



the acorn

nonfiction journal

Spring
2022-2023



Acorn Editors:

Averie Huang

Emerald Landry

Brian Carreno

Penelope Strong

Zoey Upshur

Grace Jones

Karen Gourlay

Simone Gettleman

Faculty Advisors:

Emily Hose

The Acorn, Kirby's nonfiction journal, publishes student's academic work biannually. Our editors review all work anonymously and provide edits. Submit to nonfiction@kirby.org or join as a staff member; meetings are held during club time in room 309.



the acorn

nonfiction journal

Volume 6, Number 2

Spring 2022-2023

Table of Contents

Pontiac and the Prophet: How Neolin's Ideas Inspired Multiple Rebellions	3	Grace Jones
The Price We Pay: An Analysis of Gender in Literature	9	Maddie Taylor
Oh Dear!	15	Zenobia Russi Barrett
If You Were a Slave: How Anti-Slavery Writers Humanized Slaves to White Readers	21	Bryony Crawford
The Relationship Between Women's Rights and Abolitionism: How a Lack of Intersectionality Divided a Movement	29	Grace Jones

Pontiac and the Prophet: How Neolin's Ideas Inspired Multiple Rebellions

By Grace Jones

Ideas are powerful. That is a fact. But can one idea become powerful enough to contribute to the fall of an empire? It has become common today to assume that the American Revolution began in the bustling coastal cities of colonial America. The war is an essential part of the American narrative, and the stories of the bravery and heart of the American people which surround it are deeply rooted in the minds of modern Americans and the mythology of a united United States which many hold dear. However, the sparks of that legendary war actually began to fly deeper in the interior of the country, when a man named Neolin began preaching ideas that would spread like wildfire and kindle rebellion upon rebellion. A prophet of the Lenni Lenape people, Neolin lived in the village of Muskingum, in what was then called the Ohio Country. In the early 1760s, Neolin began telling of a vision he had, in which he claimed that the Master of Life (the concept of a life force present in many Native American religious practices) visited him and proclaimed his disapproval of the people's "addiction to the white man's alcohol, and deplored Indian polygamy, sexual promiscuity, witchcraft, and strife," and then promised that if Native Americans were to drive out the European invaders, all the old traditions would be renewed and prosperity would return to the land.¹ Neolin's words were warmly received by his people, and he soon gained many followers throughout the Ohio Country. Perhaps the most famous of those followers was the Odawa chief, Pontiac. A renowned leader, Pontiac was at the center of a group of chiefs who took action from Neolin's ideas and fought such a successful campaign against the colonists that the British government was forced to recognize Native

¹ Alfred Cave, "The Delaware Prophet Neolin: A Reappraisal", *Ethnohistory* 46, no. 2, 1999, 265–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/482962>.

American authority. This in turn caused settlers of the Ohio Country, who held a hatred for the Native Americans, to rebel against the British, turning this so-called “backcountry” of colonial America into one of the first crucibles of the revolution.² By examining military records and journals, among other sources, these first stirrings of the American Revolution can be traced to the runaway words of one man, Neolin, whose ideas caused rebellions, sowed intercultural distrust and hostility, and brought unprecedented unity to the tribes of the Ohio country.

Neolin was born into a generation of Lenni Lenape who were “the product of a century of upheaval and dislocation.”³ Though the traditional homelands of the Lenape people included the modern states of New York, New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania, by the time Neolin became an active figure in the community, many Lenape had been forced out of those lands through dubious treaties such as the infamous Walking Purchase of 1737.⁴ Many towns in the Ohio Country at that time were not so much centers for specific and unified cultural groups as they were refugee villages composed of a multitude of tribes, cultures and beliefs, their only true similarities were the loss of their lands and a very warranted distrust of colonial authorities. Those who lived in these makeshift groups had also often lost many members of their family or clan to disease brought by colonists. In fact, much of the village of Muskingum in which Neolin lived was decimated by some sort of disease in the 1750s, likely during his lifetime.⁵ It makes sense, then, that in this atmosphere of loss in these cobbled-together towns of refugees, many prophets sprung up, all claiming similar things. Multiple accounts describe encounters with Native American prophets or seers who condemned the newfound materialism of the tribes, specifically

² David Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America* (2005, University of Oklahoma Press).

³ Cave, “The Delaware Prophet”.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Kirrily Apthorp, "As Good As An Army: Mapping Smallpox during the Seven Years' War in North America," (2011, University of Sydney).

materialism dependent on European trade and especially the consumption of alcohol.⁶ Therefore, Neolin was not the first prophet to bring these ideas to his people. However by the time he began preaching, the surrounding communities were primed with similar stories and more than ready to hear about how they could work together to change all the terrible things which had befallen them. From this perfectly poised climate, many devoted followers of Neolin began to spring up. The Odawa chief Pontiac would become the most influential of these new followers. Pontiac would be the one to turn Neolin's words into actions when he organized a rebellion against the British which would later become a war bearing his own name.

Pontiac's War began in the spring of 1763. In an attempt to rally multiple Native American groups to the cause, Pontiac amplified Neolin's calls to drive out the invading nations, proclaiming that it was "important" that they "all swear their [the French and the British's] destruction" and "wait no longer" to "exterminate from our lands this nation which seeks only to destroy us."⁷ Following the erection of multiple British forts in the Ohio country despite a treaty promising this would not happen, several Native American leaders, Pontiac among them, took it as a sign that this was the time to make Neolin's words of prophecy come true. In May of 1763, Pontiac and others struck out at Fort Detroit, a British and French fort on the Detroit River in present day Michigan. Despite their efforts, Pontiac and the three hundred followers who fought with him were unable to seize the fort, as an informer had forewarned the British commander of the oncoming attack. However, Pontiac continued to lay siege to the fort and was slowly joined by several hundred other Native Americans. These Native Americans represented a multitude of tribes. This was a previously unseen event in American history, as it saw the first documented, coordinated effort across so many tribes. Despite a confused modern American vision of internal

⁶ Cave, "The Delaware Prophet".

⁷ Howard Peckham, *Pontiac and the Indian Uprising*, (1947, Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Native American politics, Native American tribes were largely separate and fought with each other often, so the beginning of Pontiac's War was a monumental occasion with consequences that would ripple across generations to come and serve as an important precedent to future resistance efforts by Native Americans. Though lives were certainly lost and battles were undoubtedly bloody, the success of the Native American alliance during Pontiac's war is irrefutable. At one point, Native American forces controlled nine of the eleven active forts in the Ohio Country and even destroyed Fort Sandusky, the first fort established in the Ohio Country which broke the original treaty signed by the British. Pontiac's War and the actions caused by Neolin's ideas would have reverberating consequences not only to the spirit of the Native American community, but to the politics and relationship between Native Americans and colonial settlers of the region.

