

## Our Mission

Teachers of every discipline recognize the importance of written expression. In the social studies, we encourage students to inquire, analyze, and synthesize in a variety of media, communicating their insights back to us in clean, well-reasoned prose. We are happy to present “Open Notes,” a forum we have created to recognize student achievement in this area. Each selection in “Open Notes” was created by a New Trier student for a Social Studies class.

This year’s edition of “Open Notes” contains a diverse collection of student work that displays wonderful introspection, analysis, creativity and reflection. Whether it’s an investigation of racial stereotyping in American sitcoms, a thoughtful commentary on *Persepolis*, a reflection on being a student election judge, or the plans for a video game based on the 1970s , you will be delighted and inspired by the passion and energy that resonates in each selection. If you’re curious about how our younger citizens view our shared history and their place in the world, you need not look any further than the following pages. Enjoy.

“Open Notes” Editorial Board, 2010-2011

Elizabeth Plank and Robin Forrest, Social Studies

## Table of Contents

<b>“Our Mission”</b> .....	i
By Elizabeth Plank and Robin Forrest for “open notes”	
<b>“Three Things Everyone Should Know About The Civil War”</b> .....	1
By Sarah Golden for U.S. History (Jones)	
<b>“Sitcoms Doing African-Americans Justice”</b> .....	4
By Margot Young for IGSS US History/English (Vargas/Markham)	
<b>“The Changes Throughout The Centuries”</b> .....	12
By Chiara Pesa for World History (Hall)	
<b>“Serving As An Election Judge”</b> .....	14
By Andrew Young for U.S. History (Jones)	
<b>“Powerful Agribusiness Prevent Humane Animal Farming”</b> .....	17
By Victoria Rachmaninoff for IGSS US History/English (Vargas/Markham)	
<b>“History Through The Lens Of Family”</b> .....	25
By Lauren Ison for English/History (Forrest/Haskell)	
<b>“Civil Rights: Document Based Question Response”</b> .....	29
By Karim Pirani for U.S. History (Plank)	
<b>“A Polish Interview: A Guidebook for Chicago Immigrants”</b> .....	41
By Maggie McKenna for U.S. History (Levin)	
<b>“The 70’s Game”</b> .....	45
By Emily Marguerite for Modern America (Gerhardt)	

### Three Things Everyone Should Know about the Civil War

The Civil War period was one of the most turbulent times in America's brief past. At that time, the United States were no longer united and opinions regarding politics differed extensively, yet, throughout the four year span of the war, great strides were made. Mathew Brady popularized the art of photography with his innovative shots of Civil War battlefields and the Emancipation Proclamation was passed. However, the nation was stunned when Abraham Lincoln, the president who carried the Union through the war, was assassinated. This event caused Americans to question their safety, even though the Civil War had already come to a close. The Civil War had more casualties than any other war in America's past and it forever altered the fabric of the United States, continuing to act as a reminder of what can occur when disagreements turn to hatred, and later violence.

Imagine a newspaper or magazine without photographs and one can see what today's news media would be like without the pioneering work of Mathew Brady. Often referred to as the first photojournalist, Mathew Brady is famous for his photography of the Civil War. Prior to his innovative work during the Civil War, Brady studied with Samuel F. B. Morse, the inventor and photography enthusiast. Brady later opened his own photography studio in New York and made a living taking portraits of prominent leaders of the time. By the middle of the 1850s, Brady was highly successful and wealthy. When the Civil War broke out in 1861, Mathew Brady was determined to capture the battles on film and began taking photos on the battlefields. His first set of famous Civil War photographs were of the soldiers at the Battle of Bull Run. After that successful project, Brady began losing his eyesight and hired several photographers to photograph the battles of the Civil War on his behalf. Brady's employees were able to photograph the Battle of Antietam, the bloodiest single-day battle in American history. Brady's photos were printed in newspapers and displayed in his personal gallery, but they were not received well by the public, who found the photos of the soldiers to be rather gory. Soon after this, the public grew tired of seeing photos of the war and lost interest in Mathew Brady's work. Brady's eyesight continued to worsen along with his financial situation, and he was forced to file for bankruptcy. The passing of his wife in 1887 only worsened his situation by making him extremely lonesome. Mathew Brady's turbulent life ended on January 15, 1896 after being involved in a car accident. Brady died nearly penniless and left

barely anything behind, but his artistic images of the Civil War remained. Without the innovative photography of Mathew Brady, the Civil War would not have resonated in the minds of the American public and modern society would be left to imagine what the horrid battles of the Civil War were like, rather than seeing proof of the violence captured in Brady's photographs.

The Emancipation Proclamation, one of the most well known documents in American history, was the culmination of the Union's changing strategy and affected the outcome of the Civil War. The Emancipation Proclamation was a presidential order issued in 1863 to free all slaves in the Confederacy. However, this order did not free the slaves in the five Border States who fought with the Union. Though this order did not officially free all slaves, it was responsible for increasing the size of the Union army, as many of the freed slaves from the Confederacy joined the Union to combat the system they once were a part of. In addition, the Emancipation Proclamation prevented Britain from joining the war. In the early years of the war, Britain had supported the Confederacy, but as Britain's abolitionist movement gained strength and as the Union's main focus shifted toward outlawing slavery, Britain realized that their further support of the Confederacy would be morally wrong. Without Lincoln's issuing of the Emancipation Proclamation, the Union may have lost the war due to a lack of troops and Britain may have joined the Civil War on the Confederate side, meaning that there would be more destruction, debt, and loss of life.

The assassination of President Abraham Lincoln was a pivotal event for the United States because it proved that no one, not even the president, was unaffected by violence during the Civil War period. John Wilkes Booth, an avid supporter of slavery and a famous actor, had been planning to act out against the president in some form since the reelection of Lincoln in 1864. He, along with other conspirators, originally sought out to kidnap Lincoln and demand the release of several Confederate prisoners. But over time, Booth's plan changed to murder. On April 11<sup>th</sup>, 1865, Abraham Lincoln spoke about possibly granting voting rights to former slaves. This concept angered Booth and cemented his plan of murder into action. On April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1865, Booth heard that Lincoln and his wife would be attending the play *Our American Cousin*, at Ford's Theater later that night. Booth planned to assassinate President Lincoln, Vice President Andrew Johnson, and Secretary of State William H. Seward. Since Booth was a well-known actor, he would not be questioned for entering the theater, and in fact, could do whatever he pleased there. That night, amid an audience of

1,675 people, John Wilkes Booth entered Lincoln's box, aimed at the President, and drew a single gunshot. Booth yelled, "Sic semper tyrannis" or "Thus always to tyrants." Booth was able to escape to Virginia, later writing in his diary about the nation's reaction to his crime and his thoughts of what occurred. "...I struck boldly, and not as the papers say. I can never repent it, though we hated to kill." John Wilkes Booth was killed by Union soldiers on April 26<sup>th</sup>, 1865. Though the nation continued to mourn the loss of their 16<sup>th</sup> president, his presidency and assassination became a subject of interest throughout the American public, leading to both civilized discussions and virulent attacks. Lincoln's assassination reminded the public that violence transcends no one, not even the president of the United States.

Though it was one of the most unstable times in American history, the Civil War brought about many changes that continue to affect the country today. The public was often skeptical of his work, but without the battlefield photography by Mathew Brady, America would lack a visual record of the bloodiest battle in our nation's history and photojournalism would not be as popular as it is today. Without President Abraham Lincoln's abolitionist beliefs and his creation of the Emancipation Proclamation, America would have remained set in their pro-slavery ways, likely leading to additional feuds. Like the Civil War, the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was an event that transformed the American public and made it clear that violence, whether it be widespread in the form of war or contained in the form of assassination, could affect everyone. As a result of the Civil War, the United States became a permanently cohesive machine, determined to improve their standing in the world with radically new innovations and peace within the country.

## Sitcoms Doing African Americans Justice

During the Civil Rights Movement in 1956, Louisiana state legislators blamed the television business for using “the communist technique of brainwashing for racial integration by bringing into private homes...harmful programs designed to affect the minds and attitudes of juveniles” (Doherty 73). Contrary to Louisiana’s concerns that television promoted racial equality, it prompted the opposite—“brainwashing” juveniles’ minds *against* racial integration. Louisiana’s accusations coincided with the Civil Rights Movement and television’s “Nonrecognizable Era”—a period extending to the ‘70’s during which blacks disappeared from television sitcoms (Dalton 127). Prior to the 1970s, black sitcoms demeaned blacks and promoted a one-sided view of African Americans as dimwitted and poor. Before 1956, the only sitcoms to air with black actors were *The Beulah Show* and *Amos n’ Andy* where white people played blacks on the radio before the programs migrated to television with black actors (Dalton 127). In *Beulah*, the main character was a black, uneducated female maid (Bodroghkozy), while characters in *Amos n’ Andy* had a “thick dialect full of grammatical errors” that emphasized their uneducated and impoverished status (Ashby 255).

If television sitcoms before the 1970s unjustly portrayed African Americans, did the ‘70s act as a turning point in conveying more just depictions of black characters on sitcoms? Following decades of narrow-minded and unjust portrayals of blacks on television, the 1970s ushered in a new and lasting era of greater tolerance with the introduction of a broad range of black sitcoms on the air. Through more developed characters and plot lines that integrated blacks into “white society,” television sitcoms increasingly presented a multi-dimensional perspective of the socioeconomic status of blacks, allowing future shows - and society - to break more easily from past stereotypes.

The 1970s was a turning point for black television sitcoms where blacks for the first time played roles spanning a variety of socioeconomic levels - not just subservient maids - reflecting many experiences and values that paralleled depictions of white society. *Julia*, which debuted in 1968, portrayed a widowed middle class black mother and nurse, Julia Baker, who more closely resembled the portrayal of women in white sitcoms—demonstrating black and white women were more alike than media promoted. By showing how blacks can lead financially stable lives, *Julia*, starring Diahann Carroll, introduced a new dimension of black women on sitcoms, moving from the working class maid

in *Beulah* to Julia's self-sufficient professional character. Five months after Martin Luther King's assassination, producer Hal Kanter, took the controversial step of creating *Julia*, the first non-stereotypical depiction of a black family (Bloom 186). This series acted as a turning point for blacks on sitcoms by portraying Julia as "TVs first educated, independent black woman" (Cutler). Through Julia, Kanter took the first step during the Civil Rights Movement to introduce blacks on sitcoms into higher social classes—demonstrating through television that not all blacks are uneducated and poor. In an interview about the program, Carroll revealed the truthful nature of the show:

She represents another and more realistic evolution, purely because of the circumstances of her existence. She has her faults, but Julia is still quite special in that she's bright and curious. I identify very much with Julia ("Julia" 60).

Carroll recognizes that the show represented a "realistic evolution" from blacks as lower class and uneducated to "bright" and "curious." With the close of the Civil Rights Movement in 1968, *Julia* helped portray a more just depiction of blacks as middle class professionals that contradicted long-held biases about the inferior place of blacks in society.

