

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE  
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

History Sec/Ed

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

- 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



## Student Portfolio

### Secondary Education History Major

The first paper I will discuss in the portfolio is my History 200 paper, which discusses the veteran bonus debate that took place in the early 1930's. This highly contested debate had splintered the country's opinion in how to handle the bonuses promised to World War I veterans. Since this was such a controversial issue, not all historians agree on how to tell the story. In my research I encountered many different perspectives and biases that I had to sift through in order to tell the story of the bonus marchers accurately. In the process of doing this I came across many different primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. Therefore, I was able to question historical data, place sources in context, and consider multiple perspectives. All of these factors allowed me to demonstrate my research skills. Additionally, I was able to formulate and explain my own interpretations of the veteran bonus debate. In this paper I completed learning outcomes 1, 2,3,4,7, and 8.

The next paper I will discuss is my History 362 paper, which discusses the role the Cold War had on the Eisenhower administration's decisions regarding domestic policy. The concentration of this paper explains that outside forces and cultures influenced how the United States approached civil rights and segregation. In order to write this paper effectively I had to comprehend the meaning of historical texts while thinking chronologically and comprehensively. Additionally, the paper includes how cultures and values compare throughout the world and how those values change or try to stay the same. This paper represents all of the techniques and strategies I have learned in the history program at Rhode Island College, which demonstrates that

I have the necessary skills to be an independent and lifelong learner. In this paper I completed learning outcomes 2, 3, 5, 8, and 9.

The final paper in this portfolio I will discuss is from my History 300 (Ancient Greece) class. This paper explains the differences in gender roles between the Greek city-states during antiquity. The focus of this paper was to discuss the differences in culture between two societies that were located in the same region. The gender roles of these societies affected politics, technology, and employment in ancient Greece. This paper required extensive research of primary and secondary sources which debated the role of women in Athens and Sparta. In order to achieve the object of the paper I interpreted and analyzed a range of sources. Furthermore, in gathering these sources I formulated my own interpretations of these ancient societies and their gender roles. In this paper I completed learning outcomes 1, 2,4,6, and 7.

# STUDENT PORTFOLIO

## SCOPE

All liberal arts and secondary education history majors must submit a portfolio of their work to the History Department for the purpose of programmatic assessment. It is expected that portfolios will provide developmental rather than summary evidence of your performance and that portfolio artifacts will reflect the Department's learning outcomes.

## PORTFOLIO:

### PART I. INTRODUCTION:

Students must write a brief 1-2 page introduction to their portfolios which summarize the content of their artifacts and how each address the Department's learning outcomes.

### PART II. COMMON ARTIFACTS:

All student portfolios will include two common artifacts. These artifacts are the main paper from both:

- History 200 The Nature of Historical Inquiry
- History 361 Research Seminar (liberal arts majors)

Or

- History 362 Reading Seminar (secondary education majors)

### PART III. ADDITIONAL ARTIFACT:

All student portfolios will include an additional artifact from a History course taken at the 300 level. If the common artifacts do not meet all of the programmatic outcomes, please make sure you choose an additional artifact that addresses any missing outcomes. This artifact may include book reviews, precis, research papers, primary source analyses, reaction papers, exams, etc.

## SUBMISSION DATES

Liberal arts students must submit their portfolios upon the conclusion of their programmatic requirements in History. For most of you, this will occur in your senior year following completion of your History 361 seminar paper. The

submission is required for completion of the course. Secondary education students submit their portfolios at the completion of Practicum and prior to student teaching. Remember, the portfolio is an admission requirement for student teaching.

## **LEARNING OUTCOMES**

As outcomes of their education, within the overall History major, students learn and are able to:


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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
6. Understand the historical context for the interaction and interdependence of politics, society, science and technology in a variety of cultural settings.
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.
8. Demonstrate research skills utilizing the full-range of available materials including those found in libraries, archives, museums and electronic resources.
9. Demonstrate the skills necessary to be an independent and lifelong learner.



RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE  
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

ARTIFACT COVER SHEET

Student's Name: 

Artifact Title

*The Veteran Bonus Debate*

Artifact Grade:

*B+*

Course Grade:

*A*

Comments:

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

*This artifact shows mastery of learning outcome #1, 2, 4, 7 and 8. Great research and strong analysis & organization.*

Instructor's Signature

*Liz Rhode*

Date

*12/13/10*

In 1925, veterans approved legislation that determined World War I veterans would be paid their bonuses in full, twenty years later. Yet a few years later the financial market had crashed and with it many American dreams. As a result, millions of people had lost their jobs at a quickening pace. Veterans were not spared unemployment despite their contributions to the United States. The veterans became desperate for relief from high unemployment, empty pockets, and hungry stomachs. The dire situation that veterans faced triggered strong, passionate discussions on whether to fully pay the veteran bonuses in 1932, which was well before the initial deadline of 1945. Politicians and veterans debated whether the payment of these bonuses had to be made for several essential reasons. In addition, this generated another factor in the debate which was if the impact, after the bonuses had been paid to the veterans, would assist the economy or devastate the fragile financial system. By 1931 the debate about whether the veterans of World War I in the United States should have been immediately compensated became a public topic throughout the country. This debate produced strong, valid arguments from both sides of the issue that gained significant support leading to a climax and resolution to the issue. These arguments included how the government would pay the veterans, could these men live without their bonuses, would the payment to all these veterans help or hurt the economy, would giving money to only the veterans in a desperate economic time be fair to the rest of the population, and why would the government let the soldiers partly borrow on their bonuses when the government claimed full payment could not be achieved.

Many believed that the payment of the bonuses to the veterans was essential for several reasons due to the economy's dire condition and they believed that the money in those bonuses would help stimulate the economy. One reason is that many veterans and politicians believed

that the former soldiers had earned an immediate compensation for their participation in World War I and demanded the government pay it at that time. Representative Wright Patman, democrat from Texas, led the struggle in the House for veteran's full payment of bonuses. He felt that the government had an obligation to pay its ex-service men the money in a timely manner.<sup>1</sup> This meant that the bonuses should be paid to the veterans when they needed it not when the government felt it was necessary to give it to them. The Patman bill proposed, in 1931, the immediate distribution of cash to the veterans. This legislation had sparked some hope for veterans who demanded their bonuses immediately.<sup>2</sup> Representative Patman felt that the veterans were not asking for a bonus but for the payment of an honest debt that the government owed to its ex-servicemen. The bill had stated that compensation to the veterans was the civic duty of the country and that the assistance to those men was long overdue. Wright Patman was not alone in his fight for veteran bonus payment; two of his immediate supporters were Representative Edward Eslick and Senator Thomas Schall.

Congressmen Eslick and Schall both had been veterans and strongly believed that immediate payment to all the veterans was necessary and the government had no choice but to acknowledge the demands of these men. Representative Eslick believed that the current contract, which was agreed upon seven years earlier, with the ex-servicemen, was the government's duty to pay its military heroes when they needed it most. He stated "this contract was a one-sided contract. It was 'take this or nothing' between the government and its soldiers."<sup>3</sup> In addition, he argued that when the soldiers agreed to Congress's proposal they had not realized

---

<sup>1</sup> Wright Patman, "Should the World War Veterans be Paid Bonuses." Congressional Digest ; Nov32, Vol. 11 Issue 11, p270

<sup>2</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 15, 1932, 12485

<sup>3</sup> "Eslick dies in house pleading for bonuses," New York Times, June 15, 1932

that the government could have assisted them more or even that they could have received the bonuses sooner.<sup>4</sup> Eslick had suffered a heart attack during arguments on the House floor supporting the Patman plan which many people believed was because of his passion speech. He fell to the ground during the climax of his empowered argument. It was confirmed that he had a heart attack and countless veterans felt that he died fighting for their cause.<sup>5</sup> Another compassionate supporter of the Patman plan was Senator Schall who believed that the government should have admitted that they owed the former soldiers their money and should take care of them by any means necessary. He also did not understand why the soldiers should have to wait a generation to have received their bonuses.<sup>6</sup> He argued if the soldiers had done their job, which they did, then the government must do their job and that was to give the veteran what they deserve.

