

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

**RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
HISTORY DEPARTMENT**

**PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT
SUMMARY SHEET**

REVIEWERS INSTRUCTIONS: Please consult the scoring rubric on criteria for Knowledge, Communication, and Analysis and assign a numerical score of **5** for mastery, **3** for satisfactory, and **1** for unsatisfactory for each outcome.

DEPARTMENTAL OUTCOMES

1. Understand how historians gather, interpret and analyze a wide range of primary and secondary sources; literary, geographical, political and socio-economic sources construct a coherent narrative from this information. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2; NCSS 1.4, 1.7, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4)

Mastery

BA Content Accept

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

2. Demonstrate the skill of historical interpretation, such as compare and contrast, differentiate between historical facts and interpretation, consider multiple perspectives, analyze cause and effect relationships, compare competing historical narratives, recognize the tentative nature of historical interpretation and analyze the influence of the past. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2; NCSS 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1.3, 2.1.5)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

3. Think chronologically and comprehensively, identifying temporal structures of historical narratives and comprehending the meanings of historical texts, monographs and documents, including their audiences, goals, perspectives and biases. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3; NCSS 1.2, 2.1.1)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

4. Develop research capabilities that enable them to formulate historical questions and themes, obtain and question historical data, identify the gaps in available records, place sources in context, and construct reliable historical interpretations. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3; NCSS 1.7, 2.1.1, 2.1.4)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

5. Demonstrate their knowledge of the history, culture and values of diverse peoples and traditions throughout the world and compare patterns of continuity and change. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.7; NCSS 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1.6, 2.1.7)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

- 6.** Understand the historical context for the interaction and interdependence of politics, society, science and technology in a variety of cultural settings. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4; NCSS 1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, 2.1.8)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

- 7.** Formulate and explain their own interpretations of the past by examining and communicating them with clarity and precision in a variety of oral and written assignments. (RIBST 1.1, 1.2, 1.3,, 2.1, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 8.1, 8.2; NCSS 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.4)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

- 8.** Demonstrate research skills utilizing the full-range of available materials including those found in libraries, archives, museums and electronic resources. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.4; NCSS 2.1.2, 2.1.4)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

9. Demonstrate the skills necessary to be an independent and lifelong learner.
(RIBTS 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4; NCSS 2.1.1 – 2.1.8)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

TOTAL SCORE

Mastery	41 – 45
Satisfactory	25 – 40
Unsatisfactory	9 – 24

I am a secondary education student with a concentration in U.S. history. I have chose three papers to place in my portfolio based on the nine learning outcomes that have been set forth for all education students who plan to student teach in the spring. The three papers that I chose to place in my portfolio entail my history 200 paper, history 362 paper, and a paper I wrote while taking history 311, Russian studies.

The research paper that I wrote for history 200, was challenging. This paper focused on sit down strikes and how strikes were perceived by many Americans in the 1930's. This was my first research paper that I had ever done. While doing research for this paper I became aware and understood how historians gather, interpret and analyze a wide range of primary and secondary source date/material and how historians construct a coherent narrative from this information. I also learned research skills while utilizing the full-range of available materials including those found in libraries, archives, museums and electronic resources. This paper helped me become an independent and lifelong learner. While doing research and constructing my final paper I learned how to formulate and explain interpretations of the past by examining and communicating them with clarity and precision in a variety of oral and written assignments.

The paper I wrote for history 362 met the learning outcomes that the history department required. This paper focused on the nineteenth century and the role women played in end slavery in the United States. While writing this paper I demonstrated the skills of historical analysis and interpretation, such as compare and contrast, differentiate between historical facts and interpret, consider multiple perspectives, analyze cause and effect relationships, compare competing historical narratives, recognize the tentative nature of historical interpretation and analyze the influence of the past. I also learned how to develop

██████████

research capabilities that enabled me to formulate historical questions and themes, obtain and question historical data, identify the gaps in available records, place sources in context, and construct reliable historical interpretations. As a conclusion to writing this paper in 362, I feel that I can think chronologically and comprehensively, identify temporal structure of historical narratives and comprehending the meaning of historical texts, monographs and documents, including the audiences, goals, perspectives and biases.

The third paper I chose to place in my portfolio was my history 311 paper. This paper dealt with how Russia was influenced by other countries when it formed its own country. While writing this paper I demonstrated knowledge of the history, culture and values of diverse peoples and traditions throughout the world and compared patterns of continuity and change. As a result of taking this course and writing this paper, I finally understood the historical context for the interactions and interdependence of politics, society, science and technology in a variety of cultural settings.

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

ARTIFACT COVER SHEET

Student's Name: _____

Artifact Title "Flint Strike: For and Against" H200 Fall 08

Artifact Grade: B

Course Grade: B

Comments:

Identify and assess the Departmental outcomes, including knowledge and skills, addressed in this artifact.

This essay shows ~~some~~ mastery of learning outcome #1, #2, #4, 6 and 9.

