Women against Wilson

A National Woman’s Party demonstration against President Woodrow Wilson takes to the streets in Chicago in 1916 ahead of his upcoming visit during the presidential campaign. Amid the signs bluntly saying Wilson was “against women” is one that asks, “President Wilson How Long Do You Advise Us to Wait” for the right to vote. Source: Library of Congress.
Abstract: Agitation by the National Woman’s Party (NWP) was but one of several factors leading to the successful passage of the Nineteenth Amendment and woman suffrage. By turning to direct action, concentrating on a federal amendment, and courting jail sentences (unlike the more restrained National American Woman Suffrage Association), they obtained maximum publicity for their cause even when, as in Boston, their demonstration had little direct bearing on enfranchisement. Although historians have amply documented the NWP’s vigils and arrests before the White House, the history of the Massachusetts chapter of the NWP and the story of their demonstrations in Boston in 1919 has been mostly overlooked. This article gives these pioneering suffragists their recognition. Nationally, the only women to serve jail sentences on behalf of suffrage were the 168 activists arrested in the District of Columbia and the sixteen women arrested in Boston. Dr. James J. Kenneally, a Professor Emeritus and former Director of
the Martin Institute at Stonehill College, has written extensively on women’s history.¹

* * * * * * *

Alice Paul (1885–1977) and Lucy Burns (1879–1966) met in jail in 1909 in England. Both had abandoned their graduate studies to work for the Women’s Social and Political Union, a radical English direct action suffrage organization. After Burns returned to the United States in 1912, Paul and Burns were appointed chair and vice chair of the Congressional Committee of the National American Women’s Suffrage Association (NAWSA). Some NAWSA members were concerned about their radicalism, but Jane Addams, the vice president of the organization, championed them. In time they broke away and created their own groups: the Congressional Union (CU) in 1913 and the National Woman’s Party (NWP) in 1916. The NWP established state branches and published their own weekly; perhaps most importantly, rather than dispersing their resources in every state and local suffrage campaign, the NWP concentrated upon the ratification process for a federal amendment extending voting rights to women. Ideologically, they adopted the British system of holding the party in power accountable for failure to obtain desired legislation. Accordingly, in 1916 they campaigned against President Wilson and the Democratic majority in both houses of Congress.²

The NWP’s anti-Wilson tone was seen by many as anti-American, especially after the United States entered World War I in April of 1917. Unlike NAWSA, which publicly pledged its support to the war effort, the NWP remained focused solely upon a federal amendment and began picketing outside the White House in January of that year. On June 20, angry crowds tore NWP banners to pieces; two days later, picketers were arrested for the first time. On June 27, six NWP protesters were charged with obstructing traffic and sentenced to three days in jail for refusing to pay a $25 fine. Over the next few months, the number of picketers, the frequency of arrests, and the length of jail sentences mushroomed. On November 5, some imprisoned protesters began hunger strikes after their demands to be treated as political prisoners were rejected.³ (Political prisoners of the era, jailed for offenses against the state, typically under the guise of minor offenses such as trespassing or disorderly conduct, often demanded preferential treatment, arguing that they were not common criminals.) Shortly thereafter, some jailers began force-feeding NWP leaders. By the end of 1917, a jail sentence had become a badge of honor to the NWP.⁴
In January 1917, discouraged by President Wilson’s continued opposition to the suffrage amendment, Alice Paul, the leader of the National Woman’s Party (NWP) posted pickets at the White House gates—becoming the first protest group to ever picket the White House. These “silent sentinels” stayed on duty in all weather and in the face of threats, taunts, and physical violence. The banners asked: “Mr. President How Long Must Women Wait for their Liberty?” and “Mr. President What Will you do for Woman Suffrage?” Hoping to provoke a response, the language became more inflammatory, culminating in this “Kaiser Wilson” banner.
The NWP’s efforts, along with many decades of political activism by the National American Women’s Suffrage Association, finally resulted in limited success. On January 18, 1918, as a result of President Wilson’s personal intervention, the U.S. House of Representatives approved a suffrage amendment by a vote of 274 to 136. However, the amendment failed in the U.S. Senate by two votes. As President Wilson continued to pressure legislators, the measure passed again in the House, but the Senate defeated it for a second time on February 10, 1919, one vote short of the necessary two-thirds majority (55 to 29). It is interesting to note that two of the leading antisuffrage senators were from Massachusetts: Henry Cabot Lodge and John W. Weeks (Weeks was defeated in November 1918 by pro-suffragist Democrat David I. Walsh).

