

Jill Lepore, “The Woman Card: How feminism and antifeminism created Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump,” *The New Yorker*, June 27, 2016.

### **A Note about Sources**

*N.B. For readers who'd like to read more, or who are undertaking their own research, here is a select bibliography of my sources for this piece. As with all the bibliographies for New Yorker essays that I post on my Harvard faculty website, this brief discussion mentions a good number of works consulted but it's neither an exhaustive inventory of my sources nor a survey of the scholarship in a given field. Instead, I've listed works I found most useful or especially provocative. I have generally only included manuscripts, journal and magazine articles, and books; I haven't listed interviews here at all; I've not included things like newspapers, advertisements, patents, legislation, and policy statements; and I've generally left out citations from specialized bodies of literature in fields like medicine and law. A last caveat: these brief bibliographies are all frozen in time: I do not update them, and they therefore don't include anything written on these subjects after the date on which my essay was published.*

The majority of voters in the United States are women, as are the majority of party workers. The majority of elected officials, political scientists, political historians, political reporters, and political commentators are men. This difference produces a certain what-do-women-want puzzlement in American politics and its coverage, too. In daily reporting and, even more, in stories about “this historic election,” hardly anyone pays attention to the ways in which women’s entrance into public life led to fundamental changes in American political culture. This is not without consequences for American politics, and for representative government. As the historian Melanie Gustafson has observed, “This lack of history has meant that the public continually observes the political woman as an awkward, illegitimate, or misbegotten phenomenon. A lack of history has been especially damaging for women seeking political influence, because it has meant that at the same time women have been forced to answer questions about the legitimacy of their presence, they have also had to reinvent the traditions and records on which they should have been able to build.”

The problem isn't that the history of women in politics hasn't been written; the problem is that the most of the people who write about politics haven't read it. Here are some of the most influential and signal works in the field. On republican motherhood, see Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980). On the emergence of separate spheres, see Nancy F. Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: 'Woman's Sphere' in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977). On women in antebellum reform and party politics, see Mary P. Ryan, *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992). On the origins and early history of the suffrage movement, see Ellen Carol DuBois, *Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in*

*America, 1848-1869* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978, 1999). On women and the early Republican Party, see Melanie Susan Gustafson, *Women and the Republican Party, 1854-1924* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001). On the turn from suffrage to feminism, including the emergence of the National Woman's Party, see Nancy F. Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987). And on the turn to conservatism, see Catherine E. Rymph, *Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Much scholarship concerns social and political movements: many are the histories of the campaigns for temperance, abolition, peace, prohibition, suffrage, civil and equal rights, and conservatism. Another mountain of literature takes a biographical approach. Biographies of individual women from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries abound and some, for instance, Susan Ware, *Partner and I: Molly Dewson, Feminism, and New Deal Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), offer remarkable insight into the role of women in party politics. Still other vitally important biographical treatments are documentary. See, notably, Shola Lynch, dir., *Chisholm '72: Unbought and Unbossed* (Beverly Hills, CA: Twentieth Century Fox, 2004).

American political science is noteworthy for its longstanding lack of interest in women as political actors. One of the earliest stock-takings is Martin Gruberg, *Women in American Politics: An Assessment and Sourcebook* (Oshkosh, WI: Academia Press, 1968). Gruberg began by pointing out that the classics in his field, like V.O. Key's *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups*, pay virtually no attention to women. In the hands of political scientists, Gruberg writes, "by and large, women have been fated to dwell in relative obscurity, accused of a lack of political interest or drive, and rebuffed into almost complete ineffectiveness." A half-century on, Gruberg's indictment of his field is still somewhat apt. Yet the founding of the Center for Women in American Politics at Rutgers in 1971 ushered in a new era, and a spate of research, including two fascinating if discouraging early studies by Jeane Kirkpatrick. In *Political Woman* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974), Kirkpatrick concluded, "Even today, the most important and interesting question about women's political role is why that role is so insignificant. The most important and interesting question about women's political behavior is why so few seek and wield power. Women are numerous enough at the lowest level of politics—in the precincts, at the party picnics, getting out the vote, doing the telephoning, collecting the dollars—but remarkably scarce at the upper levels where decisions are made that affect the life of the community, state, nation." In *The New Presidential Elite: Men and Women in National Politics* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation and the Twentieth Century Fund, 1976) Kirkpatrick and co-author Warren E. Miller reported the results of a study of the 1972 nominating conventions, from which Kirkpatrick concluded, unhappily, "One of the most interesting political phenomena of recent history has been the emergence of women as a symbol in whose name political grievances are stated and demands are made."