Instructor's Signature

Lulu Schuster

Date:

12/13/2010

**Flint Strike:
For and Against**



History 200
Professor Schuster
May 5, 2009

December 30, 1936 marked the beginning of many sit-down strikes. These sit-down strikes started in Flint, Michigan at two General Motors plants. The disgruntled workers of these plants were unhappy with their working conditions and low wages. These workers wanted recognition of a legitimate union by General Motors. They wanted GM to recognize and negotiate with the United Auto Workers of America, which they refused to do. GM's refusal gave many of these workers no other choice other than to sit-down and strike. This strike had a huge impact on the workers, and on their unemployment statue. The terrible working conditions, combined with unfair and devious payroll practices, made the auto plants of Depression-era Flint into ripe locations for union organization. The strike was an important national event at the time and many people supported the strike while there were others who opposed it.¹

In 1935 Congress passed the Wagner Act, which legalized strikes and invigorated the new Committee for Industrial Organizations under the leadership of John L. Lewis. During the summer of 1936, Wyndham Mortimer, a leader of the White Motors strike in 1934 and 1935, came to Flint at the request of the UAW in an attempt to organize the workers. Mortimer recognized that if Flint could be won for the union, the CIO and UAW would have established their most important "beachhead" within industrial America. Working from a hotel room, he sent letters to workers whom he felt might be sympathetic, while in the evenings he held secret meetings in workers' homes in order to avoid the notice of company spies. Gradually, the union grew, and supporters followed.²

¹ "Union squators and General motors' shy from the brink of peace and return to battle." *Newsweek*, no. 9 (1937): 10-12.

² "Sit-down stike, origin, technique, cost." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 135-138.

Many of the workers of GM who joined the union became sit-downers. They claimed that they were striking not only for themselves but for the rights of every human being that wished to work for General Motors, or who had been wrongfully fired. The sit-downers wanted a conference between the United Automobile Workers of America and the heads of General Motors to negotiate a national agreement. They wanted not only recognition of the union by GM, but GM to recognize the union as the sole bargaining agency. The sit-downers also demanded that employees discriminated against based on their union membership be reinstated. General Motors kept delaying the meeting, until finally strikers began to occupy GM plants. General Motors refused to have a meeting or even consider talking until the sit-down strikers had left the plants. This caused conflicts because neither side wanted to cave in to the others demands.³

In order to get their point across and their demands met, sit-down strikers refused to leave the plants they occupied. They would not work, and refused entry to those they deemed as a threat to their cause. The plant would lose money because it would not be producing anything. As a result of the lack of production, many parts production companies suffered as well. By January 1937, 28,000 workers in 12 Fisher, Chevrolet, and Buick plant and subsidiaries of General Motors Corporations had lost their jobs. Enforced shutdowns in glass, steel, rubber, and parts factories increased the total idle to 70,000. Employers lost money and money was not received by the old employer. Essentially if products were not being bought and made, then the employer was not making as much money as he or she had in previous years. Rubber manufacturers, directly dependent upon tire sales lost millions of dollars and had to lay off

³ Soul, G.H. "Behind the Motors strike." *The New Republic*, no. 89 (1937): 353-354.

about 100,000 employees. In addition, A Good-year Tire and Rubber Company executive disclosed plans to cut 1937 production, and a Youngstown Ohio steel plant closed for lack of GM orders. Many workers became unemployed due to this new method of striking. The sit-downers eventually left the GM plant in February 11, 1937, when some of their demands were met.⁴

There were many different reasons for people to support the strikers. Some supported the strikers on the grounds that workers had the right to support themselves 'and uses strikes to obtain their rights. George Soul was a local man who supported the sit-downers because he believed that a man had a duty to support his family. According to Pope Pius, if a man could not support his family, he was seen negatively in the eyes of others. With long hours and little pay, men from the General Motors Company were in rough financial shape. They had little time with their families, and very little to show for it. According to Pope Pius, "justice above all, which should induce employers and the wealthy to recognize the inalienable right of the working man to a wage sufficient for himself and his family, and safeguard, even in labor, his lofty dignity as a man and a child of God." Pope Pius believed that a man had a responsibility to support his family, and that the sit-down strike was necessary for survival. Pope Pius was concerned with workers justice in general, and approved of the sit-downers.⁵

Others defended the sit-downers on the grounds that they were pursuing non-violent tactics. Sit-downers were not violent, and did not damage any of the plants equipment that were in the buildings and thus were just trying to get their demands met. According to Bruce

⁴ "Labor: Affronted workers throw auto industry out of gear and lead their leaders into major war." *Newsweek*, no. 9 (1937): 9-10.

⁵ "Washington feels labor pressures as sit-downs spread over nation." *Literary Digest*, no. 123 (1937): 3.

Bliven, a local journalist, workers kept the plant clean and even dusted and swept the plant daily. They did not want to destroy the plants; they were simply trying to get a point across that they would no longer work at starvation wages. Victor Reuther, an important labor leader who helped build the United Auto Workers with his two other brothers. Reuther rallied sit-down strikers at General Motors plant and argued that it was the police who created the violence, not the sit-downers. According to Reuther, police went into occupied plants with tear gas, clubs, and guns to try and force the sit-downers out. If equipment got damaged while the sit-downers were in the occupied buildings, it was most likely the police or an informant from GM trying to get them out. Reuther argued that local police have acted as strikebreakers for generations. Reuther and Bliven saw the police as enemies to the sit-downers. Reuther and Bliven both believed that the sit-downers had been forced into this new tactic of striking not by choice. Police brutality and thugs hired by the companies to get strikers to abandon their post outside of the plants led to the emergence of this new strike strategy.⁶

Others argued that the strikers were protecting their interest, just as industrialists had done. Strikers were defending their rights to strike. From the beginning of the New Deal, large industrial and financial concerns led many big businesses to disobey laws of which they did not approve of. Justice Ferdinand Pecora, an American lawyer and judge, argued that the sit-downers were actually doing the same things when they took a stand to strike. When individuals who had little wealth tried to use this tactic of striking, big businesses were not happy according to Justice Ferdinand Pecora. Employers did not want to give decent wages to their employees, because then they would not be as rich. Pecora argued that “employees, who

⁶ Bliven, B. "Sitting down in Flint." *The New Republic*, no. 89 (1937): 377-379

thrive for increased wages, and collective bargaining, are helping to keep a capitalistic system in America.”⁷ According to Pecora, employers were actually in danger of creating a fascist economy, and creating more labor troubles due to their greed not the strikers.⁸