Another argument brought up in the debate for the bonuses was the unfair borrowing that the government had let the veterans make on their bonuses. In 1931, the veterans had been allowed to borrow up to fifty percent on their bonuses before the 1945 deadline, but with high interest. One of the veteran's leaders outspoken on this issue was W.W. Waters. He led part of the Bonus Expeditionary Force (B.E.F.), a group of veterans fighting for the full payment of their bonuses. He and other veterans had become desperate for the money and applied for the partial "loan" on their bonuses. Waters himself had been told that he applied too late and would have to wait for two additional years to receive fifty percent of his bonus early. The majority of others had been able to receive their money but at a cost of high interest.<sup>7</sup> This would mean that the veterans who had borrowed would receive less money in 1945, if any at all. Waters and his

---

<sup>4</sup> New York Times, June 15, 1932

<sup>5</sup> New York Times, June 15, 1932

<sup>6</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 13, 1932, 13271-13273

<sup>7</sup> W.W. Waters, *Mass violence in America: B.E.F. The whole story of the bonus army* (1933), 2

fellow veterans argued that the interest that was supposed to be accumulated would not reach its goal because over half the fund would be depleted early. In other words, the government needed a minimum amount of money in this private fund so that a large amount of interest could become compounded over time, which would produce more money. This then would have resulted in the veterans receiving less than agreed upon and they would have still waited until 1945. Patman and other Congressmen believed this was completely wrong and immoral because the interest would eat up the remainder of the veteran's bonus money. Since the money had been intended for the ex-soldier they should not have been penalized for taking money out of their own fund. Patman argued that this was an additional reason that the bonuses should be paid immediately because the ex-soldiers had been getting less than agreed upon and the government started to profit off the bonuses.<sup>8</sup> The veterans and the American Legion felt that if the Congress and the President of the United States had passed a law that let the soldier borrow half the money from their own fund, then there was no reason to resist paying the remainder of the bonuses in 1932.

An additional argument for the immediate payment of bonuses was that this would help the veterans survive the depression and also help stimulate the troubled economy. The veterans had the ability to do this through the combination of the Owen plan with the established Patman bill. The Owen plan was a program that was proposed to control the expansion of currency by purposely adding new currency to the economy.<sup>9</sup> The Owen plan would pump money into the economy by giving money to the veterans, which would accomplish both goals. This currency would be a massive payment of bonuses to the veterans totaling in the billions.<sup>10</sup> The form of disbursement to most of the veterans would be immediate cash payment

---

<sup>8</sup> Patman, 271

<sup>9</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 13, 1932, 12843-12844

<sup>10</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 13, 1932, 12835

but some would be paid through bonds that could be used to accumulate interest that would then produce the correct amount of money that was owed to them.<sup>11</sup> The supporters of this combined plan had argued that not only would the veterans be able to survive the depression but even assist the economy. A few of these supporters had been Representative Carl Vinson, Senator Elmer Thomas, Senator John Blaine, and veteran W.W. Waters. Vinson argued that paying veterans their bonuses would mean that they would have purchasing power. This power means that these men would spend their money on essential products and services that would help benefit the economy. As a result, Vinson and others argued that not only would the veterans be able to survive the depression but the economy could improve. Then, some Americans had a chance to have felt some financial relief. The payment could be used as a type of small stimulus package to get money moving in the economy. Senator Thomas had agreed that if the bill had passed the veterans would not be the only people benefiting from the bill. He believed the other millions of American citizens would benefit even more from the bonuses than the veterans would have themselves.<sup>12</sup> He believed that this purchasing would bring more money into circulation. Thomas and his supporters argued that making the dollar more plentiful would reduce the value of the dollar, so that it will supply more citizens with money.<sup>13</sup> Senator Blaine had argued that the vast majority of veterans would not hoard the money for themselves but spend it and add to the anemic economy. He argued that even though some veterans were in stable condition the vast majority of veterans had been suffering and deserved the immediate payment of the

---

<sup>11</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 13, 1932, 12844-12846

<sup>12</sup> Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13249-13250

<sup>13</sup> Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13251-13253

adjusted-service certificates.<sup>14</sup> In addition, supporters suggest that payment of bonuses would also lead to a lower unemployment rate because employers would be more likely to hire workers with extra money being spent by the population which would end up in businesses.

Representative Thomas had argued that the payment of the veteran's adjusted-service certificates would fill the soldier's pockets and they would then purchase goods and services that allowed businesses to have place orders and replenish shelves.<sup>15</sup> Thomas believed that this would encourage businesses to have hired more workers which would lower the incredibly high unemployment rate. In addition, the severely overwhelmed charities all over the country would receive some relief because there would be less people in the population that had to receive assistance or charity. Therefore, no veterans would be in need and more Americans could then use the public services such as: soup kitchens and homeless shelters, supplied by the government and some private citizens to improve daily life during the depression. Senator Blaine also argued that if the government had been able to pass a bill that loaned millions of dollars to the railroads, the banks, and certain insurance companies then it should honor its obligation to the veterans and should receive their money without further delay.<sup>16</sup> He also stated that if the government has that money to loan out to support private businesses then the government had the money to pay the soldiers who were on the federal payroll. The leader of the Bonus Expeditionary Force W.W. Waters and his fellow veterans agreed with the Congressmen's arguments regarding the immediate payment of bonuses. He argued the bonus would enable him and other veterans to have obtained food, housing, clothes, and other essentials that a job would have been able to

---

<sup>14</sup>Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13242-13243

<sup>15</sup>Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13252

<sup>16</sup>Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13240

supply. Waters said that the lump sum of money would also pay for the debt accumulated during the depression and help them survive until they eventually found another job.<sup>17</sup>

The increasing age of the veterans had sparked another argument supporting the immediate payment of the bonuses. The increase in age had brought additional, costly medical care that would have a negative effect on the veteran's families. Wright Patman had pointed out that since the average age of the veterans was thirty-nine they would not have received their bonuses until they had reached fifty-two years old if the prior agreement was upheld.<sup>18</sup>

According to Patman, if the veterans had to wait until the 1945 deadline many might have died or experienced awful hardships that their families would have to endure while waiting for the bonuses. The veterans should receive their bonuses when they need it most not twenty years after they are in need of them. Patman believed that the immediate payment of the bonuses would be the only real and honorable solution to the whole debate.<sup>19</sup>

This debate had also produced passionate and convincing arguments that had been against the immediate disbursement of bonuses. These people believed that the payment of bonuses to the veterans would hurt the United States economy as a whole and the veterans could survive economically until 1945, when they would have received their bonuses. The main supporter of these two arguments was the President of the United States. President Hoover believed that the welfare of the nation as a whole must take priority over the demands of any particular group including the veterans of World War I. He argued that he had a duty to protect and serve the other twenty-one million families of the United States not just the four million

---

<sup>17</sup> Waters, 9

<sup>18</sup> Patman, 271

<sup>19</sup> Patman, 271



veterans and their families.<sup>20</sup> The veterans were not the only citizens in desperate need of economic assistance, the rest of the families in the United States had been in the same situation so they had to wait for their bonuses until 1945. President Hoover stated that those nonveteran families were also entitled to consideration of any legislation passed by Congress. He believed that the employment and recovery of the United States would only be secured once the normal economic life of the nation was restored. The president stated that restoring balance to the economy was what he and congress had been devoting their time and best efforts towards. That is why he believed the Patman bill should not have passed and anything else that stood in the way of those goals he would oppose and veto.<sup>21</sup> Senator George Norris from Nebraska agreed with President Hoover's assessment of the adjust-service certificates for the veterans. Norris argued that the veterans had not been the only people unemployed in the country during the depression and should not receive their bonuses early because of high unemployment. According to the Senator, the best option for the ex-servicemen was to try to stimulate jobs for them as well as all other Americans that are not employed.<sup>22</sup> Senator Norris stated that he would have voted for the immediate payment of the veteran bonuses if they had been the only group of people unemployed in the country, however they were just a small fraction of the needy. He argued that the largest priority at that time was to alleviate the high unemployment rate in the United States and then discuss the other issues on a later date, which included the bonus payments<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Herbert Hoover, *Presidential Papers, 1932-1933*, 426-427

<sup>21</sup> Hoover, 427

<sup>22</sup> Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13254-13255

<sup>23</sup> Senate floor, *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932, 13255

An additional argument against the payment of bonuses was that it was dangerous and unfair to give a large amount of money to a small group of people, which would damage the economy further. Fiorello LaGuardia was one figure leading the opposition to the immediate payment of the bonuses. He stated that if the veterans had received their bonuses early, less than four percent of the population would receive over two billion dollars.<sup>24</sup> LaGuardia, a member of the House of Representatives, argued that this would devastate the economy; therefore the plan would not produce growth or stimulate the economy. In addition he believed that if the government gave the former soldiers their bonus early it would do nothing to provide employment to the country's citizens. Another person in opposition was Roy Woodruff who had served in World War I and had been promised a bonus. The difference was that Woodruff was now an elected official in the House of Representatives who felt the veterans should not receive that much money during a depression. Therefore, he felt himself and any other veteran should not be given the bonus. Congressman Woodruff argued that the unemployed had reached ten million but only approximately one million of them had been World War I veterans. He felt that giving the payment due to the veterans any earlier than the date already agreed upon would show great injustice to the others now out of work and suffering economically.<sup>25</sup> As a result, he and other veterans that would receive the bonuses would help hurt the economy further.

