



South Carolina and the Enfranchisement of Women: The Later Years

Author(s): Antoinette Elizabeth Taylor

Source: *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 80, No. 4 (Oct., 1979), pp. 298-310

Published by: South Carolina Historical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27567582>

Accessed: 13-04-2016 16:04 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



South Carolina Historical Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*

SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN: THE LATER YEARS

ANTOINETTE ELIZABETH TAYLOR *

By the summer of 1912, it was evident that the votes of women were becoming politically significant. Six states had fully enfranchised them, and three others were soon to do so.¹ No longer was the thought of women at the polls considered strange and novel. It had become generally acceptable, and, in some circles, even fashionable. Suffragists now numbered in the tens of thousands, and the question of female enfranchisement was being debated in both Congress and the state legislatures. It was a rare state indeed that lacked a suffrage organization.

Among those lacking such an organization in the summer of 1912 was South Carolina. Such had not always been the case. Some years earlier, during the 1890s, there had been an Equal Rights Association with members in several parts of the state. After an interlude of activity, however, it had declined and had become defunct.² Some individuals continued to be interested in women's rights, but their interest tended to be personal and private. Without organizational support and leadership, public agitation ceased.

Eventually, some of this personal and private interest evolved into group action. In September, 1912, thirty women in Spartanburg joined together to form the New Era Club. These women, who described themselves as "progressive" and "abreast with the times," stated that their objective was "to stimulate interest in civic affairs and to advance the industrial, legal and educational rights of women and children." They planned to meet twice each month, and selected as their first topic for study "The Status of Women and Children in South Carolina."³

The New Era soon became one of the city's most active organizations. On March 30, 1913, it sponsored a special edition of the Spartanburg *Herald*. Much of the issue was devoted to women's rights, espe-

* Dr. Taylor is Professor of History at Texas Woman's University, Denton.

¹ Women were fully enfranchised in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington and California. In the November election in 1912 the voters of Arizona, Kansas, and Oregon added woman suffrage amendments to their state constitutions.

² For an account of early woman suffrage agitation in the state, see Antoinette Elizabeth Taylor, "South Carolina and the Enfranchisement of Women: The Early Years," this *Magazine*, 77 (1976): 115-126.

³ Spartanburg *Herald*, March 30, 1913.

cially suffrage.⁴ There were articles by Anna Howard Shaw, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, and Alva E. Belmont, president of the New York City Political Equality League but a southern woman by birth. There was an article in which Hannah Hemp-hill Coleman, president of the South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs, urged the women of the state to prepare themselves for the full responsibilities of citizenship. There were testimonials by the governors of Wyoming and Colorado and by persons of prominence in states where women were enfranchised.⁵

The New Era ladies presented pro-suffrage arguments in the form of short statements, question-and-answer sequences, and even parodies on Mother Goose rhymes. It was pointed out that women were citizens and taxpayers as well as wives and homemakers. Their sphere extended beyond the confines of their homes. A woman might be the "cleanest house-keeper, best cook [and] most devoted mother" imaginable, but she would realize little satisfaction if the water of her city were impure, the garbage uncollected, and the schools poorly equipped. She could not remedy these conditions by staying at home, but could hope to remedy them by going to the polls.⁶

The New Era continued to function as a civic study group until January 29, 1914, when it abandoned its camouflage and became the state's only avowed and admitted suffrage club. Its members announced their intention of affiliating with the National American Woman Suffrage Association and chose as their president Mrs. John Gary Evans, wife of a former governor of the state.⁷

A few weeks later, a prominent Virginia suffragist, Mrs. Lila Meade Valentine, delivered a public lecture in Spartanburg. She spoke in Columbia and Charleston also. As a consequence of her visit, suffrage clubs were formed in those cities, making a total of three such organizations in the state.⁸

By May, 1914, the collective membership of the three clubs exceeded four hundred. Feeling that the time had come to form a state organiza-

⁴ The New Era affiliated with the South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs and with the Women's Clubs of Spartanburg. Though ostensibly a civic study group, the New Era was, from its inception, concerned with women's rights.

⁵ Spartanburg *Herald*, March 30, 1913.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, January 30, 1914; Charleston *News and Courier*, January 30, 1914.

