the “preliminary reading had been so thoroughly done,” the life and times of Margaret Fuller were a vast mystery to Anthony. “[A]t each turn in the road another vista springs up before me,” she wrote to Dummer. “[O]nly yesterday I discovered that Jefferson’s Letters would have to be read, though I had persuaded myself previously that I could leave them out. And so it goes.”

Naturally, she released Dummer from her pecuniary obligation. “I owe ‘Margaret’ to you already, a hundred times over,” Anthony said. But Dummer insisted on sending checks for at least the next three months. In January, when Dummer found out what her tax bill was going to be, she might “be obliged to curtail some of [her] hobbies,” but for the time being she was happy and able to pay.

Ethel Dummer was impressed that Katharine Anthony could get any work done at all in the fall of 1918. “[S]o much of one’s vitality seems absorbed in feeling the import of the time,” she wrote to Anthony in October. “Ringling’s four ring circus has trained us to keep our eyes on many rings, but it is certainly difficult to keep tab on the thrilling acrobatic performances of nations: the lofty tumbling of royalty, the giant swing of labor, the feminist race and the political clowns. ... Of course you need more time to interpret

---
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“Margaret.” Anthony blamed her slow progress on her “miserable habits of thoroughness,” which she used to cloak an “innate lack of self-confidence,” rather than on the “absorbing public events”; but the fall of 1918 was both exhilarating and preoccupying for Anthony nonetheless.61

The war appeared to be approaching an end by September, which cheered Katharine Anthony greatly. The recent collapse of the Bulgarian Front made the defeat of the Central Powers seem almost certain, and provoked the Austro-Hungarian government to draft a peace note to the Allies. In America, the “hysterical press”—as Anthony referred to the New York Tribune and the New York Times—made it hard to tell if progress was actually being made. A headline on the front page of the Times on September 16 announced that “Washington [was] Hostile” to the peace note, and that “‘force without stint’ until victory is achieved” was still President Wilson’s plan.62 Furthermore, in Washington, there was supposedly “a very general disposition ... to look upon the Austrian peace overtures as concealing a trick. ... It is not the belief of the Washington Government that Germany has yet ‘cracked’ to the point where the Berlin government would make a peace satisfactory to the Allies.”63 Anthony hoped this was simply American bravado—perhaps rhetoric meant to intimidate Germany, or maybe a

60 Ibid.
61 KA to ESD, November 6, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL; ESD to KA, November 30, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
63 Ibid.
“ballon d’essai.” But Anthony was also realistic. “Tomorrow my hopes [for peace] may be fled again.”

In October, Katharine Anthony learned that the war was essentially over from an old man driving his donkey down a dirt road in Connecticut. His name was Frank Wanzer, “a well-known local character,” and while Anthony was out for a walk during a weekend escape from the city, he informed her “that the Germans ‘had quit’,—he saw it written on a Danbury bulletin board Saturday night at twelve o’clock.” With Anthony in tow, Frank Wanzer “stopped by every farm-house and told the same news,” and Anthony “could hardly wait to get back to town and see the newspapers after [her] ride with Paul Revere and his donkey!”

Indeed, on October 4, 1918, the German Chancellor Max von Baden sent a telegram to President Wilson seeking an armistice. And on Sunday, October 13, 1918, the day Katharine Anthony was pulled around the countryside by Frank Wanzer’s donkey, the New York Times announced on the front-page that there was a “Peace Furor in Berlin.”

The only words heard anywhere in Germany are “Peace at last.” ... People are kissing one another in the streets, though they are perfect strangers, and shouting peace congratulations to each other. ... In spite of official denials, the belief gains ground in Germany that there is truth in the report that the Kaiser seriously thinks of abandoning the throne, especially as many persons in Germany, and probably the majority of the working classes, openly regard his retention of the throne as the most serious obstacle to peace.

---
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Unsurprisingly, members of Congress were not nearly as united or convinced as were the people of Germany. Many claimed that a peace agreement was premature, and that President Wilson should stand firm until all of his fourteen points had been clearly accepted.69 But Katharine Anthony felt more optimistic than she had in months. “This seems to be the beginning of a series of parleys, and though that may stretch out into infinity or somewhere near it, surely the destruction of life will stop all at once as it did on the Russian front and not gradually taper off as the parleys proceed. Anyway, I am inclined to make the most of our present hopes.”70

Hope became reality when, on November 11, 1918, the Germans signed an armistice agreement with the Allies in Compiègne, France. Revolution immediately erupted in Germany, and Katharine Anthony was newly occupied “search[ing] the news from Germany every day without ever feeling that the truth is actually coming through. I think it is a fact that the censorship has succeeded in making the German Revolution even more remote from us than the Russian Revolution was.”71 She couldn’t find any information about the German women—“except what can be got from a microscopic search of the inside pages of the papers.”72 And the names that did appear in the papers worried her: Alice Solomon, Gertrud Bäumer, and Anita Augsburg were all “bourgeois leaders” who “have never striven for anything more than a political democracy,” Anthony said.73 The only clear post-war hope in Germany seemed to be coming from
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Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, co-founders of the radical communist Spartacus League.\textsuperscript{74}

There was also the situation in Russia. Unbeknownst to many, if not most, Americans, President Wilson had sent troops to Siberia in August under the pretense of preventing Allied supplies from falling into German hands in the wake of the Bolsheviks’ peace treaty with Germany in March and the subsequent collapse of the Eastern Front. But the troops were also there to aid the anti-Bolshevik Czech Legion, and to support Admiral Kolchek’s anti-Bolshevik government—if, of course, they organized a suitably democratic one. Based on historical precedent, Katharine Anthony feared that the Russian Revolution “was doomed when intervention occurred. France, Italy, and—now—Russia, all have tried it and found that one solitary country cannot make a revolution.”\textsuperscript{75}

The atmosphere of war and peace that hovered like both raincloud and rainbow over the world in the fall of 1918 nonetheless gave an added energy to Katharine Anthony’s work on Margaret Fuller. “I have been living through the year 1848 with Margaret Fuller in Italy, a period that is terribly interesting now because it has so many analogies with our present time,” she wrote to Dummer in late October.

The position of the Roman Republic of those days, nobly sustaining itself against a hostile world and betrayed by ‘friendly’ intervention, was that of the Soviet Government of today. Margaret wrote some beautiful words about Mazzini’s republic,—‘We will wait, whisper the nations, and see if they can bear it. Rack them well to see if they are brave. \textit{If they can do without us, we will help them. It is thus ye would be served in your turn? \textsc{Beware}.}’ Doesn’t it seem to describe \textit{[how]} the Russian people’s government is being treated now?\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{74} KA to ESD, “Christmas Day,” 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
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At the same time, Katharine Anthony and her fellow New Yorkers were being apprised of a new enemy—one that didn’t take sides, and one that ultimately killed more people in their homes than bullets killed soldiers on the battlefield. In the spring of 1918, military personnel at a packed military camp in Kansas had fallen ill with what seemed to be nothing more than a common cold. Sent from the midwest to sea ports on the East Coast, where hundreds of thousands of soldiers were crammed onto boats headed for Europe, the Spanish Influenza, as it came to be called, left almost no country untouched by the time it subsided nearly two years later. Globally, 500 million people were infected, and somewhere between 50 and 100 million people died.

In New York City, the flu arrived on ships coming from Europe. On August 11, 1918, the Norwegian Bergensfiord docked in New York harbor with twenty-one infected persons on board. Less than a week later, another twenty-two disembarked, and the ships continued to come. By September 12, the city health commissioner, Royal S. Copeland, had quarantined the entire port; but the virus couldn’t be roped in like ships in a harbor. On September 21, the New York Times reported that thirty-one new cases of Spanish influenza had been found in the city, eighteen of which had been discovered just the day before—“five in Manhattan, eleven in Brooklyn, one in the Bronx, and one in Queens.”77 All of the cases had “originated on ships just arrived from foreign waters.”78 One week later, on September 28, those numbers had skyrocketed. “During the twenty-four hours ended at 9 o’clock yesterday morning 324 new cases were reported. ... The daily report

78 Ibid.
gave Manhattan 95 cases, Bronx 64, Brooklyn 132, Queens 11, and Richmond [Staten Island] 22,” the Times announced.\(^{79}\) In a strange twist of fate, a disproportionate number of those infected were young adults, in their late twenties and thirties, a phenomenon that has recently gained attention and explanation.\(^{80}\)

Although some doctors attempted to downplay the outbreak by claiming it was much like “grippe” and could be effectively maintained by coughing and sneezing into a sleeve, and although the number of cases remained but a small percentage of the city’s 5.6 million inhabitants, it was clear to most that the flu was “pandemic in the city.”\(^{81}\)

Beginning on Monday, October 7, businesses in New York City were required to stagger the times they opened and closed, in an effort to contain the spread of disease.

That very same day, voter registration commenced in New York City, and Katharine Anthony “had the satisfaction of registering for my first vote ... at the little tailor-shop across the street. It was the first day and half the line were women; I am hoping that the total proportion will be as good.”\(^{82}\) When the booths closed at 10:30 P.M. on Saturday, October 12, 90,000 women had registered in Manhattan alone, compared with 148,823 men; women comprised over 252,000 of the total 648,000 registered voters in the five boroughs; and there were 4,293 new cases of influenza in the city.\(^{83}\) Katharine


\(^{80}\) In a 2014 study it was discovered that individuals who were first exposed to the flu in the 1889 pandemic did not develop the antibodies needed to fight the 1918 strain. Thus, the elderly in 1918, who were first exposed in the mid-1800s, and the young, born after 1900, were best equipped to fight the flu in 1918—an ironic twist to the usual vulnerable demographic. See Carl Zimmer, “In 1918 Flu Pandemic, Timing Was a Killer,” \textit{New York Times}, April 30, 2014.

\(^{81}\) “Fight Stiffens Here Against Influenza,” \textit{New York Times}, October 12, 1918.

\(^{82}\) KA to ESD, October 14, 1918, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.

Anthony immediately left for her country home in Connecticut, citing the “prevalence of influenza” and the fresh country air as a good “preventative measure.”

She only stayed the weekend. She had work to do and a ballot to cast. Mid-term elections were held on November 5, 1918, and despite President Wilson’s appeal to citizens in late October to choose Democratic candidates on behalf of national security, voters returned a Republican majority in both the House and the Senate. Party lines seemed to be in flux, and Katharine Anthony held out hope that there still might be a progressive political overhaul. “For instance, the young Republican member from my district here is a near-Socialist and there must be many of his sort who will not yield easily to the policies of the Root-Roosevelt leadership,” Anthony wrote the day after the election. “Can you imagine that we may yet see party-lines wavering even within the House and the Senate, so that each side does not vote as a solid block? That would be interesting, wouldn’t it?”

In the mid-term elections four years later, Copeland successfully ran as a Democrat for the Senate, in large part because of his successful containment of the flu. At the conclusion of the pandemic, somewhere between 20,000 and 24,000 New Yorkers had died, which was lower than the death ratio for other big cities, including Boston and Philadelphia. The number of new flu cases dropped after the 1918 election, only to spike again in December, although never to the numbers seen in October.

---
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1918 marked the “third wave” of the influenza pandemic, when 2,100 people died of influenza or pneumonia—a well-known complication of the virus—in New York City alone.88

On Christmas Day, 1918, Katharine Anthony opened a letter to Ethel Sturges Dummer, not with holiday greetings and cheer, or with words about Margaret Fuller, but with the sad news that “Randolph Bourne is dead.”89 He was thirty-two. On December 14, Bourne had moved into a new apartment on Eighth Street, “and rode down on the furniture wagon in the best of health and spirits.” On December 19, he fell ill with pneumonia. And three days later, on December 22, Randolph Bourne died, “another casualty of war,” Anthony wrote.90

* * *

Katharine Anthony started the new year with a daydream. A few months earlier, an old liberal newspaper, The Dial, moved its headquarters to New York City, “just around the corner” from Anthony and Irwin.91 But “[s]o far they are not expressing the woman’s point of view,” Anthony noted. Anthony said this about a lot of publications; but The Dial was special: when it was founded in 1840, Margaret Fuller had served as the quarterly’s first editor-in-chief.92 Fuller had also originally published Woman in the Nineteenth Century (1844) in The Dial under the ponderous title, “The Great Lawsuit:
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Man versus Men; Woman versus Women”—the feminist milestone that had but one predecessor, Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792).