During Pontiac's war, Native American forces attacked not only military forts, but also several British settlements. This bred much hostility on the part of the settlers toward the Native Americans. There was undoubtedly brutality on both sides of the war, and the colonists wanted their government to punish the Native Americans for it.⁸ However, the distant British colonial government, engaged in a war it was increasingly clear they were losing, were able to do very little to protect the settlers from violence and displacement.⁹ Over five hundred settlers were killed in the conflict as well as 450 fighters on the British side and at least two hundred Native American warriors. Another four thousand settlers were displaced from their homes, further fueling frustration and anger.¹⁰ Ultimately, it became clear to the British that this conflict would only be resolved through diplomatic strategies. Eager to negotiate a resolution, the British made

⁸ Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Gregory Dowd, *War under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, & the British Empire*, (2002, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

a formal treaty with Pontiac at Fort Ontario on July 25, 1766. Indeed, the overwhelming victory of Pontiac's War was so pivotal because it forced colonial authorities to recognize Native American sovereignty, and inspired such acts as the Proclamation Line of 1763. The strategy and pure force of Native American fighters during the war spurred the British government to finally consider the benefits of recognizing the rights of Native Americans. British people who had some influence and "were knowledgeable about Indian relations, such as Sir William Johnson" encouraged upholding "promises made to the Indians regarding the preservation of their lands" and "insisted" that that was "the best way to keep peace" finally made their way into the psyches of colonial authorities.¹¹ In the Proclamation of 1763, the British even went so far as to say they would punish settlers who disobeyed Native American land rights. Settlers in the Ohio Country, already dissatisfied with the lack of protection during Pontiac's War, became further frustrated with colonial authorities because of this.¹² They desired the exact opposite response from their government, and urged officials to make Native Americans pay for the violence they had inflicted on them. Ironically, this ultimately led to the colonists rebelling against British authority just as the Native Americans had. In the end, the colonists and Native Americans were protesting the same things: poor treatment from British authority, lack of autonomy over their own lands and loss of the resources and stability needed to control their own destinies – all of which Americans would list as reasons for their own revolution in just a few short years. The colonists' rebellions of the Ohio Country caused the backcountry of Colonial America to become a land of upheaval and uncertainty around the future of the authority of the British government, one of the first areas to have such an atmosphere in Colonial America. Soon, the revolutionary spirit made

¹¹ Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*.

¹² *Ibid.*

its way down to the coastal cities of legend, and the embers of the American Revolution began to stir.

With the words of one prophet in a small village deep in the “backcountry” of Colonial America, a spark began which would go on to take the whole world apart with the force of its blaze. The ideas of Neolin inspired great numbers of devoted followers and drew warriors to their cause, inciting a rebellion which would fuel such passion and tensions that yet another rebellion would occur– that rebellion being the American revolution, a war which would go down in history as the birth of an entirely new country.

Works Cited

- Dixon, David. “Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac’s Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America”. 2005, University of Oklahoma Press.
- Cave, Alfred A. “The Delaware Prophet Neolin: A Reappraisal.” *Ethnohistory* 46, no. 2 (1999): 265–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/482962>.
- Rindfleisch, Bryan. “Pontiac’s Rebellion,” mountvernon.org.
- King George III. “A Proclamation.” 1763.
- d’Errico, Peter. “Jeffery Amherst and Smallpox.” University of Massachusetts.
https://people.umass.edu/derrico/amherst/lord_jeff.html.

The Price We Pay: An Analysis of Gender in Literature

By Maddie Taylor

It is no longer radical for a woman leader to be steadfast and unafraid to blaze her trail, but it was not always this way. Examples of powerful men silencing the strength women show exist throughout history. During the Victorian Era, affluent women were nothing more than ladies of the house. Many women in the working class found jobs to support themselves. Thus, because of the standards for women that demanded they be a part of the home, the working class women were lesser. The best woman — according to societal norms — needed to be pure, submissive, and domestic. They needed to be *true*. However, as the nineteenth century progressed, women began to break free of the demands of their male counterparts. They bared their intelligence and strength for all to see and consequently put themselves in a position of danger. The stories “A Jury of Her Peers” by Susan Glaspell, “The Yellow Wallpaper” by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and “The Story of an Hour” by Kate Chopin are all stories that were published during the transition from True Womanhood to the ideas of intellectual and ambitious women created by New Womanhood. “The Yellow Wallpaper,” published in 1892, describes a woman put on the “rest cure” by her husband, who doubles as her doctor. While trapped in a horrid little room, her mental health declines rapidly, but her husband believes she is nothing more than dramatic or hysterical, despite the seriousness of her complaints. Chopin's “The Story of an Hour” tells the tale of a freshly widowed woman enjoying the recently discovered freedom stolen from her in marriage — but only until her husband comes back. Lastly, “A Jury of Her Peers” is about a woman named Mrs. Hale, who explores her friend Mrs. Wright's — previously known as Minnie Foster — kitchen as she slowly pieces together the clues that explain Mr.

Wright's murder. Each author uses symbolism, diction, and plot to craft reformist stories depicting the lives of women. The three stories expose the cost of living imprisoned by True Womanhood while attempting to gain their own autonomy.

Throughout all three stories, men rule over their wives. Societal norms suck women dry of their intelligence and autonomy. While searching the kitchen for clues regarding Mrs. Wright's motive for killing her husband, Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters discover a broken birdcage and a murdered songbird. For the women, this discovery cements Mrs. Wright's guilt while also convincing them of the abuse she endured. In her grief, Mrs. Hale compares Mrs. Wright to the bird: "She used to sing. He killed that too" (Glaspell 158). One of the goals of New Womanhood was to showcase feminine creativity and allow women to pursue art and eventually self-expression. The song is one of many beautiful forms of art, and one that Mrs. Wright possessed. Minnie Foster previously sang for the town choir, but stopped after becoming Mrs. Wright. The death of her music, caused by her husband, distinctly shows that nineteenth-century marriages are suppressive of women's voices. Glaspell's use of short, stark sentences accentuates her point, especially in contrast to her more loquacious writing. The association between Mrs. Wright and the bird adds further depth to the symbolism of the broken birdcage. By murdering her husband, Mrs. Wright expresses her need to break free from his mental imprisonment. Additionally, Mr. Wright breaks the bird cage, illustrating how his violence was the inciting incident in Minnie Foster's rebellion. In "The Story of an Hour," Mrs. Mallard learns of her husband's death. Her grief is cut short when she has an epiphany: her marriage was limiting. Her new claim to freedom changes her perspective of life greatly: "She breathed a quick prayer that life might be long. It was only yesterday she had thought with a shudder that life might be long" (Chopin 758). Whilst Mrs. Mallard's revelation is vital in understanding the relationship between

men and women, that marriages such as hers as well as Mrs. Wright's were draining, the timing is also key. Because it was not until after her husband's death that she even began to recognize her unhappiness, Mrs. Mallard exposes the training women endure so that they accept their position in life. Similarly to both "The Story of an Hour" and "A Jury of Her Peers," in Gilman's "The Yellow Wallpaper," the narrator's husband, John, often belittles her through his use of pet names. Rather than strengthening a bond and providing reassurance, the narrator's husband uses pet names to enforce a hierarchy. In one instance, he calls her a "blessed little goose" (Gilman 134). By using the word "little," John compares his wife to a child while also making her feel inferior. Such comparisons were not uncommon in the period. Throughout the entirety of "The Yellow Wallpaper," John uses infantilization as a tactic to make the narrator malleable to the whims of her husband. Similarly, in "A Jury of her Peers," the women are also treated as unintelligent inferiors. In this case, both stories conceptualize women's feelings toward demeaning language and actions.