Most remarks about women in party politics in political science scholarship have been incidental, occasioned by the appeals made to women by particular campaign, like that made by the Eisenhower campaign in 1956, or by the parties' platform planks regarding

matters like equal rights and equal. After 1980, the emergence of a so-called and much-disputed gender gap, commanded a great deal of attention both in the popular press and in scholarly journals, an ambit of work that includes everything from, for example, Bella Abzug, *Gender Gap: Bella Abzug's Guide to Political Power for American Women* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984) to Jane J. Mansbridge, "Myth and Reality: The ERA and the Gender Gap in the 1980 Election," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 49 (1985): 164-178.

Political science scholarship that considers women in party politics as a subject in its own right is scarcer. The most ambitious and trenchant work is that of Jo Freeman. See, in particular, *A Room at a Time: How Women Entered Party Politics* (Lanham, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), and *We Will be Heard: Women's Struggles for Political Power in the United States* (Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, 2008). (Freeman's [website](#) also contains a trove of historical material.) Freeman's studies are richly historical, and stand alongside a considerable body of historical scholarship that, in the last twenty years, has also approached the question of women in party politics squarely. The range of this work is well illustrated by two important anthologies: Louise A. Tilly and Patricia Gurin, eds., *Women, Politics, and Change* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1990) and Melanie Gustafson, Kristie Miller, and Elisabeth I. Perry, eds., *We Have Come to Stay: American Women and Political Parties 1880-1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999). Since the Reagan era, in particular, the emergence of the conservative movement has drawn the attention of many political historians, and the best accounts tackle the important role played by women in that movement. See, for instance, Lisa McGirr's fantastic book, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001). And, for an exhaustive, shrewd, and powerfully illuminating investigation, covering more than a century of history, see Rymph, *Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right*, cited above.

On the more particular matter of the aspirations of women to the Oval Office, see Ellen Fitzpatrick, *The Highest Glass Ceiling: Women's Quest for the American Presidency* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016). Since I've written about this question before—in 2014, I wrote a short [essay](#) on the matter of the first female president--I here simply include the bibliography I posted then: "Much of the best scholarship on women and elected office is sponsored by the [Center for American Women in Politics](#), at Rutgers, whose website is invaluable. For the role of the CAWP in the record-breaking election of 2012, see its account of the [2012 Project](#). A landmark inquiry into the question of why more women don't run for office is Susan Welch, "Women as Political Animals? A Test of Some Explanations for Male-Female Political Participation Differences," *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (1977): 711-730. Welch uses SRC data from 1952, 1964 and 1972. The best recent literature includes Susan J. Carroll and Kira Sanbonmatsu, *More Women Can Run: Gender and Pathways to the State Legislatures* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox, *Men Rule: The Continued Under-Representation of Women in U.S. Politics* (Washington, DC: Women and Politics Institute, 2012); Barbara Palmer and Dennis Simon, *Women and Congressional Elections: A Century of Change* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2012); and Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox, *It Takes a*

*Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Another body of scholarship has looked at the question of women and the presidency. See, e.g., Justin S. Vaughn and Lilly J. Goren, eds., *Women and the White House: Gender, Popular Culture, and Presidential Politics* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2013); Lori Cox Han and Caroline Heldman, eds., *Rethinking Madam President: Are We Ready for a Woman in the White House* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007); and Robert P. Watson and Ann Gordon, eds., *Anticipating Madam President* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2003). And, on the question of voter reaction to women candidates, as surveyed by pollsters since 1937, see, e.g., Matthew J. Streb et al, "Social Desirability Effects and Support for a Female American President," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72 (2008): 76-89; Kathleen A. Dolan, *Voting for Women: How the Public Evaluates Women Candidates* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004). And for general introductions to gender and American politics, see Susan J. Carroll et al, *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Christina Wolbrecht et al, eds., *Political Women and American Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), and for an influential account of women and political participation, see Nancy Burns et al, *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001)."

--Jill Lepore  
June 20, 2016