Despite these setbacks, most contemporary observers agreed that Senate passage was but a matter of time. It was widely assumed that the new Republican Congress elected in 1918, combined with Northern Democrats, would have a two-thirds majority, overcoming the opposition of Southern Democrats. That conservative group feared that the Fourteenth Amendment’s reduction clause, decreasing Congressional representation if eligible voters were prevented from exercising their rights, might be enforced against Southern states if eligible African American women were disenfranchised. Moreover, it was widely known that the president would have to call a special session to address numerous pressing issues, for the Sixty-Fifth Congress had left much vital legislation undone. Nevertheless, the NWP continued to exert pressure and to hold the president responsible for suffrage’s failure. Alice Paul contended that Wilson had abandoned suffrage in order to go abroad for treaty making. In early 1919, the National Woman’s Party planned anti-Wilson demonstrations around the president’s temporary return from the Paris Peace Conference to sign legislation before Congress’s March 4 adjournment.

**PLANNING FOR THE DEMONSTRATION**

Plans for a New York demonstration had to be changed quickly when Wilson, following the recommendations of his advisers, decided instead to dock at Boston. There he would be assured of an enthusiastic welcome by Mayor Andrew J. Peters, who had served him as assistant secretary of the Treasury from 1914 to 1918. Many believed that a warm reception, especially in the home of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the most prominent critic of the League of Nations, would strengthen Wilson’s hand in both Paris and Washington. Arrangements were finalized on February 22 for his
arrival the next day. After docking at Boston, passengers would remain on board overnight and be greeted at the pier the next morning. Wilson and his entourage would then be driven through Boston, passing by a reviewing stand in front of the State House packed with returning veterans and other dignitaries. After a private luncheon at the Copley Plaza Hotel, the President and his wife, Edith Wilson, would proceed to Mechanics Hall for a short
ad lib address, and then to South Station for a train departing at 4:30 p.m., arriving in Washington the following morning.9

On February 17, the day after Mayor Peters publicly announced that Wilson would land in Boston, Alice Paul directed Agnes Morey to coordinate NWP demonstrations with his arrival.10 Morey was from Brookline, Massachusetts, and was “chairman” of the Massachusetts branch of the NWP, which she had helped to found. Her daughter, Katherine Morey, was one of the first women ever arrested for picketing the White House. The Moreys played key roles in the NWP at both the national and local levels. In 1916, Agnes Morey had campaigned against Wilson and the Democrats in thirteen suffrage states as part of the “Suffrage Special” speaking tour and had served time in 1917 in Washington, D.C.’s notorious Occoquan Work House for picketing. By 1919, however, Morey was seriously overworked and somewhat dispirited. She had even contemplated resigning due in part to financial problems.

As of February 3, 1919, Morey had only $82 on hand but estimated that she would need between $300 and $400 for the “Prison Special”—a cross-country train stopping at fifteen cities from New York to California and carrying twenty-six prison-garbed suffragists who had served jail sentences for demonstrating. The train would be in Boston on March 9 and 10. Morey had already arranged, but not paid, for a theater to host a rally after the train arrived. She still had to make arrangements for the passengers’ overnight stay as well as to obtain publicity and to organize a reception. With little support from district chairs, Morey described herself as “extremely humiliated,” believing that Massachusetts was not doing its share to provide picketers. Ruth Small, state organizer, wrote to Paul that Morey was not feeling well and that, in relation to White House demonstrations, it “is almost an impossibility to get any Massachusetts woman to go to jail especially those of social prominence.”11 To assist the beleaguered Agnes Morey, Alice Paul ordered Elsie Hill, a paid organizer and daughter of former Connecticut Congressman Ebenezer Hill, to leave South Carolina and hurry to Boston. Another paid organizer, Betty Gram of Portland, Oregon, who was already in Boston to help with the “Prison Special” train reception, was told to remain and assist with the Wilson demonstration. Paul herself left for Boston on February 22.12

Tensions were already simmering when Paul arrived. On February 19, the superintendent of police had announced that although he expected suffragists to behave, police would prevent annoyances, heckling, or disorderly conduct from female protesters.13 The following day, because of an anarchist attempt to assassinate French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau when he was
leaving the Paris Peace Conference, extraordinary protection was added for Wilson: the parade route was to be lined with both police and military, with a cordon surrounding his car and armed police mingling with the crowd. Colonel Albert Williams, in charge of security, asserted that “the United States Army can take care of the suffragists.”

Meanwhile, the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association and the Boston Equal Suffrage League, both affiliates of and aligned with NAWSA’s more conservative and conciliatory policies, repudiated NWP tactics. They emphasized the difference between their organizations and reiterated their gratitude for all that President Wilson had done for suffrage. In contrast, on the same day, the NWP revealed that it planned to display suffrage banners along the president’s route and at Boston Common, where they would burn transcripts of Wilson’s words spoken at Mechanics Hall, and even released the names of five activists scheduled to participate in the Common demonstration.

