



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Feminist Opposition to Abortion: Reframing Histories to Limit Reproductive Rights

Parry, M.S.

Published in:

Gender and activism: women's voices in political debate

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Parry, M. (2015). Feminist Opposition to Abortion: Reframing Histories to Limit Reproductive Rights. In M. Aerts (Ed.), *Gender and activism: women's voices in political debate* (pp. 107-118). (Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis; No. 35). Amsterdam: Verloren.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Feminist Opposition to Abortion

Reframing Histories to Limit Reproductive Rights

MANON PARRY

The battle over reproductive rights in the United States is increasingly fought in public spaces outside of the conventional realms of political activism, as part of the broader culture wars that have put issues of race, religion, gender, and sexuality at the centre of political debates about ‘American values’.¹ Although the birth control movement has received far less scholarly attention than other contested topics of the ‘history wars,’ competing historical narratives feature heavily in public discussion about reproductive issues. Indeed, such cultural work plays a significant role in the wider effort to restrict access to abortion.² Opponents of abortion claim a new lineage for modern feminism based on revised versions of the history of the women’s movement. In this study I focus on controversial representations of Susan B. Anthony and Margaret Sanger, as part of this reframing of women’s history to limit women’s reproductive rights.

Reproductive issues receive scant attention in the country’s established venues for women’s history.³ Outside major museums and National Historic Landmarks, newly empowered ‘amateur’ historians are filling the void by presenting their alternative narratives, based on the traditional tools of research including photographs and archival documents. Such activities constitute the frontline in the on-going ‘democratization’ of history promoted by public historians, evident in the trend towards participatory museum exhibitions and ‘community curated’ projects, and greatly facilitated by digital tools.⁴

Historians working on contested topics, such as the Civil War, have paid particular attention to the misrepresentations of the past that have proliferated as a result of the broadening range of published histories available.⁵ While some scholars continue to engage with those who produce misleading interpretations, others note the impossibility of challenging every example, given the massive amount of ‘amateur’ historians self-publishing online and in print. Overall, most tend to assume that these histories are consciously or cynically devised. As religious historian Deborah Whitehead wrote

regarding the case of Susan B. Anthony, 'in conservative attempts to 'reclaim' history, what we see is an effort to take literal or rhetorical possession of broadly culturally authoritative sources from the past and put them to oppositional uses in the present'.⁶

What is less often considered, however, is how these uses of history reflect and reinforce authentic identities. The women generating the alternative histories I discuss here describe themselves as 'conservative feminists,' a claim often derided in the media.⁷ Scholars have also been sceptical, at first dismissing conservative women as submissive or exploited, although later scholarship demonstrated how women participate strategically in patriarchal organizations for their own goals.⁸ More recently, studies suggest that conservative women may embrace political identities that include anti-feminist agendas neither in compliance with oppression nor self-interest, but in a more complex negotiation of religious and political beliefs.⁹

While I acknowledge that public histories are sometimes cynically reconfigured for their political usefulness, I suggest here that it is worth considering how these women look to a shared past to find some common cause with the broader feminist movement. Building on existing scholarship on movements and countermovements in the history of reproductive rights, I argue that conservative women have mobilized alternative feminist histories within a longer trajectory of attempting to create a conservative space *within* feminism.¹⁰ Conservative feminism as represented in the contested public histories discussed here, is not just a recent and calculated appropriation, but instead rooted in the redefinition of reproductive politics following *Roe vs. Wade* (1973). This study thus demonstrates the operation of, and overlap between, movement and countermovement activities in an arena rarely examined in existing studies of the interaction between feminist and anti-feminist groups: public histories of abortion and contraception. The analysis demonstrates how the democratized landscape of public history has facilitated misrepresentations of the history of the birth control movement in the absence of mainstream public history projects on the topic.