⁸ *Ibid.*, March 19, 1914; Columbia *State*, March 15, 18, 22, 1914. Presidents of the two new clubs were Mrs. Henry Martin of Columbia and Miss Susan Pringle Frost of Charleston.

tion, the Spartanburg club invited Miss Lavinia Engle of the National American Woman Suffrage Association to visit the city. Under her direction, at a meeting in the Kennedy Library on May 15, the South Carolina Equal Suffrage League was organized. Mrs. John Gary Evans of Spartanburg was elected vice-president and Mrs. Hannah Hemphill Coleman of Abbeville president. Mrs. Coleman was the retiring president of the South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs and the daughter of Robert R. Hemphill, a champion of women's rights during the 1890s.⁹

The formation of the League stimulated suffrage activity. In the interest of educating public opinion, its members distributed literature, published articles, and sponsored public meetings. On occasions, they brought to the state such prominent speakers as Anna Howard Shaw of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, Madeline McDowell Breckinridge of Kentucky, and Kate M. Gordon of Louisiana. In the fall of 1915, they sponsored an attractive booth at the State Fair in Columbia. They also participated in the State Fair parade. Their section consisted of a large float representing "Justice" followed by a fleet of fourteen automobiles decorated with "Votes-for-Women" banners.¹⁰ Always they endeavored to agitate in a dignified and restrained manner. They disapproved of militant tactics, and, on several occasions, adopted resolutions condemning them as injurious to the cause and discrediting to women.

In October, 1915, the League held a convention in Columbia. Delegates from more than seven cities attended and were told that the organization's membership had doubled since its formation in the spring of 1914. Mrs. Coleman declined to continue as president, and Mrs. Harriet Powe Lynch of Cheraw was chosen as her successor.¹¹

At the League's convention in Charleston in October, 1916, Mrs. Lynch stressed the importance of organization and announced that she had appointed sixteen chairmen to direct suffrage work in their respective counties.¹² The following January, Miss Eudora Ramsay of the National American Woman Suffrage Association toured the state and or-

⁹ Mrs. W. C. Cathcart, "South Carolina," Stanton, Anthony, et al., eds., *History of Woman Suffrage* (6 vols. Rochester and New York, 1881-1922), VI, 579-580.

¹⁰ *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association*, 1915, pp. 123-124, hereafter cited as *NAWSA Proceedings*.

¹¹ *Columbia State*, October 28, 29, 1915; *Charleston News and Courier*, October 29, 1915. The convention's chief speaker was Nellie Nugent Somerville of Mississippi, one of the South's more prominent suffragists and a vice-president of the NAWSA.

¹² Cathcart, "South Carolina," *Woman Suffrage*, VI, 580.

ganized several new clubs.¹³ In Columbia in 1917, Mrs. Lynch reported that there were twenty-five such clubs, but noted that some were not active.¹⁴ She stated that sentiment in favor of suffrage was growing and noted that the South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs, the State Federation of Labor, and the South Carolina Woman's Christian Temperance Union had adopted resolutions endorsing it.¹⁵

The South Carolina League was an affiliate of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, the nation's largest and most influential women's rights organization. During the presidency of Woodrow Wilson, however, the NAWSA found itself in competition with the National Woman's Party which had come into prominence under the leadership of Alice Paul. The two organizations had the same goal, but differed as to tactics. The NAWSA was non-militant in its agitation and endeavored to win concessions for suffrage from both the state and federal governments. The National Woman's Party focused on the federal amendment and employed militant tactics in its behalf.

The League was consistently loyal to the NAWSA. By 1917, however, some of its supporters were coming to feel that the Woman's Party might be the more effective organization. Aware of this sentiment, the party sent two of its organizers to Charleston. They established headquarters in the Charleston Hotel, contacted interested persons, distributed a large amount of literature, and gave a series of street talks. Then, at a luncheon meeting on April 11th, they organized a South Carolina division of the National Woman's Party with Mrs. E. W. Durant of Charleston as state chairman.¹⁶ A few months later, she resigned and was replaced by Mrs. Helen E. Vaughan of Greenville.¹⁷

There was strong support for the Woman's Party in Charleston where several prominent suffragists had come to feel that more aggressive methods were needed. The leader of this group was Susan Pringle Frost, a dedicated feminist and long-time president of the Charleston club.¹⁸ In

¹³ *Columbia State*, January 22, 1917.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, October 21, 1917. Some of the towns having suffrage clubs were Columbia, Spartanburg, Charleston, Aiken, St. George, Newberry, Johnston, Anderson, Florence, Lancaster, Marion, Rock Hill, Sumter, Union, and Congaree.