On February 22, the day before Wilson’s ship was to arrive, Agnes Morey announced that the NWP had no intention of interfering with the city’s official reception unless harassed by police. There had as yet been no word regarding their request for a permit for a mass meeting at 4:30 or 5:00 on Boston Common; the meeting would be chaired by local members of the NWP, accompanied by leaders from other states. They would express their opposition to Wilson’s failure to implement domestically the principles of democracy and self-government that he had espoused internationally. Moreover, Morey reminded the public that with Congress due to adjourn on March 4, there was only one week remaining to get the additional vote in the Senate to pass the suffrage amendment. For the NWP, President Wilson, as leader of his party, was responsible for securing its passage. By expressing their demand, Morey averred that “we are making the way easier for him to accomplish this.”

More details were revealed the following day when Alice Paul arrived in Boston and announced that participants would march the short distance from party headquarters on Park Street to the governor’s reviewing stand in front of the State House; there they would form a line. She stated that they would carry a United States flag, the NWP flag, and suffrage banners. After the presidential procession passed, NWP members would cross the street to the Parkman Bandstand in Boston Common, where they would meet other suffragists and burn sections of Wilson’s speech. There was, she claimed, the possibility of arrest since they had not received permission to gather, but avowed that “if ordered to move we will not go.” Despite this assertive stance, NWP supporters were advised to be nonconfrontational. Before
leaving headquarters the following morning, Morey offered the protestors some recommendations. “Ladies,” she advised, “I think it would look more dignified to be as sober as possible. It is better not to smile. . . . Don’t be provoked to discussion. If you are arrested, offer no resistance and prefer [sic] no arguments. If an inquisition should take place as to the aims of our party, refuse to talk on any subject save the enfranchisement of women.”

*Agnes Morey*

Morey was chair of the National Woman’s Party’s Massachusetts branch.
Katherine Morey

The legislative chair of the NWP’s Massachusetts branch and daughter of Agnes Morey was one of the first women ever arrested for picketing the White House.

DEMONSTRATION & ARRESTS

Led by Katherine Morey, who carried an American flag, twenty-two suffragists marched from NWP headquarters toward the State House reviewing stand, where they fully expected to be arrested. Following Morey and carrying a large banner especially made for the occasion were organizer
Ruth Small and former Massachusetts resident and chair of the New Hampshire NWP Lois Shaw. Their banner read:

Mr. President you said in the Senate on September 28 ‘We shall not only be distrusted but we shall deserve to be distrusted if we do not enfranchise women.’ You alone can remove this distrust now by securing the one vote needed to pass the suffrage amendment before March 4.\(^\text{20}\)

The suffragists forced their way through a cordon of sailors, crossed Beacon Street, and formed a line in front of the reviewing stand, which contained about five hundred wounded soldiers. After about forty-five minutes, Police Commissioner Edwin U. Curtis and Superintendent Michael Crowley politely informed the women that they must leave before the president’s cavalcade approached, or the police would have to arrest them. When the demonstrators refused, the police appealed to Alice Paul. She replied that the women would carry out their plans. The suffragists were then informed that in seven minutes they would be arrested for loitering. The minutes passed; about an hour before the president’s entourage arrived, the protesters were taken into custody.

Even Alice Paul admitted the police were “real gentlemanly.”\(^\text{21}\) With one exception, the women peaceably entered the patrol wagons. It took two patrolmen to carry a struggling Betty Gram, who refused to relinquish her banner, into a wagon.\(^\text{22}\) According to newspaper accounts, the crowd seemed amused by the arrests. However, Wilson saw nothing of the fracas because the arrests had occurred before the parade reached the reviewing stand.\(^\text{23}\)

When the Boston Common demonstration began at around 3:00 p.m., the spectators numbered only about one hundred. After ten minutes, a single policeman warned that if the protestors on the bandstand persisted, they would be arrested. The suffragists continued their rally as they awaited the arrival of additional police. Meanwhile, the audience swelled to about one thousand. Before the arresting officers appeared, Louise Sykes of Cambridge, widow of a president of Connecticut College for Women, resorted to burning blank paper in lieu of actual accounts of Wilson’s remarks. Agnes Morey and Florence (Mrs. Robert Treat) Whitehouse of Portland, Maine, also addressed the throng.

Arriving on the scene, the police arrested Sykes and two other protestors. All accounts mention the arrest of Elsie Hill and Pascia (Mrs. Mortimer) Warren of New Hampshire. Warren, who had “timidly” delivered her very first public speech at this demonstration, was released at the police station.\(^\text{24}\)
According to the *Herald*, she later referred to her arrest as “romantic” and wished she had done something to justify more drastic action.\(^{25}\) Hill, because of her belligerence toward the arresting officers, was transferred to the House of Detention for Women where she joined those arrested at the State House in the morning to await arraignment.