Case Study 1: Susan B. Anthony

In the 1960s and 1970s, before the boundaries in reproductive politics were as sharply delineated as they are today, many conservative women identified as both feminist and anti-abortion when they first began to embrace the women's movement. Patricia Goltz and Cathy Callaghan, both members of the National Organization of Women (NOW), formed Feminists for Life in 1972 as a more conservative alternative. Although at first they maintained their NOW membership, as abortion access became more central to mainstream feminist politics it became increasingly difficult to bridge the growing divide between the two organizations.¹¹ In response, Feminists for Life 'attempted to navigate the rising feminist boundary by framing their pro-life position in feminist terms'.¹² However, the legalization of abortion in 1973 in *Roe vs. Wade* had a dramatic impact on the anti-abortion movement. Previously dominated by (mostly Catholic) men, it quickly became a refuge for married women with children, predominantly

without college degrees or jobs, who interpreted feminism as a threat to their social status as mothers.¹³ The schism between feminists and the anti-abortion movement thus intensified, and in 1974 Goltz was expelled from NOW for her position on abortion. She later noted that despite her original vision for Feminists for Life (FFL), 'the women joining FFL were largely unwilling to also join feminist groups', and 'feminist groups were becoming less and less willing to partner with a pro-life group.'¹⁴ Although she initially resisted alignment with the religious 'pro-life' movement, the popularity of Feminists for Life there, in contrast to their unpopularity among feminist organizations, gradually confirmed their place within the Christian conservative anti-abortion movement.¹⁵

In 1993, Rachel MacNair, while serving as president of Feminists for Life, founded the Susan B. Anthony List, a political action committee (PAC) committed to fundraising and lobbying for anti-abortion election candidates. She established the organization in response to the success of EMILY's List, a PAC credited with bringing pro-choice women to Congress in the 1992 election.¹⁶ The identification with Susan B. Anthony, a suffrage campaigner from feminism's first wave, clearly links the organization's electoral goals with the earlier movement to grant women the right to vote. Representatives of the Susan B. Anthony List also tried to link their namesake to their cause by deploying historical sources to claim abortion contravened the feminist principles of suffrage campaigners. List president Marjorie Dannenfelser has stated that the organization is 'named for the suffragette herself who was very pro-life', and the organization's website frames its work within 'the spirit and tradition of the original suffragettes'.¹⁷ MacNair also co-edited *ProLife Feminism: Yesterday and Today*, now in its second, expanded edition, which presents this claim alongside an article purportedly written by Anthony deploring 'the horrible crime of child-murder'.¹⁸

At first, this appropriation of Anthony was little noticed or questioned by historians and feminist scholars. In 2007 for example, a review of *ProLife Feminism*, in the *Journal of International Women's Studies*, mentioned Anthony in a list of 'particularly notable people' featured in the collection and cited 'overwhelming opposition to abortion by early feminists, many of whom are currently touted as the foremothers of today's prochoice feminism. Many people, including some feminists, are undoubtedly unaware of the revisionist history employed in such practices'.¹⁹ The review's author, Kimberly Kelly, described herself as a prochoice feminist twice in the review and ended by cautioning 'other prochoice feminists' against dismissing the collection or prolife feminism 'out of fear of undermining their own support of legal abortion'.²⁰ By 2010, students routinely assumed that Anthony was anti-abortion, with few of their professors having mobilized to address the issue. As Ann Gordon, editor of the *Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* told the press that year, 'a lot of scholars did not have a clue this was happening'.²¹

Academics and journalists eventually took up the topic as the claims made their way beyond the book and into more public venues. In 2009, Carol Crossed, a member of Feminists Choosing Life of New York (Formerly Feminists for Life of NY, a chapter of Feminists for Life) bought Anthony's birthplace in Adams, Massachusetts, with plans to

turn the site into a museum to rival the existing National Susan B. Anthony Museum and House, a National Historic Landmark since 1965.²² The purchase and transformation of the site into the Susan B. Anthony Birthplace Museum (hereafter the Birthplace Museum) cost \$800,000.00.²³ In response to questions about whether the new museum would become a platform for anti-abortion arguments, Crossed responded, 'the pro-life views expressed in Anthony's newspaper, *The Revolution*, will not be excluded from the exhibition ... it will not be an overwhelming theme of the birthplace. Anthony's own anti-abortion stance is mentioned in just one of the museum's 10 exhibits'.²⁴ Yet the focus on birth embedded in the concept of a 'birthplace' museum is exploited for maximum impact, appearing in the name, the museum logo, which depicts a baby in a cradle, and in the framing of the rooms of the house, with the room where Anthony was born described on the website as 'one of the most poignant of the museum exhibits'.²⁵

Moreover, the concluding section of the house tour, effectively the last word on the subject of Anthony's politics, focuses on the topic of abortion. The final room includes Anthony's activities in the temperance movement, civil rights, women's suffrage, and ends with 'Opposition to Restellism.' The exhibition text describes Madame Restell as 'a New York City abortionist who advertised her services in *The New York Times*,' and concludes that because Anthony's newspaper 'refused to advertise abortion services and suffered financially for this moral stand', Anthony was 'the first anti-abortion feminist'.²⁶