Ironically, during *The Dial*’s early years, “[t]he common criticism was that [it] was too ‘feminine,’” as Katharine Anthony wrote in her biography of Fuller. “It was true that the editor wore a shawl, and one suspects that this fact had something to do with the impression of femininity ascribed to the whole enterprise. Theodore Parker, who was one of the chief contributors and quite stalwart and masculine, also thought that what *The Dial* needed was a beard.”

But the charge had since been reversed, and Katharine Anthony was “having a little day-dream” about it: she wanted the editors of *The Dial* “to assign to [her] regular books [to review] which deal with the woman problem in any way,—whether the theme is ‘emotions in women’ or ‘women in industry’ or whether the book is sociology or fiction or biography or what-not in form,—and to let [her] use the review for a vehicle for feminism.” Anthony’s old friend from Chicago, Robert Morss Lovett, was one of the new editors at *The Dial*, which “emboldened” her to ask. Anthony had also recently published a book review there, so she knew they were familiar with her work.

Katharine Anthony had also recently read and emphatically reviewed English feminist Maude Royden’s *Women and the Sovereign State* (1918) for *The New Republic*, and Royden’s message spoke loudly to Anthony. The “toilers” of society—the workers and the enslaved who built the countries that oppressed them—were for the most part
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invisible and unappreciated, Royden argued. “But more silent and more hidden still have been the women—more completely denied all freedom of development, more punished for aspiration, more derided for rebellion. The wrong ... of exploitation can never be truly comprehended till the history of women is written.”

In January 1919, Katharine Anthony reiterated this point in a letter to Dummer. Although there were “many forms of social injustice that cried out for adjustment,” she wrote, “there is no form for which actually less is said and done than for the cause of feminism. And the things that need to be said and done primarily need women to say and do them.” But how could Anthony best contribute to the feminist fight? What should her medium be? That she was searching for a feminist mouthpiece while she was writing the biography of Fuller suggests that it was not yet clear in Anthony’s mind that feminist biography would, or could, be that outlet. She knew that women’s emancipation was getting buried in world events. And she had known for years that women’s history and women’s work was thoroughly enshrouded by the history of men who—they would have you think—built the world and populated it all by themselves. Was the best way to spread the truth about women to be found in reviewing histories that others had written—by turning Fuller’s “feminine” journal into a “vehicle for feminism”? Or was it to be found in something else? Writing reviews for The Dial, Anthony guessed, “would

---

99 KA to ESD, January 17, 1919, Box 26, Folder 433, ESD-SL.
only require at most three or four days out of each fortnight and the rest of the time would be free for finishing ‘Margaret.’”

Her daydream turned to disappointment when she asked Lovett if she could review *Women and the Labor Party*, by Australian activist Marion Phillips, and he “told me that he was not in a position to assign a book like [that] ... without referring the matter to Helen Marot.” Anthony knew that Marot, a prominent labor organizer, was “not interested in the feminist aspect of [the labor movement] or in the woman question as such.” Lovett assigned Anthony a different book to review, a work of fiction, which she published in March, and she never wrote for *The Dial* again. In less than a year, as Anthony predicted, “*The Dial* ... [had] passed out of existence as a liberal magazine.”

The failure of *The Dial* was just one of the many “discouraging signs” that Katharine Anthony saw between the United States’ entry into World War I and 1919. After the Russian Revolution, most suffrage organizations had distanced themselves from radicalism, which, they argued, would threaten their fight for the vote, and just as it was nearing a successful finish. Carrie Chapman Catt was happy to announce in 1917 that the NAWSA was a “bourgeois movement with nothing radical about it.” In response to this disappointing shift, Anthony observed in August 1918 that the American suffragists were “still very backward in the promotion of social and economic reforms of any kind.
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The suffrage organization of the state contains too little of the Bolshevist element, and is almost entirely dominated by old-fashioned political ideals.”106

Even in Great Britain, where feminist militancy was born and where women had been granted access (albeit severely restricted) to the vote in February 1918, there was a noticeable turn away from radical feminism. Katharine Anthony “waited with expectancy for the next incarnation of feminist striving among the Island women. ... [She] longed for the Anglo-Saxon feminist who would at last boldly attack the sex problem in the open.”107 But the future was clear when British labor feminists Mary MacArthur and Margaret Bondfield were both defeated in the December 1918 election, and Anthony was prevented from planning the “torch-light procession” that she said she would have organized if they had won.108 Women in Britain would be denied unqualified voting rights for another decade.

Perhaps most discouraging to Katharine Anthony was the news she read in January 1919 about forty-six members of the Industrial Workers of the World who were convicted in California for violating the Espionage Act—two months after the armistice agreement between Germany and the Allies. Anthony saw this as an ominous sign that “the measures of suppression [were going to] continue unchanged ... even after the war is over.”109 She was right. Strikes, race riots, bombings, and mass imprisonments without due process would mark the next two years of American history in what would come to
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be called the First Red Scare. The Socialist movement in America was dismantled in its wake. The Communist organization splintered. And feminism in America followed in the footsteps of Great Britain, discarding any remaining radical elements for respectability and political positioning. By the end of the 1920s, “feminism” had become the narrow aspirations of mostly white professional women, with little resemblance to the deep, diverse, alive movement it so briefly was in the 1910s. As Lucia Oliviere, a socialist and (unsuccessful) candidate for the New York Senate in the 1920s, poignantly wrote, “1919 will be known as the fatal year to all the illusions by which mankind has been held in bondage.”\(^{110}\)

Katharine Anthony also learned in January 1919 that Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg had been violently murdered in Berlin, and the hopeful flickers that had pointed to a Bolshevik-like restructuring in Germany were extinguished once and for all by the Weimar Republic established in the wake of the humiliating Treaty of Versailles.\(^{111}\) Anthony now “pin[ned] all [her] hopes to the Non Partisan League” in America, a radical farmers’ union that originated in North Dakota in 1915 and surprisingly controlled the state after the 1918 election. They established a state-owned bank, introduced a graduated income tax, and implemented an inheritance tax in one of the most radical experiments in American political history. But the experiment was short-lived. Wilson’s newly appointed Attorney General, A. Mitchell Palmer, went after suspected radicals with a fierce new energy, and progressive politics were locked up along with “Commies” and Wobblies by 1920. “[A]re we in the midst of a world
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Revolution,” Anthony asked Dummer shortly before the Palmer Raids began in November 1919. “I begin to think we are, myself, and if we are not yet in medias res, we are approaching that stage by swift degrees.”

All the while, Katharine Anthony kept her “hand ... to the plough” on Margaret Fuller, which was the one thing she was surely happy about for a time. She finished the last two chapters between August and October 1919, in Danbury, Connecticut, where she enjoyed “long busy writing hours and beautiful nights sleeping out of doors.” She worked every day from 9 to 4. Elisabeth came up on weekends, but beyond those much needed breaks, she didn’t let anything or anyone come between her and her typewriter. “‘Margaret’ keeps right on moving, like an obedient crowd at the cop’s command—me being the patient but determined cop,” Anthony wrote to Dummer in late October. The final push was followed immediately by an “attack of fatigue” that left her bedridden for several days. But she was fully recovered by November 3, 1919, by which time “there [was] only revision to be done. That and the publisher.”

Katharine Anthony referred to her time writing Margaret Fuller as “an experience in happiness and the sense of freedom.” The months she spent writing the life of the first American “feminist” represented the first time in Anthony’s adult life that she had
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been able to devote all of her daylight hours and energy to her own writing. Dummer’s support had made that possible, and Anthony would never forget it. But finding a publisher? “Oh the terrors of that thought.”

Anthony had put everything she had into the book—her beliefs, her energy, her talent, countless hours, even her health—and if no one wanted it, the future seemed unbearably bleak.

Amidst all the patriotic drivel and scattershot attacks on liberalism during the First Red Scare, 1919 saw the inception of a progressive new publishing house in New York City, when two Columbia University graduates, Alfred Harcourt and Donald Brace, resigned from Henry Holt & Company after realizing “that [they] [were] not going to be able to publish books dealing with the new ideas with which the world was seething and that Henry Holt would never feel safe with [them] again.”

Harcourt and Brace wanted to take on fresh, young authors, and progressive thinkers, and they opened their firm (with Will D. Howe) intending to do just that.

“Have you heard of a new publishing firm, Harcourt, Brace, and somebody?” Katharine Anthony wrote to Ethel Sturges Dummer in October 1919. “Mr. Harcourt was formerly with Henry Holt and has just branched out for himself. He was the only progressive element in the Holt concern, and now that he is ‘on his own’ he may be more satisfactory to deal with than in the old relations.” Dummer did know of it, and thought Harcourt, Brace, and Howe (HBH) very well might be the right place for
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Margaret Fuller. “I heard Mr. Harcourt speak at [Madge Jenison and Mary Mowbray-Clark’s bookshop] the Sunwise Turn one evening,” she wrote to Anthony. “From his mentioning the Farmer’s Non-Partisan League as a subject about which he would like to find someone to write a book, and from his putting out Gantt’s ‘Organizing for Work’ I take it that Mr. Harcourt is looking into the future, and I shall be interested to know the result of your talk with him. ... I am sure forward looking people must know the world is ready for your interpretation of Margaret.”

Katharine Anthony returned to New York in early November, but she would have to wait until February “to go with ‘Margaret’ to the publishers.” Harcourt was in Europe, and after consulting with Dummer, Anthony “thought best to try him first with it.” At the end of January 1920, when she “had the manuscript all ready to take to Mr. Harcourt,” she came down with the flu. She was still sick on February 17, but she “broke bounds” and took Margaret Fuller to Harcourt herself anyway. He wrote to her three days later. “We are very much interested in your life of Margaret Fuller and thank you for bringing it to us. We want to publish it, and suggest a flat royalty of ten percent of the published price on all copies which we sell. Is this satisfactory to you? If so, we shall send you the usual formal agreements for your signature.” Anthony was delighted and wrote to Harcourt three days after that. “I shall be very glad to have you publish ‘Margaret Fuller’. ... There remain to be supplied a preface, bibliography, and
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index,” she explained; “and I am trying to run down a portrait which has not been used.”

Katharine Anthony wanted in her book the reproduction of an oil painting of Margaret Fuller by the American artist Thomas Hicks, completed in Rome in 1848, and “described by Henry James who remembers seeing it as a little boy.”

No other image would do. As Anthony explained it, “That particular portrait is the one we must have; it expresses the personality that I have developed in my study.” Thus commenced a hunt that would last more than six months and prove to be an obstacle almost as difficult as the writing itself. The search, entertaining as it is to recount, is told here in full because of the light it sheds on Katharine Anthony’s interpretation of Margaret Fuller. In fact, taking Anthony’s claim that the portrait represented the personality she developed in her book seriously, analyzing Margaret Fuller through this story and this portrait is perhaps the most natural way to discuss Anthony’s first biography.

She wrote to Century Magazine first, where the painting had appeared in 1893, but their reply was of little help. They did not have anything “definite” to tell her about the portrait’s whereabouts. It had been returned twenty-seven years ago to a Fanny M.
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Ward on East 29th Street in Manhattan; and of course, “many things may have happened since.”

Katharine Anthony soon learned one thing that had definitely happened: Fanny Ward had died. And the executor of Ward’s estate had no record of the portrait. After following up on “every clue” she had by July, five months after first mentioning the painting to Harcourt, Anthony appealed to her publisher for help. Couldn’t he arrange for the rights of reproduction with Century directly, since they had previously printed the image? A letter was sent to The Century Co. from HBH on July 19, but they received the following reply: “We regret exceedingly that we cannot help you in the matter of the Margaret Fuller portrait. … We have no rights of publication in the picture and cannot extend permission for its reproduction unless you can get in touch with the heirs of the estate of George Cabot Ward.” HBH broke the news to Anthony in a letter dated August 13, in which they also gently nudged Anthony to give up the search. There could be “a good deal of delay” if it went on much longer.

They suggested she find another suitable image for her book. “Have you tried the old print dealers to see whether some other satisfactory portrait cannot be found?”, HBH wrote to Katharine Anthony on August 13. They recommended either Gottschalk on Sixth Avenue or Fridenberg on West 56th. “We are now ready to print the book, and, of course, prompt decision in the matter is important.”
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Katharine Anthony couldn’t let it go. Her determination only intensified. “I think we can get in touch with the George Cabot Ward Estate,” she wrote to Mr. Brace (notably not Mr. Harcourt) on August 15.