The *Globe* reported the arrest of Warren, Hill, and a third unidentified woman. The *Herald* was the only paper that mentioned the arrest of Cerise Carman (Mrs. John) Jack, identified only as the “wife of a Harvard professor.” However, Jack was already prominent in her own right. She was one of the founders of the Massachusetts Birth Control League, a member of the Executive Board of the Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union, and in later years, an active supporter of Sacco and Vanzetti. In her remarks, she had criticized Wilson for violating his promise to make every effort to promote female suffrage and claimed that the police were probably present by his order or by that of surrogates. Cerise Carman Jack was not mentioned in newspapers again until April when it was reported that her guilty finding in municipal court for “speaking on the Common without a permit” had been overturned on appeal. Jack’s absence from newspaper accounts highlights the difficulty of researching this event. In many cases, one is forced to rely solely on contemporary newspapers, which were often biased, incomplete, and occasionally contradictory but agreed on major events.\(^{26}\)

Ultimately, a total of twenty-five women were arrested, nineteen of whom spent the night in jail. Two were released and four more—Minnie (Mrs. J. Irving) Gross and Mrs. Frank Page, both of Boston, Dorothy Pratt of Roxbury, Massachusetts, and Rose Lewis of New York—were freed on bail. The remainder, held overnight, were well-fed, for their evening meal was brought in by other suffragists.\(^{27}\)

In contrast with the NWP reception, the more traditional NAWSA suffragists as well as a group of representatives of working women, primarily from the Women’s Trade Union League, presented Edith Wilson with flowers at the pier, met with the president at the hotel, and were present at the train platform as he left Boston. They bestowed on Wilson souvenirs of the city and thanked him for his support of suffrage and of working women.\(^{28}\)

**COURTROOM EXPERIENCES**\(^{29}\)

After spending the night and breakfasting at the House of Detention, nineteen of the arrested women were transported to the Pemberton Square Courthouse where they appeared, mostly one at a time, before Chief Justice of the Municipal Court Wilfred A. Bolster. Along with other prominent
Bostonians, Bolster had been appointed by the mayor to the reception committee for President Wilson. Over thirty suffragists crowded into the courtroom. Bolster, fearing disturbances from an unruly audience, moved the proceedings to a smaller room from which he barred the general public but not the press. Suffragists and NWP members denounced the change, and Paul threatened “to tell all America about this kind of Star Chamber.”

The prisoners, when called before the judge, expressed contempt for the proceedings by refusing to give their names, by identifying themselves as “Jane Doe,” or by giving the names of other prisoners or false names. Most refused to pay a $5.00 fine, choosing instead a sentence of eight days in the Charles Street Jail. The *Herald*, which opposed woman suffrage, described the majority of women before Bolster as of the:

neurotic type, extremely nervous, keeping their self-control by [a] strong grip on their will power. None of them were as attractive looking as they were meant to be naturally. All looked a little worse for a night among the inconveniences of the House of Detention. A night in prison is certainly hard on one’s complexion . . . They were all well-dressed. There seemed to be no representative of the working class among them — to judge from their appearances.

The four women released on bail were more cooperative than their fellow demonstrators. All four had caretaking responsibilities. Dorothy Pratt of Roxbury, a supporter of the Boys Club and one of the few detainees characterized in the press as “teary,” paid her fine out of consideration for her mother. Rose Lewis, active in the New York NWP, denied her guilt but paid her fine, claiming that she had to return home. The elderly Minnie Gross, a charter member of the state NWP and previously jailed in Washington, told the judge that with an aged, sick husband at home, she hoped she would not be held for long. She then agreed with Bolster’s suggestion to have the charges placed on file. A fourth woman, Edith Turner of Allston, also paid her fine and “hurried away.”

Two other women soon pleaded not guilty. Youthful Frances Fowler of Brookline, assisted by Eleanor Calnan, seemed to be on the “verge of hysteria” when she appeared before Judge Bolster. The judge, who said that he did not want to try a sick woman, suggested that she go home, released on her own recognizance. Calnan persuaded Fowler to stay and be tried. Shortly thereafter, according to local press accounts, Fowler began to “sob wildly.” Bolster refused to try her and continued the case until February 27. On that day she pleaded not guilty and the case was filed. Christine Page, a well-
known advocate of the city’s women and stump speaker for John J. Fitzgerald (Honey Fitz) during his successful 1910 mayoral campaign, also pleaded not guilty, contending that she had no intention of breaking the law. She stated that she had not moved after the seven-minute ultimatum because no one told her that time was up. She was acquitted.\textsuperscript{35}

**THE JAILED SUFFRAGISTS**

The sixteen women who refused to pay their fine were sentenced to eight days in the Charles Street jail. They became the last women in the United States jailed for suffrage demonstrations. A diverse group, their ages ranged from the early twenties to the mid-sixties. Most were long-time suffragists; at least six had been arrested previously and served time at the notorious Occoquan Women’s Workhouse outside of Washington, D.C. None are well-known today, but nearly everyone was a significant leader either at the local or national level. They each deserve greater recognition, although only a brief description can be offered here.\textsuperscript{36}