The sit-downers also justified their striking by claiming that their action was legal, and they were not breaking any laws. At this time, there were no laws that prohibited this method of striking. Henry Kraus, first editor of the United Automobile Workers' national newspaper and a labor historian, believed that the sit-downers were not trespassing, according to the legal definition. The definition of trespassing is defined as the “entry of thieves and other criminals who break in for the purpose of damaging property.”⁹ The sit-down strikers entered the property with the knowledge and consent of management, and had no desire to steal or damage any of the property. Their only hope to unionize the automobile industry was to sit-down and strike. General Motors had violated the terms of the Wagner Labor Relations Act thus leaving the employers unprotected. General Motors felt the law to be unconstitutional, and thus bribed men and coerced them not to take part in union activity or join a union.⁷

The sit-down strikers did not have the support of American citizen to agree with them and support their cause. Senator James F. Byrnes, from South Carolina was one of many who did not favor the new tactic of sit-down striking. He believed that since the sit downers ignored the written notice to leave the GM plant they were breaking the law. The sit-downers were violating personal and property rights. Byrnes felt that GM strikers with written notice should

⁷ "Sit-down and fascism." *The New Republic*, no. 90 (1937): 11-13.

⁸ "Sit-down and fascism." *The New Republic*, no. 90 (1937): 11-13.

⁹ "Is the sit-down unfair?." *The New Republic*, no. 90 (1937): 32-33.

follow the law, as abiding citizens.¹⁰ Byrnes argued that “an employee who is employed upon property, and ceases to work for any reason satisfactory to him, whether because he wants higher wages, or because he wants better working conditions-whatever the reason-when he ceases to work and then remains upon the property after receiving notice to leave he is breaking the law.”¹¹ Byrnes had little compassion for the working man when it came to matters of property. California Senator Hiram Johnson agreed with Byrnes in regards to the sit-down tactic. Johnson believed that the sit-downers were violating the law of the United States by not leaving the GM plant. He felt that the President should intervene in the sit-down strike and if need be send the militia in to clear out the GM workers. Byrnes also argued that violence would be the only way to get the sit-downer out of the plant and to abide by the laws of the United States.¹² Senator James Hamilton Lewis, an Illinois Democrat, believed that the state of Michigan needed help, and if the President would not, then it would be the Supreme Court’s obligation to oust the sit-downers out of the plants. According to Lewis, the sit-down strikers were breaking the law, and they should not be able to get away with doing so.¹³

It is unclear where the American public stood on this issue. One Gallup poll showed that Americans wished to expel the sit-down strikers with a turnout of two to one in favor of expelling. George Gallup, the director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, who later thought it appropriate that the average American was not prepared to be tolerant of the sit-down strike.¹⁴ The sit-down strikers started off with many middle class Americans who sympathized with the workers according to the Gallup polls. As the strike progresses and as the

¹⁰ Byrnes, James. “Congress and the sit-down strikes.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 145-146.

¹¹ Byrnes, James. “Congress and the sit-down strikes.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 145-146.

¹² Johnson, Hiram. “Congress and the sit-down strikes.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 146-147.

¹³ “‘Sit-down’ Strikes and supreme courts issue stir congress.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 4 (1937): 97-99.

¹⁴ Gallop, George. “Congress and the sit-down strikes.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 151-152.

public had time to form an opinion of sit-down strikers, the percentage who took the side of the employers increased according to Gallop. At the end of the strike 62 per cent of all people took the side of GM, whereas 38 per cent took the side of the strikers.¹⁵

Some critics saw the strike as presenting a risk to the traditions of American Democracy. Texas representative, Martin Dies and John Frey the president of Metal Trades Department of the A.F. of L, believed that the sit downers were not only violating personal and property rights but they were risking the destruction of democracy. According to Dies, the dictatorship of Mussolini and Hitler had been preceded by a series of such sit down strikes. The sit-downers according to Dies are tenses lending aid and comfort to the enemies of democracy, and are trying to acquire what they want wrongfully. The enemies of Democracy according to Martin Dies are the nations or nations of other people that do not have a Democratic government. The enemies of Democracy could also be Americans that do not condone the way America is run. Dies said that "if he cannot secure the enjoyment of his property rights or the fruits of his labor and earnings under a democracy, he will attempt to do so under dictatorship." Martin Dies was fearful that the sit-down strikes would spread all over America, and thus ruin American Democracy.¹⁶

While many Americans feared that the sit-down strikers was a communist approach others feared fascism as a result of the sit-down strikers. According to John Frey, Italian workmen used the sit-down method, which gave Mussolini the opportunity of issuing edicts that destroyed their voluntary trade unions. This led to the compulsory organizing of the

¹⁵ Gallup, George. "Special supplement: Public opinion in a democracy." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, no. 2 (1938): 8-14.

¹⁶ Dies, Martin. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 147-149.

Fascist unions by the government. John Frey was worried that if the sit-downers continued striking that democracy would be lost to Fascism in America.¹⁷

Other critics of the sit-down strike thought if it continued that American Democracy would be destroyed and the communist regime would take over not Fascism. Joseph Fitcher, a well known writer and reporter at the time argued that the sit-down approach was a communist tactic. The Communist could too easy use it to change every strike into a general strike and create havoc on the American government according to Fitcher. According to Fitcher, when the sit-down strikers began to strike, the Party's Central Committee called upon all Communist to "rally wholeheartedly and at once to the aid of the strikers,"¹⁸ and the Communist were to place "themselves at the total disposal of the union and to do everything possible toward winning the strike."¹⁹ Fitcher argued that the sit-downers were claiming that "the end justifies any means, legal or illegal,"²⁰ which he said was a communist saying, and proved Fitcher's fears.²¹

Many American believed that labor would lose public support the more it chose the path to sit-down. Detroit Mayor Frank Couzens felt that sit-downers were doing more harm than good for the cause of labor. He argued that the majority of the people of the United States did not support the sit-down strikers, and were for presidential intervention or even intervention by the Federal government. American citizens that wanted and were able to work could not, and many became homeless. According to Couzens, "courts orders have been

¹⁷ Frey, John. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 150-151.