*Julia* revealed a different dimension of black society through a lead character with whom any race—black or white—could identify. Acting as a force to overcome tensions between blacks and whites in the '60s, she eloquently and knowledgably addresses the conflicts, but pushes past them. When Julia's son Corey tells her that their neighbors prevented him from playing with their white grandchild, and reveals that the neighbors said they make the "clean" apartment building "dirty," Julia then teaches him about prejudice: "It's up to you and me and all of us to help teach her and other prejudice people how wrong they are" ("Paint Your Waggedorn"). While educating her son, Julia also educates viewers that blacks are not as "dirty" and low class as some people in society believed. In addition, the sitcom took a significant step forward by producing a black show that paralleled many white programs, making it seem less foreign to white viewers. For example, Julia lived in a "lavish" apartment, like many white single women on sitcoms of the time, such as "The Lucy Show" (Dalton 151). Unlike earlier programs like *Beulah*, Julia could live at the same economic level as white women. Financially stable and above

the hostility, *Julia* represented a middle-class woman others could respect and admire. According to Nielson ratings, *Julia* was the highest-rated sitcom at the time, watched regularly by both white and black Americans (“Julia Baker ’Julia’” 15). The diverse viewing audience made it permissible for black females to be represented in professional, middle class sitcom roles. In this way, sitcoms like *Julia* helped mend the social tensions that flared in the 1960s, serving as a force to overcome injustices long faced by African Americans. Following on *Julia*’s success were other black sitcoms showing people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds.

The 1970s marked an important transition in black television sitcoms by blurring the line between how blacks and whites of different classes should relate through portrayals of both black and white bigots. When *The Jeffersons* debuted in 1975 this mainly black sitcom portrayed a rich African American family that mocked, yet, integrated with white society and revealed a hidden truth that bigotry toward white people also existed in black society. Unlike *Julia*, *The Jeffersons* represented an upper class family—revealing another dimension of African American society. At a time when eighty-four percent of all television sitcoms depicted the middle class, *The Jeffersons* for the first time showed a rich black family (Adler 220). Headed by George and Louise Jefferson, the program showed that black families, too, can be wealthy. Surprising viewers, *The Jeffersons* revealed that black families can also harbor prejudices. For instance, George, a black bigot, often referred to white people as “honkies,” while his black maid Florence teased him by calling him “Shorty” (Deane). Through their offensive word choice, *The Jeffersons* revealed that bigotry and loathing can occur on any level—between people of the same or different race and social class. Moreover, this show brought the roots of disrespect to the surface. Even though this negative portrayal in *The Jeffersons* seems to contradict progress, in fact it reflects a marked improvement. Racial conflict was no longer something to be avoided on television; rather, television highlighted racial conflict that still existed. Despite bigotry, *The Jeffersons* demonstrated that black and white people can still live together in a civilized and integrated world. For example, a black woman, Ms. Roker, played by Hellen Willis, and a white man, Tom, played by Franklin Cover, represented the first interracial marriage to exist on television (“Roxie Roker, 66, Who Broke”). Overcoming the intolerance of the 1960s, *The Jeffersons* opened another door—allowing white and black people to live under the same roof, in addition to having the same social status. By acknowledging racial tensions, *The*

*Jeffersons* used it to their advantage to push past prevailing prejudices.

In contrast, the 1978 sitcom, *Maude*, presented a wealthy, white family with a black maid that battled stereotypes through comedy to mock the bigotry that existed amongst black and white society. Esther Roelle played black maid Florida Evans, who worked for a white woman, Maude Findlay and later starred in her own spin-off “Good Times” (Adler 213). With a mostly white cast, one could say that *Maude* stalled the positive depiction of blacks on television because the show reverted back to the “black maid,” the prevailing role for black females before the ‘70s. Instead, Florida took the portrayal of black maids to a new level by depicting a strong woman unafraid to stand up to her white boss of a higher class. For example, after Maude criticizes Florida of not being “proud” of her black culture, Florida responds without hesitation: “And for one week, I’ve been trying to do my work like a black woman who is just as proud and just as self-respecting as any white woman and you are just too darned dumb to know that” (“Maude Meets Florida”). Florida bluntly questions Maude’s extreme liberal stance, demonstrating that she does not want special treatment based on her race and lesser social class. Like *The Jeffersons*, *Maude* battles social issues of the time and highlights racist views through comedy. While Florida defines her attitude as “proud,” Maude views it as self-deprecating and says to her husband, “Florida is not your modern negro. She hasn’t found that new sense of self-respect and militancy yet” (“Quality versus Relevance”). Maude remains unaware that Florida has great “self-respect” because she is comfortable with her status as a working class black. Through their comedic arguments, Maude and Florida battle real issues people faced, adding further depth to the black female role and demonstrating that it was acceptable to reveal conflicts between blacks and whites.

After the 1970s began breaking down social barriers to black roles on television, sitcoms in the ‘80s and ‘90s showed blacks more comfortably able to live interchangeably in both black and white worlds. In 1984, Bill Cosby created *The Cosby Show* that portrayed an upper-middle class black family living in what some called a “white society,” but in actuality reflected his personal experience. Having grown up in an abusive family in the housing projects of Philadelphia, Cosby wanted to change his life on stage by achieving acceptance “not just to white America but to [him] and blacks everywhere” (Ashby 361). He chose acting as a way to improve his socioeconomic standing and reveal another dimension of black society. When he created *The Cosby*

*Show*, he decided to model the family off of his own—four daughters and one son (Hill). Just as Cosby worked hard to achieve his financial success, *The Cosby Show* portrayed his home life, showing that a black family could reasonably live a wealthy lifestyle integrated with white people. In a family headed by professionals Cliff Huxtable, an obstetrician, and Clair Huxtable, a lawyer, the children in *The Cosby Show* respected adults (Hill). The Huxtables portrayed an educated and dignified black family integrated in a white world. Not taking for granted his financial and social success, Cliff Huxtable regularly impresses upon his children the importance of hard work and responsibility. For example, when the Huxtable's son Theo consistently receives bad grades, he attempts to persuade Cliff that he could lead a financially stable life without attending college. Cliff then uses Monopoly money to illustrate for Theo the financial challenges he would face without working in a career made possible by a college degree (“Theo's Economic Lesson”). Like *Julia* and *The Jeffersons* from the '70s, *The Cosby Show* embraced education but took it a step further to demonstrate that education, not race, is the key to economic success. Blending the way in which blacks and whites lived, *The Cosby Show* was broadly viewed, which influenced the popular spread of sitcoms—both black and white. Improving television in its entirety, *The Cosby Show* was the highest-rated program on television during 1984, which “rescued sitcom form itself from the grave” (Wynter 110). The widely accepted and varied portrayal of black people on television in the 1970s allowed this successful black family to become a sensation in the homes of black and white people alike. In this way, *The Cosby Show* proved that the line dividing the social class between blacks and whites was truly blurring.

Riding the wave of sitcoms, *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air* in 1990 showcased a range of black experiences in one show, revealing that it is the norm for blacks to come from various walks of life. The main character Will, played by Will Smith, was a “ghetto” child who went to live with his upper-class aunt, uncle, and cousins in the wealthy Los Angeles neighborhood of Bel-Air, immediately bringing together two disparate experiences in black society (Cuff). Similar to *The Cosby Show*, *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air* depicted a well-off black family, but incorporated a range of socioeconomic situations exposed on various television programs in the 1970s. As a result, this sitcom in each episode brought together old stereotypes of blacks with new perspectives. For example, Geoffrey, played by Joseph Marcell, works as a black British butler for Will's upper-class family, the Banks.

Marcell describes how the show portrayed the first black British man on American television:

At first I thought Geoffrey was a stereotypical English butler, not a stereotypical black butler...But he couldn't be a stereotype. There had never been a black English anything on American TV before ( "The Fresh Prince " ).

Further breaking through stereotypes, *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air* not only integrated past biases with a new view of the black experience, but also introduced a new type of black character on sitcoms. Contrasting different black experiences, Will and Carlton, his cousin, perceive the world through the lens of their own experiences. Carlton, who grew up in a wealthy family, patronizes Will for believing they got pulled over by the cops for being black: "But maybe growing up where you did has made you a little touchy, but I think you've blown this whole thing way out of proportion" ( "Mistaken Identity" ). Even though Will was correct, the conflict between Will and Carlton illustrated how their experiences from two completely different black upbringings influenced their views about what occurred. In this way, *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air* did justice for African Americans on television by portraying the range of socioeconomic levels that truly reflect the black experience in America. While the '80s and '90s black sitcoms distanced themselves from the black and white tensions still battled through television in the '70s, some characters continued to reference and evaluate the conflicts, but did not make it the central focus of their series.

While the relationship between class and race can be plagued with stereotypes, television has the power to break down these biases by conveying a more well-rounded portrayal of any given group. Not only does television reflect social beliefs of the time, it can be used to challenge common misperceptions to help create a just depiction of social class and race. Transforming the narrow-minded depiction of African Americans on television before the '70s to the multi-dimensional portrayal now common, sitcoms advanced justice by promoting the breakdown of stereotypes about blacks and socioeconomic status. Because television acts as a powerful means of driving change—positive and negative—sitcom programming needs to remain sensitive to the stereotypes they promote because their influence has an enduring impact on American culture.

## Works Cited

- Adler, Richard. *Understanding Television: Essays on Television as a Social and Cultural Force*. New York: Praeger, 1981. Print.
- Ashby, Leroy. *With Amusement for All: A History of American Popular Culture since 1830*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2006. Print.
- Bloom, Ken, Frank Vlastnik, and John Lithgow. *Sitcoms: The 101 Greatest TV Comedies of All Time*. New York: Black Dog & Leventhal Publishers, 2007. *Google Books*. Web. 8 Jan. 2011.
- Bodroghkozy, Aniko. "Beulah." *The Museum of Broadcast Communications*. The Museum of Broadcast Communications, n.d. Web. 9 Jan. 2011.
- Cuff, John Haslett. "The Color of Change Television." *Globe and Mail* [Toronto] 21 Aug. 1990: C1. *ProQuest Platinum*. Web. 7 Jan. 2011.
- Cutler, Jacqueline. "TV Highlights Black History with New Shows on Cable." *Augusta Chronicle* [Augusta, GA] 6 Feb. 2002: D01. *ProQuest Platinum*. Web. 8 Jan. 2011.
- Dalton, Mary M, and Laura R Linder. *The Sitcom Reader: America Viewed and Skewed*. Albany: State U of New York, 2005. Print.
- Deane, Pam. "The Jeffersons." *The Museum of Broadcast Communications*. The Museum of Broadcast Communications, n.d. Web. 9 Jan. 2011.
- Doherty, Thomas Patrick. *Cold War, Cool Medium: Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*. New York: Columbia, 2003. *Google Books*. Web. 9 Jan. 2011.
- "The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air: 1990-1996." *People* 26 June 2000: 84-88. Web. 9 Jan. 2011.
- Hill, Michael E. "'Cosby Show' Retrospective a Must-See; NBC's Landmark Sitcom Left Imprint on Industry." *Charleston Daily Mail* 18 May 2002: 4C. *ProQuest Platinum*. Web. 9 Jan. 2011.
- "Julia." *Ebony* Nov. 1968: 56-62. *Google Books*. Web. 8 Jan. 2011.