Others argued against early payment because reimbursement at this early date would come out of the pockets of the tax payers and the treasury and not the fund established for the ex-servicemen. This independent fund had been developed for the veterans and would acquire enough interest to pay the entire veteran's bonus money. Representative Charles Crisp argued that the immediate payment of the veteran bonuses would have brought even further economic

---

<sup>24</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 13, 1932, 12847

<sup>25</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 14, 1932, 12918

disarray upon the United States. Crisp believed that since the appropriate interest had not been acquired in the government's veteran fund because not enough time had elapsed so, the American taxpayers would have to pay for the bonuses.<sup>26</sup> Also, he felt that the economic condition of the country could not handle the disbursement of such a large sum of money to the veterans before the 1945 deadline. General John O'Ryan who had been in the New York National Guard was opposed to the immediate payment of bonuses to the soldiers.<sup>27</sup> He explained that the fund set up by the government, in 1925, was filled with some of the veteran's bonuses to then acquire a four percent interest for the following twenty years.<sup>28</sup> This compounded interest would then have produced the remaining money needed to pay the veterans. O'Ryan believed that if that plan was altered in anyway the veterans would not be able to receive the bonuses in 1945. He argued that no veteran would be able to receive their bonuses if the bonuses loaned out to the veterans.<sup>29</sup> President Hoover also argued that the fund developed to produce compound interest was the only option to give the veterans their bonuses. Hoover stated that if the veterans had to be paid in 1932, then every American family would have to be taxed to cover the bonuses.<sup>30</sup> He argued that tax increase "would drain every family budget in our country today and weigh heavily on business struggling in the midst of depression."<sup>31</sup> He believed that such a decision would trigger widespread ruin to the whole country and devastate all of the country's citizens. In addition, President Hoover warned that the country had lost a lot in the depression but could lose more if the wrong decisions were made.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 14, 1932, 12915-12916

<sup>27</sup> John F. O'Ryan, "Should the World War Veterans' Service Certificates be Paid in Cash?," *Congressional Digest*; Nov32, Vol. 11 Issue 11, p281

<sup>28</sup> O'Ryan, 281

<sup>29</sup> O'Ryan, 283

<sup>30</sup> Hoover, 428

<sup>31</sup> Hoover, 428

<sup>32</sup> Hoover, 429

One argument against the payment of the bonus was that the veterans and their leadership had agreed to accept bonus payment in 1945, which demonstrated that they had acknowledged they could have survived financially until that year. The veterans had understood the conditions of the agreement made in 1925 that allowed for twenty years of interest to accumulate, then at that time pay the bonuses. An article in "The New York Times" addressed the issue of federal relief for the veterans up until 1932. The article states that the veterans and their families of World War I had received over five billion dollars in relief and medical care since the end of the war.<sup>33</sup> Also, the veteran leaders who had agreed to the payment at a later date acknowledge that the contract was fair and that the veterans could survive until the compensation in twenty years. The article also states that the bonuses would account for a quarter of all the expenditures the government would have in 1932.<sup>34</sup> This was well over the estimated budget for that year.

Another argument against the payment of bonuses in 1932 was that the government had offered a measure of assistance to the veterans by letting them borrow up to fifty percent of the face value of their bonus certificates. Representative Hamilton Fish argued, in the House, that since the veterans had able to borrow fifty percent of their bonuses already that the payment of the remaining balance was impossible. He believed that the government had properly given assistance to the veterans by allowing them to borrow on their bonuses but the government could not allow additional relief.<sup>35</sup> Fish believed that the Congress had made its decision to not allow full, immediate payment of the bonuses when they had granted the loan to the veterans to borrow up to fifty percent. President Hoover also argued that the passage of the law that allowed the veterans to borrow this percentage on their bonuses was sufficient relief. The president also

---

<sup>33</sup> Charles Merz. "Again the nation debates the bonus issue," *New York Times*, April 10, 1932

<sup>34</sup> Merz, April 10

<sup>35</sup> House floor, *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*, 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 14, 1932, 12916

believed that the veterans had to back that loan with interest in order to put the money back into the veteran fund to have the proper amount of money for all the soldiers to receive their bonuses.<sup>36</sup> General O’Ryan had also believed that since the veterans already borrowed from the government one half the value of their bonuses that they had received assistance. He also argued that if they received the remaining balance of the bonus the government would be paying the veterans interest that had not yet been earned.<sup>37</sup> He continued by saying that the veterans would be the only party that would have benefited if they had gotten the full balance without any interest on their loans.

In conclusion, it seems that the veterans had sparked an important debate that had produced many arguments on each side of the issue. This debate had brought a fundamental division of solutions among politicians and veterans. The two sides were both grateful for what the veterans had done in World War I but differed on when to reward them for those services. The debate that had started in 1925 and then reemerged in 1931 had brought two logical and competent alternatives regarding the veteran’s bonus. Both sides had also gained significant support that led to the hard fought debate that had concluded in 1932. With this debate it showed how desperate some interest groups had become during the Great Depression. The depression not only brought unemployment and hunger but also anxiety and uncertainty to all citizens in the United States. The payment of the bonuses had not only included when to give the bonuses to the veterans but if the government could afford to hand out such a large sum of money during a depression. The great depression was a main reason why the debate, regarding payment of the veteran bonuses, was rekindled in 1932. As a result, the veterans financial need was not the only issued considered by the politicians when they decided which side of the issue they would join.

---

<sup>36</sup> Hoover, 428

<sup>37</sup> O’Ryan, 283

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

"Eslick dies in House pleading for bonus:" Tennessee Democrat stricken by heart disease in midst of impassioned speech. Tragedy moves veterans shack flags put at half-staff—House adjourns and will vote on Patman Bill today. Eslick falls dead pleading for bonus. *New York Times*, June 15, 1932, (1857-Current file)

Hoover, Herbert. *Herbert Hoover: 1932-1933*: containing the public messages, speeches, and statements of the president, Jan 1, 1932- March 4, 1933. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Library, 2005

Merz, Charles. "Again the nation debates the bonus issue:" *The Proposal for Immediate Redemption of Adjusted Service Certificates, Viewed in the Light of Our Past Expenditures for Veterans' Relief and of Possible Effects on the Federal Budget* . Retrieved November 10, 2009, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers, *The New York Times*, April 10, 1932 (1857-Current file)

O'Ryan F. John. *Should the World War Veterans' Service Certificates be Paid in Cash?*, Congressional Digest; Nov32, Vol. 11 Issue 11

Patman, Wright. *Should the World War Veterans be Paid Bonuses*. Congressional Digest: Nov32, Vol. 11 Issue 11

U.S. Congress. Senate. *Debate and vote for payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*. 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 17, 1932.

U.S. Congress. House. *Payment of adjusted-service certificates bill*. 72<sup>nd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> session, June 13-June 15, 1932.

Waters, W.W. *Mass Violence in America: B.E.F. The Whole Story of the Bonus Army*. The John Day Company: New York, 1933

## Secondary and Tertiary Resources

Daniels, Roger. *The Bonus March: An episode of the Great Depression*. Westport: CT, 1971.

*Encyclopedia of the Great Depression*

*Historical Dictionary of the 1920's*. Greenwood Press: New York, 1988.

Olson, James S. *From WWI to the New Deal, 1919-1933*

Olson, James S. *Historical Dictionary of the Great Depression, 1929-1940*. Greenwood Press: Westport, CT, 2001

*The Great Depression: An historical bibliography*

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE  
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

ARTIFACT COVER SHEET

Student's Name: [REDACTED]

Artifact Title Eisenhower - Cold War Civil Rights

Artifact Grade: 90

Course Grade: A

Comments:

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

The paper was well done and certainly captures the go slow argument presented by Mr. Labonte - there is a minor transition bump towards the end of the paper when Louis discusses Vietnam - but overall great job - Louis is a senior student who got his assignments in on time and demonstrated a real aptitude to engage the material -

Instructor's Signature

Date: 13 Dec 10

He is very much ready for student level academic work



democracy. Throughout Eisenhower's presidency he would stand by the ideals that had got him elected into office twice. These ideals were to have a strong foreign policy that hindered communisms progress and keep the fight for racial equality at a slow pace. However, Eisenhower would also have to modify and adapt some of his policies, especially in regard to civil rights, because of Cold War politics from abroad and at home. Having said that, he and his administration made only the slightest changes in order to show some effort to alter the status quo, which supported segregation and kept African Americans out of important positions within the federal government.

In the post World War II era Dwight Eisenhower had run for the presidency on a platform that was centered around foreign policy and world politics, not racial agendas. However, in 1952, during the presidential election Eisenhower and his presidential opponent, Democrat Adlai Stevenson, both supported racial and legal equality for African Americans. On the other hand both did so on very general terms and had no concrete form of action to change the oppression of blacks. Eisenhower, who was a Republican, agreed with his party's philosophy and received significant support from Southern advocates of segregation. This support from segregated states would become important later in the influence of Eisenhower's presidency. However, within the first year of his presidency he had started to end segregation in Washington D.C. The president had decided to make this a quick process that was to be carried out quietly. Even though the Eisenhower administration was not in favor of a full-scale civil rights movement he did want to desegregate the capital.<sup>1</sup> The president understood that the world was watching the United States and how they acted within a democratic system.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert L. Branyan and Lawrence H. Larsen, *The Eisenhower Administration 1953-1961: A documentary History*. Volume 2 (Random House, Inc., 1971), p.1049-1053.