The widow of George Cabot Ward, Mrs. Frances Morris Ward, died but recently. Her real estate in New York is handled by Payson M. Merrill Co., 9 East 44th Street. I addressed a letter in their care to Mrs. Ward and in this way learned of her death. I received a postal card from M. B. Morris, Jr., stating merely that Mrs. Ward did not own the painting I inquired about. There was no address on the postal card but it was mailed at Westport, Conn. I intended to write to the said Mr. J. B. Morris, and inquire what had become of the portrait, if Mrs. Morris no longer owned it, who did. But I did not follow it up because I thought if you got permission from the Century Company to reproduce that would be all that was necessary. I think now that if you will use these clues and go after these people it may be possible to locate the representative of the Frances Morris War Estate from whom the permission that the Century people want could be obtained. Very likely the Payson Merrill Co. as well as J.B. Morris, Jr., might respond more explicitly to an inquiry from a business firm than from an individual like myself. I just must have that picture because the other one that is often used has no distinction at all. This one represents the character I have given her and has a good deal of history attached. Henry James writes about its first exhibition in New York in his “Small Boy and Others”; Thomas Hicks painted it; and so on. I did not have any idea that the Century Co. could not give permission without the estate’s permission. All the portraits in Lytton Strachey’s “Eminent Victorians” are reproduced by courtesy of different publishers not of the owners of the original portraits. I deduced from that that the Century people would have the power. Sorry that the picture makes so much trouble, but it really is worth a great deal.139

Less than two weeks later, Katharine Anthony received another unsatisfactory reply from HBH. The individual “most likely” to have information on the painting’s current whereabouts, a certain Mrs. Low, “doesn’t know who purchased it some years
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ago. It seems to us rather hopeless. Hadn’t we better go ahead with some other portrait or with no portrait?”

Katharine Anthony went in person to The Century Co. on Fourth Avenue in late August with the purpose of speaking to the Art Director face-to-face, an Englishman named George Frederick Scotson-Clark. For one reason or another, Anthony couldn’t see Scotson-Clark that day, which he “regret[ted]”; but the next day she received the following note. “I fear we cannot in the circumstances grant you any permission to reproduce the Margaret Fuller portrait, because we have no power to do so. If however, you like to assume all risks and reproduce from our block in the Century Magazine we would raise no objection, but we cannot grant permission nor assume any responsibility for your reproduction.” He suggested that if she did decide to include the image she also include the following caption beneath it: “From the Century Magazine, April 1893.”

Katharine Anthony took this letter as the rubber stamp she was waiting for, and the portrait of Margaret Fuller by Thomas Hicks, completed in Rome in 1848, and seen by Henry James, appears on the first page of the book, immediately to the left of the title page. Beneath it reads, “From the Century Magazine, April, 1893” (Figure 5.1).

What was it about Hicks’s portrait that resonated so deeply with Katharine Anthony? She said nothing beyond her belief that it expressed the same personality she
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had tried to realize in her biography. Curiously, she didn’t even mention the portrait in the final biography. Anthony’s comment, however, speaks to a long-established tradition dating back to antiquity that portraits in some way revealed the character of the sitter—in part taken from Plutarch (ca. 45-120 CE), who famously referred to painting as “mute poetry,” and to poetry as “a speaking picture.””

Freud himself referred to this sentiment in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, which Anthony used to write *Margaret Fuller*. “[T]he dream has at its disposal no means for representing ... logical relations among the dream thoughts,” Freud reasoned.

The descriptive arts are limited in the same manner—painting and the plastic arts in comparison with poetry, which can employ speech. ... Before the art of painting had arrived at an understanding of the laws of expression by which it is bound, it attempted to escape this disadvantage. In old paintings little tags were hung from the mouths of the persons represented giving the speech, the expression of which in the picture the artist despaired of. ... But just as the art of painting finally succeeded in depicting in the represented persons, at least their intention in speaking—their tenderness, threatening attitude, warning mien, and the like—by other means than the dangling tag, so also the dream has found it possible to render account of a few of the logical relations among its dream thoughts by means of an appropriate modification of the peculiar method of dream representation.

What happens if we imagine Katharine Anthony’s biography as a “dangling tag” beneath Fuller’s mouth in Hicks’s portrait? What was Fuller meant to say in Hicks’s painting—or rather, what intention was Hicks trying to capture that Katharine Anthony also sought to illustrate in her biography? There are several moments in *Margaret Fuller*
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that might help us understand Katharine Anthony’s strong attachment to the portrait. But in the end, it seems likely that one theme, clearly evident in both the painting and the book, led Anthony to pursue the portrait with such an extraordinary relentlessness.

Margaret Fuller was roughly four months pregnant when she sat for the portrait in the spring of 1848—Angelo was born in September—and her gravid state is apparent, despite the fact that she was probably not yet showing in any significant way, and despite her seated position, thick gown, and shawl. Fuller appears in Venice—not Rome—in the Gothic arcade of the Doge’s Palace, the historic seat of government of the Venetian Doge, and she rests just in front of a portrait bust of Eros. She looks careworn, and with her head tilted in the direction of the sea, which can be seen just beyond the marble arches of the palace.

This particular time in Margaret Fuller’s life—in the early stages of her pregnancy, and probably before she had married the father of her child, Angelo Ossoli—marked a profound moment of transition in Fuller’s life, when Fuller (and ostensibly viewers) could see with equal clarity her self-determined past and her pre-determined future. As Katharine Anthony wrote, “[a]pparently [Fuller] did not intend to be married to [Ossoli], for she regarded the marriage as unsuitable in many ways. The difference in their ages and interests and the similarity in their poverty made the union seem impossible. But her fate pursued her swiftly and before Christmas, she knew that she was to have a child. What she had entered upon as a perishable romance would have to be perpetuated as life-long common struggle for existence.”
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In other words, this was the moment in Margaret Fuller’s life when choice ended and fate began. She exists between two stages (before and after pregnancy), and between two selves (independent journalist and married mother), just as Katharine Anthony sought to paint Fuller as a complex woman moving between two eras (traditional and modern); multiple identities (daughter and intellectual; “spinster” and wife; journalist and mother); and dozens of conflicting emotions (strength and vulnerability, clarity and confusion, loneliness and fulfillment, independence and desire). Anthony’s “portrait” is filled with these kinds of intended tensions—or, as Anthony put it, these “strange contradictions in [Fuller’s] life which were a puzzle to her age”—because it was exactly in these moments that the complexity and reality of Fuller’s humanity, sexuality, and psychology were most evident.147

In Katharine Anthony’s hands, Fuller became “a woman who had certain so-called masculine traits,” alongside her expected feminine ones; a woman who was “madly ambitious” but who also possessed an “intense maternal tenderness”; a woman whose “delusional life was over-developed,” but whose “whole conscious nature ... loved the truth and never ceased from following it”; a self-defined radical who cared tremendously what other people thought of her; a brave, intelligent woman whose experience with motherhood made her “absurdly fearful,” “a miserable coward.”148 “I love him too much,” Fuller said about her son. “I hope I shall not be forced to be as brave for him, as I have been for myself.”149
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Margaret Fuller was a mother for but two of the forty years she was alive; but the time during which motherhood, both imagined and real, occupied a place in her life—from the realization of her pregnancy in December 1847 to her death in July 1850—comprises nearly a third of Katharine Anthony’s biography. Indeed, the starkest tension in Fuller’s life, as Anthony seems to have understood it, was between her independent, professional self, and her biological, maternal self. For many women living in the 1920s, the same was true, which would have made it all the more important for Anthony to emphasize this aspect of Fuller’s life. As Anthony’s close friend Crystal Eastman said in 1927, the “great woman question of to-day,” indeed, “the very essence of feminism,” is “how to reconcile a woman’s natural desire for love and home and children with her equally natural desire for work of her own for which she is paid.”

With the stark break between choice and fate in Katharine Anthony’s biography of Margaret Fuller, it’s almost as if fate took over entirely, and Fuller could no longer direct the course of her life—even when it came down to life and death. Perhaps most drastically, Fuller became in Anthony’s construction a decisive woman who ultimately submitted to her fate, first with motherhood and marriage, and second with death. Death is, of course, the inevitable fate of all of humanity; but Anthony paid particular attention to Fuller’s submission to that fate. When it mattered most, Fuller, who exhibited such a raw and palpable vitality, and who made so many brave and novel choices in her lifetime, didn’t so much as kick her legs against the waves that claimed the life of her one-year-old son, her husband, and herself. The shoreline, Anthony pointed out, was only fifty yards
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away from the sinking ship, yet Fuller’s last words were said to be, “‘I see nothing but death before me,—I shall never reach the shore.’” Anthony emphasized Fuller’s “strange paralysis” in the face of death repeatedly in the last section of her biography: “Margaret remained a passive spectator of approaching death until the end”; “[s]tricken with a passivity, which was afterwards described as Christian fortitude, [Fuller] awaited the end”; her passivity “was allowed to decide the fate of her whole family.” Without relying on the ambiguity that Anthony typically embraced in her portraits of women, Anthony wrote that “Margaret went down alone. ... She ‘submitted to be drowned.’ Her death had in it the elements of pagan acquiescence, of consenting to her destiny.”

In some ways, perhaps Hicks’s portrait pointed towards Fuller’s end as Anthony envisioned it: a wearied Madonna whose youthful vigor had been usurped by her destiny, a woman who had no fight left in her when the water ripped apart her ship and threatened to drown her only child. In the painting, the sea is to Fuller’s right, where her fate would finally bring her; and behind her—and within her—is love.

Indeed, love is the theme that runs like a thread through Katharine Anthony’s biography of Margaret Fuller from beginning to end. Her first dissection of Fuller’s personality and her final meditation on Fuller’s life center on this single emotion. Anthony’s purpose was probably three-fold. First, love was of great interest to Margaret Fuller (love and politics were Fuller’s two “chief interests in life,” Anthony claimed), so naturally, love would play a dominant role in her biography. Anthony wrote extended
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passages in her journals about love that were so astute, Anthony said, that Fuller was actually a “pioneer” in the “psychology of love,” presaging almost verbatim some of Freud’s most revolutionary findings.\textsuperscript{155} As Anthony put it, “[Fuller] was one of those who stood as sign-posts along the road which was to lead in time to a scientific view of the nature of love.”\textsuperscript{156} For instance, “[w]ithout any help from modern psychology, Margaret was most intelligently aware of the criss-crossing of the sexes by character-types which are common to both. ‘There is no wholly masculine man,’ [Fuller] wrote, ‘no purely feminine woman’.”\textsuperscript{157} Fuller also posited “‘that a woman may be in love with a woman, and a man with a man’,” and she detailed her own passionate love for another woman in poignant detail: “[h]er face was always gleaming before me,” Fuller remembered; “‘her voice was echoing in my ear. All poetic thoughts clustered round the dear image’.”\textsuperscript{158} To question the accepted definitions of femininity and masculinity in the first half of the nineteenth century, and to use that new understanding to reevaluate romantic love, was so far ahead of the time that Fuller’s life and work made more sense in Anthony’s mind to women in 1920 than it did to women in her own time.