“Julia Baker ‘Julia.’ ” *Jet* 15 May 2006: 15. *Google Books*. Web. 17 Jan. 2011.

“Maude Meets Florida.” *Maude*. By Rod Parker and Walter Stone. Dir. Robert H. Livingston. CBS. 26 Sept. 1972. *YouTube*. Web. Transcript. 9 Jan. 2011.

“Mistaken Identity.” *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air*. By Andy Borowitz and Susan Borowitz. Dir. Jeffrey Melman. NBC. 15 Oct. 1990. *YouTube*. Web. Transcript. 9 Jan. 2011.

“Paint Your Waggedorn.” By Harry Dolan and Harry Winkler. Dir. Coby Ruskin. Prod. Hal Kanter. *Julia*. NBC. 26 Nov. 1968. *Youtube*. Web. Transcript. 17 Jan. 2011.

“Quality versus Relevance: Feminism, Race, and the Politics of the Sign in 1970s Television.” *Contemporary Women’s Issues* 1 Jan. 2000: 69+. *eLibrary*. Web. 3 Jan. 2011.

“Roxie Roker, 66, Who Broke Barrier in Her Marriage on TV’s ‘Jeffersons.’ ” *New York Times* 6 Dec. 1995: n. pag. Web. 9 Jan. 2011.

“Theo’s Economic Lesson.” *The Cosby Show*. By Bill Cosby, Michael Leeson, and Ed. Weinberger. Dir. Jay Sandrich. Prod. Bill Cosby. NBC. 20 Sept. 1984. *Vimeo*. Web. Transcript. 17 Jan. 2011.

Wynter, Leon E. *American Skin: Pop Culture, Big Business, and the End of White America*. New York: Crown, 2002. Print.

## The Changes Throughout the Centuries

How did Chinese traditions grow or cease throughout the centuries? During the dynasties traditions were set throughout China. Under the rule of Mao these traditions were modified, ceased, or kept the way they were. Today, traditions under Mao grow, fade away, or remain the same. *While the dynastic traditions of family importance and distinct class ranking were temporarily changed by Mao, the tradition of discrimination against girls was changed permanently by Mao.*

Mao temporarily changed family importance. Having and taking care of a family was important to the Chinese people during the era of the dynasties. It was critical for the peasants to have children, especially boys, because they were the ones who took care of the land once the elders had passed away. Younger Chinese people were expected to respect their elders. Filial piety was followed daily. Under Mao, families weren't important at all. Mao thought that different families should work, sleep, eat, and bath together in communes. Families brought progress down in the eyes of Mao. Mao wanted to know who was a good communist and who wasn't. In the Cultural Revolution children would turn in their parents to the Red Guards if they were acting inappropriately. The Red Guards got these parents and sent them off to be "reeducated". This would put a lot of pressure on families and often it would break them apart. After Mao's death, family importance went back to the way it was during the dynasties. Today children respect their elders again, by celebrating a special day for the elders. "With the passing of time many traditions have been forgotten but one that has survived intact is that of respecting the elders." ("Old age has its honour")

Just as with family importance the distinct class ranking tradition was also temporarily changed by Mao. The rich or "nobles" were the highest in rank of class during the dynasties. The peasants, which made up 85% of China, were considered scum and lowest class. The rich got the opportunity to get an education, when the peasants had no education and had to start working as little kids. The nobles would be able to join the government. Nobles were treated with respect and the peasants had to respect them. Mao was outraged with the amount of little respect that the government had towards the peasants. When Mao was fighting Jiang, he won the hearts of many peasants. He thought that if they were the ones producing the food and taking care of the land, they should be the ones respected and given land. When Mao came to power, he gave that power towards the peasants. He punished the noble and

landlords by executing them for what they did to the peasants during the dynasties. Hundreds of thousands were killed. Today there are more millionaires than ever in China. Their great minds have earned them millions of dollars, but there are still many peasants. Their right to own their own land has recently changed. Now farmers can own land, still the rich are ranked before the poor.

Unlike family importance and the distinct class ranking tradition, Mao permanently changed the discrimination towards girls. Discriminating girls was the norm during the rule of the dynasties. Girls had to be last for everything. They didn't have the chance to get an education. Women were thought of as people incapable of comprehending difficult information. Boys were the ones prepared for the real world. Girls were also subjected to feet binding. One woman describes that, “ ‘my feet were wrapped when I was 5 years old. No one wanted you unless you bound your feet.’ ” ( “Living Memories of Bound Feet War and Chaos in China” ) It was considered a prerequisite for landing a husband. When Mao came to power he demanded that all women had to unwrap their feet and no one new were to bind their feet. Mao allowed women to start getting an education for themselves. He pushed for less illiterate people in China. Women's rights grew in marriage as well. Now women are not forced to marry an abusive husband. Since Mao, women have seen more of a change from others. They now have the ability to divorce their husbands. This is good because if the relationship was an abusive one, the woman would have the ability to get out of it. Since then the divorce rates have sky rocketed, especially in cities.

All and all, women have gone through foot binding, having the chance to learn to read and being able to escape a horrible marriage. Class ranking oddly flipped sides from the peasants being neglected from the government to having all the attention. Family was honored, then neglected and destroyed, and then, honored once again. Why did so few traditions change? As powerful and strong a dictator was Mao, he only had the ability to change one tradition. The traditions of family importance and distinct class ranking were more powerful then Mao himself. Mao only permanently changed the tradition of discrimination against girls, while the dynastic traditions of family importance and distinct class ranking were only temporarily changed by Mao.

## Serving as an Election Judge

“[A] government of the people, by the people, [and] for the people” was how Abraham Lincoln described the United States of America. The U.S. government depends on its citizens to lead the country in the right direction. Thankfully, American citizens have the right to voice their opinion without bearing the responsibility of appearing at a weekly assembly to discuss and vote on thousand-page bills like in a direct democracy. In the U.S. it is as simple as researching the candidates’ views and voting for the one who you feel will help lead the country in the correct path. Even so, some citizens put in more effort than others. While I would have liked to have been voting on Election Day, one must be at least eighteen years of age to do so. For this reason Election Judging sounded like a great way to learn about the voting process. My duty for the Election was to set up the polling place, help residents cast their vote, and at the end of the long day close the polling place. By serving as an Election Judge I experienced my first time at the polls. While taking the responsibility of running the voting in the precinct, I saw how seriously and responsibly citizens took their right to vote.

Contrary to what I thought, serving as an Election Judge took many hours of preparation and was not as easy as simply showing up on the day of the election. The best way to break down my Election Judge experience is into four parts: online training, training at the Community House, preparation of the polling place, and working the polling place on the day of the election. After signing up to be an election judge my first task was to complete an online training course. Noting that it stated it would take about two hours I relaxed on a Saturday afternoon and took my time going through it. While the text was pretty boring and self-explanatory, the interactive games in which you learned how to assembly, use, and put away each voting machine weren’ t that bad. At the end of each section was a multiple-choice question. The questions were not hard but every section was longer than the preceding section and soon I found myself trying to rush through the pages so this wouldn’ t take up my whole afternoon. After three hours I finally came to the end. Five days later I went to a training session at the Winnetka Community House. This was much more fun than the online training since the instructors joked around and there was no reading page after page on a computer screen. The next day I talked with the equipment manager on the phone and we decided on a time to prepare the polling place the night before the Election. The two other Election

Judges were great. Throughout the whole experience they respected my ideas and shared interesting stories about past elections. With all the training, setting up the touchscreens, scanners, card activators, and voting booths the evening went very quickly.

On Election Day I arrived shortly after 5:00 am. As it turned out, two of the election judges at our precinct were unable to make it, leaving only the equipment manager, supply judge, and me. My job was to find each voters name in two thick booklets and ask them to sign their name and I would initial mine, a task that went slow at first. The morning was busy and, knowing that people wanted to get to work, I rushed through the booklets to get them on their way to the next station where they would get their paper ballot or touchscreen card. After an hour or two I was blazing through the books finding people in just a few seconds. As the day progressed voting slowed down and the other judges and I took breaks. During one of my breaks I went outside where I found a well-dressed man smiling and talking with voters and handing out papers of some sort. Recognizing the man as Hamilton Chang, a candidate for the House of Representatives, I informed him that if he wanted to campaign he had to be at least a hundred feet from the entrance of the polls. It felt good enforcing the law. While the candidate's intentions are good, they should know that some voters can feel uncomfortable and harassed by receiving buttons and stickers only minutes before they cast their vote.

With all the people who talk about how meaningless one person's vote is, the turnout that day was a great surprise. I was excited to see the experienced voters come out and joke around and the first-time voters realize a great, new right and responsibility of theirs. Many seasoned voters brought in materials so they could make a better decision on many candidates and judges they knew little about. There were also voters who did not know anything about the several judges on the ballot but just wanted to cast their vote on certain positions. Every citizen should do their best to vote for who they think is the right candidate and if they feel they are unable to make a good decision on a position they should leave the space blank. As I fed the ballots through the scanner I saw that many voters made the decision to leave certain spaces blank. One man had been driving around for quite some time trying to find his polling place and when we told him he had once again come to the wrong building he didn't care. He stated that even if it took all day he was determined to voice his opinion. As many voters know, voting is not always easy. With so many people voting in so many different places on a single day many things can, and do, go

wrong. Knowing that, it was great to see people make an effort to improve their country.

At the end of the day I went home exhausted. Before going to bed I watched the election coverage with more enthusiasm than ever before. That night I realized something: the next time I go to the polls *I* will be the one voicing my opinion.

## Powerful Agribusinesses Prevent Humane Animal Farming

In a 2010 interview with *Time Magazine*, Wayne Pacelle said, “I do worry about post traumatic stress disorder with our investigators because they see the worst things that humans do to other creatures” (Pacelle 2). Wayne, the president of PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals), was not talking about murder investigators, soldiers fighting in war, or rape cases– he was talking about the emotional scarring caused by exposure to farm animal cruelty. Before there were mass media campaigns to spread awareness, Americans would have scoffed at the idea that farm animals could be so badly abused that investigators become mentally ill. And, as the truth about industry practices slowly surfaces, pressure from the American public on meat producers to stop animal cruelty has increased. In a recent article for Tufts University, Andrew Rowan said that there are now over ten million Americans who are committed to the animal rights movement (Rowan 34). So, if people are beginning to demand a more humane system, why is it that a large portion of the industry still commits the same abuses that were outlawed over fifty ago by the Humane Slaughter Act (Mallon 31)? The blame lies in the hands of large agricultural corporations. These agribusinesses that control the majority of the meat industry use political and economic clout to their advantage in order to prevent regulation and punishment and rid the industry of small humane farms.