Washington D.C. would have countless ambassadors from countries that had leaders of dark skin come to the United States. These leaders and ambassadors were being refused service and called racial slurs at restaurants, hotels and other social businesses because of their skin color. These events had made the United States look like a hypocritical state to those countries of color that were weighing which political system they wanted to adopt. The pressure from outside the country, mostly from the Soviet Union, to have equal rights for all Americans influenced the president's decision. This sort of behavior occurring in the capital of the United States was specific evidence that the Soviet Union could use against the democratic model and support its accusations.<sup>2</sup> This is an example of how foreign Cold War politics influenced the domestic affairs of the United States. This was a direct attack on democracy. Eisenhower and the United States realized some change had to occur.

The issues in the capital only reinforced the negative reputation that was present at a United Nations conference held in San Francisco concerning peace and security in 1945. At this event representatives from all over the world either observed, heard or read about the atrocities to blacks in America.<sup>3</sup> Foreign diplomats witnessed so much of the racial customs present within the United States that Eisenhower's Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was apologizing for the discrimination they faced while staying in the country. Dulles went so far to admit that the discrimination practices within the United States were ruining American foreign policy.<sup>4</sup> This is a direct connection between the effects foreign policy would have on domestic policy changes within the United States during Eisenhower's tenure.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Bronyan and Larsen*, p.1049-1053

<sup>3</sup> Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), p. 24-25.

<sup>4</sup> Plummer, p. 32

The Eisenhower administration had wanted to show the world that they were in favor of improving the condition of African Americans in the United States. The president had made room in his cabinet and administration for blacks. The president's decision to do this was not because he felt that African Americans would contribute positively to his presidency but to show the world and other blacks that he was trying to change the attitude of the American government. Eisenhower had sporadically placed lower-level black appointees throughout his administration.<sup>5</sup> He and his administration had sprinkled those African Americans in symbolic posts within the executive departments rather than fundamentally important positions. Throughout Eisenhower's tenure he and his administration realized how crucial it was to have blacks within his branch of government because of the importance of international opinion during the Cold War. A few examples of these appointments are John B. Eubanks, Clifton Wharton, Robert Lee Brokenburr, Charles H. Mahoney, Archibald J. Carey, and Frederic Morrow who were all appointed with foreign opinions and critics in mind.<sup>6</sup>

Eisenhower made these changes for two critical reasons, the first being to follow through on a campaign promise in 1952 to allow more "qualified" blacks into administration positions and the second, more important reason, was to use them as symbols of racial change within the United States. In particular Mahoney and Brokenburr were both appointed American delegates of the United Nations. Additionally, Eubanks became the head of the Rural Improvements Staff for the U.S. Operations Mission of the International Cooperation Administration.<sup>7</sup> The president and his cabinet were clearly trying to show the world that the United States was not a racial

---

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), p. 88-89.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Fredrick Burk, *The Eisenhower Administration and Black Civil Rights* (The University of Tennessee Press/Knoxville, 1984), p. 68-69.

<sup>7</sup> Burk, p. 69

democracy but a unified country that did not appoint individuals to the government based on the color of a person's skin. Furthermore, it was obviously that this was only a strategic tactic by Eisenhower because those positions were not very powerful but could be seen by the world as real change.

Those black appointees were carefully placed in positions that would produce the least amount of controversy for the president in regards to domestic politics.<sup>8</sup> One example of these black appointments was Archibald J. Carey, who was appointed by the president to be on the Committee on Government Employment Policy. This committee had Carey on it to show the clear indication that it was the policy of the United States Government that all employment positions within the federal government was open to all persons who were qualified regardless of race.<sup>9</sup> This was a low stakes move for the president because the committee had little power and made almost no crucial decisions despite its title. Carey and Frederic Morrow were chosen for their positions not only because they were black but because they would not publicly damage the Eisenhower administration. Both figures saw themselves as symbols for the black community and would not jeopardize their positions by becoming outspoken against Eisenhower. It is evident that Dwight Eisenhower was attempting to use the presidency to combat the "false" Soviet accusations against America's democracy while also still showing his party and supporters that he would not allow those positions held by blacks fundamentally influence the United States in a negative way. That negative way being referred too, was allowing blacks to change the policies that kept white Americans in control of the government.

---

<sup>8</sup> Burk, p. 70-71

<sup>9</sup> Burk, p. 73

With the increase of appointees to the executive branch during Eisenhower's presidency the only African American chosen to be part of the White House staff was Frederic Morrow. Morrow's tenure within the administration, which began in 1955, exposes the real attitude that President Eisenhower and his cabinet had toward blacks. Mr. Morrow was told by Wilton Persons, who was the White House chief of staff, that he was to speak about all issues except those regarding race or civil rights because his skin color made him too emotionally invested.<sup>10</sup> This would reveal how Eisenhower really felt about racial equality in the United States and the real reason why he appointed African Americans within his administration. Morrow's account had displayed that at the highest levels of the American government racial discrimination and insensitivity was present on a daily basis.<sup>11</sup> His accounts include constantly being called racial slurs and being completely ignored by all of the other white members of the administration when discussing policy. For example, other White House staffers would not eat with him, work under him or acknowledge his title. Even worse, in Morrow's opinion, was that the president would not listen to his opinion on any minority affairs including how to publicly handle the murder and lynching of Emmitt Till.<sup>12</sup> During Eisenhower's first term he was forced to live in subpar housing that was separate from the other members of the White House staff.<sup>13</sup> Frederic Morrow decided to stay on the president's staff because he believed that he was showing the African Americans in the country that they had the ability to climb to high ranking positions within the government and have an influence on decisions made at that level. Finally, Morrow, at first, felt that democracy was fair and equal within its own borders and wanted to support that system.

---

<sup>10</sup> Borstelmann, p. 88

<sup>11</sup> Borstelmann, p. 89

<sup>12</sup> Stephen J. Whitfield, *A Death in the Delta: The Story of Emmett Till* (The Free Press, 1988), p. 72-73.

<sup>13</sup> Borstelmann, p. 89

Even though Eisenhower had allowed black appointment to the government he wanted to resist the access of unapproved African Americans to the White House. President Eisenhower did this figuratively and literally. During both of his terms, President Eisenhower had refused to meet with black political leaders and prominent black Americans. He only once personally met with any black American leader in eight years as president, which was in 1958 for only forty-five minutes.<sup>14</sup> This is a prime example of how the president, throughout his presidency, preferred to ignore the problem of civil rights and inequality within the United States. The president's cabinet agreed with Eisenhower's philosophy towards racial equality and African Americans role in the United States government, which was not favorable towards blacks. Additionally, Eisenhower had visited almost every continent and country as president except those that had a population with darker skin. He was completely ignorant of the awful conditions these countries were dealing with and did not try to investigate those issues.<sup>15</sup> This relates to how he handled domestic policy as well because he never wanted to investigate how deplorable the conditions of African Americans were within the United States. It was the government's philosophy to ignore segregation and civil rights that kept these Americans in poor and unequal conditions. However, it was the Cold War that forced Eisenhower to acknowledge the problem of segregation and civil rights.

As the Cold War escalated during Eisenhower's administration with newly formed states from the Asian and African parts of the world the United Nations started to change the way the United States was depicted. The United States was becoming more and more criticized by civil rights groups within the country as well as outside the country. One of the most significant examples of both of these criticisms was Eleanor Roosevelt. She voiced her anger and

---

<sup>14</sup> Borstelmann, p .87-88

<sup>25</sup> Borstelmann, p. 89

disappointment toward the American government's lack of desire to pass civil rights legislation through the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights as the American representative.<sup>16</sup> Mrs. Roosevelt was a symbol of change for civil rights in America, which threatened the status quo that Eisenhower wanted to uphold. As a result she was fired by the president from her position which displays the real agenda of the Eisenhower administration.

The Eisenhower administration's firing of Roosevelt was just another example of foreign policy effecting their domestic decisions. Roosevelt was outspoken in the United Nations and helped to bring light on the racial issues present within the United States. She felt, like others fighting for civil rights, that those struggling for racial equality in one area of the world could identify with people on the other side of the globe fighting similar issues of equality.<sup>17</sup> Roosevelt contributed to the increased activism within the United Nations (U.N.) during the 1950's, which made racism an international agenda. Activists like herself within the U.N. triggered the development of declarations such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.<sup>18</sup> The fact that the international community and the U.N. were trying to combat racial attitudes throughout the world started to push the Eisenhower administration to make those changes within its own borders. The fact that President Eisenhower was slow to allow racial changes within the United States triggered many attacks towards the country. The United States reputation started to deteriorate because of its domestic policy.