True Womanhood not only created a hierarchy in romantic relationships, but also established a standard for the way women treat each other. In "The Yellow Wallpaper," John, the husband, does not permit the narrator, a writer, to do any activity more taxing than lying in bed. She, however, disobeys this rule as she writes her thoughts in her journal, describing her sister-in-law, Jennie, as "perfect, an enthusiastic housekeeper, and hopes for no better profession. I verily believe she thinks it is the writing which made me sick!" (Gilman 136). In their relationship, Jennie becomes maternal to her sister-in-law. Because society expects women to care for the family, it is no surprise that they consequently became more maternal towards one another as well. Moreover, in "The Story of an Hour," Mrs. Mallard's sister tries to lessen the blow of Mr. Mallard's death: "It was her sister Josephine who told her, in broken sentences;

veiled hints that revealed in half concealing” (Chopin 756). Josephine’s careful approach demonstrates her maternal instincts as well as the internal belief that her sister’s reaction may be so *dramatic* as to cause a heart attack. Although Josephine breaks free from infantilization through her maternal instincts, she continues to force the same standards upon her sister-in-law, creating a dynamic where a woman is enforcing the stereotypes. Her actions also reflect the belief that women can not exist independently of their husbands. On a related note, in “A Jury of Her Peers” Mrs. Hale plays the part of the New Woman in comparison to Mrs. Peters, who acts as the True Woman. When the two women first arrive at the house and begin to search for a motive, Mrs. Hale disdains the other woman: “She looked at Mrs. Peters, and there was something in the other woman’s look that irritated her” (Glaspell 151). Their friendship depicts the conflict between the two types of women. Because the two women best reflect two different sets of standards for women individually, their lack of respect for each other portrays how New Womanhood and True Womanhood are opposite idealistically. Furthermore, it illustrates how societal standards impact friendships between two women, since the two disagree because of their views on womanhood. The change in their relationship — allies undermining male dominance — corresponds to the way societal norms began to interact and become more cohesive as time progressed. All three stories directly illustrate relationships where women are once again impacted by the pressure of societal expectations.

In defiance of the hardships forced upon them, the women in these stories fight to secure self-determination for themselves. Cooped up in her room, the narrator of “The Yellow Wallpaper” slowly loses grip on her sanity. In the end, John finds the narrator crawling around her room, believing she has broken free from her wallpaper. She shouts to her husband, “‘I’ve got out at last,’ said I, ‘in spite of you and Jane!’” (Gilman 147). Even though John and Jane

understand her words to be a madwoman's ramblings, the narrator is declaring her freedom; she can prove not only to herself, but to her family as well that she will no longer be controlled.

Through her breakdown, the narrator finally achieves liberation, at the cost of her stability. In "A Jury of Her Peers," while their husbands spend time investigating Mr. Wright's murder, Mrs. Peters and Mrs. Hale discover a dead songbird which leads them to theorize a motive. However, when it comes time to leave, they do not share their findings with their husbands: "For a moment Mrs. Peters did not move. And then she did it...Martha Hale snatched the box from the sheriff's wife, and got it in the pocket of her big coat just as the sheriff and the county attorney came back into the kitchen" (Glaspell 161). In the beginning, Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters do not see eye-to-eye. However, by the end of the story the two work together to protect their friend. The two oppose their husbands — going against the True Womanhood concept of obedience — as they cover up the murder. Despite Mrs. Peters' hesitation, it is obvious she could not allow the men to imprison Mrs. Wright, especially considering the abuse she endured. Lastly, in "The Story of an Hour," Mrs. Mallard realizes the constraint her marriage forced upon her. In her elation, she is described to have "a feverish triumph in her eyes, and [carries] herself unwittingly like a goddess of Victory" (Chopin 758). Chopin's imagery paints a clear picture of the widow's excitement. Her simile comparing Mrs. Mallard to a goddess of victory — often the Greek goddess Nike, who is often associated with winning wars — reveals the fight for autonomy to be a battle with both risk and reward. Mrs. Mallard's death at the end of the story continues to add to this idea because she becomes a martyr for all women demanding autonomy. Mr. Mallard's arrival may have stolen her hope, but her life symbolizes the efforts women take to be completely independent. Throughout all the stories, current situations force the protagonists to reconcile with their current position in society and make difficult choices to change it.

The protagonists in “The Yellow Wallpaper,” “A Jury of Her Peers,” and “The Story of an Hour” learn how to proudly express themselves. Whether it be through madness, death, or friendships, all the women find ways to be independent. The stories all illustrate different paths to reaching freedom as well as different interpretations of New Womanhood. No two protagonists are the same, and no two stories are the same. However, each includes similar elements that uncover what it means to be neither a True Woman nor a New Woman, but a woman who is confident in herself, including both the happy moments and the harder ones. Each story asks the question “What is the price for my autonomy?” While the cost may differ from story to story, they all agree that the result is worth the sacrifice. These Victorian Era stories pave the way in literature, inviting others to write about what they believe in — feminism — and protagonists who uncover the political impact on their relationships and decide their course of action. Chopin, Glaspell, and Gilman use their writing talent to declare their freedom.

Works Cited

- Chopin, Kate. “The Story of an Hour.” 1894. *Kate Chopin: Complete Novels and Stories*, The Library of America, 2000, pp. 756-758.
- Gilman, Charlotte. “The Yellow Wallpaper.” 1892. *American Fantastic Tales: Terror and the Uncanny from Poe to the Pulps*, edited by Peter Straub, The Library of America, 2009, pp. 131-147.
- Glaspell, Susan. “A Jury of Her Peers.” 1917. *The Oxford Book of American Detective Stories*, edited by Tony Hillerman, Rosemary Herbert, Oxford UP, 1993, pp. 143-161.

Oh Dear!