Many of the women would devote their lives to women’s rights and social justice causes. Elsie Hill of Norwalk, Connecticut, was a high school French teacher who had assisted Alice Paul in planning the Washington suffrage parade in 1913. Shortly thereafter, she became a full time worker for the NWP. Hill had been sentenced to jail for a Washington demonstration, campaigned against Democrats in Colorado in 1916, raised money for the cause, and would have her salary reduced while in jail following the Boston protest. According to Alice Paul, there was not a day until Hill died in 1970 that they did not work together.\textsuperscript{37} Ironically, Boston’s Sheriff John A. Keliher had served with her father in Congress from 1903 to 1910.\textsuperscript{38}

Eleanor Calnan of Methuen was a district chair of the state NWP. She had two previous arrests in Washington DC and had served time in the Occoquan Workhouse. Like Ruth Small, she had previously complained to Alice Paul of the difficulty of getting Massachusetts women to picket; they were not “hot on it” and “they made me sick with their Red Cross work.”\textsuperscript{39} The militant Ruth Small was the only child of a wealthy Boston banker. She had already participated in several state campaigns and sometimes managed the Boston NWP office, all by the age of twenty-three.\textsuperscript{40} Betty Connolly of West Newton was a maid in the Small family household and was apparently not involved in any other demonstrations.\textsuperscript{41} Nothing more is known of her. Along with Martha H. Foley, Betty Connolly was the only exception to the solidly middle- and upper-class backgrounds of the others. Twenty-two-year-old Foley of Dorchester was active in many radical causes. She was working
at the local Socialist Party headquarters licking envelopes, but answered the appeal when a member of the NWP came looking for volunteers. Another young woman was Berry Pottier of Boston, an art student active in the NWP since 1915.

A lifelong activist, Camilla Whitcomb of Worcester was fifty-five years old and also from a wealthy family. A socialist and pacifist, she was the chair of the Fourth Congressional District NWP and had participated in a hunger strike during her only previous arrest. At the time of her death in 1944, she was a board member of the Worcester People’s Forum, which she helped to establish.

Several women had been active in suffrage since their college years. Betty Gram of Portland, Maine, was attracted to the NWP early on while a student at the University of Oregon. She was a business manager of the Suffragist, had served time in the Occuquan Workhouse, and, as a paid organizer, would have her salary reduced for the days spent in the Charles Street Jail.

Similarly, Rosa H. (Mrs. George) Roewer of Boston had participated in suffrage movements since Radcliffe College days. Although she initially appealed her conviction on the basis that she had young children at home, she changed her mind. Her husband, a well-known lawyer, told the Boston Post that he was neither peeved nor shocked that his thirty-three-year-old wife had landed in jail; he agreed with her pro-suffrage views and maintained that with “a pair of servants who will tend to the house, mind the kiddies, and cook the food, there is little room [for a husband] to be disgruntled over a minor matter like his wife being in jail especially when she wants to be there.”

As this husband’s statement suggests, the ability to hire servants facilitated women’s activism. Lois W. (Mrs. William L.) Shaw of Manchester also benefitted from her family’s economic status. She was chair of the New Hampshire NWP and a mother of six. She had helped her former Vassar roommate, Elsie Hill, organize the Wilson reception. Shaw’s husband, the general manager of a shoe company, sent a telegram to his jailed wife that read: “Don’t be quitters. I have competent nurses to care for the children.” Nevertheless, during her second day in jail she was released when her sister-in-law, Pascia Warren, paid her fine.

There was one mother-daughter pair. Jessica (Mrs. Walter B. Henderson of Wayland, Massachusetts, appeared in court with her daughter, Wilma. An acknowledged radical, Henderson had feared a government raid during the war years. Consequently, she had hidden her papers to avoid embarrassing her very conservative, wealthy husband. Mother and daughter were sentenced
to jail, but during a recess, Henderson told Judge Bolster that Wilma was a minor, securing Wilma’s release.\textsuperscript{47}

Katherine Morey of Brookline, Massachusetts, had organized the NWP Kansas campaign against Wilson and the Democrats in 1916, served as the legislative chair of the Massachusetts NWP, and participated in many demonstrations. On June 22, 1917, she was one of the first suffrage demonstrators arrested in Washington. After her second arrest, she was incarcerated for refusing to pay a fine for picketing the White House.\textsuperscript{48}

Elise T. Russian of Detroit, Michigan, was the sixth activist who had been recently jailed as a result of NWP demonstrations in front of the White House. Although she was a state officer in the Michigan Branch, she had formerly taught in Massachusetts. She received a telegram of congratulations from the Michigan NWP while jailed in Boston. Upon her release, Russian “cheerfully” told the press this was her second arrest in two weeks.\textsuperscript{49}

Josephine Collins of Framingham, Massachusetts, was another early NWP member. She owned and managed the Framingham Center Village Store and had received “serious opposition” from some of her customers for her suffrage activities.\textsuperscript{50}