---

<sup>16</sup> Plummer, p. 31

<sup>17</sup> Plummer, p. 33

<sup>18</sup> Plummer, p. 34

A major example of criticism coming from outside the country was at the Bandung Conference in April 1955, which was also known as the Asian-African Conference. At this conference twenty-nine nations were picked to conjugate in Indonesia which did not include any country from the Americas or Europe. The sponsors of this conference were Burma, Ceyon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan who wanted to bring together the representatives of African and Asian countries to discuss how to tackle the issues of colonialism, racism, and national sovereignty as well as the social and economic problems they were facing.<sup>19</sup> Those leaders made it particularly clear that the two superpowers during the Cold War era, the United States and Soviet Union, would not be invited.<sup>20</sup> The countries that attended this conference were all less developed and/or poor nations from the African or Asian continents, which represented more than half of the world population at the time. All of these nations were also nonwhite who shared some experience or exposure with Western colonial control or dominance over the population and the country as a whole.<sup>21</sup>

At the meeting in Bandung there was a communist presence, which was China and North Korea. However, the United States had an ally at the conference as well which was Turkey who was part of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The United States government and the press had become paranoid of the influence the communists would have on the neutralist states that were attending the conference. Additionally, the American government was fearful of the harsh criticisms they were facing regarding race and their stance on colonialism from the international community, especially those countries attending the Bandung Conference.<sup>22</sup> These criticisms impacted the way the Eisenhower administration would deal with American domestic

---

<sup>19</sup> Peter Lyon, *Eisenhower: Portrait of the Hero* (Boston, 1974), p. 641.

<sup>20</sup> Carols P. Romulo, *The Meaning of Bandung* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1956), P. 1-2.

<sup>21</sup> Romulo, p. 3

<sup>22</sup> Romulo, p. 4



and foreign policy. Concerning domestic policy Eisenhower would be strongly convinced in how he dealt with segregation and civil rights because of these Cold War critics.

The strong criticisms that were coming from the Soviet Union and China were now drawing increasingly more attention from the countries at the Bandung conference. This was because most of the nations present at the conference were part of the Third World trying to decide which model of government to adopt. The attacks that were directed at the United States from these countries were because of the current foreign and domestic policy in place during Eisenhower's administration. The members of this conference pointed out the problem of the white man's attitude of discrimination against colored peoples and the evils of Western colonialism.<sup>23</sup> These were both criticisms that the Soviet Union was also accusing the United States of performing inside and outside the country. Other common and vocal criticisms of American philosophy included the constant talk of freedom and human rights but the continuous support of colonial policies of their allies such as France and England.<sup>24</sup> This was an not only a direct attack on the foreign policy of the United States but also an indirect attack on the resistance of the American government to allow African American equal freedom and rights. The Bandung Conference showed the United States how much criticism there was from other countries, especially those counties of color they were trying to influence politically. This conference's opinion would contribute to the domestic changes occurring in the United States during Eisenhower's presidency.

The attitude towards Emmett Till's death by the Eisenhower administration was one of the incidents that fueled the anger of how the United States government was handling racial

---

<sup>23</sup> Plummer, p. 123

<sup>24</sup> Romulo, p. 43

issues. Till's death had brought criticism from within the country and Eisenhower's popularity had dropped significantly with black voters according to a Gallup Poll in late 1955.<sup>25</sup> Till was a black fourteen year old boy from Chicago who was visiting family in Mississippi in August 1955. He had been brutally beaten, mutilated, lynched, and killed because he was a black boy who allegedly talked to a white, married woman in a sexual tone who he physically harassed and supposedly then whistled at her.<sup>26</sup> The white woman who was approached by Till was Mississippi resident Carolyn Bryant.

The murder of the young black boy was not just another example of the racism in the United States but it exposed a fundamental problem that American democracy had during Eisenhower's presidency. The two white men, Bryant's husband and his half brother, who were put on trial for the torture and murder of Till in Tallahatchie County, Mississippi were found not guilty by an all white jury. The verdict had seriously damaged American prestige because of the substantial evidence that was presented to the court.<sup>27</sup> This had a huge impact on how Third World countries and their leaders viewed the justice system for all citizens in a democratic United States. The publicity of Till's brutal death and his funeral would put pressure on the United States government to change the attitude they had on civil rights. Additionally, the Till murder would challenge Eisenhower's strategy of ignoring any issues about racism or racial inequality because of how much international attention it received.<sup>28</sup> Many newspapers within and outside the country wondered if African Americans could exist in the United States as equals

---

<sup>25</sup> Burk, p. 70

<sup>26</sup> Whitfield, p. 19

<sup>27</sup> Whitfield, p. 46

<sup>28</sup> Whitfield, p. 74

with the white population.<sup>29</sup> This event would have a profound effect on how the Eisenhower administration would handle future matters regarding race or civil rights. The international attention focused on the United States concerning racial equality would only grow throughout Eisenhower's presidency.

Countries from all over the world were publicly criticizing the United States agenda on racial equality and civil rights. Till's death was just one example of the shock that the international community had regarding lynching and racism within the United States. The United States had exposed itself to the world by becoming a leader in the Cold War. During the Eisenhower administration it became apparent that the international community was paying close attention to the racial inequality in the United States during the 1950's. In the Soviet Union the *Trud* newspaper had reported vivid details of recent lynchings in the South and how the United States did not give equality to blacks under their democratic system.<sup>30</sup> It was not just the enemies of the United States that criticized their policies on race. The *Fiji Times & Herald* published articles that informed its readers that America has one of the worst oppressive systems that persecute minorities.<sup>31</sup> Another example of harsh foreign criticism that effected the United States domestic policies was from the *Bombay Chronicle* that wrote the Americans' fought against Nazi race doctrines during the war but also defend those same types of beliefs at home.<sup>32</sup> These attacks represented the opinion of most of the countries that the United States wanted to convert to democracy and reject a communist government.

---

<sup>29</sup> Davis W. Houck, Matthew A. Grindy, and Keith A. Beauchamp, *Emmett Till and the Mississippi Press* (University Press of Mississippi, 2008), p. 59.

<sup>30</sup> Plummer, p. 26-27

<sup>31</sup> Plummer, p. 26

<sup>32</sup> Plummer, p. 26

A specific example of foreign policy being more important and directly affecting domestic policy was the actions that developed in Little Rock, Arkansas in September 1957. Eisenhower realized that the refusal of eight black students entrance into Central High School in Little Rock, after the ruling of the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision, would trigger the event being put under a microscope and reported to the whole world.<sup>33</sup> The landmark decision by the Supreme Court in May of 1954 outlawed racially segregating public schools, which overturned the *Plessy vs. Ferguson* ruling that was in place since 1896, which supported separate but equal policies.<sup>34</sup> The president knew he was in a difficult and delicate situation that would force him to either intervene, for the first time, in civil rights issues and integration or to allow segregationists to challenge the Supreme Court's decision that ruled separate but equal was unconstitutional. Eisenhower was well aware that the United States was involved in a Cold War and that the world was watching his decision. However, Eisenhower one year before the Little Rock incident ordered that black students not be allowed entry into an all white school in Mansfield, Texas.<sup>35</sup> The president obviously understood that the circumstances were different in 1957 and he had to act in another way for several reasons.

One reason was that the year 1956 was a presidential election year and Texas had been an essential state for Eisenhower's reelection bid. Additionally, Eisenhower was close friends and political allies with Texas' Governor Shivers. The governor did not support desegregation or the Supreme Court's decision. Eisenhower made the decision to stop blacks from entering an all white school.<sup>36</sup> This is another example of how American foreign policy and relations had effected domestic decisions during the Eisenhower administration because the president decision

---

<sup>33</sup> Burk, p. 176

<sup>34</sup> Plummer, p. 32

<sup>35</sup> Burk, p. 185

<sup>36</sup> Burk, p. 186

a year later would be effected by outside forces. The other more critical reason was that the president's decision to intervene could be used as concrete evidence in supporting the United States case to the world, which was that they were doing more about inequality to African Americans within the country.<sup>37</sup> Since the president was forced to act in Arkansas he would take full advantage of his involvement in the issue.