By Zenobia Russi Barrett

Acquiring basic rights as a woman has been a never-ending struggle, pioneered by brave women who advocate for equality. Since the beginning of time, advocacy can be seen in literature through authors who unearth hidden and detrimental gender roles within society. Gender roles include having to hide or suppress any rational and analytical thinking because that was reserved for a man. “The Yellow Wallpaper” by Charlotte Perkins Gilman and “A Jury of Her Peers” by Susan Glaspell both display the control of men over women’s lives and expressions as well as the assumptions that men hold. During the time of these stories’ publications, the idea of “True Womanhood” enveloped the nation. True Womanhood was a belief that the ideal woman should worship her husband, or any male, while veiling her talents, skills, and independent thinking to appeal to his needs. The “True Woman” was pious, pure, submissive, and domestic. She had to express herself in a way approved by males, with no free thinking or problem-solving for herself. She also could not conspire with other women, for that would suggest their control over their own lives. These ideals were the social norm until the “New Woman” emerged and overturned the limits of the social construct. Unlike the women in “The Yellow Wallpaper” and “A Jury of Her Peers,” the “New Woman” could have the freedom to express herself, pursue her goals intellectually, and negate the thinking that she is less than others. In “The Yellow Wallpaper” the protagonist appeals to her husband’s needs by expressing herself in an intuitive, nurturing, and sheltered manner. “A Jury of Her Peers” exhibits two women who are thought by their male counterparts to lack intellectual reasoning and have to secretly express themselves to each other to convey their thoughts for lack of understanding. In

“The Yellow Wallpaper” and “A Jury of Her Peers,” it is clear that men have great influence over women’s self expression and control of their interactions with outside people and other women.

Many works of the time display the roles of women as True Women, who must fulfill the duty of a housewife and fit the standards of a wife. In “A Jury of Her Peers,” these roles make an appearance when Mrs. Hale says, “I’d hate to have men comin’ into my kitchen...snoopin’ round and criticizin,’” and Mrs. Peters responds, “Of course, it’s no more than their duty” (Glaspell 150). The statement that men must criticize the work of a woman highlights the normalcy of men’s superiority over the women. The role of a woman was clearly distinguished by how she must make the home welcoming and inviting for the man to stay at home, further showing how the domesticity in the role of a woman plays into the story. Another example of this is when Mr. Henderson, the county attorney, exclaims, “Dirty towels! Not much of a housekeeper, would you say ladies?”, about Minnie’s ability to take care of her household (Glaspell 149). Mr. Henderson belittles not only Minnie, but the other women. His job is to investigate this murder case, but he instead focuses on insulting Minnie’s work, reinforcing that the only job of a woman is to clean the house and be a great housekeeper. He thinks it is unacceptable for a woman to allow her house to be in disarray. In Gilman’s story, the narrator is also pressured into fitting the True Woman narrative. When the narrator is explaining how her state of being has improved, she says, “I really do eat better, and am more quiet than I was. John is so pleased to see me improve!”, signifying that her improving health relates to her behavior (Gilman 174). Here, the narrator associates health with obedience. The narrator wishes to please her husband by improving the way she acts and embodying the True Woman by acting submissive. Adding on to the True Woman aspect, the narrator rationalizes, “John laughs at me, of course, but one expects that [in marriage]” (Gilman 111). Expressing that it is expected that he

laugh at her foolishness shows the true belittlement of a woman. She must endure his slights and the authoritative nature that comes with the role of a husband, completely justifying him looking down on her. His authority can be seen in how he calls the narrator “darling” and “little girl,” names that suggest she is a child in need of care, also playing into her sick condition (Gilman 118-119). True Womanhood is shown by the submissive, somewhat weak, behavior and, as a result, a woman’s role, which is intertwined with domesticity in both stories.

These literary works display the oppression of women’s self expression and how isolation from friends, family, and the world is used as a key technique of control. In “A Jury Of Her Peers,” Mrs. Hale draws attention to how much Minnie shifted after marrying Mr. Wright. She observes that Minnie “kept so much to herself” and says, “I s’pose she felt she couldn’t do her part; and then, you do not enjoy things when you feel shabby. She used to wear pretty clothes and be lively – when she was Minnie Foster, one of the town girls, singing in the choir. But that – oh, that was twenty years ago” (Glaspell 151). This illustrates how marriage limits women’s self-expression through the oppression of their interests. Prior to her marriage, Minnie dressed how she wanted and seemed proud of who she was. However, after Minnie married and became Mrs. Wright, she was limited in not only how she dressed but in her involvement with the choir. She used to sing and follow her interests until the marriage, which Mrs. Hale highlights when she ponders, “‘Wright wouldn’t like the bird,’ and ‘a thing that sang. She used to sing. He killed that too’” (Glaspell 158). The dramatic shift of marriage places Mrs. Wright under her husband’s command while her love of singing is extirpated simply because Mr. Wright was not fond of the noise or perhaps the level of freedom that accompanied it. Mr. Wright “wrung [the bird’s] neck”, suffocating Minnie’s freedom with it, as the bird symbolizes her previously vibrant life. The dominance of men can also be seen in “The Yellow Wallpaper,” in how the narrator’s contact

with others is limited by her husband. At one point, the narrator wishes for company. She thinks, “I wished he would let me go and make a visit to Cousin Henry and Julia. But he said I wasn’t able to go, nor able to stand it for myself when I got there,” coinciding with the notion that he wants to isolate her from her own family (Gilman 138). He also further demonstrates this when he threatens the narrator by sending her to “Weir Mitchell in the fall,” further separating her from familiar friends and family (Gilman 136). Although the narrator thinks to herself, “But I don’t want to go there at all,” she keeps her needs a secret, as expressing her wish to stay away from Weir Mitchell would directly defy her husband (Gilman 136). Her husband John keeps her on the rest cure, meaning she is restricted in what she can do and limited to her bed, lining up with his need to keep her confined from her family. He uses his role and connected power as a husband to suppress her contact with others and keep her unstimulated, thinking her unable to handle what lies beyond his regulated cage of control.