Since agribusinesses have millions of dollars at their disposal, they use lobbyist and financial contributions to sway politicians and regulatory organizations like the USDA. In Robyn Mallon’s Michigan State University law journal, she explains how the financial contributions of agribusinesses corrupt politicians and government agencies:

Lately, the USDA has focused more on this promotion [of American agriculture] due to ‘the beef industry’ s large donations to the Republican Party, and its political appointees.’ However, both political parties are vulnerable to the financial lobbying of the meat industry (Mallon 34).

The money given to government agencies and politicians is not given for the purpose of support: instead it is given as a way for meat companies to barter with those in power who are able to change how they run their business and treat farm animals. According to PETA, agribusinesses gave over 140 million dollars in political donations between 2000 and 2005

(Animals Used for Food). That amount averages to over 23 million dollars a year. And when this is compared to the 41 million dollars given over a ten-year span between 1987 and 1996 by agribusinesses (Mallon 27), it is clear that lobbying has only become stronger in the recent years. Because so much money is at stake for politicians, the choice between protecting farm animals and shielding meat producers is simple— the meat producers win. As a result, one of the only organizations that exists with the ability to stop farm animal cruelty, intentionally allows the abuse to continue.

At the financial urging of agribusinesses, government leaders are swayed to appoint both former heads of major agricultural corporations and pro-agribusiness supporters to high positions in the USDA and FDA. In the 2008 documentary, *Food, Inc.*, Michael Pollan explains that “there has been this revolving door between Monsanto’s corporate offices and the various regulatory and judicial bodies that have made the key decisions” (Kenner). While Monsanto, the supplier of millions of farmer’s seeds (monsanto.com), is not directly involved in meat production, leaders of animal farming businesses are similarly given powerful roles in the USDA (Kenner). Because the leaders of the USDA and FDA often change between their positions in agribusinesses and positions in agricultural regulatory agencies, their decisions as government officials are made with the success of agribusinesses in mind. Thus, when USDA agents try to complain about practices in slaughterhouses and factory farms, they risk losing their jobs because of executive pressure to maintain the agricultural corporations’ high profits (Mallon 35). The consequence is that USDA agents fear speaking up about problems because senior executives have warned them against it. This creates a system where those designed to impartially monitor how food is produced and ensure that the law is being followed purposefully fail to do so.

One of the greatest problems with the USDA’s support for meat producers is that the USDA’s inspection of slaughterhouses and factory farms has diminished in order to allow agribusinesses to operate with minimal intervention. When talking about government involvement in chicken farming, author Steve Striffler says that “government regulation and inspection may limit the industry’s worst transgressions, but by and large the state has looked the other way and even helped institutionalize the current way we process meat and poultry” (Striffler 165). This means that instead of stopping the cruelty to chickens in industrial farms, the United States’ government has ignored these problems to allow factory farming to succeed. And while very little regulation and inspection currently exists,

agribusinesses are working to pass legislation that will make regulation even more difficult. In Ohio, a new bill is being considered called “Issue 2” that would limit the role of government agencies in farm regulation and instead create an “industry-dominated council to decide all rules related to farm-animal handling” (Issue 2: Vote 1). According to the Springfield News, “agricultural leaders and compliant politicians maneuver to move the state sharply backward” (Issue 2: Vote 1) to a system where animals have less protection. Furthermore, the bill would “make it more difficult for voters not only to address the humane treatment of animals used in agriculture, but also to protect communities from factory farm pollution...” (Issue 2: Vote 2). Instead of shifting to a system where the treatment of farm animals is easier to monitor, large agribusinesses, with the support of politicians, are trying to create a system with even less governmental regulation. By leaving regulation in the hands of agribusinesses, it would be nearly impossible to stop the abuse of farm animals because those responsible for the abuses would be in charge of regulating themselves. Therefore, not only have the USDA and government agencies decreased regulation, but agribusinesses have also swayed state politicians to support a system where large corporations monitor themselves.

In addition to the government’s failure to regulate the meat industry, strict legal protocol makes it very difficult for organizations and individuals to supervise slaughterhouses and factory farms. In a journal written by David J. Wolfson for the University of Arkansas’ law school, Wolfson depicts the process for receiving a warrant to search a farm or slaughterhouse:

Police and law enforcement officers associated with SPCAs and humane societies must demonstrate probable cause to obtain a warrant to search private property for evidence of abuse. Unless the agency is informed by someone “on the inside,” it is extremely difficult for information to be discovered (Wolfson 132).

Since factory farms and slaughterhouses are considered private property, any person who wants to search them must have probable cause to receive a warrant. However, without an insider who alerts the agencies that there is cruelty occurring, the protection groups have no justification for their search. This leaves them with no other means of searching but through illegal entrance. And even if the investigators find animal abuse, it is disregarded because it was not properly uncovered (Wolfson

132). In addition, unlawful entrance to factory farms and slaughterhouses can lead to serious consequences. One animal rights activist, Gene Bauston, described a situation where he illegally entered a slaughterhouse and called the police after finding horrible mistreatment:

There have been times at slaughterhouses where we' ve seen outrageous cruelty going on. We would call the police and ask them to address the problem. When the police arrived, they would threaten to charge *us* for trespassing, and at the same time turn their backs on what' s happening at the facility (Marcus 148).

Because it is considered trespassing, private organizations and individuals monitoring animal cruelty can be punished by police officers. Therefore, in addition to having their illegally obtained reports of cruelty discounted, activists can face severe charges for trespassing. The policies regarding non-governmental regulation make it very difficult for activists to change the industry because either they are unable to enter the locations where abuse may occur or they are reprimanded for entering without proper documentation, making their findings invalid.

Even when anti-cruelty laws do exist, many factory farms and slaughterhouses continue to break them anyway because enforcement is too weak to catch them or they only face a small fine for their crime. On top of just breaking the law once, agribusinesses continue to break the law even after they are warned that they have committed a crime. Striffler describes this frequent disobedience by saying, "Terms like 'chronic,' 'willful,' and 'repeat violations' used in the citations suggest that giant food companies know what they are doing and frequently continue to engage in criminal behavior even after being caught" (Striffler 164). Since many livestock companies receive warnings for breaking the law on multiple occasions, it is clear that they intentionally disregard the law or at least do not bother to change their procedure. Wolfson stated that animal cruelty "convictions are infrequent and generally limited to minimal fines... With little enforcement and small penalties, many individuals only view such laws as irrelevant" (Wolfson 132). To large corporations earning millions or even billions of dollars a year, a small fine of only a few hundred dollars is of no consequence. And because the fine is so small, the profits from breaking a law can outweigh the fine. For example,

increased slaughter line speeds lead to mistakes where many animals are stunned improperly, violating the Humane Slaughter Act of 1958 (Challenging Concentration 2653). However the money that is earned by the faster production can outweigh corporate fear of receiving a five hundred dollar penalty. So unless stricter regulation and greater fines are implemented, factory farms and slaughterhouses will continue to violate the law and abuse farm animals.

In addition to dominance in politics, agribusinesses' wealth allows them to take over smaller farms and make intensive confinement industry wide. Diane Beers, an animal rights movement specialist, claimed that when the idea of factory farming emerged, "agribusiness philosophy condemned traditional farmers as 'uneconomic and sentimental,' and the large and economically powerful businesses inevitably squeezed millions of small cattle, dairy, and chicken farmers out of the market" (Beers 167). The ability to maximize profits by farming large numbers of animals in smaller living conditions created a group of very successful meat producers. Since small farms cannot compete with the factory farmer's meat prices, they are either purchased or go out of business. This has resulted in incredible market dominance by only a few suppliers. Now the USDA says that "2% of U.S. livestock facilities raise an estimated 40% of all farm animals" (Suddath 1) as a result of the creation of the factory farm. The effect is that very large facilities are responsible for producing most of the American meat supply. Therefore, when trying to increase profits, even a single corporation's choice to confine their animals to small and inhumane living conditions can effect millions of animals a year.

The result of market dominance is devastation to the animal rights movement. In the Harvard Law Review article "Challenging Concentration," the author says that when large companies purchase smaller farms, "a few processors set industry standards and have the power to drive the market toward use of even more intensive confinement of animals and higher-speed processing" (Challenging Concentration 2652). Since the farmers no longer control their own livestock, their employers (agribusinesses) are able to determine how they should raise their animals- and the conditions usually result in those found in a factory farm because the farmer will increase their profits. Then, the percent of animals raised using factory farming methods such as close confinement of animals, debeaking of chickens, and lifetime crating of veal increases. But the problem is that state cruelty laws exempt "accepted," "common," and "customary" conditions from being questioned as cruel (Marcus 148). Even the most inhumane conditions are

not punishable by law as long as they are “common.” Thus, as the meat industry becomes controlled by agribusinesses that set inhumane standards on how farm animals should be cared for and slaughtered, industry practices all conform to the same cruel system. As factory farming methods take over, there is less hope that legislation will be able to prevent cruelty.

For farm animal abuse to be permanently ended, the solution lies in an extensive legislative change. The idea that agribusinesses will monitor themselves or change to more humane practices is absurd. Their main concern is not if each animal lives a pain-free and pleasant life, but how profitable each animal is. Since the time of Aristotle, humans have believed that “animals exist for the sake of man” (Sundquist 1). And while this view is slowly changing in American culture, it is still deeply engrained in American agriculture— the animal is profit. However, Robyn Mallon stated that “perhaps the notion of animals of property is something that needs to be changed in the law because it is obvious that animals can feel pain as evidenced by the screams of pigs in slaughterhouses being scalded alive” (Mallon 25–26). Many people might find Mallon’s idea to give animals legal rights unrealistic. However, this idea has already been implemented in other parts of the world, such as Switzerland. According to the Atlanta Journal, “Switzerland adopted a constitutional amendment in 1992 acknowledging animals as ‘beings’ rather than things” (Sundquist 1). If the constitutional rights of animals in the United States were changed, it would be difficult for agribusinesses to deny that their treatment of farm animals breaks even the most basic rights. In addition, Congress would be forced to seriously punish animal cruelty violations because they would break the constitution of the United States. For true change, animals must be seen as living, breathing creatures that are able to suffer and feel pain. Once Americans change their views and policies about animals, agribusinesses will have to comply because their profits are controlled by the consumer.

## Works Cited

“Animals Used for Food.” *Peta*. N.p., n.d. Web. 16 Jan. 2011.

<<http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/default.aspx>>.

Beers, Diane L. *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States*. Athens, Ohio: Shallow Press/Ohio University, 2006. Print.

“Challenging Concentration of Control in the American Meat Industry.”

*Harvard Law Review* 117.8 (2004): 2643–2664. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Jan. 2011.

“Issue 2: Vote No If You Care about the Welfare of Animals.” *Springfield*

*News – Sun* 17 Oct. 2009: n. pag. *ProQuest Platinum*. Web. 7 Dec. 2010.

Kenner, Robert, dir. *Food, Inc.* 2008. DVD.

Mallon, Robyn. “The Deplorable Standards of Living Faced by Farmed Animals in America’s Meat Industry and How to Improve Conditions by Eliminating the Corporate Farm.” *Google*. N.p., Jan. 2005. Web. 6 Jan. 2011.