The Governor of Arkansas, Orval Faubus was not a huge supporter of Eisenhower or of his policies in general. Faubus' refusal to allow black students into Central High School or any other type of desegregation had attracted the attention of the national media because he had become so outspoken with his opinions. Since Faubus had been on media shows such as CBS's *Face the Nation*, announcing his disapproval of desegregation and his inability to make up his mind on whether he would comply with the Supreme Court's decision attracted a lot of attention.<sup>38</sup> In addition, the violent mobs forming outside the high school by white families who did not want their children to integrate with black students had damaged the United States prestige regarding race issues. With the world watching, Eisenhower intervened in Little Rock by sending federal troops to enforce the integration of black and white students at the high school.<sup>39</sup> The president did this by issuing an executive order that stated all persons in Arkansas would adhere to the decision made by the Supreme Court or face the consequences from the federal troops being sent there by the president himself.<sup>40</sup> In ordering this action Eisenhower had alienated himself from certain allies within the Republican Party but he knew a Cold War world was waiting for his decision. He and his administration would use this intervention into desegregation as propaganda to gain support from countries of color to fight against communism

---

<sup>37</sup> Burk, p. 186

<sup>38</sup> Burk, p. 182

<sup>39</sup> Branyan and Larsen, p. 1051-1052

<sup>40</sup> Federal Register, XXII, No. 186 (September 25 1957), 7628.

and adopt a capitalist system.<sup>41</sup> The president himself admitted that his decision to intervene in Little Rock was heavily influenced by the opinions of countries and political leaders outside the United States.<sup>42</sup> Countries that were in the Third World were looking at the civil rights battle in the United States to decide whether communism or democracy was right for them.

President Eisenhower had a long history of military experience which influenced his philosophy to militarily and financially intervene to protect the interests and ideals of democracy throughout the world during the Cold War. The president had asked Congress for billions in the form of either military financial aid or resources over his eight years as president.<sup>43</sup> Eisenhower had surrounded himself with people who were on the same wavelength as himself in regards to these strategies. The president had asked for several resolutions from Congress in order to receive funds to support his containment approach. Eisenhower also would request American troops and supplies on numerous occasions to support countries throughout the world that backed the United States government. One example of this was the Eisenhower Doctrine, which was the president's ability to convince Congress to authorize American military and financial aid to any Near East countries threaten by communism.<sup>44</sup> Since he was a Cold War president he was constantly alerted when communist countries, in particular China and the Soviet Union, were trying to influence a neutral or Democratic country. Eisenhower and his cabinet believed that the Cold War had to be won by any means necessary even use nuclear weapons against the larger communist regimes. The Cold war had dictated where Eisenhower would use the funds that were supplied by Congress during his presidency.

---

<sup>41</sup> Bork, p. 187

<sup>42</sup> Plummer, p. 37

<sup>43</sup> Robert L. Branyan and Lawrence H. Larsen, *The Eisenhower Administration 1953-1961: A documentary History*. Volume 1 (Random House, Inc., 1971), p. 639.

<sup>44</sup> Branyan and Larsen, p. 638-639

One place where any extensive amount of money and resources was used to contain communism was in Indochina. In particular South Vietnam would draw significant effort from the Eisenhower administration to keep the country a neutral or democratic state. During Eisenhower's presidency South Vietnam would draw criticism from abroad and at home causing domestic issues for the United States. The United States financial support of France in the region had attracted major criticism because of the hypocritical stance that America had on freedom and human rights for all people in the world.<sup>45</sup> The evidence of these attacks was created from the support the United States had given France in its attempt to keep Vietnam a colony and attempting to keep the population oppressed. The civil rights movement and the struggle for South Vietnamese to become independent of any colonial rule were linked. Simultaneously African Americans and Vietnamese were both trying to resist the white status quo that the Eisenhower administration was trying to uphold.<sup>46</sup>

The result of the May 1954 Geneva Conference had decided to have South Vietnam become a separate, neutralist country from Northern Vietnam and that no outside country could try to influence or interfere in their type of government or internal interests.<sup>47</sup> Eisenhower had refused to sign this agreement but did acknowledge that it existed and would follow its terms. This was important because the United States would become increasingly criticized because it did not officially recognize that South Vietnam was independent. Eisenhower had supported the decision at Geneva because the South would not become communist, not because he felt that the people of Vietnam could govern themselves.<sup>48</sup> This would further tarnish America's reputation

---

<sup>45</sup> David L. Anderson, *Trapped By Success: The Eisenhower Administration and Vietnam, 1953-61* (Columbia University Press, 1991), p. 48-64.

<sup>46</sup> Anderson, p. 205-206

<sup>47</sup> Anderson, p. 48-64

<sup>48</sup> Anderson, p. 46-64

with the international community and provide evidence that the United States did not want change within or outside its borders regarding race and equality. Once again these negative attacks during the Cold War had further pushed Eisenhower in a direction that would allow for domestic change within the United States.

President Eisenhower and his administration started to expand their Cold War policies to more countries of color who continued to expose the unfair domestic policy directed at African Americans. Eisenhower had made the decision to apply the domino theory not only to include mainland Southeast Asia but also to include the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and Taiwan. This theory is that if the communists knock down one domino, a noncommunist country, then there will be a chain reaction that will bring down the rest of the dominos, which would put the United States and democracy at risk.<sup>49</sup> Even though this theory was not new to American foreign policy it reinforced the present paranoia of communism that was in the Eisenhower White House. Given that Eisenhower put almost all of his efforts into combating communism throughout the world it is apparent that foreign policy was the most important factor in his presidency.<sup>50</sup> However, foreign policy directly affected domestic policy because the Eisenhower administration wanted to defeat communism but also promote democratic ideals. Since the United States showed the world that it had fundamental flaws in its democratic system other countries did not want to adopt a racially flawed system, especially when those countries represented the race being marginalized.

Since Eisenhower's foreign policy was exposing its domestic issues and policies to the world that would affect how they move forward with those domestic affairs. In other words,

---

<sup>49</sup> Anderson, p.18

<sup>50</sup> David Kaiser, *American Tragedy: Kennedy, Johnson, and the Origins of the Vietnam War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 34.



Eisenhower's constant intervention throughout the world to contain communism had put the United States on the world stage and had revealed their internal issues regarding civil rights in America. The United States declared that it would use containment and battle communism with the spread of international democracy.<sup>51</sup> As a result of this African Americans who were fighting for civil rights had also seen other colored nations going through the same struggles that they were having in the United States. The most apparent examples of this were in Vietnam and the continent of Africa. Black American leaders saw the opportunity to raise their voices louder in order to put an end to segregation by investing confidence in Third World Countries, especially those in Africa. These countries used the U.N. as its platform to expose the racial inequality occurring within the United States during the Cold War. They were able to do this because of Eisenhower and the United States government's primary objective was to win the Cold war.<sup>52</sup> This was the main reason that domestic policy started to change in American during Eisenhower's administration.

In conclusion, President Eisenhower and his administration's tenure during the Cold War directly impacted the way they handled foreign policy, which affected domestic issues. The United States was not giving African Americans the right to be equal within its own borders which was being observed by newly formed countries that were of the same color as these struggling Americans. The Soviet Union tried to use this weakness against the United States by proclaiming to nations of color that they have a government model that would give equal rights to all people no matter what color their skin. Eisenhower identified and acknowledges this foreign relations problem by making domestic changes within the government and the country in

---

<sup>51</sup> Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Owl Books, 2007), p. 18.

<sup>52</sup> Joseph, p. 18

regards to certain civil rights issues. However, those changes in civil rights would be deliberately slow, supporting the status quo, because Eisenhower and the government's main concern was the defeat of communist, not civil rights. Even though the two issues were linked Eisenhower felt that he did not have to make drastic changes in domestic policy to deflect the critics of the world but minor and slow change which kept whites in power. Foreign policy and criticisms during the Cold War had directly affected how Eisenhower and his administration handled domestic issues such as segregation and civil rights.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, David L. *Trapped By Success: The Eisenhower Administration and Vietnam, 1953-61*. Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Borstelmann, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Branyan, Robert L. and Lawrence H. Larsen. *The Eisenhower Administration 1953-1961: A documentary History*. Volume 1. Random House Inc., 1971.
- Branyan, Robert L. and Lawrence H. Larsen. *The Eisenhower Administration 1953-1961: A documentary History*. Volume 2. Random House Inc., 1971.
- Burk, Robert Fredrick. *The Eisenhower Administration and Black Civil Rights*. The University of Tennessee Press: Knoxville, 1984
- Federal Register, XXII, No. 186. September 25 1957.
- Houck, Davis W., Matthew A. Grindy, and Keith A. Beauchamp. *Emmett Till and the Mississippi Press*. University Press of Mississippi, 2008.
- Joseph, Peniel E. *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America*. New York: Owl Books, 2007.
- Kaiser, David. *American Tragedy: Kennedy, Johnson, and the Origins of the Vietnam War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Lyon, Peter. *Eisenhower: Portrait of the Hero*. Boston, 1974.
- Plummer, Brenda Gayle. *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Romulo, Carols P. *The Meaning of Bandung*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1956.
- Whitfield, Stephen J. *A Death in the Delta: The Story of Emmett Till*. The Free Press, 1988.