Lucy J. C. Daniels of Grafton, Vermont, was another long time suffragist. Sixty-one years of age, she had refused to pay state taxes to protest her lack of a vote. She also had two previous arrests for demonstrations and had a huge sign promoting “Votes for Vermont Women” painted on the side of her house. Daniels was such an advocate for the rights of African American women and their presence in the movement that Alice Paul suspected she was African American until told otherwise.\textsuperscript{51} It should be noted that some Woman’s Party chapters turned away African American members. The National Women’s Party not only failed publicly to champion their cause but was also hesitant about their participation in NWP public events. Mary Church Terrell, president of the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), and Walter White of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) concluded that if Paul and other leaders could get the amendment approved without enfranchising African American women, they would do so.\textsuperscript{52}

Finally, nothing is known of a “Mrs. George Hill” of Brookline. She was reported as having been arrested in the \textit{Globe, Post, Transcript} and \textit{Herald} but her name was not included in their account of the arraignments.\textsuperscript{53}

These were the sixteen women arrested in the only suffrage civil disobedience to occur in Massachusetts. After arraignment and sentencing, the prisoners were booked, bathed, and fed at the Charles Street Jail. According to some newspaper accounts, they refused an offering of bread
and cocoa because they were not hungry; others thought that rejection was the beginning of a hunger strike. Agnes Morey, who had not been arrested, was informed that the women could have their own underwear, nightgowns, combs, and brushes, which she immediately arranged for their families to supply. Meanwhile, the arrestees demanded to be treated as political prisoners, asking for their own clothes and books as well as generous visiting hours and no work details. When these demands were refused, Alice Paul objected on their behalf, comparing the suffragists’ treatment with that of German political prisoners when the United States entered the World War. Morey also issued a statement criticizing Wilson for championing the rights of people abroad while failing to secure equal rights for women at home. She stated that when he realized the demands of the country, he would secure the one Senate vote needed for the amendment before Congress adjourned.54

Although for years the Suffolk County (or “Charles Street”) jail had been considered a model prison, by 1918 it had become “an unfit, inhumane structure,” according to the Boston City Council.55 The women’s first full day in jail started routinely with a 6:00 a.m. wakeup, followed by breakfast of boiled rice, syrup, coffee, and bread at 7:00; lunch of “American Chop Suey” at 11:30; and supper of frankfurters and sauerkraut at 4:30. But little else was routine that day. Early on, Jessica Henderson’s husband, on the grounds that the children needed their mother at home, paid his wife’s fine, and she was released. It was more contentious shortly thereafter when twenty-two-year-old Martha Foley’s father came to pay her fine. Foley, wearing a NWP sash, remonstrated at length with him and with the sheriff, leaving only after her father assured her she could appeal her release to the courts.

Also that morning, Alice Paul first conferred with the arrestees and then spoke to the press, deploring jail conditions. Paul stated that the women were kept in solitary confinement, men walked up and down the corridors in front of their cells, parcels were not delivered, and inmates were refused writing materials and books. Cells were cold, towels were dirty, and toilet facilities were crude. (All of the jail cells lacked running water; inmates were provided with small buckets of cold water for washing. Moreover, each morning they had to carry a good-sized toilet bucket down to the jail yard to empty it.) Paul generally denounced the jail, its conditions, and its administration, and demanded that suffragists be treated as political prisoners. She then sent telegrams protesting jail conditions to President Wilson, Mayor Peters, and Judge Bolster.

Sheriff Keliher along with his deputy and the chief matron held a press conference to answer Paul’s charges and to take questions from reporters. He also provided tours of the facility and opportunities to interview prisoners.
Mary Winsor of Pennsylvania Holds a Suffrage Banner, 1917
Keliher explained that they were not in prison garb as there was no work for them to do, but, if they desired, they could sew for the Red Cross. He assured the public that if there were to be a hunger strike, as Paul had implied, there would be no forced feeding because the women’s sentences were too brief. Keliher insisted that the women were not in solitary confinement but rather in individual cells as required by state law and that these cells had been newly cleaned. Refuting the other charges, he maintained that only one man—the prison doctor—had walked up and down the corridor. He explained that delivering packages was difficult when the women had all been booked as “Jane Doe” and most had revealed their names only to the press. Furthermore, he noted that suffragists had access to additional blankets and to a limited library. According to the sheriff, only one individual had asked for writing materials, which she had received.

Other complaints were advanced by a handful who claimed the food was “tasteless.” Katherine Morey, who was described as looking “slight” claimed she had lost twelve pounds, and Rosa Roewer groused that there was not enough fresh air. However, despite protesting the physical conditions, almost all said they had been treated with kindness, and those who had been jailed in Washington compared Boston conditions favorably.56

RELEASE FROM JAIL

That afternoon, a mysterious “Mr. E. J. Howe,” unknown to the suffragists and the sheriff, appeared at the jail to pay the fines of Katherine Morey, Ruth Small, and the Small family’s maid, Betty Connolly. When the women were brought to the sheriff and informed that they would be released, they objected, contending that he had no right to free them. Sheriff Keliher in turn asserted that he had no right to keep them. After about half an hour, Morey was carried to the street, protesting that only a husband had a right to pay a woman’s fine. Small and Connolly were escorted by guards who carried their suitcases. Outside were Morey’s mother who had come to visit her daughter, Small’s mother, and Martha Foley, who had returned to join her fellow evictees. These women confessed that Keliher had treated them with consideration; Foley even stated she found the jail comfortable. Her only complaint was with the House of Detention. Some noted that in Washington, taxis had been provided for inmates upon release.