Both works display restrictions placed upon the mental stimulation of women and how they were thought to be less capable of rational thinking. At the beginning of “The Yellow Wallpaper,” the narrator frantically states, “There comes John, and I must put this away,—he hates to have me write a word” (Gilman 165). The narrator is swayed by her husband’s arrival and the thought of his reaction to her writing, suggesting that John has command over his wife’s activities and interests. At the time, men were thought to be the brain, the head of the household, and the rational thinker, while women were more prone to whimsical “fancies.” This assumption shows up later in the story, when the narrator is bothered by the wallpaper and says her husband “meant to repaper the room, but afterward, he said that I was letting it get the better of me and that nothing was worse for a nervous patient than to give way to such fancies” (Gilman 134). By using the word “fancy,” John is undermining her concerns and marking them as trivial. He also

uses the leverage of her dwindling health to call her weak and imply her problems have no substance. Even from the opening, the narrator mentions her husband “assures friends and relatives that there is really nothing the matter with [her] but temporary nervous depression—a slight hysterical tendency,” adding to this invalidation of the narrator (Gilman 131). John devalues her depression as a notion that could come and go as it pleases, perpetuating the idea that she is illogical and lacks self awareness. The narrator brings attention to this again: “I sometimes fancy that in my condition if I had less opposition and more society and stimulus—but John says the very worst thing I can do is think about my condition,” interrupting her thought process to recall his instructions (Gilman 164). She has internalized his doubt in her capability to think for herself. By stating that she desires more exposure, the narrator emphasizes its absence and almost regulates her behavior to align with her supposed mindlessness. These assumptions of the capabilities of women also arise in “A Jury of Her Peers,” when the county attorney Henderson speculates, “No telling; you women might come upon a clue to the motive—and that's the thing we need” followed closely by Mr. Hale adding, “But would the women know a clue if they did come upon it?” (Glaspell 150). The phrase “no telling” conveys Henderson’s disbelief of the possibility of women finding a clue. Mr. Hale questions the women’s abilities to rationalize and distinguish a clue, pointing to the preconceived notions of their intellect and lack of. Earlier in the story, Mr. Hale also reasons, “Women are used to worrying over trifles”, categorizing women as again, trivial, and deserving of pity for their lack of logical reasons to worry. Over and over again men hold irrational assumptions and devalue women who express their opinions or feelings, emphasizing the sheer control men had on the overall lives of women.

In both stories, the values of the nineteenth century reflect how women were treated on a day-to-day basis. Not only did men hold immense faculty over a woman's life, but also treated her like she was lesser, and couldn't mentally support herself without the much needed interference of men. Her aspirations and goals were overshadowed by her male counterparts and the freedom to explore them was harshly limited. These literary works confront expectations, control, and power over a woman, and bring to light the need for radical change. Change has been and will continue to take place with the help of such literature to expose injustices all around us.

Works Cited

- Gilman, Charlotte. "The Yellow Wallpaper." 1892. *American Fantastic Tales: Terror and the Uncanny from Poe to the Pulps*, edited by Peter Straub, The Library of America, 2009, pp. 131-147.
- Glaspell, Susan. "A Jury of Her Peers." 1917. *The Oxford Book of American Detective Stories*, edited by Tony Hillerman, Rosemary Herbert, Oxford UP, 1993, pp. 143-161.

If You Were a Slave: How Anti-Slavery Authors Humanized Slaves to White Readers

By Bryony Crawford

In Harriet Beecher Stowe's iconic nineteenth-century anti-slavery novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, she implores the reader to question: "If it were your Harry, mother, or your Willie, that were going to be torn from you by a brutal trader, tomorrow morning,—if you had seen the man, and heard that the papers were signed and delivered, and you had only from twelve o'clock till morning to make good your escape,—how fast could you walk?" (Stowe 127). This scenario of an enslaved family being sold and separated in slave auctions was far too common during the antebellum era. Works such as Frederick Douglass's *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, Harriet Jacobs' *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, William Wells Brown's *Clotel*, Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and many other anti-slavery writings took advantage of these heartrending circumstances to convert readers to their side. It was extremely common to see scenes emphasizing the importance of family and the cruelty of enslavers tearing families apart in abolitionist literature, due to the universal nature of one's love for their family and their family's love for them. This idea extended to many other areas of abolitionist writing—authors constantly compared their characters to traits of their readers, forcing white readers to examine their beliefs on slaves by revealing the true level of similarity between the two groups. Anti-slavery authors accomplished their goal of humanizing slaves to white readers by detailing the hardships of slaves' lives and correlating their experiences to those of the reader.

Abolitionist literature commonly utilized word choice and literary devices to convey an anti-slavery message. In *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, Douglass uses the anaphoras of loneliness and loss. He speculates how his grandmother was sent out to live "in

perfect loneliness,” mourning “the loss of children, the loss of grandchildren, and the loss of great-grandchildren” (Douglass 29). This repetition asserts Douglass’s belief that slavery destroys families and connects his grandmother’s experience to a wider collective by omitting personal pronouns when describing the losses she mourns, suggesting that the descendants she grieves may not be just hers but those of many other slaves as well. Additionally, the fact that Douglass has to speculate on what is happening to his grandmother is further proof of his point — since he was torn from his grandmother by enslavers, he has lost the basic right of being in contact with his own relatives. Douglass also quotes a poem by J. G. Whittier to further his message, borrowing another anti-slavery writer’s language:

Gone, gone, sold and gone

To the rice swamp dank and lone

From Virginia hills and waters—

Woe is me, my stolen daughters! (Whittier, qtd. in Douglass 29)

This language of “stolen daughters” emphasizes Douglass’s argument on how slavery tears apart familial bonds by selling off people with no regard for their relationships with one another, whether it be sibling, partner, or child. Whittier’s choice of the word “stolen” calls to mind imagery of a crime, comparing slave traders to common thieves. However, an anonymous poem employs more fanciful metaphors, comparing a slave mother’s grief over losing her child to “the bounds of the rock-girdled ocean” (Anonymous 106). They also compare slavery to a “mildew... [that] has blighted every blossom” and liken hope for a future free of slavery to “the rain-bow so cheering” (Anonymous 106). These metaphors paint a vivid picture of the injustices of slavery, therefore influencing readers more effectively. Additionally, the grand scale of this figurative language may have served to show white readers that Black people also showed and felt

emotions as strongly as white people, as it was a common belief at the time that a slave's emotions were less genuine than a white person's, furthering their dehumanization. By using such precise and intense language, anti-slavery literature effectively convinced white readers to the side of abolitionism.

Another way anti-slavery authors humanized their characters to their readers was by putting their slave characters in closer proximity to whiteness. Harriet Beecher Stowe's Eliza was a mulatto, as were many of the main characters of prevalent abolitionist writings. Since slavery was determined by the race of the mother, a mulatto whose father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all white would still be considered a slave as long as their great-grandmother was Black. Therefore, mixed-race slaves blurred the lines between what was "acceptable" slavery and what wasn't. When narratives brought characters who were mostly white but still treated as slaves, white readers would likely question how enslavers could still keep someone so similar to themselves in slavery. A Virginian statesman and slaveholder, John Randolph, said that "the blood of the first American statesmen coursed through the veins of the slave of the South" (Randolph, qtd. in Brown 109). With white readers realizing that modern slaves were tied by blood to powerful white men and perhaps even to their own relatives, how could they not turn to abolitionism? Additionally, slave narratives emphasized their dedication to Christianity, since anti-slavery authors knew white readers were more likely to sympathize with slaves if the characters exhibited traits readers could relate to. Readers believed Christians to be more respectable, and therefore associated Christianity with the respectability of whiteness. By showing readers that slaves could be Christian, abolitionist authors put their characters in closer proximity to whiteness, causing readers to be more sympathetic to slaves. In his poem "The Christian Slave," J.G. Whittier seems appalled that a Christian could be sold at a slave auction —

that she could be subject to such an inhumane process — writing “A Christian! going, gone! / Who bids for God’s own image?” (Whittier, li. 1-2). He compares the slave to God’s ideals, implying that all Christians are made equal in God’s eyes, no matter their race. Whittier, along with other abolitionist authors, hoped to humanize slaves by forcing white readers to compare slaves to themselves.