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE  
HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

ARTIFACT COVER SHEET

Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Artifact Title Gender roles in Greek Antiquity

Artifact Grade: A- Course Grade: A-

Comments:

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

The paper shows a good grasp of understanding how historians gather, interpret and assess material from primary and secondary works. This paper as well shows a complex approach to the material, viewing the role of women not as a monolithic whole, but determined, in part, by the differing cultures of different city-states. Thus, it demonstrates the ability to think critically about the material and shows good research capabilities. The utilization of reputable scholarly works displays sound research skills and signals the presence of life-long learning skills. The paper is well-organized and clearly written, and makes the author's view and interpretation of the material clear.

Instructor's Signature Gregory K. Golden Date: 12/13/10

that ownership was passed from father to son which was called the *kyrios*.<sup>1</sup> Since land was so valuable in Greece, a person who had an uncontested right to a piece of land also had economic independence, something that money could rarely give a person in antiquity.<sup>2</sup> This would mean that the land in Greece gave its citizens considerable power, which women had been restricted from owning themselves in Athens. The men in this city-state tried to keep power, as well as, the title of land to only one sex in their society so they could have unilateral authority. This shows how strong the family was idealized and implemented into everyday life in Athens. Athenian law was designed to favor the males in that polis and keep women under the exclusive control of men. In addition, since land is controlled by men, it could only be sold or inherited to other men. Hence, never allowing Athenian women the opportunity to be equal to their counterparts regarding the ownership of land.

Just as with property women had not been allowed to have any of their own money in Athens. The Athenian law could not intrude in married couples finances or tell which person in the relationship could carry the money to carry out daily economic business. However, laws had been put in place to control the acquirement of money by single women, as well as, allotment in the case of death or divorce. If a women was married in Athens during antiquity the property, besides land, had belonged to the whole family so the money would technically be the man's and the woman's. In the case of a women going through the divorce process, all the property belonged to the man of the household.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> David M. Schaps, *Economic Rights of women in ancient Greece* (Edinburgh: The Scholar Press, 1979), 4

<sup>2</sup> Schaps, 4-5

<sup>3</sup> Schaps, 14-15

Since Athens had been a paternalistic and male dominated society, marriage had been used to favor the men in the polis. In other words marriage was the legal and formal process to create authority of male over female or husband over wife.<sup>4</sup> The main reason for marriage was to have the female perform services for the males, which included childbearing, cheap labor, and sexual satisfaction. Athenian society had revolved around the concept of family, which had held each sex in their particular roles. The women in the system of marriage would have demanded companionship, protection, and also sexual pleasure.<sup>5</sup> The men choose to live up to their responsibility to marriage when they needed to but the women had to perform their duties when the men wanted their wives to do them. The exploitation of women's labor was not just confined to marriage it was prevalent in all aspects of society in Athens. Most men would use women throughout their lifetime to gain comfort or material goods through cheap women's labor. The Athenian wives had been thrown into a life full of labor that only few upper-class females could escape. These women and wives would have been given a pass from labor like sowing with the spindle and loom if her family or husband had slaves to perform that cheap labor.<sup>6</sup> One example of how women had been seen by men was the use of the popular women's name of "melissa" which was the Greek word for bee. Athenian men saw their women as worker bees busying themselves for the good of the family and men. However, the most important function women had in the Athenian society was the critical role of childbearing.

Marriage was designed to have women create and care for children, but only the boys had gotten the excitement of Athenian men. The birth of girls was not as glorified as boys because

---

<sup>4</sup> Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Women's History and ancient history* (The University of North Carolina Press:Chapel Hill, 1991),50

<sup>5</sup> Eva C. Keuls, *The Reign of the phallus: The sexual politics in ancient Athens* (Harper& Row, publishers:New York, 1985),98-99

<sup>6</sup> Keuls, 99

males were in control of society. In addition, when daughters were married the father of the bride had to provide a dowry, a payment, to the man they would marry.<sup>7</sup> The dowry had been so important that if a girl did not have a wealthy father to provide a dowry, the daughter might never be married.<sup>8</sup> The payment had to be carried out because Athenian law required a dowry for all marriages. Athenian marriage had been seen as a transfer or exchange of women to accomplish effective reproduction.<sup>9</sup> Women had no rights in an Athenian marriage. They had been given the same amount of rights as slaves and spent their entire lives in a society that did not see them as anything but property.<sup>10</sup> Athenian women had been under the control of one male or another throughout their entire lives.

The education of Athenian women was neglected and was not near as extensive as their male counterparts. The education that they did receive was not a man's education and did not include school, which would teach philosophy, politics, and literature.<sup>11</sup> The women in Athenian society had been kept ignorant so that men could keep their dominance over them. One factor in this philosophy was to have young girls marry older men so that she may take an inferior position to solidify the male's control. The goal of Athenian society was to continue to keep women in a position to be dominated. The men of this polis had felt that education or development of women would be a horrible mistake and they should stay beneath the male citizens. This meant that reading and writing had been a threat to the patriarchal domination of Athens. As a result, all public facilities had been restricted for the males use only. However,

---

<sup>7</sup> Keuls, 100-101

<sup>8</sup> Schaps, 75

<sup>9</sup> Pomeroy, 61

<sup>10</sup> Keuls, 102

<sup>11</sup> Charles Seltman, *Women in antiquity* (Hyperlon Press, Inc. Westport: CT,1956),112

Athenian women had been allowed to play any and all instruments in certain public places. This had been because the study of music was much less of a threat to male dominance when compared to reading about politics and philosophy.<sup>12</sup> Since women were not allowed to follow the same way of life as the men they had found certain categories of interest to explore that men would not disapprove.

Women in ancient Athens had a significant role in religious activities, especially the preparation and burial of the dead, as well as, the religious rites. Since Athenian women could not participate in many social outlets the act of burial and the funereal itself had provided the women with some freedom from the family duties. The preparation of the dead bodies was performed by the women because death in ancient Athens was seen as a “reverse birth”<sup>13</sup> Women had been the figure of birth in society and since death was a rebirth, the women were allowed to handle some of the preparation and burial of the dead. Athenian women over the age of sixty had been the only females, besides women related to the deceased, allowed to perform the burial duties and mourning.<sup>14</sup> The women would clean the deceased then rub the body with blessed oil. Then the body would be dressed in white, specialized garments after being placed in a bed for the family to hold a vigil. The sources from Athens reveal burial was not restricted to just women but men had a significant role in the burials and preparation as well. Athenian women’s role in funeral activities, even though limited, was most likely depicted by the men as an important and cherished social function. As a result, this could have been another reason why

---

<sup>12</sup> Keuls, 105-106

<sup>13</sup> Keuls, 149

<sup>14</sup> Stanley M. Burstein, Sarah B. Pomeroy, Walter Donlan & Jennifer Tolbert Roberts, *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History* (Oxford University Press 2008), 263-264



women had wanted to accept this role in Athenian society.<sup>15</sup> The burial of the dead in Athens and all of Greece was an essential part of death and funereal rites. All Greeks believed that if their family members had not been buried that their souls would wander the earth for eternity. Religion also gave some women the temporary ability to attain power that had lacked in all other aspects of Athenian society. Athenian women could use religious activities as an excuse to meet with men and women to participate in cults, magic, trances, and ritualistic orgies.<sup>16</sup>

The female sex in Athens had some other functions that they performed to gain money for the household and family. These labors that some non-slave women participated in had been grape picking and wet-nursing in times of economic need. In addition, women with citizenship in economic disarray would sell items in the marketplaces that most likely came from their husband's estate.<sup>17</sup> These women had not been allowed to handle the financial transaction even if their husbands had died. The male relatives of these women would then take over the role of the husband and had handled such circumstances in the absence of a husband. As a result, these women had damaged their social rank and would not be seen as women of class. However, water carrying and textile working had been two labors that were encouraged and glorified in Athenian society.<sup>18</sup> These two labors had been sanctioned and praised because of religious philosophy. Those labors represented fertility and revenge in mythical and religious stories but men had been afraid of what those stories told would happen if the women rose against them. These labors had also been glorified and sanctioned because it was a form of cheap labor that the males of Athens could exploit from the women. After the offspring of Athenian women had

---

<sup>15</sup> Keuls, 150

<sup>16</sup> Mary R. Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant, *Women in Greece and Rome* (Samuel-Stevens, Publishers 1977), 91

<sup>17</sup> Keuls, 231-232

<sup>18</sup> Keuls, 232

reached an age in which they had become self-sufficient; some of those women had become professional mourners, midwives, or matchmakers. The women of ancient Athens did not usually work in the fields or participate in any "outside" labors.<sup>19</sup> The men were expected to perform almost all of the labors outside the house, which included farming, selling products and crops, and protecting the polis. The men would never participate in female labor. The females were expected to perform the labors of inside the home which would be spinning and weaving, as well as, taken care of the children.<sup>20</sup>

An additional obligation or role that was demanded by Athenian men of their women was that they provide sexual pleasure. Besides the existence of homosexuality the women of Athens were to supply the men with sexual satisfaction. Since Athens had been a patriarchal society the wives of Athenian men were to be loyal, therefore only having a single partner while married. On the other hand the men of Athens could have multiple partners while they were married but these men could not have more than one wife.<sup>21</sup> In Athens, the wives did not supply most of the sexual pleasure in their husbands lives, that job were for the prostitutes or slaves. Athenian society had actually discouraged marital sex, which undoubtedly encourage promiscuous behavior by the men of the marriage but not the women.<sup>22</sup> This type of relationship in this city-state produced a division between the married women and the lower-class slaves and prostitutes. it is evident that all women in Athens had been treated as less than equals however, if a woman in society was a slave or forced into prostitution the horrors of suppression had been much

---

<sup>19</sup> Keuls, 231-234

<sup>20</sup> Keuls, 233-234

<sup>21</sup> Keuls, 204

<sup>22</sup> Keuls, 205-206

worse.<sup>23</sup> Even though all women had as much rights as slaves at least the married and upper-class women could not be bought or sold and even worse used as sexual machinery. This shows yet another division between men and women's roles in Athenian society and in a marriage itself. The role of women in Athenian society proved to be drastically different when compared to its rival in southern Greece, Sparta.