However, there was no shortage of transportation. The released were driven to NWP headquarters in the Morey and Small automobiles. There, Alice Paul announced that after a good meal, they would return to jail to picket and to see Keliher. She also stated that Roewer’s husband, George,
would undertake legal action to prevent the further release of arrestees when their fines were paid without permission. Moreover, if such actions continued, the prisoners might resort to a hunger strike.

That evening at about seven, Pascia Warren paid her sister-in-law’s fine, and Lois Shaw was released. The following day in New Hampshire, Shaw condemned the sanitary arrangements in the House of Detention and labeled the jail conditions even worse. She stated that the food was so awful, she could eat only the bread, but that the cells were clean and the beds not bad. On the second night, she was given a brand-new nightgown after not having one the first night.57

About 10:00 p.m., the four reluctantly released prisoners and Agnes Morey appeared at the jail demanding to see Keliher. When told that he was in conference, they picketed half-heartedly for about an hour. After having sung “Alive All,” a militant rallying song, to cheer those still in jail, they left due to the bitter cold, a sparse audience, and the report that Keliher would not see them.58 But to Agnes Morey, the day was a success because of the publicity.59

Thursday, February 27, was much more routine, though two additional women were released. At about 2:00 p.m., Josephine Collins’s brother paid her fine despite her objections. Matrons had to prevent her from stripping as she tried to prevent her release. In time, jail officials forced her out and placed her in her brother’s car, which promptly sped away. Several newspapers noted the evening release of a previously unreported Clara Hill to care for the needs of her family after she willingly paid her remaining $3.50. Described as the first suffragist relieved to be discharged, she claimed it was worthwhile to go to jail for a worthy cause, thanked Keliher for his courtesy, and praised the food and cleanliness of the jail. She was then driven to her Brookline home by Agnes Morey, who dismissed Hill as a “quitter” to a reporter but then refused further comment.60

To prevent her release in case her fine was paid, Elsie Hill, tagged by the press as the “directing spirit of the entire brood,” refused to dress and remained all day in her nightgown—a tactic reported as a so-called “nightgown strike.” She again demanded to be treated as a political prisoner, with extended visiting hours, a daily bath, writing materials, daily exercise in the open, liberty to converse during meals (Keliher stated silence was in keeping with jail rules), good coffee sent in from the outside for which she would pay, and protection from “impertinence” and rough handling by guards.

Agnes Morey and a delegation were rebuffed in their efforts to meet with Judge Bolster. Ruth Small, however, spent two hours at the State House beseeching members of the legislature to protest the suffragists’ release,
claiming they should be freed by the court since they had been illegally arrested. Other NWP members sent objections to Mayor Peters and Judge Bolster, and each of the arrestees signed a telegram to Wilson urging him to act on the amendment. The NWP claimed that they received messages of support from the entire nation as well as donations of about $1,200.61

On Friday, February 28, the mysterious “E. J. Howe” once again appeared at Charles Street to pay fines and thereby obtain the release of seven of the eight remaining suffragists. He did not include Rosa Roewer, whose lawyer husband had threatened legal action against any release stemming from unauthorized fine payments. (Even after his wife was the only suffragist remaining in jail, Roewer stated he still was in favor of her finishing her sentence.)62 This time Howe identified himself as Edward A. Howe of Newtonville, a graduate of Suffolk Law School acting on behalf of a client whom he would not identify and whose suffrage views would also remain private. However, Howe asserted that he did not know that paying fines to release the women was objectionable to them until he first did so.63

To the surprise of reporters from both the Globe and the Transcript, Elsie Hill purportedly appeared as “meek as a lamb” when called to Keliher’s office for her release. There her chief protest was the failure to provide transportation at the city’s expense. After some discussion, Keliher, as a gesture of good will, had his clerk drive her to NWP headquarters.64 Once outside, Hill was more critical. She complained that the food was little better than swill, and that when she objected she was asked if she wanted a French chef. Hill also reported being given a checkerboard when she asked about exercise.65

About half an hour after Hill’s release, the remaining six suffragists, smiling and toting their banners, left peaceably and met with an informal reception on the sidewalk. Katherine Morey then drove the banner-waving women to headquarters. Agnes Morey, no longer interested in Howe’s client, demanded the immediate release of Roewer, who was serenaded that evening outside the jail by her former inmates. The following day, George Roewer allowed James H. Thayer, a Harvard student, to pay Rosa Roewer’s fine. Despite her disappointment at her release, Roewer smiled as she left and met her husband, who drove her home in a limousine. George Roewer now stated that he would not pursue legal action regarding the arrests and releases and invited Thayer to their home for dinner and a discussion of suffrage. The NWP announced that all the released suffragists were weak but not ill, that Sheriff Keliher was “an agreeable chap,” and that no demonstrations were planned for Boston but that there would be a large rally open to the public at the Wilbur Theater on Sunday, March 9, with the arrival of the “Prison Special” train.66
A Message to the President

Mr. President:

You said to the United States Senate on Sept. 30th: “We shall not only be distrusted but shall deserve to be distrusted if we do not enfranchise women.”

You alone can remove this distrust NOW by securing the one vote needed to pass the Suffrage Amendment before March 4th.

Massachusetts suffragists hold a protest banner during President Wilson’s visit to Boston, Feb. 1919. Photo includes Jessica Henderson (far left) and Martha Foley (far right, in glasses). The woman in the center holding the banner is possibly Ruth E. Small, and it may be Katherine Morey to her right.Courtesy Historic New England.
The “Prison Special”

On March 9, the “Prison Special” arrived in Boston. In February, suffragists had decided to tell the country about their experiences in prison. Boarding a train in Washington, D.C., called the “Democracy Limited,” 26 NWP members embarked on a three-week cross-country train trip. Often wearing their prison uniforms, the women addressed crowds, conducted rallies across the route, and met with fellow suffragists. In Boston, they shared the platform with those who had recently been jailed and gave them “prison pins” — small brooches with bars to represent the bars of a prison cell.
Alice Paul raises a glass in front of the ratification banner celebrating Tennessee’s passage of the nineteenth amendment. Tennessee became the thirty-sixth and deciding state to ratify. On August 26, 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution became law.
The March 9 gathering was the last NWP rally held in Boston. Nine of the Charles Street prisoners received their “prison pins” and were hailed by the standing room audience. Among the local speakers was Agnes Morey, who triumphantly claimed that females “were entering the last chapter in the struggle for women’s rights.” Roewer, Henderson, Foley, and Katherine Morey all praised the courtesy of the Boston Police. The event raised $3000 for the cause.67

Two months later, President Wilson called a special session of the new Republican-controlled Congress. In his opening address, cabled from Paris, he asked for legislation on appropriations, labor, taxes, tariffs, and among “pressing domestic issues,” a “great reform”: the immediate approval of a woman suffrage amendment.68 The amendment passed early in June. After an intensive fourteen-month campaign by the NWP and NAWSA, the amendment was ratified on August 26, 1920, in time for women to vote in the 1920 presidential election.69

CONCLUSION

Suffrage was not the end for those Boston arrestees; it was but a step to equality for women. Eight were present at the first meeting organizing a new NWP, which soon dedicated itself to a Constitutional equal rights amendment. However, in 1982, this amendment fell three short of the necessary thirty-eight state ratifications. Other women who had been jailed in Boston continued their long careers as activists, agitating for such causes as birth control, civil liberties, prison reform, world peace, and labor legislation.

Postsuffrage, the most prominent of these women were Elsie Hill (1883–1970), Betty Gram (1898–1969), and Martha Foley (1897–1977). Hill served on the NWP’s National Council until her death. She was also a member of the Lucy Stone League, which encouraged married women to retain their family names, and had run for public office in Connecticut several times. Gram, who married the news commentator and reporter Raymond Swing on the condition that he take her family name, which he did until their divorce in 1944, was arrested for demonstrating for women’s rights outside the home of the French president in 1929. In addition, Gram lobbied state, national, and international organizations on behalf of women and, with others, was responsible for a United Nations resolution calling upon member states to establish political equality for women. Foley was charged and tried for inciting a riot and assaulting a police officer in a 1919 Boston May Day melee which resulted in injuries to scores of people. Her case was filed after her appeal resulted in a hung jury. Shortly thereafter, Foley left Boston to
pursue her first loves: writing, editing, and teaching. With her husband, she founded the magazine *Story*, taught at several prominent colleges, and, from 1942 until her death, edited *Best American Short Stories*. Foley continued to support women's rights and liberal causes throughout her life.70

The publicity generated by the so-called militant activities of the National Woman's Party guaranteed that war and peace issues would not overshadow the campaign for suffrage, as they kept the issue before the American public. Moreover, NWP activities had the effect of making the more staid NAWSA's advocacy of suffrage increasingly acceptable to the public. All Americans, even those who do not exercise the franchise, should be indebted to these women as well as to countless males and females who, for close to two centuries, fought to overcome societal, political, religious, and class opposition in a sometimes bitter struggle to promote universal suffrage. Their efforts are more relevant than ever, especially in the face of contemporary efforts to limit the opportunity to vote.
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