Relatedly (and second), erotic love was a key component in several of Freud’s theories, making Katharine Anthony’s task of reinterpreting Margaret Fuller in light of Freudian psychology seem almost natural. For instance, hysteria, which Anthony believed Fuller clearly suffered from, was the result of a “dammed up libido”; and narcissism (the topic of Anthony’s third chapter), was fundamentally connected to the
object of one’s erotic affections, stretching from childhood, puberty, and into
adulthood. Fuller had several great loves that Anthony could apply to Freud’s theories,
and perhaps together, they would shed new light on Fuller’s character.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, while Katharine Anthony believed that the
political realm was within a woman’s reach by 1920, she argued that that same woman
“would still find that love was for her sex a forbidden topic. ... Though it is considered
womanly to love and unwomanly not to love, to take an intelligent and outspoken interest
in the subject is quite another matter. A woman should open her mouth and shut her
eyes.” Undoubtedly, Hicks’s portrait embodied both politics and love: Fuller sits in
the Venetian seat of government with Eros hovering over her. But, true to form, Anthony
went after love because it was forbidden. Love was the next feminist frontier, and
Margaret Fuller helped blaze the trail. “[Margaret Fuller] believed in the hunger of the
affections, because she had experienced it,” Anthony explained. “‘Imperfect as love is,’
[Fuller] wrote in the last year of her life, ‘I want human beings to love, as I suffocate
without.’ ... Her biographers often speak of this characteristic of Margaret’s nature as if it
were the exceptional trait of her unusual disposition. As a matter of fact, it is a universal
trait of normal human nature, and Margaret’s originality lay in the frank admission of
it.”
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Katharine Anthony focused on several different “loves” in her biography of Fuller, all of which in some way undermined deep-seated sexist assumptions that prevailed in 1920. First, Anthony brought to light Fuller’s love for her father, which, Anthony concluded, naturally had “an erotic element” to it.163 “Margaret’s whole emotional life in childhood centered around her father who likened her to Juno and wrote verses to a lock of her hair,” Anthony wrote. “Her childish love was the mainspring of her whole career.”164 Anthony’s purpose here went beyond simply applying Freud to Fuller’s life. By uncovering Margaret’s passionate love for her father, Anthony undermined the predominating theory that “Margaret’s precocious studies [were] the cause of her life-long ill health.”165 Anthony suggested instead that her “precocious sexuality and painful repressions” were to blame.166 Margaret’s unacknowledged love for her father, which included other “evil wishes which she had to keep secret even from herself,” such as the “primeval and murderous wish to attend the funeral of her beloved mother,” were the underlying causes of her life-long emotional issues, Anthony argued.167 In this way, Anthony used Freud to subvert Freud in the name of feminism: she attacked the 19th-century assumption that educating women led to “hysteria,” and simultaneously acknowledged the natural reality of female sexuality. In fact, Margaret was “normal,” Anthony stated.168
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Margaret Fuller’s second love, Katharine Anthony claimed, happened when she was thirteen-years-old. “She fell in love ‘at first sight’ (her life-long pattern for this process) with a stranger, whom she saw at church. The stranger was an English lady, who played the harp and read Sir Walter Scott.” Anthony titled this chapter—the third out of the eleven that comprise Margaret Fuller—“Narcissa,” a candid reference to Freud’s 1914 essay, “On Narcissism,” his first protracted, albeit not comprehensive, discussion on female sexuality. As Freud’s theory goes, all human beings begin life with two sexual objects: him/herself and the woman who nurses him/her. At puberty, a boy’s ego is suppressed by his libido “in favour of the love-object.” But for girls, Freud maintained, “[a] different course is followed.” Puberty “seems to bring about an intensification of the original narcissism [in girls]. ... Strictly speaking, it is only themselves that such women love with an intensity comparable to that of the man’s love for them. Nor does their need lie in the direction of loving, but of being loved.” In other words, women loved themselves and perhaps other women, but they didn’t naturally love men: their heterosexual desire was to be loved by men.

Katharine Anthony followed Freud’s theory fairly literally in her chapter. When the older woman left, Margaret “was unable to cope with her excessive grief.” Her pent-up emotions turned toward herself. Fuller’s father sent her to a girls’ boarding school, assuming it would help her to be around other girls her age. But when Margaret started painting her cheeks, “saying she thought it made her look pretty,” she was
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humiliated and laughed at by her peers and teachers.\textsuperscript{173} When she was sixteen, Margaret “went into society,” but “no love affairs developed.”\textsuperscript{174} Instead, “Margaret’s passions found some outlet in the particular form of self-love which is known as ambition,” Anthony wrote.\textsuperscript{175} In the end, however, Margaret “longed for love and marriage, and yet she took no steps to satisfy her longing.”\textsuperscript{176}

As a perfect example of Freud’s theory of narcissism, Margaret Fuller did not pursue men presumably \textit{because she wanted to be pursued}. Katharine Anthony’s comment on this point was the crux of her feminist re-writing in this chapter: “[Margaret] sat in a prison of her own making,” Anthony determined.\textsuperscript{177} Freud was not a fortune teller. His theories could not predict what a woman was going to do unless she let them. There were numerous opportunities for individuality to move in, which is how Anthony here deviated from Freud in favor of feminism. Biology may have determined certain things (and patriarchal society may have determined certain things), but psychology could triumph over biology (and women could triumph over patriarchy, no matter how firmly rooted in the psyche it was).

The final great loves in Katharine Anthony’s \textit{Margaret Fuller} were the beautiful, “impoverished Marchese, about ten years younger than Margaret,” and the son she would bear from him.\textsuperscript{178} Fuller’s love affair with Angelo Ossoli was an important relationship in Anthony’s portrait, primarily because it served as a gateway for criticizing several
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sexist assumptions. Anthony used it to undermine society’s shaming of the unmarried mother. Margaret was not a “loose” woman, and yet she found herself pregnant and unmarried in Rome. More overtly, and well ahead of her time, Anthony used Margaret’s love affair to criticize the “common assumption that a young man cannot entertain a romantic attachment for an older woman. So strongly established is this opinion that we find Margaret’s biographers preoccupied with proofs that Ossoli really did love his American wife and that he did not marry her for her money!”  

If Ossoli’s love for Margaret needed explanation, Anthony reasoned, then Fuller’s affection for Ossoli also warranted a look: “[t]he puzzle was a double one.” Ossoli’s “education had been in the hands of a lazy priest who had neglected him, so that books and reading played no part in his grown-up life.” How could Ossoli love a woman significantly older than he was, and who, it was claimed again and again, was “altogether without beauty?” And how could the brilliant Margaret Fuller love an uneducated man who cared nothing for books? “The answer to the puzzle is that he loved her for her age and dignity and authority, she loved him for his youth and beauty,” Anthony wrote. It was hard to find fault in that.

Margaret Fuller’s love for her son, Angelo Eugene Philip Ossoli, is arguably the most complicated love in Katharine Anthony’s biography. Anthony immediately repudiated the loud voices that shamed women who didn’t desire children, or who chose a career over marriage, by pointing out that Fuller’s love for her son wasn’t immediate. The sentimental image of a mother, fully captivated by the baby she has just given birth
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to, was not an accurate picture. In fact, Anthony wrote, Margaret was first and foremost “tormented by his crying”; then “she began to take pleasure in watching him”; “at the end of twelve days, she was tracing resemblances to his father and herself”; and “[a]t the end of three weeks, she was quite in love with him.”

Katharine Anthony didn’t leave it at that. She emphasized the tension between career and motherhood without judgment, allowing room for both maternal love and intellectual pursuit in the life of a single woman. For instance, when Margaret Fuller left her son in the care of his wet nurse for roughly eight months while she went to Rome to write about the revolution, Anthony noted that “[t]he thought of leaving him with strangers became most painful” to Margaret; but Margaret also knew that her constant “affection and attention upon the child” was not healthy for either her or her baby.

When the wet nurse threatened to abandon the child if Margaret didn’t send more money, Margaret sent the money; yet although she feared for her child and concluded that “‘the position of a mother separated from her only child is too frightfully unnatural’,” she stayed in Rome until she knew that Mazzini had safely gotten out. “A mother is after all a complex human being,” Anthony wrote. When Margaret Fuller finally returned for her son, he was “in such a sad condition of malnutrition that it seemed to [Margaret] impossible that he could live.” But still Katharine Anthony laid no blame on Fuller:
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“[the baby] had all but succumbed to a combination of untoward circumstances which Margaret could not have foreseen.”

Margaret Fuller loved many things and many people in her short life. She loved her father, older women, her husband, her son, journalism, ideas, politics, argument, and Ralph Waldo Emerson; she “loved Italy and Rome with all the ardor of a personal love.” But throughout Katharine Anthony’s biography, one love endures: Margaret Fuller’s passion for the emancipation of her sex. Turning again to one of her arguments in *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, Anthony addressed love (and hatred) between women on several occasions in *Margaret Fuller*. Fuller was not “a womanly woman,” but “A Woman’s Woman,” the title of Anthony’s fifth chapter (and Shaw’s essay). Fuller “loved women and knew them,” Anthony wrote, “and to the end of her life she served with earnestness and sincerity the world-wide community of her sex.”

Predicting the fractious disagreements between women over the Equal Rights Amendment, and the denouncement of feminists as “man haters,” Katharine Anthony ridiculed the “attitude [that] assumes that ill-will among men and ill-will among women are the only basis for good-will between the sexes. ... [W]hen Margaret Fuller taught, in the words of Antigone, that ‘the aim of women is not to hate but to love each other,’ there were many who hastened to construe this as ‘the aim of women is not to love but to hate men.’ Nothing was more foreign to Margaret’s real feeling.” Anthony pushed this argument further, claiming that the entire philosophy of feminism was “based on ... an
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erotic impulse” that women naturally felt for one another.\textsuperscript{193} If the feeling wasn’t there, something was wrong. “Women who are unfriendly and unsympathetic toward the mass problems of their own sex are defective on this side of their emotional development,” Anthony wrote.\textsuperscript{194}

The bust of Eros watching over Fuller in Hicks’s portrait represented almost all of Margaret Fuller’s loves as Anthony interpreted them. But perhaps most significantly, Eros was the foundation and essence of feminism—for Margaret Fuller, for Katharine Anthony, and for the successful realization of women’s emancipation.

We are ultimately left to our own hypotheses about the portrait, which might have been just as well for Katharine Anthony, who thought that ambiguity was probably the closest one could come to any person’s inner self, including one’s own. But in the final line of the book, Anthony provides a sense of closure by reconciling the tension captured in Hicks’s portrait, and the tension that runs so clearly throughout Anthony’s biography. Margaret Fuller wasn’t one thing or the other, journalist or mother, intellectual or wife, freed or fated. For Anthony, “[Fuller’s] life was a vindication of her belief, as an intellectual woman, in the reality of the instinctive life; as it was also a vindication of her belief, as an instinctive woman, in the reality of the intellectual life.”\textsuperscript{195}

When she was finished, Katharine Anthony claimed that her biography of Margaret Fuller was not meant to be a diagnosis. And she “[d]id not think it would be
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just to call [her] book a psychoanalytical study.”196 But when it was published by Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, on September 30, 1920, the cover read just that: Margaret Fuller: A Psychological Biography. In retrospect, Olivia Howard Dunbar referred to the publication of MF as “an event” that was “exquisitely timed.”197 Looking back, Anthony considered Margaret Fuller to be her “first real literary venture.”198 Only when she saw a review of it in the Boston Evening Transcript did she begin to think, “I must be a writer. I got a bigger thrill out of that review than I had ever got out of seeing anything of my own in print.”199

Reactions to Margaret Fuller were mixed, but almost all of them were emotional. The review that “thrilled” Katharine Anthony was one of the first to come out. It was short and entirely negative. The reviewer accused Anthony of writing cryptically and lacking a sense of humor, citing Anthony’s description of Margaret’s birth in Cambridge as justification for the latter. While Margaret’s mother was in labor, Anthony wrote, “one can almost imagine Timothy Fuller in the pangs of a couvade in the adjoining chamber.”200 The reviewer determined that, “[f]rom this [sentence] we easily gather that Miss Anthony is a biographer whose equipment does not include a sense of humor.”201
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He or she then focused on Katharine Anthony’s portrayal of Margaret Fuller’s mother, which was undoubtedly negative. “Was ever a mother of a famous woman so condescendingly maligned as is Mrs. Timothy Fuller by the twentieth century biographer of her daughter?” the reviewer asked. “For the good elements in Margaret Fuller, praise is given by Miss Anthony to her father; for the bad her mother is held responsible.”

Without question, Timothy Fuller dominates his daughter’s early and adolescent life in Katharine Anthony’s biography. Margaret’s mother, on the other hand, is never once referred to by name in Anthony’s book. The fact that Mrs. Fuller “became a mother at the same time [that Timothy became a father] ... was almost an incidental fact,” Anthony dared to write, “for she proved to be the merest footnote of a mother. Her influence appears to have been limited to the physical acts of motherhood and to have terminated with her daughter’s very brief term of infancy.” Mrs. Fuller “was a weak submissive woman, like the mother of Mary Wollstonecraft,” “the perfect example of the self-effacing mother,” “a true woman.” In sharp contrast, Timothy “not only instructed his daughter in the classics but he guided her training in the domestic arts as well.”