Controversy surrounded the launch of the museum in 2010, as historians began to query such claims. Blogger Jill Stanek, describing herself as 'a national figure in the effort to protect both preborn and postborn innocent human life', mentioned 'some dispute' over the idea that Anthony expressed anti-abortion views but reasserted its validity.²⁷ 'Today's feminists cannot stand that part of Susan B. Anthony's history' she wrote, 'yet pro-lifers have prevailed against revisionist history'.²⁸ She named the Susan B. Anthony List and the museum as evidence of the successful rebranding of this significant historical figure.

A few months later, Sarah Palin declared that Anthony was one of her heroes in a speech to members of the List, and the controversy, as well as the concept of 'conservative feminism,' became a prominent topic in American media.²⁹ Historian Ann Gordon and broadcaster Lynn Sherr, both experts on Anthony's writings, publicly refuted the idea that she had ever clearly expressed a position on the issue.³⁰ In a joint editorial in *The Washington Post*, the authors also argued that the source claimed as evidence for Anthony's views (and included in the edited collection *ProLife Feminism*), has never been proven to have been written by her. They noted that the anonymous author, signed merely 'A,' was critical of 'the horrible crime of child-murder,' but that he or she also opposed 'demanding a law for its suppression'.³¹

Despite these attempts to challenge the narrative of Anthony as an anti-abortion feminist, the claims continue to circulate in public debate and in numerous presentations of women's history online. The activities of the Birthplace Museum and the Susan B. Anthony List have also created confusion about the original National Susan B. Anthony Museum and House.³² Having made such an impact with their private mu-

seum, the proponents of this narrative have now set their sights on a bigger platform: the proposed National Women's History Museum (hereafter NWHM).

Case Study 2: Margaret Sanger

The plans for this new major museum alongside the Smithsonian Institution buildings on the National Mall in Washington, DC, have stalled repeatedly since 1996. Overall, the factors delaying progress include concerns about the financial management of the project, the credentials of the staff, and the quality of the exhibitions already developed for the online version of the museum.³³ The most inflammatory topic, however, is which stories the museum should tell. Both critics and supporters have interpreted the NWHM project as inherently feminist, with an underlying assumption that the narratives will support the values of Democratic politics. Republican politicians and conservative groups have aggressively opposed the plans, drawing on particular historical narratives of the birth control movement to mobilize their constituencies.

While anti-abortion groups have claimed Susan B. Anthony as their founding feminist, they denounce Margaret Sanger, a leading figure in the development of the contraceptive pill and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, as their greatest historical enemy. Despite the claims made in her lifetime and ever since, she did not condone abortion, and did not have a leadership role in the eugenics movement. Sanger disagreed with many eugenic principles, although she did endorse limits on immigration and the sterilization of the insane and 'feebleminded'.³⁴ Anti-abortion groups misrepresent her views on race and eugenics, claiming that she agreed with Nazi ideology and aimed to limit reproduction among black Americans. Many of these misrepresentations draw on her own writings, circulating a handful of quotes as damning evidence of her views when presented out of context. In an article considering the 'misattributions, misunderstandings, and outright falsehoods' that surround this history, her grandson Alexander Sanger considered statements she made in support of eugenics and reiterated her core commitment to the availability of birth control for all women to use voluntarily.³⁵ The archive of her papers also includes letters of support from black leaders and from women living in poverty who desperately wanted to limit their fertility. Nevertheless, Sanger is regularly misrepresented as a racist abortion advocate who targeted black Americans.

While the internet is unsurprisingly the source of many of these instances, the claims circulating there have reappeared in professional venues, including the *Wall Street Journal* in 1997 and the International Center for Photography (ICP) in New York City in 2001. By 2004, such myths were attracting so much attention that the Planned Parenthood Federation of America released a fact sheet to debunk them.³⁶ This struggle over the representation of Sanger has intensified in recent years and now plays a major role in the troubled development of the proposed National Women's History Museum (NWHM).