Marriage, and the breaking of it, was another popular theme used to garner readers’ sympathy. In his novel about Thomas Jefferson’s fictional daughter, William Wells Brown writes that “as husband and wife through each other become conscious of complete humanity, and every human feeling, and every human virtue; so children, at their first awakening in the fond covenant of love between parents, both of whom are tenderly concerned for the same object, find an image of complete humanity leagued in free love” (Brown 110). He highlights the sacred union of marriage in American culture at the time. In the middle of a long exposition on the holiness of marriage, Brown calls marriage a “covenant”, bringing to mind connotations of a divine contract and using dramatic language to underscore its importance. Brown is appealing to his readers’ emotions to sway them against separating partners at slave auctions by engaging their own married sensibilities and translating those emotions to slave marriages. In contrast, Harriet Jacobs calls attention to slaves who don’t even get the chance to marry the people they love. She asks her master for permission to marry a freedman she is in love with and who has offered to buy her. He refuses, offering to marry her off to another of his slaves instead. Jacobs asks him: “[Can] a slave have some preference about marrying? Do you suppose that all men are alike to her?” (Jacobs 35). She successfully questions the dehumanization of Black people on the part of the reader by calling out her master’s belief that all Black men are interchangeable to her and showing his clear disrespect for the sanctity of marriage, i.e, Brown’s sacred “covenant” in

which two specific people pledge their lives to each other. Jacobs' narrative may have caused readers to correlate their own love to hers, despite not drawing an outright parallel between the two. If the reader's partnership is unique and irreplaceable, so are those between slaves. By this logic, it becomes difficult for white readers to ignore and pardon the cruelty committed against slave families.

Multiple abolitionist authors also highlighted another universal connection—one between mother and child. Harriet Beecher Stowe chooses to focus on Eliza's love for her son in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Throughout Eliza's escape with her child, Stowe emphasizes how Eliza's love for her son grants her almost superhuman abilities—Eliza walks for unusual amounts of time, overcomes exhaustion to carry her child, and pushes through hunger pangs until her child is safe. When describing Eliza's escape, Stowe writes, “How the touch of those warm arms, the gentle breathings that came in her neck, seemed to add fire and spirit to her movements! It seemed to her as if strength poured into her in electric streams, from every gentle touch and movement of the sleeping, confiding child” (Stowe 128). This truly sums up Stowe's argument: the bond between mother and child is the strongest love in the world, and slavery is a cruel force for separating the two. After all, when Eliza is running away on foot from slave catchers on horses in a nerve wracking chase scene, Stowe writes that “stronger than all [is] maternal love, wrought into a paroxysm of frenzy by the near approach of a fearful danger” (Stowe 127). Harriet Jacobs also emphasizes the bond between mothers and their children in *Incidents of the Life of a Slave Girl*. In her attempt to protect her children from the wrath of her enslaver, Jacobs hides in an attic for seven long years, suffering from multiple illnesses and unable to even stand up. She endures this torture for two reasons: to her, it's preferable to slavery, and it protects her children from their enslaver's full anger. Jacobs “suffered for air even more than for light. But [she] was not

comfortless. [She] heard the voices of [her] children” (Jacobs 92). Her love for her children is so great that, despite her terrible circumstances, she is still able to find joy in simply knowing they’re near her. However, despite these slave mothers’ unending love for their children, the fact remained that they had no rights to their children as long as either was enslaved. As the poet Frances Ellen Harper wrote about a slave mother’s child: “He is not hers, for cruel hands / May rudely tear apart” (Harper 103). Abolitionist authors emphasized the love between slave mothers and their children while simultaneously portraying how that love could never be kept safe until slavery was abolished.

Abolitionist authors used the medium of story in every possible way. Through subtle and unsubtle tactics, from metaphors to anecdotes, each word they wrote was a fight against slavery—an act of rebellion. They fought for a future where no husband would be sold away from his wife, no mother would have to be torn apart from her child, and that child would never be enslaved. As an anonymous poet wrote, “Rejoice, O rejoice! for the child thou art rearing / May one day lift up its unmanacled form” (Anonymous 106). This hope for the future was grounded in reality—slavery was finally abolished in 1865. However, despite our outward condemnation of slavery, practices and beliefs from the antebellum era still exist today in a different form. Many believe that today’s prison system is just a modern form of slavery, unfairly incarcerating Black people and exploiting their labor. Indeed, a new genre of literature rallying against America’s police system and the prison industrial complex is emerging with notable memoirs such as Albert Woodfox’s *Solitary* and novels like Angie Thomas’ *The Hate U Give*. These works employ many of the same tactics that abolitionist authors from the nineteenth century used, relative to Stowe’s humanization of her characters and Jacobs’ intense emotions towards her broken family ties. Anti-slavery literature was key in bringing about the downfall of

antebellum slavery, and these modern narratives hold the same hope for a free future. Through specific anecdotes detailing the hardships of unfair incarceration and evoking sympathy for those convicts, prison abolitionist authors can humanize themselves and their characters, just like the abolitionist authors fighting for a free future from centuries ago.

Works Cited

- Anonymous. "O, Pity the Slave Mother." *The Anti-Slavery Harp*, ed. William Wells Brown, 1848. Rpt. *Uncle Tom's Cabin and American Culture*, ed. Stephen Raillton, University of Virginia, 2006, <http://utc.iath.virginia.edu/abolitn/absowwba3t.html>. *Supplemental Readings Fall 2022*, edited by Maria Elena Caballero-Robb, Kirby School, 2022, p. 106.
- Brown, William Wells. "Ch. 1 The Negro Sale." *Clotel, or the President's Daughter*, 1853. *Supplemental Readings Fall 2020*, edited by Maria Elena Caballero-Robb, Kirby School, 2022, pp. 109-114.
- Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*. Dover Publications, 1995.
- Harper, Frances Ellen Watkins. "The Slave Mother." *American Poetry: The Nineteenth Century*, Library of America, 1993. *Supplemental Readings Fall 2022*, edited by Maria Elena Caballero-Robb, Kirby School, 2022, p. 103.
- Jacobs, Harriet Ann. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*. W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 2001.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. John P. Jewett, 1852. *Uncle Tom's Cabin and American Culture*, edited by Stephen Raillton, Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, University of Virginia, 1998, <http://utc.iath.virginia.edu/>. 9 June 2016.