¹⁵ NAWSA *Proceedings*, 1917, p. 226.

¹⁶ *Charleston News and Courier*, April 12, 1917; *Suffragist*, V (April 21, 1917), 8.

¹⁷ *Suffragist*, VI (February 23, 1918), 12.

¹⁸ Miss Frost was Reporter for the United States District Court in Charleston. She was also a prominent businesswoman who dealt in residential real estate. The owner of one of the handsomest mansions in Charleston herself, she led the way in restoring old houses.

December, 1917, the Frost faction proposed that the suffragists withdraw from the South Carolina League and affiliate with the National Woman's Party. This proposal was defeated by only four votes.¹⁹ The dissidents then seceded from the existing organization and formed a Charleston branch of the National Woman's Party with Susan P. Frost as chairman.²⁰ The old-line club retaliated by electing a new president to replace the defecting Miss Frost.²¹ It also adopted a resolution condemning militancy in the woman's movement.²²

In February, 1918, the equal suffrage club of Greenville severed its affiliation with the South Carolina League and joined the Woman's Party.²³ A few months later, a Woman's Party unit was formed in Orangeburg.²⁴ The groups in Charleston, Greenville, and Orangeburg were the only organized ones in the state. There were individual members in many places, but the Party's numerical strength was never great.²⁵ The overwhelming majority of South Carolina feminists were loyal to the National American Woman Suffrage Association. A few were affiliated with both organizations, however.

The Woman's Party of South Carolina endorsed the philosophy of militant crusading, but seems to have engaged in no militancy in the state. Its members supported militant actions in the nation's capital, however, and sometimes sent messages to President Wilson protesting the imprisonment of women whose only "crime" was asking for their rights.²⁶ In February, 1919, some of the women who had been incarcerated visited Charleston as passengers on the Suffrage Prison Special.²⁷ With the

¹⁹ *Columbia State*, December 9, 1917. The vote was thirty for and thirty-four against the resolution to affiliate with the National Woman's Party.

²⁰ *Suffragist*, V (December 29, 1917), 12. For a detailed account of this schism, see a six-page typed manuscript dated December 11, 1917, Tray 15, National Woman's Party Papers, Library of Congress.

²¹ The new president was Miss Isabella Heyward.

²² *Columbia State*, December 16, 1917. The Woman's Party group in Charleston had fifty-three members. The old-line suffrage club had more than six hundred, but many were not active in the affairs of the organization.

²³ *Suffragist*, VI (February 23, 1918), 12.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, VI (June 22, 1918), 7.

²⁵ In May, 1919, 130 South Carolinians were listed as National Woman's Party members. See "South Carolina Membership. May 20, 1919," Tray 20, National Woman's Party Papers, Library of Congress.

²⁶ As far as the author of this article can determine, no South Carolina woman was imprisoned for her participation in the suffrage movement.

²⁷ The Special was a train carrying women who had been imprisoned because of suffrage activities.

support and assistance of local women, they conducted a public meeting at which they told a large audience about their prison experiences.²⁸ They also spoke at two street meetings, and then went to Columbia, where the legislature was in session. They were not permitted to address the legislature, but did hold two street meetings in the state's capital city.²⁹

In spite of the efforts of the suffragists, the majority of South Carolinians remained unenthusiastic about woman's enfranchisement. Many probably gave the matter little thought. In 1914, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, spoke in Charleston, but established no anti-suffrage club there.³⁰ In fact, there was never an anti-suffrage organization in the state. With both custom and tradition on their side, the "antis" apparently felt little need for one.

In 1915, for the first time, the South Carolina legislature gave the suffrage issue serious consideration.³¹ On January 21st, Joseph A. McCullough of Greenville County introduced in the House a proposal to enfranchise women through an amendment to the state constitution. This proposal was received "in silence," and referred to the Judiciary Committee.³²

A few days later, the "silence" was broken when Mrs. Lila Meade Valentine of Virginia addressed the House. Before a packed gallery consisting mostly of women, she assured the legislators that suffrage was not a threat to family life and the home. On the contrary, women wanted the ballot for the protection of the home and the betterment of the community. She noted that idiots and women were "debarred from participating in the great function of self-government" and asked that women be enfranchised as a matter of self-esteem. She challenged the assumption that southern women would be reluctant to vote by saying that they trusted their men and would not hesitate to meet them at the polls.³³

On the afternoon of January 31st, the House Judiciary Committee conducted a hearing on the McCullough proposal. Several men and

²⁸ *Charleston News and Courier*, February 17, 1919.