In 2010, the same year that Sarah Palin declared herself a 'conservative femi-

nist' in her speech to the Susan B. Anthony List, Tom Coburn (R-OK) and Jim DeMint (R-SC), placed a hold on a bill to grant the NWHM permission to purchase land near the mall. Their actions arose from a request by conservative activist group Concerned Women for America (CWA), founded in 1979 in opposition to the National Organization for Women. CWA claimed that the museum would become a 'shrine to leftist ideology', and would promote permissive sexual values and abortion rights.³⁷ These charges reflect antipathy towards those involved in the museum, (especially Ann E. W. Stone, a senior vice president of the museum board and founder of Republicans for Choice, a pro-choice PAC), and resistance to the presentation of specific narratives on the NWHM website.³⁸ Conservative opponents object to the portrayal of '“role models” like Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger', criticizing her inclusion in the exhibitions as well as the celebratory narrative in which she was originally presented.³⁹ In an article opposing the museum, right-wing writer William Stauff called Sanger 'the queen of racism, the champion of Eugenics, and the Founder of Planned Parenthood', framing her as a leading proponent of eugenic theory and situating Planned Parenthood within that history.⁴⁰

Rather than address this mythologizing head-on, however, the leadership of the NWHM attempted to appease their conservative critics by editing and adding to the histories on the website. They appointed a Republican lobbyist and former head of the Eagle Forum (a 'pro-family' conservative interest group founded in 1972) to the museum board, revised an online biography of Margaret Sanger, added an exhibition on motherhood with a profile of Republican Michele Bachmann, and developed additional biographies of conservative figures including Eagle Forum founder Phyllis Schlafly.⁴¹ Museum president Joan Bradley Wages also argued that despite being a highly charged political issue, abortion 'does not rank among the most important from an historical perspective.' She concluded the topic would never be tackled in an exhibition because of the need to raise \$400 million to build the museum, saying 'we cannot afford, literally, to focus on issues that are divisive'.⁴²

Despite the accommodations made, the accusations resurfaced in 2014 when legislation to build the museum was once again presented to Congress. Republican Michele Bachmann charged that the project could become an 'ideological shrine to abortion,' and criticized the website for 'an overwhelming bias towards women which fails to paint the actual picture of lives and women throughout our history'.⁴³ Situating feminism in explicit opposition to conservative values, she claimed that the proposed museum 'will enshrine the radical feminist movement that stands against the pro-life movement, the pro-family movement, and pro-traditional marriage movement'.⁴⁴

Conservative congressmen and lobby groups including the Susan B. Anthony List similarly argued that the museum would celebrate figures such as Margaret Sanger when instead she should be presented as a proponent of eugenics and enforced sterilization. List members urged Congress to reject the legislation 'until it includes guarantees that [the museum] can accurately tell the history of public figures like suffragists and Margaret Sanger', with President Marjorie Dannenfelser clarifying the specific historical claims they want included:

The suffragists saw their defense of unborn children as intrinsically linked to their fight for women's rights. They knew that authentic women's rights could not be built on the broken backs of innocent unborn children. Yet nowhere are these strong pro-life convictions and advocacy mentioned on the National Women's History Museum web pages.⁴⁵

Dannenfelser thus tied together the representation of Sanger as an abortion advocate with a racist agenda, with the re-characterization of Anthony as a founding feminist of the anti-abortion movement.

Conclusion

At the height of the controversy over Anthony's legacy in 2010, historian Janine Giordano commented that feminist academics are 'not used to sharing the narrative authority of the history of feminism, or interpretation of the historical record, with "conservative feminists"'.⁴⁶ In fact, many were not used to sharing this authority at all, let alone with a group whose political identity they viewed as suspect and inauthentic. As a result, some of the responses by traditional historians have proven problematic. Sherr and Gordon, for example, have been criticized for claiming that Anthony saw no place for religion in politics, oversimplifying the issue 'in order to dismiss the Religious Right's present claims on Anthony as an advocate for their pro-life cause'.⁴⁷ Although some have worried about the misuse of historical work to limit reproductive health care, honest assessments of the past, including, for example, acknowledgement of coercive and controversial practices, are important for preventing future abuses and for depoliticizing 'difficult' histories.⁴⁸

Most worryingly, historians have largely given up the production of histories of reproduction in the public sphere, citing the volatile political climate and the assumed opposition of stakeholders.⁴⁹ Yet as the 'Who Chooses' program at the Matilda Joslyn Gage Foundation demonstrates, multiple perspectives on abortion can be discussed in productive, even transformative ways, in public history venues. Gage was a contemporary of Anthony's in the suffrage movement and served as executive director of the National Women's Suffrage Association, but she has not been as well remembered. The foundation uses 'facilitated dialogue' led by trained volunteers, to engage visitors in discussion. Outcomes have included new allies and additional funding to expand the program, as well as support from stakeholders and major shifts in thinking:

One devout Catholic acknowledged that she had joined the dialogue because she wanted to know 'how anyone could hate so much that they would want to kill babies'. 'What I know now,' she told the group, 'is that when you hear women's stories, you can no longer judge.' A Planned Parenthood employee who was in the same group was similarly moved. She came into the dialogue, she admitted, expecting the group would be polarized into 'us' and 'them.' But

the process of sharing personal experiences brought the group together, despite their differences. She had trouble now, she marveled, even remembering the person she was who saw the world in 'us' and 'them' terms.⁵⁰

No doubt one of the reasons for the Gage Foundation's success is that the project focuses on Gage's philosophy of learning from others, rather than her values specifically. Gage is also less well known than Susan B. Anthony, and therefore a less politicized figure. Most strikingly, the Gage Foundation uses history as a *starting point* for a discussion of contemporary issues, not as a means to understand the past in relation to the present. Increasing historical knowledge is clearly not the primary educational goal, and instead the focus is on current issues and the range of perspectives associated with them.

While it makes sense to move away from any attempt to understand the views of the past in relation to the present, the on-going significance of an issue is surely one of the most compelling reasons drawing publics to investigate history themselves. As *this essay was being prepared for publication, for example, a new challenge to the presentation of Margaret Sanger was launched by a group of black church representatives, who wrote to the director of the National Portrait Gallery to request the removal of a bust of her from the exhibition 'Struggle for Justice', claiming that she supported the goals of the Ku Klux Klan.*⁵¹ In a letter declining their request, director Kim Sajet noted that Sanger's association with eugenics has made her a controversial figure, but that 'many scholars' disagree with the claims made about her attitudes to race.⁵² The claims, and their refutation, are now published online, where the debate is sure to continue. The abortion issue is likely to continue to divide women, yet histories, as well as debates about those histories, have the potential to build new opportunities for understanding. Moreover, if public historians do not take on the challenge of interpreting abortion and contraception, the problematic narratives discussed here will dominate, rather than democratize, women's history.

Notes

- 1 There is extensive literature on the culture wars, but key works include James Davison Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America* (New York: Basic Books, 1991) and Gary Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997). On museum exhibitions and historic sites, see Edward T. Linenthal and Tom Engelhardt (eds.), *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past* (Henry Holt & Co., 1996); James Oliver Horton, *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008); Robert C. Post, *Who Owns America's Past: The Smithsonian and the Problem of History* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 2013).
- 2 Manon Parry, *Broadcasting Birth Control: Mass Media and Family Planning* (Camden, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2013). See also Gretchen Sisson and Katrina Kimport, 'Telling Stories about Abortion: Abortion-Related Plots in American Film and Television, 1916-2013' *Contraception* 89 (2014) 5, 413-8.