<[http://www.law.msu.edu/king/2005/2005\\_Mallon.pdf](http://www.law.msu.edu/king/2005/2005_Mallon.pdf)>.

Marcus, Erik. *Vegan*. Ithaca: McBooks, 1998. Print.

Pacelle, Wayne. “Putting Animal Cruelty on the Ballot.” Interview by Kate Pickert. *Time*. N.p., 13 Dec. 2010. Web. 13 Dec. 2010.

<<http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,1856019,00.html>>.

Rowan, Andrew N. “Animal Well-Being: Key Philosophical, Ethical, Political, and Public Issues Affecting Food Animal Agriculture.” *Google Scholar*.

- Google, n. d. Web. 6 Dec. 2010.  
<<http://hub.ansc.purdue.edu/wellbeing/FAWB1993/Rowan.pdf>>.
- Striffler, Steve. *Chicken : The Dangerous Transformation of America's Favorite Food*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005. Print.
- Suddath, Claire. "The Problem with Factory Farms." *Time Magazine*. N. p., 23 Apr. 2010. Web. 7 Dec. 2010.
- Sundquist, Eric. "Nonhuman Rights: Are Animals Ours to Eat, to Wear, to Experiment On?" *Atlanta Journal - Constitution* 25 Aug. 2002: Q. 1. *ProQuest Platinum*. Web. 7 Dec. 2010.
- "What We Do." *Monsanto*. N. p., n. d. Web. 17 Jan. 2011.  
<<http://www.monsanto.com/>>.
- Wolfson, David J. "Beyond the Law, Agribusiness and the Systematic Abuse of Animals Raised for Food or Food Production." *Google Scholar*. N. p., 1995. Web. 8 Jan. 2011.  
<[http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/bibarticles/wolfson\\_beyond.pdf](http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/bibarticles/wolfson_beyond.pdf)>.

## History Through the Lens of Family

Since 1945, many people have been killed as a result of the conflict in Israel. In one year of Iran's Islamic Revolution, over 3,000 civilians were known to be executed. In a country where violence and disarray is the norm, how can a child find his or her place? For the past century, political and ethnic groups have competed for power in the Middle East. When the Jews finally made Israel an independent state after the Holocaust, forcing many Palestinians out, animosity between Arabs and Jews grew. In Iran in the 1970s, the lives of Iranian citizens were drastically changed when Iran became an Islamic republic. Whenever nations go through intense periods of political change, conflicts regarding social order inevitably arise for the people living in them. However, one's family ultimately influences how an individual's identity changes—through rebellion, submission, or a combination thereof—in reaction to these conflicts. These changes have the most influence on a young person's identity as he or she becomes an adult. In Marjane Satrapi's memoir *Persepolis*, and the movie based on her life, viewers saw a young Marji struggle to find her place while leaning on her family. The documentary *Promises* showcased the resilience of seven young people living in Israel, but three stood out for their interesting beliefs. The openness, as well as the passiveness, of twins Yarko and Daniel was fostered by their parents, while Sanabel's worldview was influenced by a father in jail.

In *Persepolis*, Marji's Uncle Anoosh and revolutionary Marxist parents taught her to value individuality and heroism, but she also received mixed messages about the Iranian Revolution that confused her sense of identity. Marji's parents were very active in the demonstrations of the late 1970s. They revolted against the Shah of Iran and his brutal police, known as the SAVAK, because they believed they should have more political power as citizens. They were hoping for a Marxist, secular government. At an early age, Marji learned that people should fight for what they wanted; though she didn't fully understand the cause they supported, Marji idolized her parents. She saw her Uncle Anoosh as an even bigger hero, since he had lived in the USSR and was a revolutionary. Marji saw Anoosh as a source of honor for her family. She began to associate herself with him, and he became a large part of her identity. But the world as Marji saw it changed dramatically when the Ayatollah Khomeini took power in 1979. He wrote a new Islamic constitution and enforced its laws with violence. Marji still had hope that she would find honor, until her uncle Anoosh was

executed as a “Russian spy.” Marji rejected her God—that was the moment when she lost her faith in the future. Losing a family member made the Iranian revolution seem much more brutal and oppressive to Marji. It spurred her to rebel against authority in any way possible. Her parents encouraged her sense of individualism, but they also feared for her safety. Satrapi described her parents’ reaction to one act of rebellion she performed at age 14:

‘It was the principal of Marji’ s school. Apparently she told off the religion teacher. She gets that from her uncle.’

‘Maybe you’ d like her to end up like him too? Executed?’  
(Satrapi 145).

Marji’ s father praised her for her rebellion, while her mother scolded. These contradicting attitudes sowed doubt in Marji about the person she was trying to become. Soon after this, Marji’ s parents deemed that it was not safe for her to stay in Iran. They sent her to live by herself in Vienna, hoping her brashness would be more accepted. However, Marji struggled with feelings of extreme guilt. She had always been proud to be from Iran, but now she saw that her behavior had made it impossible to be there. For years, Marji felt that she had betrayed her family. She suffered from extreme guilt and depression, which rivaled the emptiness she felt after losing Anoosh. For a long time, the world was overwhelming for Marji, and she used her family as an anchor. But this complete faith in them also led to her own questions about what her true identity was.

While less involved than Marji’ s parents, Yarko and Daniel’ s family allowed them to make their own conclusions about what was right. Nevertheless, their general attitude toward the situation in Israel later seemed to mirror that of their parents. Yarko and Daniel’ s grandfather was a Polish Holocaust survivor who had migrated to Israel after World War II. This was a time when the UN began to support Zionism, an idea that many Jews had favored since the late 1800s. With this political support, thousands of European and Middle Eastern Jews began to immigrate to Israel, hopeful that they could use it as a place safe from persecution. But there were still many Palestinian Arabs inhabiting the area, who were forced to become refugees, living in camps on the West Bank or the Gaza Strip. Yarko and Daniel were secular Jews who lived close by in West Jerusalem but in a very different world. Unlike their Arab counterparts, they had the chance to just enjoy their childhood, playing volleyball and hanging out with friends. The twins’

parents believed that it was not right to kick out the Palestinians, yet they did not see it as their duty to find a solution to the crisis in Israel. They were practical, just focusing on their own lives. In *Promises*, they did allow Yarko and Daniel to enter Deheishe refugee camp to meet some of the Palestinian kids featured in the film, but they were more concerned with their own children's safety than anything else. Yarko and Daniel were open to getting to know Arabs without bias; they easily made friends with them. But soon after, issues in their own lives became a higher priority than any friendships with Palestinians. Near the end of the movie, one twin said, "I want there to be peace here—I really do. I just don't deal with it day to day." This submissive outlook was strikingly similar to the views Yarko and Daniel's parents expressed. As Yarko and Daniel became adults, Yarko and Daniel seemingly stepped into their parents shoes, giving up any childhood fantasies they once had about peace between Arabs and Israelis. From watching their parents, the twins knew that aloofness would allow them to survive and thrive in a place of constant conflict.

Throughout *Promises*, Sanabel had a strong conviction that the segregation of Palestinians and Israelis was not right. Sanabel's moral responsibility and sense of optimism can actually be attributed to her father's example. Out of all the characters in *Promises*, Sanabel is one who a viewer would expect to be the most angry and biased. She was one of more than 4 million refugees currently living in Israel; her home was Deheishe refugee camp on the West Bank. Many checkpoints meant to protect Israelis from Palestinian terrorists prevented Sanabel from ever entering Jerusalem or meeting Jewish people. Even more importantly, Sanabel's father, a leader and journalist for the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, was in an Israeli prison. Still, Sanabel's father remained a strong presence in her life. She mentioned him often in *Promises*, describing him as a brave hero who was proud to represent his people. Sanabel too was determined to create a little bit of harmony between Palestinians and Jews. She desperately wanted to speak to an Israeli child, and she eventually had the chance too. When discussing this with other refugee children, she responded to a criticism of her hopes: "No Palestinian child ever tried to explain our situation to the Jews. Arabs and Jews should meet—not politicians! I want CHILDREN to meet!" Speaking and compromising with other children was Sanabel's own, unique way to stand up for her people and make a difference to her country. Upon first examination, Sanabel might seem very different than her father—she just wanted to make friends while he wanted to oppose Israel—but in many ways, they were

very similar. They both wanted to improve the lives of their people through words, the only difference being that Sanabel wanted to speak to children. The imprisonment of Sanabel's father did not scare her into silence; it inspired her to live up to his expectations. The political situation in Israel made it possible for her to develop this worldview, but her father prompted her to actually do so. In this way, Sanabel was able to incorporate her parent's identity into her own.

The political environment a child lives in does impact his or her life, but that does not mean that all children in that environment will develop the same personal identity. Family is the force that is the closest to all people; therefore, it is the strongest. Whether a child struggles or succeeds in emulating his parents, he changes himself in the process. The effects on one's identity can vary: Marji was caught between rebellion and compliance, Yarko and Daniel adopted their parents' aloofness, and Sanabel was inspired by her father. But the effects are always there. Whether it is obvious or not, every person can look at himself and see how he has been changed by the people in his environment.

## Civil Rights: Document Based Question Response

First articulated in the 1830s, the call for abolition started a protracted and ongoing battle for Black civil rights in America. The 1860s brought the issue to the forefront of politics and presented a renewed hope for blacks, especially with the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation by President Lincoln. The little hope that offered itself during that decade, however, was crushed with the coming of the 1870s, 1880s, 1890s, and the implementation of Reconstruction. When it seemed like the Republicans would work for black rights, the Compromise of 1877 was made, and unity of North and South was deemed more important than black civil rights. In essence, the Proclamation, however consequential in its implication, was ultimately overlooked and the Blacks paid the price for national harmony and were once again left to fend for themselves. Plagued with discrimination, subordination, and disenfranchisement, the whole of Black history up until the 1940s was exactly this: a history of hope and betrayal, of resistance and surrender, of whites being inherently superior to blacks, of being pawns in a game of war. But the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s brought about a succession of transformations that took Black civil rights to places it had never went before, accomplish what it had never accomplished before, and reap the benefits it had never reaped before. Each audacious act was followed by a bolder one, eventually culminating in acknowledgment and prominence in the 1960s. While the 1940s and 1950s were important in realizing civil rights for blacks, the biggest gains were made in the 1960s, as the two decades earlier primarily served to establish a foundation and disturb the complacency of the issue of civil rights, which eventually achieved national recognition and sparked constructive reforms in the 1960s.