²⁹ *Columbia State*, February 18, 1919; *Suffragist*, VII (March 1, 1919), 4-5.

³⁰ *Charleston News and Courier*, January 19, 1914.

³¹ Resolutions to enfranchise women had been introduced in both houses during the 1914 session, but had failed to receive favorable committee reports. See *South Carolina House Journal*, 1914, pp. 320, 352; *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1914, pp. 153, 949, 991.

³² *South Carolina House Journal*, 1915, p. 98; *Columbia State*, January 22, 1915.

³³ *Columbia State*, January 28, 1915. The House invited the Senate to attend Mrs. Valentine's address, but the invitation was not accepted.

women spoke in its favor. Their chief arguments were that women suffrage was both just and desirable and that women wanted it.³⁴

When the Committee reported to the House, the majority opposed woman suffrage while the minority favored it. In view of the climate of opinion in South Carolina, even a favorable minority report indicated some degree of progress. The suffragists decided not to press the matter, however, for they felt that there was no likelihood of securing the measure's passage.³⁵

The following year, 1916, the suffrage question was debated on the floor of the House. Speaking in its behalf, McCullough stated that women were citizens and taxpayers and should not be discriminated against because of their sex. Their enfranchisement was not "freak" legislation, but was supported by such men as Woodrow Wilson, William Jennings Bryan, and Theodore Roosevelt. He predicted that woman suffrage would eventually prevail and urged the legislators "to get on the bandwagon."³⁶

Other speakers stated that woman suffrage had been successful in states where it had been tried and that it had not lessened man's respect for womanhood. As D. L. Smith of Colleton County pointed out, woman was a human being, and as such, "entitled to equal rights with man." Opponents of the measure argued that man was the protector of womanhood and, for this reason, women did not need the ballot. In fact, their demand for it constituted a "sad commentary on the men" of the state.³⁷

At the end of debate, the House voted on a motion to strike the resolving clause from the suffrage resolution. This motion carried sixty-one to fifty-one.³⁸ Its adoption signified the defeat of the suffrage cause in the 1916 session. However, there were some women who felt heartened by the fact that fifty-one House members had supported it.³⁹

³⁴ Ibid., January 31, 1915. Among the speakers were Dr. Rose Gantt of Columbia, Mrs. Harriet Powe Lynch of Cheraw, and Mrs. Hannah Hemphill Coleman of Abbeville.

³⁵ South Carolina *House Journal*, 1915, p. 334; NAWSA *Proceedings*, 1915 p. 124. During the 1915 session, Representative John H. McMahan of Richland County introduced a resolution to enfranchise the *white* women of the state. This resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee but never reported. See South Carolina *House Journal*, 1915, p. 124.

³⁶ Columbia *State*, January 21, 1916.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ South Carolina *House Journal*, 1916, pp. 166, 173.

³⁹ Columbia *State*, January 21, 1916. The Governor of South Carolina during this phase of the suffrage movement was Richard Irvine Manning, who was in office 1915-1919. Manning did little to help the suffragists win concessions from the legislature. See Robert Milton Burts, *Richard Irvine Manning and the Progressive Movement in South Carolina* (Columbia, 1974), pp. 188-189.

A few months later, at the State Democratic convention in Columbia, the suffragists presented a petition bearing 1,500 signatures. During the fifteen minutes allotted them, they asked for the ballot in the name of "justice and liberty," and urged that equal suffrage planks be placed in both the state and national Democratic party platforms. The convention responded by adopting a plank asking the legislature to submit the question to the voters by "proper act or resolution." It declined, however, to instruct its delegation to support suffrage at the coming National Democratic convention.⁴⁰

Encouraged by the pledge of the State Democratic Party, the suffragists approached the 1917 session with optimism. Under the direction of their legislative chairman, Mrs. Ellen C. Cathcart of Columbia, they conducted a lobby in which women from many parts of the state participated. Wearing yellow "Votes for Women" badges, they endeavored to establish rapport and maintain daily contact with the lawmakers.⁴¹