Supplemental Readings Fall 2022, edited by Maria Elena Caballero-Robb, Kirby School, 2022, pp. 119-167.

Whittier, John Greenleaf. "The Christian Slave." 1843. *Anti-slavery Poems: Songs of Labor and Reform*, Houghton Mifflin, 1888. Rpt. *American Verse Project*, University of Michigan, n.d.

<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/amverse/BAE0044.0001.001/1:4.22?rgn=div2;view=fulltext>.

Supplemental Readings Fall 2022, edited by Maria Elena Caballero-Robb, Kirby School, 2022, p. 107.

The Relationship Between Women's Rights and Abolitionism: How a Lack of Intersectionality Divided a Movement

By Grace Jones

The women's rights movement in nineteenth century America walked a long and winding path to eventually win suffrage for women of the next century. Though the significance of the myriad influences and events of this time are in perpetual debate, many accounts draw a straight line between abolitionism and women's suffrage. While it's true that there are important connections between the struggle for the rights of Black Americans and advocates for the vote for women, the relationship between the two campaigns and the posturing of the activists who moved between them was complex and often unexpected. For example, when the Fifteenth Amendment was proposed on February 25, 1869, one might think that all advocates for women's rights, being ardent supporters of civil rights, would have celebrated the introduction of an act guaranteeing "the right of citizens of the United States to vote" regardless of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude."¹³ However, this was not at all the case. Though some prominent activists such as Frederick Douglass and Lucy Stone supported the amendment, others, including widely renowned figures Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, opposed the amendment. This severe schism led to deep factionalism, splitting the movement into what were essentially two opposing sects for over twenty years. Increasingly visible racism, disagreements about the best methods for achieving suffrage and debates surrounding involvement in advocacy for other political issues divided the women's rights movement into two major groups: the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association. With the hindsight of history, many people think the journey from abolitionism to the women's right's

¹³U.S. Constitution, Amendment XV.

movement was a clear sequence of activism and political influence, but the actual chain of events and labyrinthine road leading to women's suffrage is full of intricate relationships and damaging setbacks. The opinions of different factions and individuals on the Fifteenth Amendment contained vast and convoluted complexity as well.

In the early nineteenth century, the movement to end slavery was growing tremendously in the United States. As it did so, it roused a generation of women into the realization that they too could participate in political affairs. In particular, women in the 1830s increasingly used petitions as a common form of resistance and activism.¹⁴ It is estimated that of all the petitions supporting abolitionism and abolitionist causes and societies, seventy-three percent of the signatures were women's.¹⁵ This taste of political action sparked something that could not be stopped, and many American women became much more involved in abolitionist societies, eventually going on to join other causes such as the temperance movement and so-called moral reform societies, which tended to focus on the controlling of men's sexualities and rudimentary concepts of rape and women's sexual rights.¹⁶ Because the idea of women seizing political independence and lobbying for change was a relatively radical prospect, many women were at first relegated to second-rate committees and side jobs within the abolitionist societies they joined.¹⁷ This sexism within the abolitionist movement influenced women to move forward by founding their own women's abolitionist groups.

The first of these groups was the Female Anti-Slavery Society of Salem, which was also notable for being formed and run by Black women.¹⁸ Soon, women began branching out even

¹⁴ Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Women's Rights Emerges within the Antislavery Movement* (New York, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), 18.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid, 28.

¹⁷ Ibid, 9.

¹⁸ Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Women's Rights Emerges within the Antislavery Movement* (New York, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), 10.

farther into more realms of political outreach, with some advocates speaking in front of audiences to promote the abolitionist cause. Because a “true woman’s” belonged in the domestic sphere of the home and was not supposed to have much contact with the world outside of her family and a few female friends, the idea of women orating and developing a degree of influence over a public audience was one not easily accepted into American society. Indeed, the level of discomfort with this idea can be inferred simply by the name for a mixed audience of both women and men: a “promiscuous” audience. The first American woman to speak before such an audience was Maria Stewart, who also happened to be Black.¹⁹

Two important recruits to the abolitionist movement were Angelina and Sarah Grimké, who were drawn to abolitionism through Quaker groups. Born and raised in a wealthy slaveholding family in South Carolina, sisters Angelina and Sarah split from their relatives initially not because of a change in moral values, but because of a change in religious faith.²⁰ Sarah was drawn to the Quakers of Pennsylvania, and after several years and many persuasive letters, she convinced Angelina to join her there. Together, they were exposed to a world of moral and abolitionist beliefs which led them to reflect on their childhood witnesses of slavery as incredibly and intolerably cruel.²¹ The Quaker perspective eventually led them to see slavery as truly evil, and the Grimkés eventually embarked on a speaking tour of New England which gained them much fame and regard, especially for the extraordinary oratorical skills of Angelina.²² This tour also spread abolitionist ideas to many communities and forced thousands of Americans to accept the idea and new reality of women actively participating in both the public and political spheres. Rightfully or not, the Grimké sisters are often heralded as the spark which

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid, 4.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid, 23.

fanned the embers of the women's side of the abolitionist movement which would soon develop into its own focused cause: the feminist movement.

Even as it became more normalized for women to be involved in political movements, there were still many debates going on both within and outside of the movement as to what was allowed and not allowed. Fierce debates and controversy were never an unfamiliar thing to the feminists of the nineteenth century. As the abolitionist movement, in particular the Garrisonian societies, expanded and changed to envelope a wider range of issues, embracing a kind of political and moral perfectionism, arguments raged over whether women's rights should be included in that array and how much weight women of the movement should be given. This led to a split in the Garrisonian abolitionist movement itself and ended up dividing some major societies into multiple other groups. Though women such as Maria Stewart and Angelina and Sarah Grimké perhaps took the sting of being some of the first prominent and recognizable American women to involve themselves in the culture of high-profile activism, they were certainly not the last to face controversy over whether they should even be allowed to have a place at the table, both literally and figuratively. Indeed, at the World Anti-Slavery Convention in London in 1840, women delegates from American societies were actually denied seats and active roles in the convention.²³ It was at this convention that Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton met. Stanton, on her honeymoon, came as a companion to her husband, while Mott was attending on her own.²⁴ Though most attendees of the convention viewed Mott as altogether too radical, too unsubtle (a perspective amplified by the locale, as British gender politics were a much more constrained affair at the time and less open to the developments of women's independence which

²³ Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from History of Woman Suffrage*, Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005), 85.