The racial problem, even to the naked eye, was quite evident in America in the 1940s. Both blacks and whites experienced the problem everyday as a result of the practice of segregation. When blacks started to realize the gravity of the situation, they began to feel like inferior second-class citizens. They began to question why things were they way they were and, in essence, why was there such an enormous discrepancy between fellow humans and why anything wasn' t being done about it (Doc A). These series of questions led to personal and communal reflection among blacks, leading to a string of awakenings within the black community. While American citizens were beginning to recognize the disparity between the races, the federal government began to investigate the problem as well. President Truman decided to call a committee to

explore the present situation of blacks in America. The report of the committee was drawn out well and did a superior job in describing the dreadful situation and candidly acknowledging that the American dream for all Americans “awaits complete realization” (Doc C). It pointed out several important things the government needed to take into consideration: the integrity of all human beings, the security needed from unnecessary violence, the need for full citizenship, the present disenfranchisement, and, most of all, the precise role of government to “secure these rights” that are specified to all Americans. Upon this advice, which had disturbed the present complacency of the issue, the government knew what it would have to do, but the American people themselves were still not ready for radical change.

Segregation stood and thrived in the 1940s. With the exception of Jackie Robinson, who broke the color barrier in baseball, much remained the same. The fact that Robinson had integrated America’s pastime, however, brought hope and courage to many blacks. This valor was seen in the next decade with the emergence of integration attempts all over the US, but perhaps most importantly, the story of Rosa Parks. When Rosa Parks got on the Montgomery Bus that December day in 1955, she was tired after a long day of work and took the first seat she could find. When white passengers asked her to move, she kindly turned down the stipulation and remained seated (Doc E). She was subsequently arrested, in the name of a greater cause. Throughout the ordeal, she showed tremendous resiliency and provoked a response from many in the black community. She was responsible for igniting the Montgomery Bus Boycott and additional boycotts of public transportation in other major cities. Besides the obvious significance of her actions, Parks also laid the foundation for the principle of desegregation through noncooperation and disobedience, and gave prominence to a little known reverend, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. He, like many other black leaders, expressed a sense of urgency in accomplishing their goals. Among the men who wanted quick and decisive action were Jackie Robinson, who himself had 11 years of firsthand experience with desegregation. In his letter to President Eisenhower, Robinson stressed the need for the government to take action and insisted on not being “patient” and “forbearing” (Doc H). In this sense, blacks were realizing that today is the day to act, that nothing could be left for tomorrow and that a strong attack needed to be launched to realize desegregation. The 1960s showed both, the sense of urgency and the attacks launched. The Sit-ins, largely based on the principle of disobedience that Rosa Parks had used, attempted to integrate lunch counters. Freedom Rides were organized to be interstate

missions that took black volunteers across the country on buses to test the volatility of the fragile nation. Although faced with violence, bitter words, and outright hatred, they brought the civil rights issue to the forefront of American life and forced the government to respond. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, banning desegregation in public places, was a result of this unrelenting effort.

The next big challenge that the black community faced was the desegregation of public schools. Thinking ahead to the necessity, the NAACP established a Legal Defense and Education Fund in the 1940s that would be absolutely essential to the process in the courts. The 1950s brought the challenges that needed to be addressed and overcome. The verdict for the biggest Supreme Court case in Black history, *Brown v. Board of Education*, was rendered in 1954. It established that separate is by no means equal, implies inferiority, and often “has no place” in society (Doc D). Not only did this disturb the complacency and present thought in effect since 1986, with the decision of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (verdict: separate can be equal and does not imply inferiority), it also set a critical precedent for desegregation. In an ironic sort of event, the very man who fought with all his heart to desegregate schools ended up desegregating the Supreme Court himself in 1967. In this case and many more, the 50s had set the groundwork and the 60s achieved the recognition.

This was not the end of the educational battle, however, as the actual integration process had yet to be undertaken. The first serious attempt at integration was at Little Rock High School in 1957. The governor at the time, Governor Faubus, vowed to maintain the segregation as it stood. The nine brave souls, who were chosen as a result of their academic performances, faced violence, cruelty, and viciousness. In order to maintain order, and primarily to maintain the integrity of a decision rendered by the Supreme Court, President Eisenhower had to send the National Guard. From this necessity it can be seen that there was popular unrest and dislike of the situation. In fact, policies like Massive Resistance and the Southern Manifesto were instituted among Southern states to ensure that schools did not desegregate. The 1960s, however, saw improvements in treatment and acceptance of blacks in public schools. It is not to say that James Meredith did not face anger and bitterness when he attempted to apply at Ole Miss, but he had the vehement support of President Kennedy, who urged the nation to accept the blacks as equal. With this powerful tool in hand, the support of the president, the blacks were riding the true course to freedom.

The last and most important tool to empower blacks was enfranchisement, the right to vote. Although voting rights were not at the forefront of the early movement, as basic rights were, the notion of equality and voting rights have always been intertwined. The earliest traces can be found with President Truman's committee report that showed their relation (Doc C). The 1950s saw some improvement in this area as the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 were passed. Overall, these Acts were a step in the right direction, but were relatively weak and inept in enforcement. The fact that these Acts faced the longest filibusters in history to avoid passage, nearly 24 hours and 82 hours respectively, showed the enormous uneasiness and detestation of these bills by Southern legislators and their constituents. They were the ones who were preventing blacks from getting to the polls, a practice that needed to be stopped. The 1960s brought about immense change in this regard due to Freedom Summer, which aimed at registering black voters in Southern states, numerous Voting Education Projects, which educated blacks and told them to vote, and specifically the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which stepped up enforcement of voting rights for all at the polls. The significance of the above measures is seen from when the percentage of blacks who voted spiked 33 percent in 6 years, even though it had only jumped 26 percent from 1940 to 1962 (Doc G). In effect, therefore, the 6 years of the 1960s were more progressive and beneficiary to blacks than the previous 22 years combined. The real progress was made in the 1960s; the foundation was laid in those 22 years prior.

The 1960s were, without a doubt, the years that gained the most recognition, accomplished the most goals, and caused the most reform. A monumental occasion in the movement occurred on August 28, 1963. By far the most memorable and significant event and originally called in 1940, the March on Washington drew upwards of 250,000 people. Its location, the Lincoln Memorial in Washington DC, added to its importance. The speech delivered on that day, in that historic place, will be forever remembered as one of the great speeches in history. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. knew well that this event would go down in history books as a great and epic one. He acknowledged the blacks present, deplorable condition and vowed to fight until it was improved. He acknowledged the need for white support and wanted a guarantee that civil rights would be extended to all, so that Black Americans could live out the American dream (Doc F). The speech, the crowd, the enthusiasm, they all pointed to a sense of urgency, resiliency, and most of all, the desire to be free. This event, therefore, caught not only national, but international

attention. It is no wonder, hence, that King won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, just one year after his historic speech. The demonstration was tactically planned so that the government was now obliged to respond.

The president at the time, President John F. Kennedy, promoted equal rights wholeheartedly. He too delivered a historic speech to the nation concerning civil rights. He was the first president to ever do so in a frank and sincere manner. He acknowledged the gap, the widening gap, between the blacks and whites in the US. He recognized the faults of the nation he loved and called on the American people to embrace all blacks and their civil rights (Doc B). Not only did he give hope to blacks, he worked to secure a safe future for them, following the guidelines set forth in 1946 with President Truman's report. Unfortunately, President Kennedy was assassinated a mere four months after his speech, before Congress had acted. It was propitious for blacks, however, that Kennedy's successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, took the oath of office and fought for black civil rights with the same zeal as his predecessor. Johnson remarked that he wanted to pay homage to his predecessor by carrying out the task that he had fought so valiantly for. With this in mind, he passed the Civil Right Acts of 1964 and 1968 through Congress and has been dubbed, informally, the "civil rights president".

It is essential to understand, however, that none of this extraordinary progress would have been possible without the dedication, determination, and continued devotion of many people. The relentless efforts that they contributed to the greater cause during the 1940s and 1950s paved the way for the unprecedented accomplishments of the 1960s. Though there were leaders throughout the movement, those that came earlier helped build a solid foundation for those who would proceed with the mission and achieve reform in the later years. This constructive reform that many fought so valiantly for, some with their lives, moved toward equality for all, celebrated diversity, and assured that there was no distinct black people or white people but one American people, one American dream, and one American destiny.

## Bibliography

Bond, Julian, narr. *Eyes On The Prize: America's Civil Rights Movement*. DVD. Produced by Henry Hampton. N. p. : PBS Video, n. d.

This movie was extremely successful in conveying the hostility and hatred between the whites and blacks. It starts by showing the deep segregation in the South in all aspects of life and goes into the Emmitt Till murder, indicating the beginning of the major movement. It served to show the major events that started the movement and put it on the national stage. The next major event was started by Rosa Parks: the Montgomery Bus Boycott. It led to the rise of Martin Luther King and caused desegregation in many states, even though it was not immensely successful in Montgomery itself. Then, there were the many school integration attempts after the Brown vs. Board of Education decision was handed down by the Supreme Court. The movie focused on the Little Rock Nine and James Meredith integrating Ole Miss. The movie, therefore, showed in what it called the “awakenings,” a pattern of disturbing the complacency of the issue of civil rights as the news media were giving it tremendous attention.

Brown, Frank. “The First Serious Implementation of Brown: The 1964 Civil Rights Act and Beyond .” *Journal of Negro Education* 73, no. 3 (Summer 2004): 182-190. <http://www.jstor.org/> (accessed November 18, 2009).

This source was almost exactly what I was looking for. It helped prove my preliminary thesis in that it showed how even though the Supreme Court's ruling in Brown vs. Board of Education ordered desegregation, the idea was not implemented right away in 1954. In fact, it laid the groundwork for coming years and this is why the article argues that it took 10 years of work to get Brown vs. Board of Education realized and enforced. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was essential in realizing true integration and the article aims to explore its importance and true value.

Burson, George. “The Black Civil Rights Movement.” *OAH Magazine of History*, Summer 1986, 35-36, 39-40. <http://www.jstor.org/> (accessed November 18, 2009).

This source is a general overview of the civil rights movement and is designed specifically for high school students. It was easy, therefore, to read through it and pick up on the essential themes. The article seeks to discover why the time was right for the movement to occur as well as the movement's immediate and long-term consequences. It helped me get a sense of urgency among blacks and led me to some statistics that show the relative success of the movement.

Divine, Robert. *America Past and Present*. N.p. : Pearson, 2009.

This source provided me with background information regarding the civil rights movement as a whole. I consulted this source primarily on that basis, searching for key words and events. I also hoped to find some sense as to why it started and ended when it did. This source focused more on the 1960s than any other decade and pointed out the two presidents, Kennedy and Johnson, and each of their roles in the movement. This source, therefore, was helpful to understand the major events and would provide a rough outline for my research.

Friedman, Leon. *The Civil Rights Reader*. Edited by Martin Duberman. N.p. : n.p., n.d.

This is a fairly general source that provides an outline of the Black Civil Rights Movement. Its chapters are broken down into specific topics of the movement including its leaders, milestones, the issues, and the response of the people and government. For this reason it was helpful in providing an overview of the movement as whole and helping me to establish a feeling of why the movement took place and its importance. It also provided various primary sources that were related to the content, which reinforced my understanding of the topic and provided the opinions of many people. This book focuses on the effects of the movement; how it affected blacks and whites.