- For more on historical uses of culture in the birth control movement, see Beth Widmaier Capo, *Textual Contraception: Birth Control and Modern American Fiction* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2007).
- 3 In the 2014 survey 'Interpreting Gender and Sexuality at Historic Sites' by the National Collaborative for Women's History Sites, 56% of respondents listed the representation of 'gender and the body' including sexuality, reproduction, and contraception as 'nearly absent' from interpretation at their locations. Moreover, 35% described the subject as 'under-represented' and none as 'well-represented.' *National Collaborative for Women's History Sites*, 'Interpreting Gender and Sexuality at Historic Sites,' Survey 2014. Results reported in Lauren Duval, Marla Miller, and Kathleen Franz, 'Women's and Gender History in the U.S.: Strangely Recurring Debates at the Intersection of Women's History and Public History,' *The Public Historian* (forthcoming 2016).
 - 4 Although the wider movement to democratize history emerged from the new social movements and history from below of the 1960s and 1970s, Michael H. Frisch proposed the influential concept of 'shared authority', so central to contemporary public history, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990); Nina Simon, *The Participatory Museum* (Santa Cruz: Museum 2.0, 2010); Bill Adair, Benjamin Filene, and Laura Koloski, *Letting Go? Sharing Historical Authority in a User-Generated World* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2015).
 - 5 There is extensive online debate over some of the most controversial topics. For a good overview of one ongoing issue, see Leslie Madsen-Brooks "'I nevertheless am a historian": Digital Historical Practice and Malpractice around Black Confederate Soldiers', in: Jack Dougherty and Kristen Nawrotzki (eds.), *Writing History in the Digital Age* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013).
 - 6 Deborah Whitehead, 'Feminism, Religion, and the Politics of History', *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 27 (2011) 2, 3-9, 9. See also Patricia L. Hipsher, 'Heretical Social Movement Organizations and Their Framing Strategies', *Sociological Inquiry* 77 (2007) 2, 241-263, 254 and 257.
 - 7 See, for example, Jessica Valenti, 'Opinion: The Fake Feminism of Sarah Palin', *The Washington Post*, 30 May 2010, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2010/05/28/AR2010052802263.html>; Amanda Marcotte, 'Stop Trying to Make Conservative Feminism Happen,' *RH Reality Check*, 29 May 2015, <http://rhrealitycheck.org/article/2015/05/29/stop-trying-make-conservative-feminism-happen/> (Accessed 28 August 2015).
 - 8 Judith Stacey and Susan Elizabeth Gerard, "'We Are Not Doormats": The Influence of Feminism on Contemporary Evangelicals in the United States', in: Faye Ginsburg and Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing (eds.), *Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture* (Boston: Beacon, 1990), 98-117.
 - 9 Orit Avishai, "'Doing Religion" in a Secular World: Women in Conservative Religions and the Question of Agency', *Gender and Society* 22 (2008) 4, 409-433; Kimberly Kelly, 'In the Name of the Mother: Renegotiating Conservative Women's Authority in the Crisis Pregnancy Center Movement', *Signs* 38 (2012) 1, 203-230, 204.
 - 10 Lee Ann Banaszak and Heather Ondercin, 'Explaining Movement and Countermovement Events in the Contemporary U.S. Women's Movement,' Presented at the American Political Science Association Meetings, September 2-5 2010, Washington DC, 4. Available online at: <http://sites.psu.edu/lee-annbanaszak/wp-content/uploads/sites/6382/2013/09/Banaszak-and-Ondercin-2010-APSA-final.pdf>; Kelsy Kretschmer, 'Shifting Boundaries and Splintering Movements: Abortion Rights in the Feminist and New Right Movements', *Sociological Forum* 29 (2014) 4, 893-915; Ellen Flournoy, 'No, It's Not a Joke: The Christian Right's Appropriation of Feminism', *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics,*

- Culture & Society*, 25 (2013) 3, 350-366.
- 11 Kretschmer, 'Shifting Boundaries', 906.
 - 12 Kristin Luker, *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), 138.
 - 13 Ibid.
 - 14 Kretschmer, 'Shifting Boundaries', 908. Two later presidents of FFL tried to re-establish links to NOW and other feminist groups but later complained of being entirely unwelcome.
 - 15 Ibid., 909.
 - 16 Joanne Sadler, 'Pro-Life Women for Congress', *The Crisis*, 1 January 1997, <http://www.crisismagazine.com/1997/final-wish-final-hope> (Accessed 20 May 2015). EMILY's List was founded in 1985.
 - 17 Marjorie Dannenfelser, quoted in 'Our Story: Susan B. Anthony List Beginnings' video, <http://www.sba-list.org/about-sba-list/our-mission> (Accessed 3 June 2015); SBA List Mission, <http://www.sba-list.org/about-sba-list/our-mission> (Accessed 3 June 2015).
 - 18 Mary Krane Kerr, Rachel MacNair, and Linda Naranjo-Hueb (eds.), *ProLife Feminism: Yesterday and Today* (Kansas City, MO: Feminism and Nonviolence Studies Association, 2005). First published in 1995 and revised and expanded in 2005. For a detailed discussion of the controversy, see Whitehead, 'Feminism', 3-9.
 - 19 Kimberly Kelly, 'Book Review: ProLife Feminism: Yesterday and Today', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 9 (2007) 2, 315-318, 316.
 - 20 Ibid., 318.
 - 21 Allison Stevens, 'Susan B. Anthony's Abortion Position Spurs Scuffle', 6 October 2006, <http://womensenews.org/story/abortion/061006/susan-b-anthonys-abortion-position-spurs-scuffle> (Accessed 31 May 2015).
 - 22 Stacy Schiff, 'Desperately Seeking Susan', *The New York Times*, 13 October 2006, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/13/opinion/13schiff.html?_r=0 (Accessed 3 June 2015).
 - 23 Lauren Mayer, 'Susan B. Anthony Birthplace and Museum Opens', National Trust for Historic Preservation, 4 March 2010, <http://www.preservationnation.org/magazine/2010/todays-news/susan-b-anthony-birthplace.html> (Accessed 20 May 2015).
 - 24 Jill Stanek, 'Susan B. Anthony museum opens today amidst abortion controversy', <http://www.jill-stanek.com/feminism/pro-lifers-and.html> (Accessed 3 June 2015).
 - 25 'Exhibits', Susan B. Anthony Birthplace Museum, <http://www.susanbanthonybirthplace.com/exhibits.html> (Accessed 3 June 2015).
 - 26 Information on the exhibition comes from Julia B. Sherman, 'Re-Claiming Susan B. Anthony', *The Highlights XVI*, <http://thehighlights.org/wp/re-claiming-susan-b-anthony> (Accessed 3 June 2015). See also Tammy Daniels, 'Anthony Museum Opening Sparks Debate on Abortion', *iBerkshires.com*, 15 February 2010, <http://www.iberkshires.com/story/33977/Anthony-Museum-Opening-Sparks-Debate-on-Abortion.html> (Accessed 24 August 2015).
 - 27 Stanek, 'Susan B. Anthony museum', emphasis in original.
 - 28 Stevens, 'Susan B. Anthony's Abortion Position'.
 - 29 Amy Gardner, 'Sarah Palin Issues a Call to Action to 'Mama Grizzlies'', *The Washington Post*, 14 May 2010, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2010/05/14/AR2010051402271.html> (Accessed 3 June 2015).
 - 30 Gordon is editor of the *Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* (New Brun-