²⁴ Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Women's Rights Emerges within the Antislavery Movement* (New York, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), 50.

were beginning to take place in the United States), Stanton came to admire her speaking skills and got to talking with her, intrigued by her opinions.²⁵ Stanton's admiration and then strong friendship with Mott set the stage for her own foray into activism, making her public debut at the legendary Seneca Falls Convention. The Seneca Falls Convention, which Mott and Stanton organized, was the first ever convention which focused specifically on the "social, civil, and religious condition and rights of woman."²⁶ This convention was also notable for representing the very beginning of Stanton's feminist career. She would go on to veer further and further away from abolitionism and begin to stay more solidly and stubbornly focused on women's rights. In a later letter, Mott, in a joking but inquisitive tone, questioned how long she would go on with feminism, and if she would soon come back to focus on abolitionism.²⁷ Stanton stayed staunchly a feminist, and for the rest of her career would focus heavily on women's rights. This pattern, of advocates questioning whether you could truly stand for several causes at once and pitting multiple movements they were involved in against each other, led to the aforementioned split in the Garrisonian societies, and would eventually lead to a monumental divide in the women's rights movement.

Some of the first signs that a division was taking hold happened inside the soaring towers of the Church of the Puritans in New York at the 1866 Women's Rights Convention. Since strong debate had always been a part of the women's rights movement, it wasn't at first clear that those debates taking place at the convention were developing into divisive arguments which would go on to form the basis for a larger split in the organization. The "welcome given to opposing

²⁵ Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Women's Rights Emerges within the Antislavery Movement* (New York, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), 51.

²⁶ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions" (Seneca Falls, 1848).

²⁷ Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Women's Rights Emerges within the Antislavery Movement* (New York, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), 61.

arguments” in earlier conventions was no more.²⁸ Inflammatory language and bitter disagreements paired with racist remarks would make it clear that this was the beginning of a harsh division in the movement. Over the next few years, as the Fourteenth Amendment enshrined the word “male” in the constitution and the Fifteenth Amendment promised voting rights for Black men, the seeds of discord sown in 1866 would culminate in fierce debates and scathing declarations either supporting or the decrying suffrage for black men.

The Fifteenth Amendment was a turning point in the women’s rights movement and heralded a variety of divisions and detours that would impact the movement for years to come. Prominent proponents of the amendment include Lucy Stone and Frederick Douglass, who accepted the amendment for the victory it was in terms of the former abolitionist and now black rights movement. When some advocates argued that now emancipation had been achieved, all focus should turn to women’s rights, Douglass rebuffed this, eloquently arguing that women did not have the “urgency to obtain the ballot” equal to that of black people, challenging feminists to consider if their equation of the oppression of women to that of slaves was truly realistic.²⁹ Lucy Stone agreed, saying that she must oppose the idea women’s suffrage should be lifted above that of black men’s in importance.³⁰

Other respected feminists, however, disagreed. Several of these women had some strong reasoning to their perspective. They argued that the Fifteenth Amendment was not enough – that yes, it was a civil rights victory, but it should not have occurred on its own like this. It should have included a clause ensuring suffrage for both black and white women as well. Stanton, for

²⁸ Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage : Selections from History of Woman Suffrage, Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005)

²⁹ Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage : Selections from History of Woman Suffrage, Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005), 258-273.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 273.

example, demanded “suffrage for all citizens of the Republic,” saying she “would not talk of negroes or women, but of citizens.”³¹ Some opponents of the amendment were also concerned that suffrage for black men alone would assist in continued oppression and cause further suffering to black women.³² In this case, the amendment was contested as an injustice and a dismissal of the other groups besides black men who desired suffrage. Not all such dissenting arguments shared this seemingly noble logic, however.

Some women’s rights advocates simply did not think it was right for the government to waste their time and ink adding an amendment to the constitution about the rights of black people. These feminists displayed their racism proudly as they argued that it was below white women for black men to achieve suffrage before them, that it was an insult to white women. And in a contradictory turn, many of the women who used racist logic to attempt to spur women’s suffrage forward were the same people who had at times campaigned for that honorable goal of universal suffrage.³³ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, in particular, was a master of declaring such noble opinions and then immediately proceeding to deliver blatantly racist speeches.³⁴ Several times, she complained that white women had lifted black men “over [their] own heads”, and continually proclaimed that “it is better to be the slave of an educated white man, than that of a degraded, ignorant black one.”³⁵ Susan B. Anthony appeared to hold similar opinions, saying at an American Equal Rights Association meeting in 1869 that “if intelligence, justice, and morality are to have precedence in the Government, let the question of woman be brought up first and that

³¹ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Theodore Stanton and Harriot Stanton Blatch, *Elizabeth Cady Stanton as Revealed in Her Letters, Diary and Reminiscences* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922), 121.

³² *Ibid*, 110

³³ Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage : Selections from History of Woman Suffrage, Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005), 254

³⁴ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Theodore Stanton and Harriot Stanton Blatch, *Elizabeth Cady Stanton as Revealed in Her Letters, Diary and Reminiscences* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922), 110.

³⁵ *Ibid*, 108-110.

of the negro last.”³⁶ Another woman present at the same meeting, Paulina Davis, expressed a concern that “slaves who are enfranchised [will] become the worst of tyrants,” citing Anthony and Stanton’s opinions on race and education as evidence.³⁷ Ironically, considering the aforementioned opinions, some advocates often equated women’s status to that of the slave in order to increase support for the cause among abolitionists.³⁸ Especially in the later years of the nineteenth century, some feminists had a tendency to support black Americans’ rights and traditionally abolitionist-adjacent causes only when it directly supported their own agendas.

After the women’s rights movement split in 1869 over these controversial opinions, two new organizations were born: the American Woman Suffrage Association and the National Woman Suffrage Association (abbreviated as AWSA and NWSA). NWSA was headed by Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and was considered the more radical of the two, while AWSA was under Lucy Stone’s leadership and was viewed as a more conservative effort.³⁹ Twenty-one years passed before the two organizations were able to reconcile their differences and once again merge together, twenty-one years in which the growth of the women’s rights movement was arguably stunted by the division within it. Regardless of whose opinion was right or wrong, the inability of leaders like Stanton, Stone and Anthony to address the intersectionality of the women’s rights movement and to incorporate racial questions into their efforts ultimately undermined both their cause and that of universal civil rights.

³⁶ Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage : Selections from History of Woman Suffrage, Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005), 259.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 267.

³⁸ *Ibid*, 71.

³⁹ Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage : Selections from History of Woman Suffrage, Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005), XXV.

Works Cited

- Anthony, Susan B. and Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. *Correspondence, Writings, Speeches*. Edited by Ellen Carol Dubois. New York: Schocken Books, 1981.
- Buhle, Mari Jo, Buhle, Paul, Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, Anthony, Susan B., and Gage, Matilda Joslyn. *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005.
- Harper, Frances Ellen Watkins. "We Are All Bound Up Together". In *Proceedings of the Eleventh National Woman's Rights Convention*, 46-48. New York: Robert J. Johnston, 1866.
- Sklar, Kathryn Kish. *Women's Rights Emerges within the Antislavery Movement, 1830-1870*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. *Elizabeth Cady Stanton as Revealed in Her Letters, Diary and Reminiscences*. Edited by Theodore Stanton and Harriot Stanton Blatch. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1922.