On January 11, woman suffrage resolutions were introduced in both houses.⁴² On January 30th and 31st, the Senate resolution was debated before crowded galleries. During the discussion, several senators pointed out that a vote in favor of the resolution was not necessarily an endorsement of woman suffrage. It was merely a vote to submit the question to the electorate and was in accord with the state Democratic platform of 1916. Some said that they thought that woman suffrage would be beneficial, but no one spoke forcefully in its behalf. A strong supporter of women's rights, Neils Christensen of Beaufort, merely urged that the matter be submitted to the people so that they could "thrash" it out. The tone of debate was definitely low-key.⁴³

The opposition argued that the plank in the 1916 Democratic platform should not be considered binding because only a "small minority" of South Carolina women wanted to vote.⁴⁴ Several called the demand for the ballot an affront to the South's traditional regard for womanhood.

⁴⁰ *Columbia State*, May 19, 21, 1916; *Charleston News and Courier*, May 19, 1916. The suffragists who addressed the convention were Mrs. Harriet Powe Lynch, Mrs. Henry Martin, Mrs. H. V. Murdaugh, and Miss Mary Brennen.

⁴¹ *NAWSA Proceedings*, 1917, p. 225.

⁴² *South Carolina House Journal*, 1917, p. 57; *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1917, p. 30. A. W. Horton of Spartanburg introduced the resolution in the House and Jesse L. Sherard of Anderson in the Senate.

⁴³ *Columbia State*, January 31, February 1, 1917. Christensen was editor of the *Beaufort Gazette* and was the staunchest supporter of woman suffrage in the South Carolina legislature.

⁴⁴ One of South Carolina's leading suffragist, Mrs. Eulalie Salley of Aiken, stated that the suffragists were a "minority among women." Interview with Mrs. Eulalie Salley, August 22, 1969.

One senator even feared that enfranchisement would mean the "death of romance."⁴⁵

At the conclusion of debate, John Frederick Williams of Aiken moved to postpone consideration until 1918. This motion was defeated by a vote of eighteen to twenty-three.⁴⁶ The Senate then voted on the resolution to amend the South Carolina Constitution in behalf of woman suffrage. The vote was twenty-five yeas and nineteen nays.⁴⁷ Since the twenty-five affirmative votes were less than the two-thirds majority required for constitutional amendments, the suffrage resolution failed of adoption.

The action of the Senate made the suffragists realize the hopelessness of their cause. When the resolution came before the House, its sponsor A. W. Horton of Spartanburg, moved that consideration be postponed until 1918. This motion was agreed to.⁴⁸

When the legislature met in 1918, the Equal Suffrage League asked that the question not be considered.⁴⁹ The United States was deeply involved in the First World War, and the suffragists were devoting their energies to the war effort. At the State Democratic convention in Columbia in May, however, the League's president, Mrs. Harriet Powe Lynch, pointed out that the United States was fighting a great war in behalf of democracy and urged the enfranchisement of women as a "logical application" of democratic principles. The convention was adamant, however, and put no suffrage plank in its platform. This unyielding attitude caused the *Columbia State* to comment that the federal amendment was "apparently . . . the only hope" for South Carolina women.⁵⁰

It may seem surprising that the suffragists were less successful in 1918 than they had been two years earlier when the Party had adopted a plank recommending that the question be submitted to the voters. Actually suffrage agitation had declined during the interlude, and the Party now felt under less pressure to support an issue to which many South Carolinians seemed indifferent or opposed. This lull in suffrage activity was a result of the entry of the United States into the First World War.

When war was declared, the suffragists began deemphasizing their women's rights agitation and directing their "time, money and strength" toward the war effort. They participated actively in Red Cross work and

⁴⁵ *Columbia State*, January 31, February 1, 1917.

⁴⁶ *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1917, p. 236.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 237.

⁴⁸ *South Carolina House Journal*, 1917, p. 578.

⁴⁹ Cathcart, "South Carolina," *Woman Suffrage*, VI, 584.

⁵⁰ *Columbia State*, May 16, 26, 1918.