- wick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997–2009); Sherr edited a collection of quotations from Anthony's speeches and letters titled *Failure Is Impossible: Susan B. Anthony in Her Own Words* (New York: Times Books, 1996).
- 31 Ann Gordon and Lynn Sherr, 'Sarah Palin Is No Susan B. Anthony', On Faith blog, *The Washington Post*, 21 May 2010, http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/guestvoices/2010/05/sarah_palin_is_no_susan_b_anthony.html (Accessed 29 May 2015).
 - 32 Deborah L. Hughes, 'We're not THAT Susan B. Anthony', 13 April 2012, <http://susanbanthonyhouse.org/index.php>, access 24 August 2015; Lauren Feeney, 'Was Susan B. Anthony "Pro-Life"? An interview with Deborah Hughes', Moyers and Company, 21 September 2012, <http://billmoyers.com/2012/09/21/was-susan-b-anthony-pro-life/> (Accessed 24 August 2015).
 - 33 Sarah Mimms, 'The National Women's History Museum Is Swamped in Controversy, Without Even Existing', *National Journal*, 21 March 2014, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/the-national-women-s-history-museum-is-swamped-in-controversy-without-even-existing-20140321> (Accessed 3 June 2015); Sonya Michel, 'The National Women's History Museum Apparently Doesn't Much Care for Women's Historians', *The New Republic*, 6 April 2014, <http://publichistorycommons.org/womens-history-museum-without-womens-historians/> (Accessed 25 May 2015); Andrea Stone and Christina Wilkie, 'National Women's History Museum Makes Little Progress After 16 Years', *Huffington Post*, 8 April 2012 (updated 13 April 2012), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/08/national-womens-history-museum_n_1408662.html?page=1 (Accessed 3 June 2015); Joan Bradley Wages, 'The National Women's History Museum Needs to Focus on Getting a Museum Built', *New Republic*, 9 April 2014, <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/117318/national-womens-history-museums-president-responds> (Accessed 3 June 2015).
 - 34 During her lifetime too, critics continuously misrepresented her views, and tried to link her ideas on contraception to abortion. This happened so often that she spoke out against it frequently, clarifying that birth control means to prevent conception, not to destroy. In fact, Sanger did not condone abortion and it was not practiced at Planned Parenthood clinics until several years after her death. See Margaret Sanger Papers Project, 'Margaret Sanger's Views on Abortion', 4 June 2012, <https://sangerpapers.wordpress.com/2012/06/04/margaret-sangers-views-on-abortion/> (Accessed 29 May 2015).
 - 35 Alexander Sanger, 'Eugenics, Race, and Margaret Sanger Revisited: Reproductive Freedom for All?', *Hypatia* 22 (2007) 2, 210–217, 210.
 - 36 See, for example, the 2001 International Center for Photography (ICP) exhibition 'Perfecting Mankind: Eugenics and Photography', discussed by Sanger, 'Eugenics', 210; Katherine Dexter McKormick Library, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, 'Opposition Claims about Margaret Sanger', http://www.plannedparenthood.org/files/8013/9611/6937/Opposition_Claims_About_Margaret_Sanger.pdf (Accessed 29 May 2015).
 - 37 Gregory Korte 'Two senators put hold on women's museum', *USA Today*, 29 September 2010, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2010-09-29-museum_N.htm (Accessed 25 May 2015); CWALAC Staff, 'National Women's History Museum Talking Points', 21 April 2014, <http://www.cwfa.org/national-womens-history-museum-talking-points/> (Accessed 25 May 2015).
 - 38 Ibid.
 - 39 Penny Nance, 'National Women's History Museum – National Shrine to Abortion You Will Pay for', 1 May 2014, <http://www.cwfa.org/national-womens-history-museum-national-shrine-to-abortion->