¹⁸ Fichter, Joseph. "What's wrong with the sit-down strike?" *Catholic World*, no. 145 (1937): 562-572.

¹⁹ Fichter, Joseph. "What's wrong with the sit-down strike?" *Catholic World*, no. 145 (1937): 562-572.

²⁰ Fichter, Joseph. "What's wrong with the sit-down strike?" *Catholic World*, no. 145 (1937): 562-572.

²¹ Fichter, Joseph. "What's wrong with the sit-down strike?" *Catholic World*, no. 145 (1937): 562-572.

ignored and defied. Thousands of Detroit citizens, desiring to continue work, have been deprived of livelihood, and many millions of dollars in wages have been lost.”²²

Others opposed the sit-down strike on the grounds that it should not be used in place of more permanent solutions. William Green, President of the AFL, believed that temporary advantages gained through sit-down strikes would inevitably lead to permanent injury, and the public would not tolerate the illegal seizure of property according to William Green. William Green was the President of the American Federation of Labor and he was strongly against the sit-down strike tactic. He felt that the sit-down tactic would “deprive organized labor of freedom of association and liberty of action within the limitations of both moral and statutory law.”²³ Joseph Fichter agreed with Green in regards to the sit down strike. Fichter felt that the sit-down strike was impermanent and that it could only be used temporarily, and then only at the “psychological proper time, when labor, public, and the government were willing to put up with its inconvenience.”²⁴

The sit-down strike occurred at a time in history that had many supporters as well as many who opposed them. These men who sat down and struck eventually got some of their demands met, and the unions are very strong today thanks to them. These men risked losing everything and sacrificed family time and pleasurable activities to strike for a cause. These men dealt with political issues and the constant threat of losing. GM workers were accused of breaking the law, being out to destroy American democracy, with very little public support as time went on. The Americans that supported the sit-down strikers tended to be of a religious

²² Couzens, Frank. “Congress and the sit-down strikes.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 149-150.

²³ Green, William. “Press statement expressing official and personal opposition to the sit-down strike.” *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 150.

²⁴ Fichter, Joseph. “What’s wrong with the sit-down strike?” *Catholic World*, no. 145 (1937): 562-572.

██████████

background, and believed in the rights of the workers. Our world today is experiencing plant shut-downs and it is too early to say if a sit-down strike will occur again over these closures. If the workers do not get compensated for their time being in the union, then I would imagine possible another sit-down strike.

Works Cited

- Bliven, B. "Sitting down in Flint." *The New Republic*, no. 89 (1937): 377-379.
- Byrnes, James. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 145-146.
- Couzens, Frank. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 149-150.
- Dies, Martin. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 147-149.
- Fichter, Joseph. "What's wrong with the sit-down strike?" *Catholic World*, no. 145 (1937): 562-572.
- Frey, John. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 150-151.
- Gallop, George. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 151-152.
- Green, William. "Press statement expressing official and personal opposition to the sit-down strike." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 150.
- "Is the sit-down unfair?" *The New Republic*, no. 90 (1937): 32-33.
- Johnson, Hiram. "Congress and the sit-down strikes." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 146-147.
- "Labor: Affronted workers throw auto industry out of gear and lead their leaders into major war." *Newsweek*, no. 9 (1937): 9-10.
- "Sit-down and fascism." *The New Republic*, no. 90 (1937): 11-13.
- "'Sit-down' Strikes and supreme courts issue stir congress." *Congressional Digest*, no. 4 (1937): 97-99.
- "Sit-down stike, origin, technique, cost." *Congressional Digest*, no. 16 (1937): 135-138.
- "'Sit-down' Strikes and supreme courts issue stir congress." *Congressional Digest*, no. 4 (1937): 97-99.
- "Union squators and General motors' shy from the brink of peace and return to battle." *Newsweek*, no. 9 (1937): 10-12.
- "Washington feels labor pressures as sit-downs spread over nation." *Literary Digest*, no. 123 (1937): 3.

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

ARTIFACT COVER SHEET

Student's Name: [Redacted]

Artifact Title: "The Cult of Boris and Gлеб"; A Renewal of a Varangian [Viking] Tradition

Artifact Grade: 87

Course Grade: B+

Comments:

Identify and assess the Departmental outcomes, including knowledge and skills, addressed in this artifact.
This is a fine exhibit that illustrates the author's skill in explicating new interpretations of old material for understanding the oldest saints' lives saga and portraying their gene in a newer light. Author was duly attentive in her unweaving and in the complexity of the text. Although I do not have in front of me the Dept. outcome sheet, Ms. Potter fulfills well the relevant outcome criteria.

Instructor's Signature: [Signature] Date: 12/14/10

Reisman, Edward S. "The Cult of Boris and Gleb: Remnant of a Varangian Tradition." *Russian Review* 37, no. 2 (April 1978): 141-157.

Edward's article in this journal dealt with the issue regarding the Varangians and how they might have influenced early Russia. Edward made a connection between two brothers who died at the hands of another one of their brothers who went by the name of Sviatopolk. The two brothers who died were Gleb and Boris and were said to have both died willingly. Sviatopolk killed his brothers because he wished to be the sole ruler of Russia. According to this article Boris and Gleb's willingness to die could have been closely tied to Varangian pagan religion as well as Christianity. Edwards goes through in great detail both the western Christian and Scandinavian pagan influence and tried to decipher to what extent the Varangians contributed to early Kievan Rus religion.