Liberty Loan drives. They staged patriotic plays and supported efforts to suppress vice in areas near army camps. They encouraged thrift in all phases of daily life and sponsored cooking and canning schools in the interest of food conservation. The league in Aiken conducted a community market to which people brought fruits and vegetables to be canned. Suffrage work and war work went "hand in hand," as women rallied "in a body" to "fight in the second line of defense at home," while the "brave boys" were fighting in the front lines abroad.⁵¹

Because of the war, the South Carolina Equal Suffrage League omitted its annual convention in 1918. A few weeks after the armistice, however, it held a meeting in Columbia with twenty-two delegates in attendance. This assemblage went on record in favor of the federal amendment and sent President Wilson a telegram in its behalf.⁵² It elected Mrs. Eulalie Chafee Salley of Aiken to succeed Mrs. Lynch as the organization's president.⁵³

Under the able and energetic leadership of Mrs. Salley, the movement in South Carolina reached its climax. Assisted by Miss Lola C. Trax of the NAWSA, the suffragists circulated petitions and distributed literature. They held numerous meetings and conferences. They organized the state along congressional district lines with a suffrage chairman in each district. For six months, they maintained a headquarters across from the capitol in downtown Columbia. During 1919, Mrs. Salley personally sent seventy-five telegrams, wrote one thousand letters, and addressed approximately ten thousand people in behalf of suffrage.⁵⁴ On one occasion, she dropped suffrage leaflets over the city of Aiken while riding in an open plane. This was one of the few times, and, probably the only one in the South, when suffrage literature was distributed in this way.⁵⁵

⁵¹ *Woman Citizen*, I (September 1, 1917), 254, II (April 27, 1918), 433; NAWSA *Proceedings*, 1919, p. 297.

⁵² During the Nineteenth Amendment's entire history in the United States Congress, only one South Carolinian voted for it. He was Senator William Pegues Pollock of Cheraw, who cast his favorable vote on February 10, 1919.

⁵³ *Columbia State*, January 19, 1919. Eulalie Salley was the thirty-six year old wife of Aiken attorney Julian B. Salley. She had joined the movement because she considered the ballot a means of improving the legal status of married women. She was the founder of the Aiken league and one of the state's most active crusaders. For additional information about Mrs. Salley's long and colorful life, see Emily L. Bull, *Eulalie* (Aiken: Kalmia Press, 1973).

⁵⁴ NAWSA *Proceedings*, 1920, pp. 184-185.

⁵⁵ Interview with Mrs. Eulalie Salley, August 22, 1969; Eulalie Salley to Mrs. E. L. Dunnivant, December 16, 1919, Eulalie Salley Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.

In June, 1919, the federal amendment was submitted to the states for ratification. When the South Carolina legislature convened for its 1920 session, twenty-seven had approved it. Few knowledgeable persons expected South Carolina to ratify. Nevertheless, the Equal Suffrage League established a lobby and worked assiduously in the amendment's behalf.

On January 14, Neils Christensen of Beaufort introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to ratify. A few days later, on January 20, John Frederick Williams of Aiken introduced a resolution to reject. Both were referred to the Judiciary Committee. On January 23, the Committee reported the Williams rejection resolution favorably and the Christensen ratification resolution unfavorably.⁵⁶

Meanwhile, on January 21, a resolution to reject the Anthony Amendment was introduced in the House.⁵⁷ The question was debated the following day.⁵⁸ House members favoring rejection maintained that suffrage should be regulated by the states and not by the federal government. They argued that the Anthony Amendment would lead to federal interference in elections and would, thereby, jeopardize white control of southern politics.⁵⁹ Those favoring ratification denied that the amendment constituted a threat to state's rights and white supremacy. They pointed out that it had the support of the National Democratic leaders and urged the legislators to stop "bucking up against the inevitable" and support the Party.⁶⁰ At the close of debate, the House voted on the resolution to reject the Anthony Amendment and approved it ninety-three to twenty-one.⁶¹ It was then sent to the Senate.

On January 28th, the Senate acted on the suffrage question. First it considered the Williams rejection resolution and passed it from second to third reading by a vote of thirty-one to four.⁶² Then it took up the Christensen ratification resolution and defeated its passage to third read-

⁵⁶ South Carolina *Senate Journal*, 1920, pp. 13, 29, 66.

⁵⁷ South Carolina *House Journal*, 1920, p. 1026. Its sponsors were William R. Bradford and John R. Hart, both of York County.

⁵⁸ The House refused to refer the resolution to a committee and also by-passed the customary three readings.

⁵⁹ Charleston *News and Courier*, January 23, 1920.

⁶⁰ Ibid; Columbia *State*, January 23, 1920. United States Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer and Democratic National Committee Chairman Homer S. Cummings urged the legislators to ratify. South Carolina Governor Robert A. Cooper did not endorse ratification, but left the question to the legislature.

⁶¹ South Carolina *House Journal*, 1920, p. 1044.

⁶² South Carolina *Senate Journal*, 1920, p. 88.

ing by a vote of four ayes and twenty-two nays.⁶³ There was no debate, and the entire proceedings took only ten minutes.⁶⁴

The following day, the Senate continued its consideration of the Anthony Amendment. By a vote of thirty-two to three, it approved the third reading and passage of the Williams resolution.⁶⁵ Then it voted on the House resolution to reject the Anthony Amendment and approved it twenty-six to four.⁶⁶ Thus both houses of the South Carolina legislature rejected the Anthony Amendment, and its defeat was now complete and final.

When the State Democratic Convention assembled in Columbia in May, the suffragists asked that the Party's rules be amended to permit women to vote in primary elections.⁶⁷ The convention refused to make this or any concession to woman suffrage.⁶⁸ Since most of the suffragists considered themselves loyal democrats and since their request for primary suffrage bypassed both the state's rights and race issues, they felt keenly disappointed. Neils Christensen commented that the Party had "taken an untenable position" from which it would "have to recede."⁶⁹ But, in May, 1920, the "determination to keep women out of the primaries" was "strong and uncompromising."⁷⁰

In spite of repeated defeats in their own state, South Carolina women were destined to become voters. With Tennessee's ratification in August, 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment became part of the United States Constitution. In the general election in November, 1920, South Carolina women voted for the first time.⁷¹ In 1921, the legislature passed an act conferring upon them "the right to vote in all elections."⁷² The suffrage victory now seemed complete.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 89. The four senators supporting ratification were Neils Christensen of Beaufort, Thomas Cary Duncan of Union, Joseph Warren Shelor of Walhalla, and LeGrand G. Walker of Georgetown.

⁶⁴ *Charleston News and Courier*, January 29, 1920.

⁶⁵ *South Carolina Senate Journal*, 1920, p. 112.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁶⁷ Since the primary was "governed entirely by the rules of the Democratic Party," no legislation was needed to effect this change. See letter from Attorney-General Samuel M. Wolfe to Mrs. Eulalie Salley, March 23, 1920. Eulalie Salley Papers.

⁶⁸ *Columbia State*, May 19, 20, 1920.

⁶⁹ Neils Christensen to Mrs. J. B. Salley, May 22, 1920, Eulalie Salley Papers.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Columbia State*, November 3, 1920.

⁷² *Acts of South Carolina*, 1921, pp. 268-269.

In the mind of Mrs. Eulalie Salley, however, the victory was not complete. Though now of no significance, the word "male" remained among the requisites for voting in the South Carolina Constitution. Mrs. Salley resolved to continue her efforts until it should be removed.

During the next several decades, through the initiative of Mrs. Salley, the question of its removal came before the legislature from time to time. There were repeated failures until 1969, however. In June of that year, Gilbert E. McMillan of Aiken introduced in the Senate two joint resolutions—one to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment and the other to amend the state constitution to delete the word "male."⁷³ Both measures passed both houses unanimously.⁷⁴

The Secretary of State of the United States was then notified that South Carolina had at long last ratified the Susan B. Anthony Amendment. The resolution to delete the word "male" from the state constitution was not yet effective, however. It had to be approved by the electorate at the polls. In the general election in November, 1970, it carried by a vote of 182,327 to 55,243.⁷⁵ Thus, fifty years after women had begun voting, South Carolina officially approved their enfranchisement.⁷⁶

⁷³ Gilbert introduced these measures as a favor to Mrs. Salley who had befriended him politically. See Bull, *Eulalie*, pp. 3-4.

⁷⁴ South Carolina *Senate Journal*, 1969, pp. 1143-1144, 1164, 1235-1236; South Carolina *House Journal*, 1969, p. 1585, 1649, 1651. Relative to the legislature's action, Mrs. Salley commented: "I never expected you gentlemen to give us the vote. You are fighters and die-harders, but today you have redeemed your reputation for chivalry." *Columbia State*, July 2, 1969.

⁷⁵ This information was supplied in a letter from O. Frank Thornton, Secretary of State, to A. Elizabeth Taylor, May 3, 1971.

⁷⁶ The veteran crusader, Mrs. Salley, died on March 8, 1975, at the age of ninety-two years.