Sparta's society had been constructed very different than Athens, Sparta was a polis that was designed to develop warriors, fight wars, and protect their city-state. Since that was ancient Sparta's main goal during their existence, the Spartan citizens did not record their own history or way of life. As a result, all the sources that describe Spartan society are by other Greeks, which form their opinion and perspective regarding the way Sparta treated their wives, daughter, and mothers.<sup>24</sup> Since Sparta had been a society dedicated to sending young boys to train throughout their own lives to be superior warriors the women in this society had much more freedoms than in Athens. It was evident that Spartan women had been the most contented, happy, and healthy women in antiquity.<sup>25</sup> Most sources inform historians about the higher ranking women in history so the following will contend to their lifestyle.

Spartan women, unlike Athenian women, could own land by either inheriting it from their father with no male heirs called *epikleroi* or could also have purchased privately owned land. <sup>26</sup>Sparta had been a military state with the men of the society either training for war or at war which gave women the opportunity to hold and own land. In many cases Spartan father had no sons to inherit property because they had perished while at war, hence a large portion of

---

<sup>23</sup> Keuls, 206

<sup>24</sup> Seltman, 56

<sup>25</sup> Seltman, 70

<sup>26</sup> Pomery, 144

women owed land. The women in Sparta had owned between two-fifths and two-thirds of all the land in Sparta, which had been the highest ratio in ancient Greece.<sup>27</sup> Comparing to Athenian law which stated that women could not own much of anything that was worth value, Sparta was a completely different society in regards to their behavior of women. Since Spartan women owned land, which was incredibly valuable in antiquity, some of the women in the ruling caste could influence political activities. In rare cases wives, daughters or mothers of kings could persuade the direction the city-state would travel.<sup>28</sup> The power that Spartan women possessed from ownership of land was significant however; they seldom used it to change the system in order to gain more power. Females could not run for office or become king but they had more freedoms than other Greek city-states. However, Spartan women could not vote just like all other Greeks in antiquity. Women in Sparta would not be complete equals to their male counterparts but they had been much closer to equality than Athens and other poleis in Greece.

The education of Spartan citizens was also distinctly different from the way Athens approached the teaching of their population. The men of Sparta had a rigorous state education focused on fighting and acquiring important skills for war while Athens concentrated in academics for men only. Although Spartan women had not been allowed to enter the same state run school that the men had they had been allowed to receive a form of education. Sparta did not fear women's desire to learn but channeled their desire in the same direction men had been striving toward. The female population in Sparta had been trained to be a conditioned mother to war heroes and proper wives. This would reflect how they were educated. The education for women would be similar to men's in the aspect of physical education and not deep philosophical

---

<sup>27</sup> Schaps, 6

<sup>28</sup> Pomeroy, 145

or academic learning. The similarity of their Spartan education was that the girls had also been divided according to age. They had been divided from young girls up to married women.<sup>29</sup> Women had engaged in intense athletic training to encourage a high level of competition.<sup>30</sup> The education of Spartan women was different than the men's by being less harsh and milder in the way they trained. In addition, the women and girls going through the physical education had lived with their mothers instead of being sent away to the agoge, when they were seven, like the boys and men.<sup>31</sup> The women in this polis had exercised their bodies in several athletics including: wrestling, racing on foot, and throwing the javelin.<sup>32</sup> The purpose of this kind of education for women was not to fight wars or gain military knowledge but to be able to create strong and energetic sons, as well as, sustain good health during childbearing. This was important to Spartan society because the population wanted to create soldiers to add to their dominating army. By participating in this kind of education the Spartan women would have gained the honor and virtue that the all men had gained through combat and sacrifice in war.<sup>33</sup>

The way society had been designed in Sparta had weakened the structure of a paternalistic family or culture, in which the laws amplified the differences between the Greek city-states.<sup>34</sup> This would have an impact on how marriage was viewed and organized in their society. Compared to Athens, the Spartan women would have much more esteem, power and freedom in their relationships with their male counterparts. Unlike Athenian women, the only social obligation to the state was to bear children and care for them until boys are sent to the

---

<sup>29</sup> Burstein, 161-162

<sup>30</sup> Lefkowitz and Fant, 52

<sup>31</sup> Pomeroy, 141.

<sup>32</sup> Seltman, 75

<sup>33</sup> Pomeroy, 141-142

<sup>34</sup> Schaps, 7

agoge and girls are married.<sup>35</sup> Usually, marriage in Sparta did not take place early in the women's life but a few years after puberty. The typical age of matrimony for Spartan women was eighteen years old, which was later than their Athenian rivals. This was done so that the girls were old enough to try to better endure the many risks of child birth.<sup>36</sup> Spartan couples would be much closer in age than their Athenian adversaries also because the Spartan men would marry before they were thirty. In addition, Spartan custom desired girls to marry later than other Greeks because they believed that it would produce a more productive and loving relationship. This would reduce the chances of a marriage being full of hate and fear because the young girls were forced to marry before they had been ready. In Spartan society the women had control over the finances in the household which was drastically different from the Athenians. This would show that the women of Sparta could handle money without hindering their status in Spartan society.<sup>37</sup> Another difference between Sparta and Athens was that adultery and jealousy was incredibly rare in Sparta. This was because men and women had been freed from any possessiveness of their counterparts because most Spartans men would be away from their wives for an extended amount of time. It was not uncommon for an older man to encourage his younger wife to procreate with a Spartan of her age.<sup>38</sup> The reciprocal situation was also not uncommon as long as the husband or wife agreed to the sharing of their spouses. As a result, children would be born out of wedlock on a regular basis but the Spartan culture allowed for such behavior. The children would always be cared for and there was no such thing as a bastard

---

<sup>35</sup> Burstein, 161

<sup>36</sup> Pomeroy, 142

<sup>37</sup> Burstein, 163

<sup>38</sup> Seltman, 81

in Sparta.<sup>39</sup> In addition, Spartans would not have had prostitution, divorce or adultery because their marriages had been so flexible that those events would not exist. The Spartans would have a type of communal marriage system that was designed to maximize fertility among the population, since they lost more men than other Greek poleis.

In conclusion, the rights and roles of women were different from that of the men in ancient Greece for the most part. In general the women in antiquity had a difficult and challenging life compared to the men in those societies. However, Greek women had an essential role in society that contributed to their society's growth and productivity. It is obvious that each ancient Greek polis had a different role and status for women. Also, it is apparent that men and women had relatively different tasks in each society; Sparta was much closer to equality than Athens. This shows that women did not have a universal status in the ancient Greek world. Each Greek polis was truly a city-state not just in foreign affairs but also in domestic issues, which were independent of outside influence. Since women in Athens and many other Greek city-states, were not allowed to receive the same education as men, if any at all, historians have to rely on sources written by men. The real accounts of ancient Greek women will never be discovered to explain their perspective of daily life and oppression. As a result, the true story of women cannot be explained through a female perspective.

---

<sup>39</sup> Seltman, 82

## Bibliography

- Burstein, Stanley M., Sarah B. Pomeroy, Walter Donlan & Jennifer Tolbert Roberts. *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History*. Oxford University Press, 2008
- Keuls, Eva C. *The Reign of the phallus: The sexual politics in ancient Athens*. Harper & Row, publishers: New York, 1985
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. and Maureen B. Fant. *Women in Greece and Rome*. Samuel-Stevens, Publishers, 1977
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Women's History and ancient history*. The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1991
- Schaps, David M. *Economic Rights of women in ancient Greece*. Edinburgh: The Scholar Press, 1979
- Scitman, Charles. *Women in antiquity*. Hyperion Press, Inc.: Westport: CT, 1956