“I Have a Dream - Address at March on Washington.” MLK ONLINE.  
<http://www.mlkonline.net/.html> (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it brought attention to the civil rights movement and led to reform. This speech is an exceptionally famous one in our history, “I have a dream” by Martin Luther King Jr. How and where it was delivered also lend to its fame. An upwards of 250,000 Blacks and Whites gathered in Washington DC, but specifically at Lincoln’s Memorial to hear this speech. The speech used eloquent words to describe the present, horrible conditions that Blacks faced and told the Whites that the Blacks would never back down. It was a fight for freedom, a fight to be won. Seeing the extraordinary support for this mass rally, the American government, no doubt, got a sense of what civil rights meant to the Blacks. Within a year, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was signed and segregation was made illegal. This speech, therefore, directly led to attention and reform.

“John F. Kennedy: Civil Rights Address.” American Rhetoric: Top 100 Speeches. <http://www.americanrhetoric.com//jfkcivilrights.htm> (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it shows that the 1960s were the most important years for Black civil rights. This document is a speech that John F. Kennedy delivered to the American people in 1963 requesting them to promote equality for all Americans. The civil rights issue received national recognition as a result of this speech and it was the first time that a president actually spoke out against segregation and the inequality that blacks inherently faced. This speech, therefore, was a monumental one and its effects were even more momentous. This speech, coupled with the March on Washington, led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which ultimately eradicated segregation. This fact supports my thesis in that the 1960s brought about constrictive reforms. What’s more is that Kennedy’s successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, fought for civil rights with the same zeal and vehemence that his predecessor did, as an homage and addition to the legacy of the fallen President.

Lowery, Charles D, John F Marszalek, and Thomas Adams Upchurch, eds. *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of African American Civil Rights*. 2nd ed. Greenwood Publishing Group, 2003.

This is an excellent source that provided me with an abundance of relevant information regarding the Black Civil Rights Movement.

Due to the well-structured chronology, it was easy to find events during my time period, 1940-1970. This source was also useful in providing me with upwards of 50 primary sources that I can possibly utilize. It explains extensively each critical event, person, and year. It also provides a brief overview of the primary documents, their importance, relevance, and necessity.

Moody, Anne. *Coming of Age in Mississippi*. N.p.: Dell, 1992.\*

This document ties in with my thesis because it shows, through a narrative account of a young Black girl, the realization that blacks and whites were inherently unequal. This realization occurred to many Blacks, especially in the 1940s when this girl wrote her account. Moody talks about the segregation that the two camps experienced and how she believed it to be improper and objectionable. Like her, many Blacks were starting to realize the obvious discrepancies between the racial groups and, more importantly, they were realizing that they had to stop this innate trend before it was too late. They attempted to disturb the complacency of obtaining civil rights by becoming outspoken about the issue. This was a period of awakenings for Blacks.

"Percentage of Voting Age Blacks Registered to Vote ," chart, Statistics of Racism in the United States: Income, Health, and Rights [http://www.struggle4reparations.com/starkey/rep\\_sta.html](http://www.struggle4reparations.com/starkey/rep_sta.html) (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it shows how the 1950s were building blocks and the 1960s achieved true reform. This table provides an important statistic, percentages of voting age Blacks registered to vote, in none other than the Southern states. The progress in the 1950s is relatively diminutive but the idea being spread is huge. In fact, Martin Luther King first called for the African-American right to vote in the 1950s, probably around 1957. It was the first time that Blacks were openly declaring themselves disenfranchised and, therefore, powerless to bring about change. The 1960s, however, did much to change that. The table shows that the percentages grew at a faster rate in the 1960s than in the 1950s. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, a reform, had a lot to with this unprecedented growth of 33 percent in 6 years; the previous years so a bit more than 1 percent increases. In effect, therefore, the 1960s were nearly 6 times more efficient than the other years that laid the groundwork.

Robinson, Jackie. Jackie Robinson to Dwight David Eisenhower, May 13, 1958. In *Jackie Robinson's Letter saying "you unwittingly crushed the spirit of freedom in negros."*  
<http://www.webofdeception.com/.html> (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it is a call for urgency and a call to the government for action. It also stresses the importance that governments should protect the rights of its people, including blacks. It, moreover, affords me an opportunity to talk about a man who successfully integrated into America's pastime and made a name for himself. He, in a sense, was the test subject of the first integration attempt, and his success prepared and encouraged people to support integration. His life was a great story of this period and he deserves credit for sparking the fervor to obtain civil rights.

"Rosa Parks on a Montgomery Bus," <http://nhs.needham.k12.ma.us/cur/wwII/07/p4-07/LHP/images/RosaParks.jpg> (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it shows one of the biggest, if not the biggest, events that ignited the civil rights movement. This image is of a woman who in 1955, a brave soul by the name of Rosa Parks, got onto a Montgomery bus and took the first empty seat she found; it happened to be a White only seat, as the bus was segregated (Whites in the front, Blacks in the back). When asked to move she refused and was subsequently arrested. Her arrest launched the beginning of the many Bus Boycotts throughout the country, many of which were quite successful in desegregating buses in large cities. Her notion of accepting punishment to support a greater cause served as a foundational inspiration to many in later years, especially the sit-in students of 1960 who would follow in her footsteps. She laid a foundation and disturbed the complacency; they would provoke greater attention and reform.

“SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).” National Park Service: US Department of the Interior. <http://www.nps.gov/////ecision54.htm> (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it shows that the 1950s disturbed the complacency of the present view of segregation. The Brown vs. Board of Education decision was handed down in 1954 and was unanimous. Chief Justice Earl Warren read the decision which stated that segregation in schools had “no place.” This ruined the complacency of the issue because it overturned the long withstanding Plessy v. Ferguson decision that was delivered in 1896. In effect, therefore, this decision was responsible for toppling what had been thought since 58 years prior. It also had a domino effect which increased its already immense impact. The domino effect caused a push for desegregation in nearly all aspects of life, not only the school systems which the Brown decision noted.

“Timeline of the African American Civil Rights Movement.” Wikipedia. [http://en.wikipedia.org//Timeline\\_of\\_the\\_American\\_Civil\\_Rights\\_Movement#1925\\_.E2.80.93\\_1949](http://en.wikipedia.org//Timeline_of_the_American_Civil_Rights_Movement#1925_.E2.80.93_1949) (accessed November 18, 2009).

This source was the first I consulted, my objective to gain a brief overview of the civil rights movement and to extrapolate key words to be used in the future. This source provided a chronological timeline of crucial events of the civil rights movement with no further explanation. The purpose of my visit was to establish a foundation for my research and to get familiar with my topic.

“To Secure These Rights: THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT’ S COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS.” Harry S. Truman Library and Museum.  
<http://www.trumanlibrary.org//srights1.htm> (accessed December 10, 2009).\*

This document ties into my thesis because it shows that people, and the government, were realizing that there was a problem with the current system of segregation. This report, prepared by a committee in 1946 that was specially sponsored by President Harry Truman, showed clear signs that the Black community was both considered and treated with inferiority and that it had less opportunity than did the whites. While this may seem obvious in retrospect, the facts that are provided within this document were considered novel at that time. This document also serves to build a foundation for future government action, as it proposes a few measures by taken to eliminate this disparity in opportunity and consideration.

Walton, Anthony. *Mississippi: An American Journey*. N.p. : Vintage Books, 1996.

This source, although not intended specifically for civil rights, focused on the history of Mississippi and, therefore, touched on many key events of the civil rights movement. It showed integration attempts and the problems that faced and was very helpful in the narrative sense.

\* denotes the primary sources that were used in the DBQ

## *Narod Polski* (The Polish Nation)

### Tygodniowy Wywiad (Weekly Interview)

Czeslaw Tomaszewski, a 23-year-old Pole, moved to Chicago in 1897 after experiencing difficulties while living in Poland. He shared his experience with us.

#### **What were your reasons for leaving Poland?**

I grew up in Fordon, Bydgoszcz in Poland and I never thought that I would end up leaving Poland. I had a plan to get married and have children there just like my parents had done before me. Once Poland's economic problems began to increase I knew that if I stayed in Poland I would not be able to support a family the way I would have liked. So I decided to move to America where everyone knew that was the place to make it rich.

#### **What was your journey from Poland to America like?**

Leaving Poland was very difficult for me. I left behind my mother and father both who wanted to stay in Poland. My father worked on a farm there and so he could not leave it to move to America. They understood my reasons for leaving and they were heartbroken when their only son decided to leave Poland for America. My mother was very upset with me and told me that I should never return if I failed in America.

I boarded the ship and lived down in the steerage area for about a week or so, I can't actually remember how long it took. The conditions were unbearable in the steerage area. All the first class men and women received luxury care but not us in the steerage. All us Poles were packed into the small steerage compartment and we tried to spend most of our up on the cold windy deck. Many people were ill and I could not believe that I had chosen this fate. The conditions were horrible, but most of us survived. When I was on board the ship, I met Ania Kowalczyk. She was a 17-year-old who, with her father, hoped to create a better life for themselves. They were headed to Chicago and asked me if I would like to join them. I decided I would because I was not sure where I was going to go, and well...she was a pretty lady.

#### **How was your experience passing through Ellis Island?**

Arriving in New York was a dream come true. I could not believe we had made it. Seeing the Statue of Liberty for the first time was like a

dream. All of the first class immigrants were checked on the boat and then they were free to go, but unfortunately that was not the case for me. When we got off the ship Ania, her father and I stayed together so we would not be separated. We were then crammed onto a ferry where we were taken to Ellis Island. On the island there was a huge building that all of the immigrants were brought into. Once we entered we saw this huge hall, and we realized what we had to do...wait. We waited there for 2 days and 1 night and just before the inspectors closed for the night we were able to get through. I was the first to be inspected, and then I passed all of the tests, and because I worked on my father's farm I was physically in shape. I also spoke some English so that helped me as well. After they checked how much money I had, which was not much, I was free to go. I met up with Ania and her father, and we were off on our new adventure.

**What struggles did you face when you first moved to Chicago?**

We arrived in Chicago about one week or so after we arrived at Ellis Island. We took a train from New York to Chicago, and it was much more enjoyable than the ride on the ship. Although I spoke a little English it was not much to carry on a full conversation. I knew I had to find a place to live and a job. I ended up living with Ania, her father and many other Poles in a small boarding house. The conditions were cramped but it was a place to live. Most of the time we were out of the house. Within the first week of living in Chicago, Ania and I went for a walk to explore the city. We then found a community center for all of the Polish immigrants in our neighborhood. We walked inside and there we signed up for English classes. The classes took place at night so we could work by day.

My first job was a newspaper delivery boy throughout "Polonia." Our Polish neighborhood had many different newspapers; my favorite was *Gazeta Polska* (The Polish Gazette). Delivering required little if no English and I was able to get to know many people in the community. So during the day I worked on my delivery route, and by night, Ania and I went to school. After about a year of delivering and schooling I had excellent English. I then applied to get a job at the local meatpacking business.