This article presented and refuted both the pagan and Christian roots associated with Boris and Gleb's deaths. Edward stated clearly why these brothers died but questioned why they did not fight back against their brother Sviatopolk. Did they know they were going to become saints so thus accepted their fate? Did they want to become Christian saints or were they willing to die for their pagan god Perun? These two questions led me to ponder why Boris and Gleb would sacrifice themselves for Perun? How was their god Perun associated with the Varangian god Oddinic? Edward went into great detail the similarities between Perun and Oddinic but failed to mention how Oddinic could have transformed into the Russian word Perun. If the Varangian god Oddinic was similar to the Russian god Perun than why did Edward state that the Russian god Perun was similar to the Varangian god Thor? Was Edward trying to say that Perun derived from Oddinic and Thor? Edward failed to make a clear distinction in this

article where Perun actually derived from. He also failed to mention how exactly the Christian faith came to Gleb and Boris. Edward did state that at their time of death they prayed to a god but to which god was unclear. Was Edward trying to tell the reader that Boris and Gleb's religious faith was that of an "intertwined" belief of pagan and Christianity?

This article was filled with open ended questions. Edward was not biased in one theory or another. Edward stated the facts that were available to him, and shared them in this article. I tended to believe that the Varangian's did influence Russia and so did Christianity. I believe that the Varangian's were the first to infiltrate Russian religion and Christianity came second. I also came to the conclusion that Gleb and Boris were of a "dual religion" and believed they were going to go to heaven but still worshipped icons. They may have been unclear as to the correct faith so thus inter mixed icon worshipping with the Christian beliefs.

This article was very helpful into giving insight into the religious ideals and roots behind Kievan Rus. It was well written, and used academic language wisely. The theories and specific dates seemed to be accurately based on prior knowledge of the subject matter. The sources he chose to use were properly cited in the footnotes. The sources he picked to cite seemed to be of good quality. Someone who knew very little about Kievan Rus would probably have a hard time following. Edward used vocabulary that one who was not familiar with Russia would have trouble. The chosen vocabulary fit well with the context, and a skilled Russian historian would be pleased to read.

Edward's article was written to a narrow audience. I personally enjoyed this article because of the details and questions it ended with. From this article I can look at the footnotes and read more on the subject matter, and the questions that were left unanswered could be

looked up easily. Edward's article gave just enough information needed to make his point made. Whether or not the Varangian's influenced early Russian religion or some other Christian faith is still questionable. This article was an excellent read and I would recommend it to anyone with some prior knowledge of Russian history. It could be a starting point for an individual to expand on his/her thoughts on Russian religion. To disprove the Varangian Pagan influence, Western Christian influence, mix of the two, or come up with a new theory behind Kievan Rus's religious origins could be a motivating factor to reading this article.

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

ARTIFACT COVER SHEET

Student's Name: _____

Artifact Title Women In the Fight to End Slavery - HIST 362

Artifact Grade: B+

Course Grade: B+

Comments:

Identify and assess the Departmental outcomes, including knowledge and skills, addressed in this artifact.

A well organized, clearly argued paper that identifies & discusses several of the most important works in the emergence of the abolitionist movement, good grasp of interpretative issues, of historical context, & of causal relationships (outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4).

Instructor's Signature

R. Dejo


Date:

12/5/10


HISTORY 362

Final Paper:

Women in the Fight to End Slavery


6/3/2009


Professor Ron Dufour



Women's role in the abolitionist movement in regards to slavery in the United States was huge. Women joined men in the quest to fight slavery the best they could. They petitioned Congress, formed societies, fundraised, as well as even risking their lives and reputation when necessary. The problem with women joining men in the pursuit to end slavery was that it questioned whether women were acting within their moral domesticity. Many women argued that they were acting within their boundaries and justified their political engagement through religion and home issues. Other argued that the issue of slavery fell out of the hands of females and into the men alone. Many females of different races joined together to fight slavery in one way or another, politically or silently, the women of the 19th century tended to be against slavery.

Alisse Portnoy's book primarily compared three major women of the 19th century in connection with the emancipation of African Americans. Portnoy did mention other female abolitionist, but not in great detail. Angelina Grimke and Sarah Grimke were two well known women who according to Portnoy were advocates for the immediate emancipation of African Americans and rejected the ACS (American Colonization Society) which was to establish a colony in Africa (Liberia) in which free African Americans would be shipped to and live in freedom.¹ Catherine Beecher was also a well known woman who was against slavery but felt that it was not a women's place to interfere since there was already a program in place to end slavery, the ACS. Beecher was of the belief that Native Americans warranted their help through any means necessary even if it included stepping into the political world of men and petitioning. According to Beecher and the Grimke sisters women had the right to petition. Beecher and

¹ Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women's Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press), 96-102.



other women who followed her ideas in 1830 and 1831 “rejected political power for women, but they made an exception for the ‘unique’ and ‘extraordinary’ case of removal”² primarily Native Americans not African Americans. The Grimke sisters believed not only in petitioning to help Native Americans but to free African Americans as well. These two women “publicly began urging women to form and join abolitionist antislavery societies-and petition the federal government to abolish slavery,”³ while Catherine Beecher disagreed. Beecher was for the colonizationists, while the Grimke sisters were for the abolitionists. This was a conflict not only for women but men as well, whether to support colonization or abolitionist and live amongst African Americans freely. Beecher along with others felt that “the only safe and legal way to end slavery was by working with southern slave owners, not by rebelling against or ostracizing them.”⁴ These women according to Portnoy gave women their rights to speak out and be heard whether for Native American, African Americans, or both, women were now entering the political sphere.⁵

Susan Zaeske’s book, dealt with issues of women stepping into the political arena and petitioning while forming their own identities. Petitioning was common among male anti-slavery societies, and in the past women would only petition on behalf of personal grievances. It was actually Quaker women who first petitioned collectively against slavery.⁶ Many women


² Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women’s Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press), 10.

³ Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women’s Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press), 186.

⁴ Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women’s Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press), 213.

⁵ Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women’s Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press), 203-243.

⁶ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 37.



however feared disapproval and violence when faced with signing petitions. Many women chose to boycott slave product instead of petitioning. Alice Jackson Lewis of Chester County, Pennsylvania urged members of the women's antislavery society for example to not buy slave products.⁷ Women formed antislavery societies during the early 1830's and initially turned away from petitioning, in favor of boycotting, fundraising, putting on fairs, and educating free African Americans, because of the difficulties.⁸ Women did petition but not in great numbers at first. In 1834 through 1836, petitioning was popular and less feared according to Zaeske. According to Zaeske northern women were obligated to petition for their slave sisters because neither slave women nor their husbands could petition for help.⁹ Vina Wendell along with 358 other ladies of Massachusetts stated that it was their duty as women to urge upon Congress to end the suffering of slave women and children.¹⁰ Zaeske is making a connection in her book between women's role in morality and in connection with their own gender.

Susan Zaeske in chapter four discusses Southern white male unrest in regards to petitioning, especially women. According to Zaeske "slaveholders were conspiring to destroy northerners civil rights and included women's right to petition among those guaranteed by the Constitution."¹¹ In the *Appeal to the Women of the Nominally Free States*, northern women were urged to work against slavery through petitioning, reading about slavery, and joining

⁷ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 41.

⁸ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 38-46.

⁹ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 65.

¹⁰ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 65.

¹¹ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 76.

abolitionist societies.¹² According to the *Appeal*, “women should be able to petition because they were equal to men and possessed the same rights.”¹³ Men were denying women their natural rights and free women would no longer tolerate it in silence. According to Zaeske, “the presence of female signatures indicates that by the mid 1830’s many women possessed a level of literacy”¹⁴ which gave them power and opportunities in the political sphere. Women’s signatures on antislavery petitions signaled not only an abolitionist identity but also the identity of women who believed that religious conviction justified political action, as well as their willingness to defy prohibitions against petitioning.¹⁵

Julie Roy Jeffrey’s book talks about how abolitionist was the first social movement to involve women. Women joined antislavery societies and formed relationships with one another. Women were working with each other for the immediate emancipation for African Americans. Ordinary women from 1830 up until the civil war were active abolitionist with the same goal in mind, and were the backbone of the movement. Jeffrey states in her book that slavery was a sin and that females had a moral and religious duty to “eradicate”.¹⁶ According to Jeffrey women’s moral duty to end slavery demanded an abolitionist commitment which limited the challenge to gender arrangements.¹⁷ Abolitionism gave women a personal and

¹² Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 89.

¹³ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 89.

¹⁴ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 106.

¹⁵ Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 107-108.

¹⁶ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 4.

¹⁷ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 8.

emotional focus and allowed a woman to create a moral identity that was both rooted in and separated from her family identity.¹⁸

Anti-slavery societies were very important for women according to Jeffrey. Many women joined antislavery societies because they believed collective action to be more effective than individual exertion.¹⁹ Anti-slavery female societies “taught women how to argue the abolitionist cause and to encourage women to circulate antislavery material, recruit, and talk with other women far from the kitchen or parlor.”²⁰ Anti-slavery societies also exchanged copies of their constitutions, advised, and shared information from the format of a meeting to their plans for the future to inspire other societies.²¹ A problem that many female antislavery societies had was maintaining their member’s initial enthusiasm and getting women to speak in public because in the past it was unheard of for a woman to speak in public.²²

Julie Roy Jeffrey’s book, in chapter three conveys what female anti-slavery societies actually did. Female anti-slavery societies not only collected signatures for petitions but circulated tracts and newspapers, fundraised, educated free blacks, put on fairs, and sewed for the fairs in which the profits went to the cause to end slavery and better the lives of free slaves while at the same time creating propaganda.²³ Women actually wrote in the *Liberator*, (a newspaper by a male abolitionist by the name of Garrison), in a section established as the

¹⁸ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 36.

¹⁹ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 40-41.

²⁰ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 52.

²¹ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 60.

²² Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 67-80.

²³ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 99-128.

Ladies' Department and wrote about the injustices of slavery and female abolitionist meetings and societies.²⁴ In the 1856 election 31 women dressed in white representing the existing states while one woman dressed in black which signified Kansas where Southerners battled to enrich slavery.²⁵ Women took a political stance on the issue of slavery and even risked their reputation to stand for what they believed in.²⁶

According to Jeffrey, as public attitude shifted during the 1850's to a greater tolerance if not acceptance of abolitionism, women who had dropped out of the anti-slavery societies became active members again.²⁷ The Dred Scott decision of 1857 gave slave owners the right to take their slaves anywhere in the United States, and enraged many free states.²⁸ This led to many antislavery female societies assisting fugitives. Abigail and Lydia Mott, two Quaker females were of the belief that assisting fugitive slaves was a duty and breaking the fugitive law was common.²⁹ Women broke laws when it went against their fight to end slavery, and fought just as hard as male abolitionist.³⁰

Beth Salerno's books explains how women formed societies and were united before the slave cause and formed new groups and expanded on the old. For decades before the slave

²⁴ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 16-23.

²⁵ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 165.

²⁶ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 170.

²⁷ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 173-174.

²⁸ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 178.

²⁹ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 178-180.