- you-will-pay-for/#sthash.196V2j1o.dpuf (Accessed 29 May 2015).
- 40 willstauf (William Stauff), 'Martha Blackburn Shilling for Margaret Sanger', 14 May 2014, <http://www.redstate.com/diary/willstauiff/2014/05/14/marsha-blackburn-shilling-margaret-sanger/> (Accessed 29 May 2015).
- 41 'Margaret Sanger', <https://www.nwhm.org/education-resources/biography/biographies/margaret-sanger/>; 'Foster Mom – Rep. Michele Bachmann', <https://www.nwhm.org/online-exhibits/motherhood/index.html>; 'Phyllis Schlafly', <https://www.nwhm.org/education-resources/biography/biographies/phyllis-schlafly/> (All accessed 3 June 2015).
- 42 Andrea Stone, 'National Women's History Museum Placates Conservatives To Get Bill Passed in Congress', *Huffington Post*, 8 August 2011 (updated 10 August 2011), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/08/08/national-womens-history-museum_n_919916.html (Accessed 3 June 2015).
- 43 Laura Bassett, 'Michele Bachmann rails against proposed National Women's History Museum', *Huffington Post*, 7 May 2014, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/07/michele-bachmann-womens-history-museum_n_5283194.html?utm_hp_ref=fb (Accessed 25 May 2015).
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Heritage Action for America, "'NO" on the Commission to Study National Women's History Museum', 7 May 2014, <http://heritageaction.com/key-votes/commission-study-national-womens-history-museum-house/> (Accessed 3 June 2015).
- 46 Janine Giordano, 'Channeling Susan B. Anthony', 20 May 2010, *Religion in American History*, <http://usreligion.blogspot.nl/2010/05/channeling-susan-b-anthony.html> (Accessed 1 September 2015).
- 47 Whitehead, 'Feminism', 9. As she argues, 'there has been a tendency in the larger women's and feminist movements to view religion negatively, seeing it in liberal feminist terms as a hindrance to women's full participation in public life, or in Marxist terms as a purveyor of false consciousness, or perhaps, owing to what Stephen Prothero has called religious illiteracy, simply ignoring the role of religion in U.S. history altogether.'
- 48 Johanna Schoen, *Choice and Coercion: Birth Control, Sterilization, and Abortion in Public Health and Welfare in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).
- 49 Sarah Pharaon et al., 'Safe Containers for Dangerous Memories', *The Public Historian* 37 (2015) 2, 61-72, 65; National Collaborative for Women's History Sites, 'Interpreting Gender and Sexuality at Historic Sites,' Survey 2014. Results reported in Lauren Duval, Marla Miller, and Kathleen Franz, 'Women's and Gender History in the U.S.: Strangely Recurring Debates at the Intersection of Women's History and Public History', *The Public Historian* (forthcoming 2016).
- 50 Pharaon et al, 'Safe Containers', 65.
- 51 Penny Starr, 'Black Pastors Ask Smithsonian to Remove Bust of Planned Parenthood Founder', *CNS News*, 7 August 2015, <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/penny-starr/black-pastors-ask-smithsonian-remove-bust-planned-parenthood-founder> (Accessed 1 September 2015).
- 52 Letter dated 19 August 2015, Kim Sajet to Bishop Jackson and Ministers Taking a Stand, http://cdn.cnsnews.com/attachments/npg_letter_to_ministers_on_sanger_bust.pdf (Accessed 25 August 2015).