We began going to St. Stanislaus Kostka Church in the east part of Chicago. It was the first Polish Catholic Church established in Chicago. Going to church was one of the normal things in my life. It reminded me

of back home, and it was nice to have something that was the same. Since I moved to America I have faced many discriminatory remarks from non-immigrants, and going to church has helped my faith improve as well as my confidence.

Ania now works at St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital, which opened to treat Poles living in the "Polonia" community. At the moment she is a receptionist. She was able to receive this job because of her strength in both the Polish and English language.

**What is life like living in Chicago?**

Life in Chicago is very different then life in Poland. Chicago is very crowded and many people are immigrants not just from Poland but also from Germany, Ireland, Italy and Sweden. The boarding houses are so crowded that sometimes I wish that I never came to America and that I stayed on my family' s big open farm.

One of the nice things about living in Chicago was the political power we Poles could receive. Back in Poland we were unable to have freedom of speech and say what we believed in newspapers. But in Chicago, because there are so many Polish newspapers, Polish immigrants are able to write letters to the editor and influence what is written. The people own many of the newspapers, by owning shares in them. This way, immigrants are able to have an influence on what goes on in the city and not feel like an outcast.

**What job are you working at now?**

I am still working in the meatpacking business. I was one of the lucky men who received a steady job unlike those who only work meatpacking in the winter and do construction work in the summer. The hours were long, 12-hour shifts, 6 days a week. I was very blessed to work there with a constant pay. Many men are unsure how long they will be there because it is so unreliable. I have worked there for 2 years now and I am out of packing meat. I am presently working in the office doing paperwork. I just recently got promoted because my English has improved so much that now I can have advanced conversations, and many people think I have lived here for much longer then 2 years. But thanks to all of the people in my community I was able to learn English very fast.

**Do you feel accepted living in Chicago?**

Living in “Polonia” is very comforting. Most of us are Poles and so we are able to support each other whenever there is something one may need. Because we all live in the same boarding house and live in the same community and work in the area we do not get out of Chicago that often. But when we do go out of town, many “Americans” look down on us. I received a similar feeling when I got off of the boat at Ellis Island. Many of the Americans, who have been here for years, look down on the immigrants entering America. I do not understand this because everyone was an immigrant at one time. But because we are able to live with our community, life becomes a lot easier for us.

**What do you see for your future?**

I hope to advance in my job in the packinghouse. If my luck continues then I may receive a management job. Ania and I will be getting married soon, and we hope to start a family. She is hoping to get a teaching job at one of the Polish Catholic schools. Although the teachers are mostly nuns they take some other women. We also hope to move into a better house with her father. I will see how my life plays out. Maybe in the future I will be able to bring my parents to America!

## Operation ERA

- **Protagonist:** Doris Plumlee.  
Doris is 40 years old and is a women's rights activist. She was raised by a single mother, who was looked down upon in the neighborhood as she was not married and had a child. Facing discrimination, her mother fought hard to give Doris a good life, even if that meant that she had to work multiple jobs. However, even with multiple jobs, Doris and her mom struggled to make ends meet. A majority of this struggling was due to the fact that Doris's mom was paid less just like every other woman. When Doris's mom grew sick and couldn't work, Doris was forced to take on her mom's jobs and she saw firsthand the struggles her mom had to go through. Therefore, this motivated Doris to fight for women's rights and become a women's right activist leader. Doris has lead numerous rallies for equal pay, better job opportunities, better working conditions, support for the ERA, less discrimination in the army, and many more.
- **Goal:** Doris is working to change how men feel about women and how the country views women. She is trying to end discrimination towards women throughout the entire United States, which would ultimately lead to the passing of the equal rights amendment. However, before she can work on getting the ERA passed she must first work on other issues such as earning equal pay at her own work, getting title IX passed in her state, and fighting in a combat position in war. Once she has done all of this, she can then work on getting support from thirty eight out of the fifty states in order to get the ERA ratified before the June 30, 1982 deadline.
- **Levels**
  - Level 1
    - Goal:** Doris is still working the same job that she took over for her mom twenty two years ago and even though she has worked there for so long and the working conditions have improved, she is still paid less than the men in her company. Doris has inquired this to her boss, whom she has known for twenty two years, several times and still nothing has happened. Therefore, Doris's goal in this level is to

earn equal pay and in order to do this, she must organize a successful strike.

**-Enemy:** The men in Doris' s company

**-Plan:** Doris must first make every woman in the company aware of the situation and the injustice in their paychecks. Then, once she does this, she must gain support from the women and together, they will plan out a strike. The women comprise about seventy five percent of the company, so Doris must get at least sixty five percent of the women to be on her side. In the game, Doris will do this by going around to every woman in her company and talking to them. She is in a company of only 100 people, so she must talk to 75 women. However, when Doris is talking to the women, she must find routes around the company to avoid the men. The company has many floors, so Doris must go up and down each floor, making sure to avoid the men. Every time, she is caught by a man, she loses a life. If she is caught by her boss, then the level is lost. Once Doris "talks" to every woman, meaning that she gets to every women, she will give them a pink dot to put on their desk. Once she gets 65 dots put on desks, Doris can start the strike. In starting the strike, all the women will leave their jobs and they will sit outside the company, making sure to avoid all violence. If the strike grows violent, then Doris will lose a life. The strike must go on for five days. After five days, Doris and the women will win and they will gain equal pay. Doris has five lives this level.

**-Outcome:** Doris is successful in her quest to gain support from the women in her company, starting a strike, remaining peaceful, and earning equal pay. The beginning of her quest was difficult as she had to avoid 25 men in route to talking to 75 women. Once her boss began seeing pink dots, he began putting guards at the door to each floor, so Doris had yet more people to avoid. However, she talked to all 75 women and 65 of them put the pink dots on their desks. Then, organizing the strike became easy as Doris divvied up jobs and all the women stop working. However, things grew difficult because the women faced much resistance and many temptations to grow violent. Nevertheless, the women remained peaceful and their strike was successful.

**-Music:** “Use Somebody” by Kings of Leon because in this level Doris is “roaming around” looking for women that she can use to help pull off this strike. She could “use somebody” more like 65 women to help her.

**-Level 2:**

**-Goal:** The goal of this level is for Doris to get Title IX, which prohibits sex discrimination all aspects of education programs that receive federal support, ratified in her state of Illinois. In this level, Doris will team up with Billy Jean King to first find the elusive Title IX document while avoiding obstacles set by Bobby Riggs. Then, once the two women find the document and see the contents, Doris will train Billy Jean King to face off in a tennis match versus Bobby Riggs. The outcome of this will determine whether or not the state of Illinois ratifies the Title IX document.

**-Enemy:** Bobby Riggs

**-Plan:** Doris and Billy Jean must first work their way through a maze full of obstacles such as fire breathing dogs, dead ends, zombie men, and much more. Then, once they complete the maze and find the Title IX document, they must decode the document using pieces that they picked up in the maze. Once the document is decoded, the women set out to start Billy Jean’s training. The document has instructions for how to train Billy Jean. However, both women must avoid obstacles and setbacks sent by Billy Jean’s competitor, Bobby Riggs. Once the training is complete, Billy Jean faces off against Bobby Riggs in a big tennis match. While the match is going on, Doris must continually fighting Bobby Rigg’s attempts to cheat. If Doris stops all the attempts, then Billy Jean will win and Title IX will get passed.

**-Outcome:** Bill Jean King and Doris prove successful as they fight their way through the maze and the setbacks in order to obtain the Title IX document. They also picked up all of the clues along the way to decode the document. The training proves to be the hardest part because this is the point where they meet the most resistance by Bobby Riggs. However, they fight through it and Billy Jean wins the tennis match with limited setbacks. Title IX gets passed in the state of Illinois.

**-Music:** “All I Do is Win” by DJ Khaled because no matter what Bobby throws Doris and Phyllis to slow down the quest, Doris and Phyllis overcome them. In this level, “all they do is win, win, win no matter what.”

**-Level 3:**

**-Goal:** Doris wants to become a general in the army as she feels that this will help get more people to support her fight to ratify the ERA, especially if she does a good job in the war. She must first go through military school. Then, she must enter into the army and after that, she must rise up the ranks in the military. Women were barely allowed in the army and once in the army, they were heavily discriminated against as men did not think that women should be in the army away from their duties at home, let alone fight in the war. A woman had never been a general in the army. The whole time she is facing off against Benjamin Norris and she is racing against him to become a general in the army. They are both vying for the same spot, therefore, Doris must complete military school, enter the army, and rise up the ranks before Benjamin does.

**-Enemy:** Benjamin Norris

**-Plan:** This level is literally going to be a car race because Doris and Benjamin are racing to see who can get to be general first. They are both racing to attain the general coat at the finish line. In the beginning of the race, the background will be in a school and here, Doris must drive past all the men, women, teachers, books, and papers at the school, trying her best to avoid crashing into them. Then, once she gets out of the school setting, she will find herself in a battle scene where she must drive past bombs, grenades, dead bodies, and army soldiers without getting hit. Once she gets past all of this, she will find herself at the finish line, looking to secure the general coat before Benjamin Norris does.

**-Outcome:** Doris wins the race and puts on the general coat before Benjamin does. She has successfully driven past all of the books, teachers, students, papers, bombs, dead bodies, grenades, and enemy soldiers before Benjamin does. Doris becomes the first woman general in the army.

**-Music:** “The General” by Dispatch because both Doris and Benjamin are fighting to become the general in the song. They want to be able to give orders to other people in battle and “gain respect on the battlefield.”

**-Level 4:**

**-Goal:** Doris is working to get the Equal Rights Amendment ratified in 38 out of the 50 states before Phyllis Schaffly claims 13 states. Phyllis Schaffly was head of the “Stop ERA program” as she believed that the ERA would destroy the feminine mystique and the women’s place in the home.

Therefore, Doris is fighting against Phyllis to gain the support of each state so that they can ratify the ERA. If she gets the support of 38 states, then the ERA will be ratified. The ERA would officially give women equal rights.

**-Plan:** Throughout this whole level, there is a map in the upper right hand corner. Once Doris gets the support of a state, the state will turn pink and once Phyllis claims a state, the state will turn blue. However, since Doris has to claim many more states, she has the extra power of moving extremely fast. Doris’s plan is to gain the support of the state by holding a big, televised rally in the capital city of the state. Using this method, she hopes to capture the attention of the public and gain their support through her fiery speeches. Phyllis on the other hand, plans to hand out “Stop ERA” memorabilia throughout the state. In this level, Doris will conduct her speeches by finding the script to the speech in the capital city and then under that will be a button which will start the rally. Phyllis, on the other hand, will pass out memorabilia to important people in the state.

**-Outcome:** In the end, Doris is able to claim the support of 35 states, just 3 short of the necessary 38. Phyllis’s strategy was not more effective; she just had to get fewer states, so her job was easier. Phyllis managed to claim 15 states, so the ERA did not pass.

**-Music:** “Never Say Never” by Justin Bieber because Doris is clearly the underdog here as she has to claim 20 more states than Phyllis in the same amount of time. Even though Doris knows the odds are against her, she “will fight to forever and never say never.”