³⁰ Julie R. Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press), 178-232.

cause women formed societies to aid the poor, needy, and oppressed.³¹ According to Salerno, women were united prior to the slave debate. The first groups of women to actually join together in the fight against slavery were Quaker women that tended to shun association with non Quakers. Before the Quaker women decided to talk with non Quakers those women who wished to be more active in the anti-slavery crusade were suppose to have supported the ACS's plan of gradual emancipation. Many African American women as well as men did not like the idea of moving to Africa when their home was in North America. Maria Stewart, a well known African American at the time lectured in Boston in 1833 and publically chastised the ACS. She wanted to be equal, and by agreeing to go to Africa she would be admitting to unworthiness.³² Women of all colors and geographic backgrounds eventually met in 1837 at the Antislavery Convention of American Women and put their differences apart to end slavery.³³

Beth Salerno's book mentioned female anti-slavery societies that were biracial. According to Salerno, two African American females by the names of Grace Douglas and Margarett Forten were said to have helped find the Philadelphia Female Anti-slavery Society. Women who joined such organizations faced mob violence, and risked social reproach. Lydia Maria Child was just one woman who lost some of her friends and reading fans when she expanded her writings on children stories to publish antislavery works. She risked her name and fans for the cause of slavery.³⁴ In 1838 women met again in concerns with ending slavery at the Second Antislavery Convention of American Women. At this convention the question of the

³¹ Beth A. Salerno, *Sister Societies: Women's Antislavery Organizations in Antebellum America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press), 5-9.

³² Beth A. Salerno, *Sister Societies: Women's Antislavery Organizations in Antebellum America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press), 14-16.

³³ Beth A. Salerno, *Sister Societies: Women's Antislavery Organizations in Antebellum America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press), 78

³⁴ Beth A. Salerno, *Sister Societies: Women's Antislavery Organizations in Antebellum America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press), 43-48.

appropriate role of women came up, and how women should confront race and gender relation issues. This eventually led women to divide even further amongst one another. Some women believed that while the slave cause was crucial they belonged in the home and men in politics. While others believed that greater equality with men was central to their ability to fight for slaves. According to Salerno, this demand for women's rights eventually led to the 1848 Woman's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, in which women demanded economic, and legal reforms in the status of women nationwide and called for women's right to vote. Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were just but a few of the many women who were advocates for reforms that included demands for economic and political rights for women. Women stepped from behind their men's shadows and into the political world and fought hard.³⁵

Jean Fagan Yellin along with John C. Van Horne, published the book *The Abolitionist Sisterhood*, that was primarily about three female abolitionist societies that had one goal in mind to eradicate slavery. The New York Female Anti-Slavery Society (NYFASS), Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society (BFASS), and the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society (PFASS) all fought hard and worked together to try and end slavery. These societies according to Yellin and Horne were the first to move beyond the limits of the family, be gender conscious, and to use these societies to eventually advance women's rights and interest.³⁶

According to Yellin and Horne, the BFASS and the PFASS were more radical than the conservative NYFASS. Angelina Grimke described the NYFASS to be "utterly ineffective, paralyzed by their sinful prejudice, which shut women of color from leadership and discouraged

³⁵ Beth A. Salerno, *Sister Societies: Women's Antislavery Organizations in Antebellum America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press), 82-125.

³⁶ Jean F. Yellen and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 4-18.

them from membership.”³⁷ The NYFASS was said to have close ties with the evangelical revivalisms which prevented them from embracing thought or action that might have weakened the “God given hierarchical family structure” and which embraced the “church going Christian family, with the mother in her proper and secondary sphere as religious and moral guardian.”³⁸ The NYFASS focuses mostly on “...religious improvements for the colored population, revealed a greater interest in benevolence and the Bible than in institutional reform.”³⁹ The BFASS was totally different and focused on the egalitarian tradition of the American Revolution and the principles of natural rights than by “...doctrines of sin and salvation.”⁴⁰ The PFASS linked political inequality to sin, and was an advocate recruiter for women of diverse backgrounds.⁴¹ All three societies according to Yellin and Horne were ridiculed by men for assuming the status of men contrary to what they thought themselves as being good Republican mothers.⁴²

Women anti-slavery societies in 1830 brought blacks and whites women together and violence sometimes broke out due to this intermixing of races. In May 1838 at the second Anti-Slavery Convention of American Women, a mob of white people burned down Pennsylvania Hall. Abby Kelley was just one white of many females who walked “arm-in-arm with black

³⁷ Jean F. Yellin and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 40.

³⁸ Jean F. Yellin and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 32.

³⁹ Jean F. Yellin and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 36.

⁴⁰ Jean F. Yellin and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 36.

⁴¹ Jean F. Yellin and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 37.

⁴² Jean F. Yellin and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 35-39.

women abolitionist, helping to protect them.”⁴³ Lucretia Mott was another woman who arranged “for women to go arm-in-arm, one black woman and one white woman.”⁴⁴ Black women who joined female anti-slavery societies had much more to lose than whites.⁴⁵ All three of these female anti-slavery societies tried the best they could, and while some white women in the organizations may have been prejudice to some degree, they all felt strongly against slavery.⁴⁶

Shirley J. Yee’s book focused on black woman activist and their efforts to overcome the barriers of racism and sexism. Racism within organized abolition became a public issue as black leaders pointed out the secondary status of blacks in the movement. Black women had more to lose than white women and were fearful of their freedom.⁴⁷ Many black women abolitionist were wage earners who struggled to make an honest living, few came from wealthy families. Female black abolitionist wage earners made a living by teaching, running small businesses, as domestic servants, seamstresses, or related work at laundresses.⁴⁸ African American females struggled not only with survival and making a living, but with keeping up with a good reputation. Black women were seen in slave states as slave labor as well as sexual commodities, which was very hard to overcome.⁴⁹

⁴³ Jean F. Yellen and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women’s Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 237.