Anthony doesn’t mention Mrs. Fuller’s death (only Margaret’s fantasy of her death). But when Timothy Fuller died, “[h]is daughter, not his wife, closed his eyes.”

There are four other notably negative reviews, much harsher in tone than the one in the *Boston Transcript*, and they are discussed here at length because they are essential to understanding Katharine Anthony’s originality and potency as a modern feminist.
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biographer. Indeed, it might be tempting to assume that Margaret Fuller was a conservative subject for the first modern feminist biography. But that is to understand it from a twenty-first-century perspective, as the hostile reviews suggest. Radicalism necessarily means different things to different people at different times, and this is no more apparent than when considering the different histories and biographies written by black and white women in the first half of the twentieth century. The radical histories being written by black women were not Afrocentric narratives that emphasized the uniqueness of their oppression, or the sexuality of black women, or the ability to combine motherhood with a career; they were by necessity attempts to emulate the narratives of white historians as a way to sanction their demands for social parity. In fact, by the turn of the twentieth century, African American women had moved away from nineteenth century writers such as Harriet Jacobs and Sojourner Truth, who revealed the sexual predation they suffered as enslaved women by white men, in favor of narratives that presented black women as “upstanding matriarchs devoid of sexuality,” as Des Jardins demonstrates. “With an eye toward achieving respectability, [African American women] construct[ed] accounts of the past that stripped African American womanhood of the sexuality Truth, Jacobs, and others revealed and defended as they had fought to establish their personhood in the nineteenth century.”

In contrast, white middle class women could write histories that made radical claims about white women’s sexuality—but that were no more radical in subject or argument than those being written by black women. One of the most radical subjects that
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a middle class white woman could have chosen in the late 1910s was a well-respected white woman who in some way pushed the boundaries of heterosexual love. White women’s (heterosexual) sexuality was a particularly contentious battleground from the 1890s on, as Glenda Gilmore demonstrates in *Gender & Jim Crow.* Thus, while it was progressive to depict women’s sexuality in any way before the “second wave” of American feminism in the 1960s, it was particularly scandalous to do so with someone like Margaret Fuller. Placing white women’s sexuality center stage is what shocked the status quo for white women in the early twentieth century, just as making claims to equality is what shook the system for black men and women.

The four most negative reviews of Katharine Anthony’s biography all focused primarily on her employment of psychoanalysis to interpret Margaret Fuller—especially her argument that Fuller’s hysteria was the result of psycho-sexual repression, and not, in fact, the more comfortable explanation of intellectual exhaustion. Anthony’s greatest offence in these reviewers’ opinions was that she broached the subject of female sexuality at all. She transgressed on several levels: she exposed the sexuality of a revered woman; she employed psychoanalysis, itself a contested field, to do so; she questioned “womanhood,” “femininity,” and the gender norms attached to these constructions; and she herself was a woman writing about these things.

A reviewer for the *New York Times* used the argument “you’ll find what you’re looking for” to question Katharine Anthony’s method and interpretation. “The sex
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obsession is the sine qua non of psychoanalysis, and the investigator into human nature who wears those goggles can discover more slithery, slinky, slimy things in that habitat than are dreamed of in any other philosophy,” he or she wrote. “When the psychoanalyst probes with his theory into the human heart he is sure to bring out, one after another, an army of sex bogies. And then he sets them all up in a row and greatly admires them, and his own cleverness in finding them.”Anthony’s seeming “oracular finality” was unconvincing, the reviewer concluded. She had “no more proof than that furnished by her own imagination and her Freudian theories,” and, in the end, she revealed more about her own obviously depraved nature than about the woman she claimed to have investigated.

A review that appeared in *The Springfield Republican* announced that Anthony’s book was “infested with preconceptions and is unpleasantly provocative in tone.” For Anthony to claim that Fuller was burdened by her “precocious sexuality” was “purely gratuitous,” the reviewer wrote. And she “forfeit[ed] the reader’s respect” entirely when she applied her unfounded theories of repression to “the domestic life of Thomas and Jane Carlyle.”

A writer for *The Weekly Review* began his or her review with exaggerated sympathy for Katharine Anthony’s subject.

Alas for poor Margaret Fuller! She endured much in her life, she suffered detraction and ridicule in her death; but it remained for a friend in these latter days to heap the last indignity upon her devoted head, by making her the subject of a study in Freudian psycho-analysis. ...
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more, is the meaning of the boastful announcement of the ‘jacket-writer’ that Miss Anthony has created ‘a new type of biography by doing for her central figure what the modern novelist does for the heroine of his story.’  

Anthony applied “Freudian gusto,” “Freudian nastiness,” a “systematic exaggeration of morbid facts,” the reviewer huffed, “to magnify Margaret Fuller as a heroine in the fight for the emancipation of women.”

The most scathing attack on Katharine Anthony and her book came from Dr. Bernard Sachs, the anti-Freud chief of Neurology at Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York City, and the journalist who interviewed him, Willis Steell. In an article tellingly titled “Psychoanalyzing the Dead: So-Called Biography of Margaret Fuller That Imputes Basest of Impulses to a Noble Woman the Final Straw,” Sachs and Steell traduced and vilified Anthony in what can only be read as a personal and hysterical assault on Anthony’s character. Steell sarcastically referred to Anthony as “the omniscient biographer to whom heart and brain of her subject are open books,” and pointed out “that the author, a woman, brings nothing new to her subject.” Sachs claimed that Anthony’s book made him “nauseous,” and he was disgusted by the “abuse” and “butchering” she engaged in to make a sale. He was particularly horrified that Anthony had “imputed” to Margaret Fuller “an abnormal love for a deeply reverenced father,” which was nothing more than a malicious assault on a woman “who has for years remained a shining example of aspiring womanhood.” Freudians like Anthony, Sachs warned, were walking a dangerous line that threatened the very foundation of society.
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“The wise father, teacher, and physician know that the sex faculties should be governed and controlled,” Sachs said. “[N]othing but evil can result from hauling up and constantly inspecting these things.”

Steell included quotes from another, lesser known neurologist, as well, a Dr. Frederick Peterson, who agreed entirely with Sachs, in order to strengthen the assault. Peterson claimed that Katharine Anthony’s horrific slandering of a “distinguished woman” like Margaret Fuller could only mean that she herself was “abnormal,” and even suggested that Anthony—and writers like her—were “psychopaths.” Both Peterson and Sachs believed that Freudianism would die off, and that “[t]he publication of this kind of book” would only kill it faster. “The theories of Freud are pernicious in their application, as well as untrue in psychology,” Peterson declared, “and I am not afraid to predict that in a few years they will be utterly disregarded but take their place in the historical medical museum along with all the other curiosities which the centuries have accumulated.”

After reading these reviews, it’s clear that there was more at stake than Margaret Fuller’s reputation. Similar to the anxious refashioning of masculinity in the late nineteenth century in the wake of the Thirteenth Amendment and rapid industrialization, these fearful reviewers lashed out against a new threat: women’s empowerment vis-à-vis their sexuality. Although Freudianism was disturbing to many people in the 1910s and 1920s, it wasn’t nearly as unnerving as feminist Freudianism, which in their minds imperiled the very fabric of society by questioning normative gender roles. “Every society is known by the fictions that it keeps,” Bederman points out, and one of the most powerful and first established “fictions” in any given society is the way in which the
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sexes are supposed to relate to each other. Disruption of the norm is a challenge to “reality,” and a challenge to reality is, to any dominant group, a threat to their hegemony, and usually quickly quelled. Women’s sexuality needed to be “controlled” in order for the definition of masculinity, and thus the patriarchal system, to maintain its dominant position. The “evil” that could result from “hauling up” women’s sexuality was women’s emancipation. Anthony, “a woman” whose “tone” was unpleasant (read: whose words were unpleasant because they were being spoken by a woman), was threatening men’s control over women. The best way to discredit Anthony was to undermine Freudianism. But Freud himself didn’t receive a more hostile review than Anthony. As Peterson said, “[t]he theories of Freud are pernicious in their application.”

Not everyone felt threatened by Katharine Anthony’s book. Some reviewers were effusive in their praise. Katherine Anne Porter referred to Margaret Fuller as a “masterpiece,” “a true act of creation [that] cannot be explained,” and called Anthony “a subtle explorer of souls by the psycho-analytic method.” Alfred Harcourt told Anthony she wrote “a splendid book.” Heywood Broun called Anthony’s book “biography in new and fascinating form.” If it had a fault, Broun said, it was that it was “just a little too logical.”
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A reviewer for the *Atlantic Monthly* praised *Margaret Fuller* for being “one of the few readable products of the dark, Freudian system; and even if one refuses to go to the extreme of that fantastic theory, one must acknowledge that Miss Anthony by its help has solved some perplexing problems in the character and career of Margaret Fuller.”\(^{224}\)

The novelist Edith Wyatt called *Margaret Fuller* “a book of adventure for girls” in her review for *The New Republic*, which Anthony loved.\(^{225}\) “[Wyatt’s review] came out on my birthday and I felt as it were my nicest present of all,” Anthony wrote to Dummer.\(^{226}\) Wyatt overflowed with praise in a uniquely cadenced style that seems to emphasize her excitement. “The book is like some fine-grained granite rock of solid psychological and historical scholarship, all sun-flicked with glinting humor and warm-hearted common sense,” Wyatt gushed.

Here is a story of the adventure of a woman’s life-time which has been drawn from beneath a wreck long-lost on the shoals of convention, and brought back to us as a fascinating trophy of the sea-changes wrought by new wisdoms of psychology, a story splendidly salvaged by deft scholarship and responsible candor. *Nothing of it that doth fade*. The pathos, the brilliancy, the ludicrous aspects, the thrilling gifts to the world of a woman of genius all sparkle in the reality of the portrait: and when you close the book, you have the sense of having been in the presence of a great woman, of a spirit of beautiful and enriching truth.\(^{227}\)

Perhaps Wyatt meant her final line of praise to be the double entendre it appears to be. Was the reader delighted to have been in the presence of Margaret Fuller, or of Katharine Anthony? Marie Jenney Howe had a similar thought in mind in the opening
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sentence of her review for *The Woman Citizen*. “Katharine Anthony has proved what many have long suspected, that the biography of a woman should be written by a woman and that an exceptional woman should be interpreted by a woman who is herself the same kind of an exception.” Anthony gave “naturalness and life” to Fuller’s story, Howe said, “[f]or Katharine Anthony is not only a feminist, she is a psychologist. She understands the human spirit in its reaction to environment and in its relation to family, friends, religion, customs, public opinion and all the many factors that go to make up individuality.”

Ethel Sturges Dummer was delighted with Katharine Anthony’s biography, and was almost comically critical of even the most positive reviews of *Margaret Fuller*. Transitioning seamlessly from patron to publicist, Dummer requested that the publisher send copies to C. J. Jung, Sigmund Freud, Constance Long, Julia Lathrop, Havelock Ellis, Wilfrid Lay, Maude Royden, Mary McArthur Anderson, and Helene Stöcker. When Ellis replied, Anthony found his comments “quite interesting in that he expresses his general attitude toward psycho-analysis.” But Dummer was “surprised at his lack
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of appreciation, and his attitude toward psychoanalysis. Well, well! How little one can predict the reactions of another’s mind!” Dummer exclaimed. “Genius a disease!”

The literary critic, satirist, editor (and well-known misogynist) H. L. Mencken claimed that Katharine Anthony’s book “is an earnest that a new spirit has begun to dawn in American literary biography and criticism. Here, for the first time, is an attempt at a comprehensive and intelligent study of one of the strangest fish that every disported in our pond of letters.” Mencken’s review is full of irreverence, sarcasm, and bellicosity, which he directed mostly at Fuller. She was “[t]all, imperious, romantic, over-sexed ... but it was not until she was nearly forty that she managed to bag a concrete husband,” Mencken wrote in crude vernacular. Of course Fuller’s love affair with Ossoli attracted Mencken’s vicious pen—not even her tragic death could assuage his need for biting sarcasm. “Marrying Ossoli was an imbecility almost indistinguishable from that of marrying a chauffeur. He was a handsome fellow,” Mencken conceded, “but it is safe to guess that he bored [Margaret] dreadfully. ... [She] was wise to die at forty.”

As for the biographer, Mencken credited Katharine Anthony with “clear[ing] away the accumulated rubbish of speculation” surrounding Fuller. The book was “well planned and entertainingly written.” Mencken especially appreciated that, “[w]hen her
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story is done with she shuts down; there is none of the empty word-spinning so common in literary biography.” 236 Naturally, Dummer “gasp[ed] at Mencken’s mind and matter”; but she was happy that “he expressed appreciation of [Anthony’s] ability.” 237

Elia Peattie reviewed Margaret Fuller in the Chicago Daily Tribune and called Anthony’s style “adroit and penetrating,” but Dummer was displeased that, “[i]t [didn’t] show much knowledge of psychoanalysis. I shall await with interest the review of Floyd Dell and Van Wyck Brooks.” 238

Dell’s review, however, focused primarily on the “group of American revolutionists” of which Fuller was a part, rather than on Fuller or Katharine Anthony. 239 Ralph Waldo Emerson was a socialist/anarchist, Dell said; Horace Greeley was a “Fourierist Socialist”; and Fuller was just “another of this Bolshevik band.” Dell was “happy to commend [Anthony’s book] to all Bolsheviks, feminists, Freudians ... and those who are interested in discovering the true history of their country.” 240 Unsurprisingly, Dummer didn’t like it. “My impression was that although [Dell] paid tribute to your brilliant mind he took the book merely as point of departure for [promoting] a hobby of his own. It merely shows how personal the male celebrity usually is.” 241

Dummer was somewhat pleased with Van Wyck Brooks’s review; “but none of the reviewers seemed to sense what, to me as the mother of girls, is the underlying
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important value of your book—its implications concerning the education of girls.” To be sure, one of Katharine Anthony’s most important feminist arguments in Margaret Fuller—that educating women did not drive them mad, as nineteenth century theorists were wont to argue—was being ignored for her shocking Freudian analysis. In fact, none of the reviewers focused on this aspect of Anthony’s book. They were all too taken with the scandalous (or marvelous, depending on the reviewer) portrayal of a great woman’s sexuality and inner life to write about much else, which was, ironically, both a defining aspect of modern feminist biography, and the thing that may have precluded many readers from grasping or discussing Anthony’s broader feminist argument(s).

But Margaret Fuller was only the first of nine women who would come to life through Katharine Anthony’s feminist imagination. Perhaps foreshadowing what was to come, Anthony didn’t end her first biography with Fuller’s death; she ended it with Fuller’s life—her personality, her resilience, her intellectual precociousness—perhaps a subtle message to readers “that [Fuller] could have stood more,” as Anthony wrote to Dummer about Margaret Fuller’s end, and that they, too, could march on.243

In December of 1920, as the reviews of Margaret Fuller flooded in, the members of Heterodoxy presented the group’s founder, Marie Jenney Howe, with a commemorative book entitled “Heterodoxy to Marie.” Each member was allotted a page for her photograph and a personal message. By the luck of her last name, Katharine
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Anthony’s page appears first, with two pictures and a note. The top photo, taken in Fort Smith, depicts a serious, teenaged Anthony, her hair done up, standing in a white, ornate dress. The second photo is of a significantly older Anthony, probably taken around 1920, wearing dark clothing, sitting at her desk, and with her head bent over a book. Beneath the picture Anthony wrote: “To Marie—is affectionately dedicated this portrayal of the evolution of a butterfly into a chrysalis” (Figure 5.2). She had used a similar metaphor in Margaret Fuller to describe Fuller’s metamorphosis from a young, naïve, precocious teenager into a successful woman of letters. The latter manifestation would never “deserve to be called ‘a true woman’” Anthony wrote. “In order to produce that glorious Margaret of tomorrow to whom the Margaret of today was as the dull caterpillar is to the gorgeous butterfly, the girl toiled indefatigably.” Anthony’s note to Howe was clearly meant to be read tongue-in-cheek, perhaps joking about her increasing seriousness as she grew older. But it also speaks to Anthony’s mindset and purpose in 1920, and might be read a different way. The chrysalis represented not closure, but possibility, transformation, and hope. The future might be unclear, but it would no doubt turn into something beautiful.

---
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Chapter 6

“This campaign for salvaging womanhood”:¹

Conclusions, 1920-1929

“She loved women and knew them, and to the end of her life she served
with earnestness and sincerity the world-wide community of her sex.”²

—Katharine Anthony, Margaret Fuller, 1920

“She never took her hand from the plow to which as a young Revolutionist
she had put it. There was no such thing for her as tiring in a good cause.
She devoted her career in all its forms to the principles of liberty,
equality, and [sister]hood which she embraced early in life.”³

—Katharine Anthony, Mercy Otis Warren, 1958

* * *

In a way, the final chapter of this dissertation is, in fact, the very beginning.
Katharine Anthony found her vocation and feminist voice when she finally put on paper
the life of an individual woman, contributing in her own way to the furtherance of
feminism after suffrage, women’s history, and the genre of biography. But it was with
the first of these—feminism—that Anthony was most concerned in the afternoon and

¹ ESD to KA, March 21, 1922, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
² KA, MF, 61.
³ KA, MOW, 15.
twilight of her long, productive life. The quotes above span Anthony’s biographical career, from her first biography, *Margaret Fuller* (1920), to her last, *Mercy Otis Warren* (1958), and well capture her own consistent, enduring commitment to feminism in the decades originally considered to be the “doldrums” of the American women’s movement.

Whether or not these really were years of feminist decline has been challenged by important studies of working women, women of color, and several individual women, who fought for a variety of feminist and humanitarian platforms in the decades after suffrage. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that feminism came under harsh attack in the 1920s, from both inside and outside of the feminist ranks, and that the organized women’s movement splintered without the unifying vision that suffrage provided. 4

Feminism became a term with no meaning—or rather, with too many possible meanings—as women in the 1920s either fashioned it to suit their individualistic needs, or, viewing it as irrelevant, problematic, or both, discarded it completely. “All we can say is that the suffrage movement is ended,” Katharine Anthony’s close friend, Crystal Eastman, remarked in 1921. 5 Feminism’s future was hardly clear.

Katharine Anthony, who had been fighting against a ballot-centric movement since at least 1915, was frustrated, but probably not surprised, at the confusion that erupted after 1920. “The whole woman question has derived new interest and increased prestige from the success of woman suffrage,” she wrote in early 1921.

The sudden release of the franchise has acted like a magical ice-breaker which makes self-expression easily and riotously possible. Fresh protagonists of feminism rise up daily in unexpected quarters and new converts from both sexes are momentarily added. Enthusiasm abounds, but too rarely is it tempered by discipline. Here is a man who rationalizes

---

4 Cott, *Grounding of Modern Feminism*, 271.
his uxorious disposition and calls it feminism, and here is a woman who rationalizes her native self-indulgence and calls that feminism. To add to the general vagueness and confusion, we have Mr. W. L. George proclaiming himself before an international public as a Feminist with a capital F, while Charlotte Perkins Gilman responds but coldly to the title with or without the capital. The situation is certainly bewildering.6

Even authors writing specifically about feminism in the 1920s had difficulty coming up with an adequate definition (“feminism” didn’t appear in the Oxford English Dictionary until 1933). In a review of Avrom Barnett’s Foundations of Feminism (1921), Katharine Anthony verbally rolled her eyes at Barnett’s sapless construction of the “new woman” as, “first of all,” someone who “possess[es] an intellect.”7 “[S]he may or may not retain the so-called graces,” Barnett continued; “but she will be a better mate, a more efficient mother, and a true, living, breathing, inspired, and aspiring individual.” Anthony was appalled. “[W]e would like something a little less vague and characterless than this pictured ideal,” she wrote.

Even novels were vague and befuddling. Katharine Anthony reviewed Jane Burr’s 1921 novel, The Passionate Spectator, which “is currently supposed to be a novel about feminism,” Anthony reported, “though why I cannot guess, unless it is because the heroine announces near the end of the story: ‘in a luminous flash, I understood Bubbles [her sister] and feminism!’ Judging from the circumstances preceding this flash, her idea of feminism was a sort of compound of feminine Don Juanism and sheer hedonism.”8

The general atmosphere of the early 1920s didn’t help feminists reformulate their goals and redefine their movement. In his bid for the presidency, Warren Harding tapped

6 KA, “Feminism—Good, Bad, and Indifferent,” 406. Walter Lionel George (1882-1926) was an English writer.
7 Ibid., 407.
8 Ibid.
into the national mood with his campaign slogan assuring a “return to normalcy.”

Although ostensibly a response to the horrors of World War I, Harding’s May 14, 1920, speech in Boston, Massachusetts, almost exactly three months prior to the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, and four months before the publication of Margaret Fuller, can be read with no significant use of the imagination as an anti-feminist document.

What America needed, Harding declared, was “not heroics, but healing; not nostrums, but normalcy; not revolution, but restoration; not agitation, but adjustment; not surgery, but serenity; not the dramatic, but the dispassionate; not experiment, but equipoise; not submergence in internationality, but sustainment in triumphant nationality.”

The women of the 1910s who had defied cultural and political limitations in their quest to secure the vote, and for some others, like Katharine Anthony, who outwardly rejected the “tyranny of the norm” as a means to both political and psychic emancipation for women, were clearly a threat to Harding’s reassuring vision.

Also troubling was the propensity among the younger generations of New Women to equate sex equality with the achievement of masculine ideals, something Katharine Anthony had specifically warned against in Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia. “The program of feminism is not the mere imitation of masculine gestures and motions,” Anthony cautioned in 1915. “The program of feminism is the development of a new science of womanhood. It is true that an important part of the program is the reinstatement of woman as a human being, and the pattern of the human

---


10 KA, FGS, 241.
being as we know him has been cut to fit the masculine personality. ... But there is every need that women should not follow blindly in the path of their brothers.”\textsuperscript{11}

The old science had, in true biblical fashion, created “womanhood” from “manhood,” when white men’s anxiety over their masculinity in the wake of the Thirteenth Amendment and rapid industrialization fixed not only their own markers of white manhood—to be a “man” meant you were emotionally impermeable, virile, strong, independent—but defined white womanhood as well: to be a “woman” was to be economically dependent, passive, sentimental, frail, and, as Katharine Anthony noted was the “chief characteristic” of her sex, to be “wantless[].”\textsuperscript{12}

Katharine Anthony didn’t blame the younger New Women for choosing a masculine vocabulary with which to express their equality with men. In a world where women were deprived of a voice and a language, this was seemingly their only option. The problem was that things weren’t equal, and to talk as if they were, simply because women could vote and act like men, was a distraction from the significant work that remained to be done. According to Anthony, one of the biggest frontiers for feminists in the 1920s was love, as she pointed out in \textit{Margaret Fuller}. And in 1922 she gently warned “[t]he ambitious girl [who] is easily converted to the view that freedom means lovelessness because this supposedly represents the typical attitude of the brave, strong

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 251. Emphasis mine.
man. ... To-day the independent and self-sufficient woman is advancing by the thousands in the business and professional world,” Anthony wrote. “Elated over her work and jealous of her independence, she is preoccupied with the vindication of her claims for equality and opportunity. ... But to imagine that these activities have emancipated her from the simple emotional necessities of life is to make a mistake which may in the long run be costly.”

Ironically, as feminism lost its already tenuous coherence and meaning after 1920, the term also started to appear more frequently in discussions by social scientists about women’s psychology and sexuality. As the reality of women’s sexual desire became more acceptable—or at least more readily acknowledged—in mainstream culture, the new concern became the focus of that desire. Women who chose other women and not men to share their lives with were suddenly “lesbians,” and not simply the more benign “invert,” or self-sufficient woman, or a woman whose sexuality had selflessly surfaced in the form of public service. Through a series of complex cultural and scientific shifts, “lesbian” and “feminist” became nearly interchangeable in popular parlance and psychoanalytic literature over the course of the 1920s; and the “lesbian/feminist” became the new “deviant” female, replacing the woman who rejected motherhood as her natural role in society.

---

14 Buhle, Feminism and Its Discontents, 56-57.
This convoluted joining of feminism and deviancy, which in large part hinged on a supposed “deficient” heterosexual desire in certain women, led to a radical restructuring of gender norms in the 1920s. Three examples serve to illustrate this shift. In his essay for Freda Kirchwey’s 1924 symposium, “Our Changing Morality”—the same symposium that Kirchwey had asked Katharine Anthony to write for, but that Anthony had declined due to her busy schedule writing Catherine the Great—Floyd Dell explained the new gender norms with delusive simplicity. “[T]he intensity of friendships between people of the same sex ... we now regard as an artificial product, the result of the segregation of the sexes and the low social position of women,” Dell wrote. “As women become free and equal with men such romantic intensity of emotion finds a more biologically appropriate expression.” In “These Modern Women,” the series of essays published in The Nation in 1926-27, many of which were written by Katharine Anthony’s close friends, one of the psychologists who was asked to provide concluding remarks determined that, “[w]hen a woman is a militant suffragist the chances are, shall we say, a hundred to one that her sex life is not well adjusted.” Another doctor wrote less ambiguously about lesbianism and the feminist impulse at the end of the decade: “the driving force in many agitators and

17 Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality,” 145-146. The disintegration of organized feminism in the 1920s was due to a variety of factors—for instance, the proposed Equal Rights Amendment alienated working class women who wanted sex based protective labor legislation and thus removed a major radical element from the women’s movement; and younger generations of women disagreed with veteran suffragists over the future and definition of feminism—but we should not overlook the concerted attack on homosocial relationships that occurred in the 1920s as another means by which patriarchal society sought to undermine feminism and the future of women’s rights.


militant women who are always after their rights, is often an unsatisfied sex impulse, with a homosexual aim. Married women with a completely satisfied libido rarely take an active interest in militant movements.”

“Companionate marriage” became the new ideal, which slyly refashioned the independent New Woman into someone who was happily married and still sexually satisfied. The archetype of the emancipated woman in the 1920s symbolized this ideal perfectly: the “flapper” was sexually forward, and undoubtedly heterosexual. (Zelda Sayre, who married F. Scott Fitzgerald in New York City less than six months before Katharine Anthony published Margaret Fuller, became the ultimate real-life example of the “flapper” in the 1920s: wild, free, sexual, and married.) Even many veteran feminists were convinced by this new fabrication. At a Heterodoxy meeting in 1927, psychologist Leta Hollingworth defined the “perfect” feminist as a happily married mother, and no one challenged her on it (we don’t know for sure whether Anthony was present, but it’s unlikely that she was.)

---

20 Cott, *Grounding of Modern Feminism*, 159.
22 Cornelia Bryce Pinchot to Ruth Pickering Pinchot, January 10, 1927, box 105, Pinchot Papers, LC, quoted in Cott, *Grounding of Modern Feminism*, 158. It is worth noting here that Hollingworth was married without children.
“Companionate marriage” was a hard model for feminists to refute. Katharine Anthony and many others had criticized bourgeois marriage in the 1910s for its structural sexism and double standards; but Anthony had also, like others, promoted the New Morality tenet of mutual sexual satisfaction, one of Ellen Key’s most important points, which looked remarkably like this new ideal. What was there to abjure? As Nancy Cott writes, “the companionate marriage model left feminists (as well as any other women) little rationale for avoiding marriage; it removed the ground underneath the objection, made by prior generations, that marriage was a system of domination that imprisoned women’s individuality.”23

But Katharine Anthony knew that companionate marriage was not the panacea it was presented to be. Without mentioning the companionate ideal directly, she spent the early years of the 1920s exposing and criticizing the persistent double standards in sex relations, and the pernicious “delusional morality” of the majority.24 For instance, in her essay on the American family, published in 1922, it’s clear that the ideal of the companionate marriage was not nearly as pervasive as it appeared to be in the marriage manuals of the 1920s. More troubling than the so-called promiscuous youth, Katharine Anthony argued, were the married, middle-aged men and women who were still promoting “celibacy within marriage as a moral victory,” and a legitimate, even superior, form of birth control.25 This was the greater “immorality,” Anthony stated. “There are thirty million families in the United States; presumably there are at least sixty million

23 Cott, *Grounding of Modern Feminism*, 158.
25 KA, “The Family,” 321. See also KA to ESD, March 20, 1921, Box 26, Folder 435, ESD-SL.
adults who have experimented with the sexual relationship with the sanction of society. But experience has taught them nothing if one may judge by the patented and soulless concepts which still pass for sexual morality among people who are surely old enough to have learned about life from living it.”

In an essay titled “The Psychology of Delinquency,” also published in 1922, Katharine Anthony attacked the capricious attitude toward prostitutes that led to a shockingly disproportionate number of women incarcerated for sexual offenses as compared to men—another example of the deeply flawed moral code of the majority.

Still, in the sunset of suffrage and the dawn of the so-called companionate marriage, “law and order for men mean one thing and for women quite another,” Anthony pointed out.

In the name of mental health, Anthony sought to expose “the shock-absorbing qualities of the herd” that made it possible for people “to endure the most conflicting beliefs about sexual morality in general and the prostitute in particular.” The prostitute was viewed “as both a martyr and a demon, as necessary but criminal, as attractive yet repulsive, irresistible yet despicable,” Anthony wrote. “No wonder that hypocrisy flourished so plentifully under the Christian dispensation; a thorough hypocrite was merely a well-adjusted man.” The consequences of such brazen contradictions went far beyond venereal disease, Anthony continued, negatively impacting the innermost workings of the human psyche:

> men have suffered serious mental damage from the abysmal cleft in their moral philosophy. Even with all the aid that herd hypocrisy can give, the nervous system of the modern male cannot tolerate the burden of conflict inherent in the existing code. For instance, he is constrained to view all women as generically good or bad and thus laboriously to adapt his

26 KA, “Family,” 322.
instinctive life to a fictitious belief about humanity. His idea of women and his whole behavior toward the opposite sex are regulated by a gentle paranoia, which does not become acute because women have such a profound interest in acting as if the delusion were a fact.\textsuperscript{28}

This may have been Katharine Anthony’s way of addressing the new assault on women who loved other women in the 1920s: categorizing lesbians as “deviant” was just one more example of the good/bad dichotomy upheld by a deeply flawed moral code. Her challenge to the new gender norm was less hidden, however, in her review of \textit{Taboo and Genetics: A Study of the Biological, Sociological and Psychological Foundation of the Family} (1920), by M. M. Knight, Iva Peters, and Phyllis Blanchard. There was now “surgical evidence,” Anthony noted, “on the bisexuality of the normal human being which dramatically corroborates the theory of laboratory biology that a genetic basis for both sexes exists in each individual. Maleness and femaleness are a question of developmental emphasis, it would appear. ... From the earliest cell-beginnings, maleness and femaleness go together. This is why the stately priority of the female element in life, so widely celebrated in the good old days of Lester Ward, is no longer acceptable.”\textsuperscript{29}

For a brief moment, Katharine Anthony considered compiling and publishing books reviews like this one into a single volume as a way to fight the feminist backlash in the 1920s—an idea first suggested to her by Ethel Sturges Dummer. “Much superficial thinking on sex relations is appearing both in fiction and in pseudo-scientific books,” Dummer wrote to Harcourt, Brace, & Howe in July 1921, and she suggested they publish “in book form certain of [Anthony’s] reviews” to help clarify things a bit.\textsuperscript{30} But Anthony

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29} KA, “Feminism—Good, Bad, and Indifferent,” 406-407.
\textsuperscript{30} ESD to HBH, July 1, 1921, Box 26, Folder 435, ESD-SL.
knew it would be difficult to get something like that published; and individual book reviews could only do so much to further the cause of feminism.\textsuperscript{31}

In the early years of the 1920s, Katharine Anthony found herself once again writing pamphlets and reports for organizations like the Y.W.C.A. and the Public Education Association (P.E.A.). But when she had finished a manuscript for the latter in December 1922 and immediately found “another job headed toward me which will engross all my energies again for another whole year,” Anthony balked.\textsuperscript{32} This kind of work was exhausting; when she was in the midst of it, her life barely consisted of more than “the day’s work and the night’s sleep.”\textsuperscript{33} There was no time left for her own writing.

Dummer also thought that Anthony’s talent was wasted on such enterprises, even if the organizations she worked for were producing important literature. “It seems like putting a race horse into one of those old treadmills for sawing wood,” Dummer said about Anthony’s employment with the Y.W.C.A. and the P.E.A..\textsuperscript{34} On December 16, 1922, when Anthony revealed to Dummer that she “want[ed] to do ... another biography, and no less a figure than Catherine the Great,” Dummer was thrilled.\textsuperscript{35} Anthony was “all ardor to begin”; and Dummer viewed it as a “privilege” to be able to “set free some of [Anthony’s] time to help in this campaign for salvaging womanhood.”\textsuperscript{36} Together they would push back against the cultural forces that sought to confine womanhood to

\textsuperscript{31} KA to ESD, May 13, 1921, Box 26, Folder 432, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{32} KA to ESD, December 16, 1922, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{33} KA to ESD, March 20, 1921, Box 26, Folder 435, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{34} ESD to KA, June 12, 1922, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{35} KA to ESD, December 16, 1922, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.; ESD to KA, March 21, 1922, Box 26, Folder 436, ESD-SL.
dishonest terms, invidious labels, and pejorative clichés. By writing one woman’s life at a time, Anthony could forge an entirely new definition, one that confronted taboos and celebrated differences, and in the process, divulged a real, living, breathing woman whose example might provide the missing story that women of Anthony’s generation sought, and women who came of age after suffrage might find.

Katharine Anthony published eight biographies after Margaret Fuller, all of which in some way challenged the status quo. Four of her nine subjects never married (Queen Elizabeth, Louisa May Alcott, Mary Lamb, and Susan B. Anthony), two had unconventional marriages and/or scandalous reputations (Margaret Fuller and Catherine the Great), and the remaining three somehow bucked the system from within their seemingly “normal” unions (Marie Antoinette, Dolly Madison, and Mercy Otis Warren).

_Catherine the Great_, Anthony’s second biography, was published by Alfred A. Knopf in 1925 to almost completely positive reviews. Of course, it was Catherine the Great’s sexuality that most interested readers and reviewers, and Anthony’s portrayal was indeed shocking, although not for the reasons that one might think. In a decade where sexual satisfaction reigned supreme, and women’s sexual desire had become a legitimate topic of discussion, Anthony proudly decreased the number of lovers the Empress was rumored to have, as if to prove that women aren’t legends so much as they are people. In fact, Catherine’s strong point was diplomacy, Anthony claimed, at which “she never knew failure”; but to the end of her life, “[t]he woman who had had twelve lovers never learned to love.”

---
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Perhaps remembering Jane Burr’s flawed portrayal of feminism in *The Passionate Spectator*, Anthony wrote: “[t]hat posterity should think of [Catherine] as a feminine Don Juan would be exactly to her taste. ... She was willing to go down to posterity as a light woman but she hoped also to be remembered as the monarch who had driven the Turks out of Europe. The number of her lovers was after all only thirteen if we count her husband. ... The Empress did not indulge in secret *rendezvous* or episodic affairs. ... Most of the romancing and denouncing came afterwards when Catherine and her twelve lovers had gone the way of all flesh.”\(^{38}\) Perhaps disappointing to eager readers hoping for a steamy tale, Anthony concluded that, in fact, “[Catherine] had a degree of faithfulness with which she has never been credited.”\(^{39}\)

With just two biographies published, Olivia Howard Dunbar published her article on Katharine Anthony in *Equal Rights*, “Katharine Anthony—Creative Feminist,” in which she credited Anthony with almost singlehandedly affecting the modern “feminine imagination.”\(^{40}\) Perhaps more than ever before, the definition of womanhood was uncertain in the 1920s, and women themselves had a chance to define it. Anthony’s interpretation of individual women who in some way challenged society’s gender norms gave to women a new and enlarged “understanding of women’s capacity,” Dunbar claimed.

Similarly, after reading Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own*, published in 1929, Ethel Sturges Dummer wrote to Anthony about Woolf’s hypothesis—that a book about “men’s opposition to women’s emancipation” might be “more interesting ... than

\(^{38}\) Ibid., 231.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., 237.
the story of that emancipation itself.”

Perhaps Anthony should write something like that. But then Dummer thought better of it: “probably better results will be obtained if you stick to your method of interpreting one type after another gradually showing the sum total of women’s abilities.”

Perhaps this is what Morris meant in 1929 when he referred to Katharine Anthony as the Mother of Modern Biography. No one could quite pinpoint what made Anthony’s biographies unique, and there was no “modern feminist biography” to speak of. Both Dunbar and Dummer knew that, for at least some of the women who read Anthony’s books, Anthony’s feminist purpose—to dismantle the false dichotomies that inhibited women from becoming who they truly were, to provide examples of women who created their own destinies, to write stories of real women, in their full humanity and sexuality—was a success. Because of work like Anthony’s, Dunbar claimed, women could finally, see that they didn’t have to choose between being nonentities or monsters;—docile, home-keeping tradition-bound ‘gentlewomen’ or creatures of barrier smashing vitality whom the rest of the world would immediately dismiss from consideration as non-women. That you can demolish barriers and proceed to create your own characteristic contribution to the face of the world, however much room it may occupy, or however much noise you may make, and still remain a normal woman,—that is the new conception. ... [And that] is the valuable service to literature and to Feminism that Katharine Anthony is accomplishing.

With so much at stake, the modern woman couldn’t “afford” to remain ignorant about women like Margaret Fuller. “It’s not knowing about such women ... that is
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partly the matter with all women,” Dunbar claimed, “not understanding the springs that moved her and that also function, with however diminished energy, in every other woman. ... Nothing, of course, so helps women to be themselves, even, by some happy chance, to be more than themselves, as to acquire an imaginative understanding of the lives of women, apparently other than they, who may, after all, be akin.”45

In some way, all of Katharine Anthony’s feminist biographies accomplished this important task of introducing women to themselves. Her biography of Queen Elizabeth challenged biological constructions—Elizabeth had both “masculine” and “feminine” characteristics—as well as the assumption that women who didn’t marry lacked a sex drive, or were somehow less than the women who became brides and had children.46 “It was in [Elizabeth’s] character as Queen, as administrator, that [she] realized her great creativeness,” Anthony wrote. “In this field she demonstrated abundant fertility. ... Her reign was a marriage, and the nation was her child.”47 Above all, Anthony prioritized Elizabeth the human as opposed to Elizabeth the queen. “[Elizabeth’s] character has been praised and blamed, exalted and abused, glorified and vilified, but it has never been explained,” Anthony wrote. “No one has been more dogmatically described than this elusive, complex woman. The broadest and most unqualified statements have been made about her. ... The story of her heroic, unwomanlike ambition has never been related.”48

Dolly Madison “was as much of an individual as the great men of her age,” Anthony asserted in her seventh biography. “Much as she loved and served James

46 KA, QE, 256.
47 Ibid., 257, 258.
48 Ibid., 250, 252.
Madison, she was never overshadowed by him. ... Her chief attribute of character was the fact that she always remained herself." And in her life of Marie Antoinette, published in 1933, Anthony “destroy[ed] completely the legend of [her] as the immaculate wife and mother. ... She was not the virtuous though stupid woman she has been made out to be.”

Even the title of one of Anthony’s chapters challenged the prejudice against childless women, and the assumption that every woman desired motherhood and adored her children more than life itself: the seventh chapter of Marie Antoinette is called “Forced Motherhood.”

Similar examples could be drawn from all of Katharine Anthony’s biographies. But in one final passage, it’s clear why her oeuvre remains relevant in the twenty-first century. In her penultimate biography, Susan B. Anthony, published in 1954, Anthony stepped away from her subject to comment on the current state of women in America. “Could Susan B. Anthony return to the scene of her activities, she would probably be disappointed with the fruits of the victory she gave her life to win,” Anthony wrote.

The relatively small part played by women in practical politics, the many invidious state laws that stand on the books, the small proportion of women in the highest centers of learning—such survivals would probably affront her as much as they ever did. More than all else would she deplore the continuing low level of women’s incomes. That the millions of women holding jobs in the U.S.A. still earn less than half of the men’s wages would be shocking intelligence for Susan.

While women in America have no doubt experienced significant political and social gains since the 1950s, every one of the items on Anthony’s list remains unfulfilled.

The assault against women is as strong as it ever was. The feminist fight is far from over; and feminist biography as a tool for women’s advancement is far from irrelevant.

Katharine Anthony probably would not have been surprised by her legacy of obscurity. It would have emboldened her to write more.
Figure 1.1, Elisabeth Irwin, Courtesy, Whedon Barn
1. All Gaul is divided into three parts. Writing biography, however, is divided into only two parts, and therefore you may be something less than Caesar and still attempt to conquer the field of biography. This is the discouraging side of the enterprise. The discouraging side is that the two parts of writing a biography are so widely separated. They are not continuous, as were the parts of Gaul. You cannot progress by using the same methods from the first to the second theatre of action. What brought you success in the first part will not bring you success in the second. You can make the grade only by a soul-shaking, revolutionary transition. To reach the second part from the first you must take a big, vaulting hurdle.

2. The two parts thus so fundamentally separated from each other are apparently a simple division into research and writing. But you have to be two personalities to grapple with the two stages. For research, you must be analytical, skeptical, acquisitive, photographic, conscientious. For writing you must be creative, suggestive, constructive, and not over-conscientious. Fortunately you do not have to represent the two incarnations at one and the same time. That couldn’t be done, for then you would become a schizo, and the little men in white coats would have to come and carry you off. A transition must be made, and it involves a painful readjustment of all your mental muscles and mental attitudes. But in return for your pain and effort you have the reward of variety and adventure in the course of the intellectual process.

3. Let’s look first at the business of research. You will probably have some background on the subject or you would not have chosen it. Perhaps you also have a fresh angle of approach; or there is some recently unearthed material that throws a new light on the subject. Whatever you start with must be supplemented by the intensive reading of many books, newspapers, documents, memoirs, letters, anything from the World “Jinxx” to the most esoteric doctor’s thesis. Everything, in short, that bears directly or indirectly on the subject. I submit that this process is just plain drudgery, and concentrated plugging. You must first empty your mind as if you were going to sleep. But keen wide-wakefulness and alertness is required of you at the same time. It requires strong self-discipline to keep this up; and the fact is that the research process takes quite a lot of time. The long time and the expense which results causes many writers to shy away from this kind of writing. But those who surmount the difficulty by hook or crook, must be prepared for an ordeal and endurance test of no small proportions.

4. Research is a long, lonely journey. There is no one who is really going to help you. You must go from library to library; you must go from the Library of Congress to Harvard, from the Newberry in Chicago to the Morgan Collection in New York. You fill countless note-books and the books you read mount into towering stacks. You get books by mail and you get them by borrowing them; and when they don’t come to you, you go to them, as Mahomet did to the mountain. You wear out your shoe-leather and use up your looks-fare; and still your concentrated exposure to printed or manuscript knowledge goes on.
5. I said it was a lonely journey, with no one to help you. I have seen many graceful acknowledgments in published biographies, addressed to librarians and others who have helped the authors. Once in a while, it is true, letters and diaries that have never before been published are discovered to be in the hands of surviving families who are generous enough to lend them for your use. But these are personal windfalls and can not be counted upon. Most of the time you are alone with your soul in the library, and your only friend is the library catalogue. But, mark my words, that library catalogue is also your best friend. The librarians have put their best into it; and if you learn how to use it well you have their best at your fingers' ends. Sometimes, by just playing around with the catalogue in solitude you will turn up the most valuable clues and the most original

6. To make your research all the more lonely, you must blank out your own imagination at this stage of the game. That chiefof the writer's solitude must be held strictly in leash. You must exercise a Spartan discipline in this preliminary period of your work. You must take accurate notes of the material just as it is written even if you know that it isn't true. This dedicated grind would be no great strain on the student of science; but it is a strain on the writer, who is something of a playboy or he wouldn't be a writer at all. To shake his will to play; to sacrifice his imagination and his youth to knowing the facts; to make the world his oyster and not have it eat him; to go through with even the most prosaic and unromantic part of the business; that is the price the writer must pay for responsible biography writing. If he is going to write a book in this field, it is purification write which he must willingly go through with. He will reap his reward in the end.

7. Eventually--though it always seems as if the day would never come--the time arrives for the creative process. The writer has assembled and organized his material and now at last he can write. The thing is ready to fall.

8. Now he can unleash his imagination. Now he can fashion a human character that is truly his own. It is none the less truly his own for being constructed from historical material that he has gleaned from others. He has done his research in an unprejudiced and unbiased spirit, and now he has a scaffolding that is firm and secure. It was for this that he has been reading and building, choosing and testing as he went along, so that now he has a sure foothold and groundwork for the imaginative superstructure that he is about to raise. He can go ahead with the creation of his character and period which will do no violence to the well-established facts.

His course from now on is not essentially different from that of the novelist, who, having first created his characters, allows the story to develop from their given traits and qualities. The writer of actual life-history is guided in much the same manner. His hero or heroine must act according to his or her nature, because that is the way people act--period! His subject, no matter how external to the common run, is bound by the same human limitations as ordinary people are. The events are rigid facts in a biographical story, and the writer can not shape them to his desire; but neither can the novelist, entirely; his fiction people must act in character. The imaginative trick that the biographer must master is the realization of the connection between character and action. To do this of course is not to phantasy a plot; but it is nevertheless a task for the imagination, and nothing else can do it. He must sense and realize the truth in regard to his character, and do it in such a way that the reader will

Figure 1.2, KA's 13 Rules for Writing Biography, Courtesy, Whedon Barn
sense and realize it with him. What I am trying to say is that the biographer is more concerned with realization than with invention, but imagination is the instrument with which he must do this.

11. Here is the place for whatever wisdom he has learned from the passage of ages over his head. Here is the place for whatever insight into life that his experience and the lessons of experience have borne him with. Here is the place for whatever understanding of human nature he may have accumulated through his own personal life, his life with his friends, his loved ones, and with strangers. Out of this background he must seize and express the meaning and significance of the life of another person, so as to bring it home to his readers.

12. When all of the characterization has been taken care of, the biographer must grapple with history. A lot of history will always be required. Just as Chekov revealed his characters in the time in which they lived, the biographer must reveal his character in the period of history in which he or she acted out his or her part. The who’s or hero’s reaction to, and action upon, the time in which he or she lived is the peculiar material of biographical writing. The character must be drawn in historical perspective; and the personal and historical sides of the picture must be integrated. It can be nothing so wooden as a few pages of history and then a few pages of characterization — a few pages of history and then a few pages of characterization — and so on. You cannot write about Roosevelt without putting in World War II; you cannot write about Lincoln without putting in the Civil War. These are extreme instances of great personages and stupendous events. But every biography presents the same problem on a greater or lesser scale. You have to digest a mess of history, and I mean digest as the physiologist uses it, and not as the literary Digest practices it. The biographer is not writing history for its own sake or presenting a panoramic view of it for easy reading. The main end and purpose of biography is characterization, and whatever else, including history, that does not contribute to this purpose throws the whole work out of focus.

As to the style in which a biography should be written, that can only come from the inner soul of the writer. There is not much that anyone can tell you about this. That is your own inward battle. You have to face it and come to terms with it every day; not once for all, but over and over, and for as long as you keep on writing. An apt place of advice, given by Paul Gallico in The Writer’s Book, can be recommended for all types of writing, though he is speaking at the moment of fiction. He says: "The mind of the writer is not his friend or his servant. It makes a sucker of him a dozen times a day. It is his worst enemy and therefore not to be trusted for a moment." As you gain experience in writing, you will come to know more and more what he means by that. Your conscious mind will not only provide you with the best excuses for leaving work and going to the ball-game or matinees. It will also mislead you into short cuts in reasoning, duplicities of style, padded phraseology and standard cliches. "Never of a man, as Paul Gallico says, is your worst enemy."
For my own style, I have reached a partial solution, one that partly alleviates the ever-recurrent conflict. To make it less acute, I have arrived at one general rule for my own guidance. Though I admire the style of Elizabeth Bowen, a Virgins' golf, or a T.S. Eliot, their styles are not possible for one born with my genes. The only thing that I can aspire to--- and I use the word "aspire" advisedly--- is to make a clear statement. First off, to find out the exact meaning of what I want to say, and then to say it as clearly and simply as possible. To some this may not seem like a great aspiration; but to me it seems so. To handle language so that it becomes as clear as freshly washed window panels; to make it a medium through which the writer's thoughts and feelings come through a clean window glass, that seems to me an aim that is well worth striving for and worth a lifetime of effort to achieve it. If it seems too easy to you, I recommend that you try it.
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Figure 5.1, Portrait of Margaret Fuller by Thomas Hicks, 1848, as it appeared in KA’s Margaret Fuller: A Psychological Biography (1920)
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