

## Teaching with Primary Sources Assessment

**Grade Level:** High School (9-10)

**Standard(s) or Objectives:** CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.9-10.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.  
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.9-10.3 Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.

### Library of Congress or Morris Special Collections Resources:



Mrs. Inez Millholland Boussevain. *The Times-Dispatch*, June 28, 1914 (Richmond, VA)

<http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85038615/1914-06-28/ed-1/seq-59/>

### Topic Background:

The campaign for women's suffrage began...in the 1820s and 30s...all sorts of reform groups were proliferating across the United States...and in many of these, women played a prominent role.

Excerpted from: <http://www.history.com/topics/womens-history/the-fight-for-womens-suffrage>

The determination of these women to expand their sphere of activities further outside the home helped legitimate the suffrage movement...[but some] reformers were impatient with the pace of change [and] adopted the more militant tactics of its English counterparts, picketing and conducting mass rallies and marches to raise public awareness and support...

Excerpted from: <http://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-Publications/WIC/Historical-Essays/No-Lady/Womens-Rights/>

On June 4, 1919, the United States Senate approved the 19th amendment to the Constitution, which states, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Excerpted from: [http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/primarysourcesets/womens-suffrage/pdf/teacher\\_guide.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/primarysourcesets/womens-suffrage/pdf/teacher_guide.pdf)

### Source(s) Used:

The source for this assessment includes excerpts from an opinion-editorial piece written by the militant suffragist Mrs. Inez Millholland Boissevain, in answer to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's prediction that Englishmen would resort to lynching in the fight against British women's suffrage. Boissevain defends the ideals and tactics employed by British suffragettes, and outlines the illegality of the tactics used in England to suppress the suffragettes.

### Answer Key:

Question 1 – B

Question 2 – D

## Mrs. Inez Millholland Boissevain, June 28, 1914

...English men...have for centuries looked upon women as 'something better than his dog; a little dearer than his horse,' and have treated them accordingly, privately and publicly, in police courts and the sanctity of the home, permitting, for example, the husband to beat his wife, and, when battered and bruised, she appeared in court against him, to punish him with a fine of \$5...

That the Government was the first to disregard law and constitutional rights many people do not know. The women who were first arrested as a result of their interruptions of political meetings—interruptions which are by no means illegal—were confined, as every prisoner is confined who is committed for political offences, even though that offence be murder, in the first division of the English prisons.

Later, the Government, in order to intimidate the women, committed them to the Third Division, although at no time was it suggested that their offence had any other than a political motive. The Third Division is the one reserved for common criminals, and hence the incarceration of political prisoners there was a denial to the women of a right that had never been denied to men. This fact, and this fact alone, was responsible for the hunger strike.

The hunger strike is not a protest against imprisonment. It is a protest, and the only protest possible, to prisoners—prisoners being individuals who are one degree worse off than those who are outside the Constitution—against imprisonment in the Third Division.

So long as the women were granted their rights and imprisoned in the First Division, there was no hunger striking. When their "prison" rights were denied them, they struck.

Now, If the British Government is in the right, why does it not allow these hunger striking women to die in prison? The answer is simple. They dare not. It is because the actions of those who would be responsible, i.e., of the British Government, will not bear the investigation that such deaths would entail...

### Questions:

1. Introducing her topic, Mrs. Boissevain asserts that:

"English men...have...looked upon women as something better than his dog; dearer than his horse, and have treated them accordingly, privately and publicly..."

Which of the following points from her article best support this idea? (CCSS. RI.9-10.1)

- a. Women exist outside constitutional rights.
- b. Female political protesters are not treated equally to me.
- c. Hunger-striking women are not allowed to die.
- d. Few men have served as political prisoners.

2. How does Mrs. Boissevain show that the British Government was "the first to disregard the law?" (CCSS. RI. 9-10.3)

- a. She describes the illegal practice of fining men only \$5 for assaulting their wives, and that women were arrested for making legal protests.
- b. She points out that women were never involved in the law-making process, and that they have no rights according to the British Constitution.
- c. She points out that the arrests of suffragists were illegal, and says that even men who commit murder for political reasons are entitled to imprisonment in the first division
- d. She describes the legal protests of the suffragists, the unfair terms of their imprisonment, and the government's need to keep the hunger strike unnoticed.