⁴⁴ Jean F. Yellen and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women’s Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 286.

⁴⁵ Jean F. Yellen and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women’s Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 239.

⁴⁶ Jean F. Yellen and John C. Van Horne, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women’s Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press), 273-2.

⁴⁷ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abalitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 1-11.

⁴⁸ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 13-17.

⁴⁹ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 20-80.

Many African Americans according to Yee thought education to be the answer. Many free blacks were focused more on improving their own standards of life than freeing the slave states. While many free African Americans did not agree with slavery, they believed by educating themselves that they could gain respect by the whites and the whites would see the wrongs in slavery.⁵⁰ An African American women by the name of Sarah Douglass believed in educating blacks and she was noted for “teaching the ‘higher branches’ of knowledge and emphasized domestic skills in her school for young black women in Philadelphia.”⁵¹ Other female African American helped one another by operating orphanages and to committing to self-help.⁵² The Fugitive slave act in 1850 “prompted leaders of benevolent societies in northern cities and Canada to increase efforts to aid fugitive slaves, most of whom arrived in a destitute condition.”⁵³ Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman were two slave women who escaped slavery with the help of abolitionist. Sojourner Truth did not forget where she came from and became an abolitionist, preacher, and advocate for women’s rights. Harriet Tubman was a female abolitionist that escaped to freedom and did not forget about other slaves she came into contact with. She led hundreds of slaves to freedom along the Underground Railroad. Many black women as well as white provided hiding places, food, and fresh clothing to fugitives in order to get them safely to Canada. Working with fugitives provided a sense of power to women.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 60-88.

⁵¹ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 64.

⁵² Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 81-85.


⁵³ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 78.

⁵⁴ Shirley J. Yee, *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press), 21-39.

All six of these books had a common theme that involved women in the slave debate. These books were very similar, and talked about a lot of the same people and societies. Alisse Portnoy's book focused around Catherine Beecher and the Grimke sisters. These two women were mentioned in the other five books I read. This book was a great introductory book into women's part in the immediate emancipation of African Americans. It failed however to go into detail as to the female anti-slavery societies, and female African Americans. It did give insight as to how women were looked at and expected to act. It mentioned Native Americans and did a great comparison as to why some women failed to petition and protest slavery.

Susan Zaeske's book went into great detail as to what the women who protested against slavery actually did. This book went beyond Portnoy's, with its details, but failed to mention particular abolitionist women in great detail. This book focused a lot on women part in petitioning. Julie R. Jeffrey's book was very similar to Beth Salerno, and Jean F. Yellen and John C. Van Horne's, *The Abolitionist Sisterhood*. Julie R. Jeffrey's book gave an overview of female's role and demands they faced while protesting. These three books talked about female societies and what they did. These three books were closely related and talked a lot about the same people, events, societies, and difficulties associated with female abolitionist. Beth Salerno's book went into a little more detail on female African Americans part in the slave cause than Jeffrey's. Yellen and Horne's book tended to repeat the same information in different ways throughout the book. This book went into the most detail when it came to female anti-slavery societies.

Shirley J. Yee's book concentrated mainly on African American women. It did mention a lot of the same events that some of the other books mentioned, but put with a twist. Yee's



book primarily mentioned only African American women that were involved and what they did and achieved. This book was a great ending book because it tied the events of the other books with black women, and the part they played in the fight to end slavery.

These six books went well with each other. These books tended to repeat the other while reinforcing what women of all races sacrificed for the slave cause. Women of the 19th century who joined in the fight to end slavery did not always have a lot of support from their family and friends, the majority did not. Women fought hard and long, and this eventually led them to wanting their own freedom, and women's rights. All six of these books ended with women's rights. Women's part in the fight against slavery gave them a voice and many expanded past what was comfortable and safe.



Bibliography

Jeffrey, Julie R. *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Portnoy, Alisse. *Their Right to Speak: Women's Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Salerno, Beth A. *Sister Societies: Women's Antislavery Organizations in Antebellum America*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2005.

Yellen, Jean F., and John C. Van Horne. *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Yee, Shirley J. *Black Women Abolitionists: A Study in Activism 1828-1860*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1992.

Zaeske, Susan. *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT
SUMMARY SHEET

REVIEWERS INSTRUCTIONS: Please consult the scoring rubric on criteria for Knowledge, Communication, and Analysis and assign a numerical score of **5** for mastery, **3** for satisfactory, and **1** for unsatisfactory for each outcome.

DEPARTMENTAL OUTCOMES

1. Understand how historians gather, interpret and analyze a wide range of primary and secondary source data/material (including literary, geographical, political and socio-economic material) and how historians construct a coherent narrative from this information. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1; NCSS 1.4, 1.7, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

2. Demonstrate the skills of historical analysis and interpretation, such as compare and contrast, differentiate between historical facts and interpretation, consider multiple perspectives, analyze cause and effect relationships, compare competing historical narratives, recognize the tentative nature of historical interpretation and analyze the influence of the past. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2; NCSS 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1.3, 2.1.5)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

3. Think chronologically and comprehensively, identifying temporal structures of historical narratives and comprehending the meanings of historical texts, monographs and documents, including their audiences, goals, perspectives and biases. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3; NCSS 1.2, 2.1.1)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

4. Develop research capabilities that enable them to formulate historical questions and themes, obtain and question historical data, identify the gaps in available records, place sources in context, and construct reliable historical interpretations. RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3; NCSS 1.7, 2.1.1, 2.1.4)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

5. Demonstrate their knowledge of the history, culture and values of diverse peoples and traditions throughout the world and compare patterns of continuity and change. (RIBTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.7; NCSS 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1.6, 2.1.7)

Mastery

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory