

The Question of Validity

Ex-Slave Interview vs. Slave Narrative

Evelyn-Michelle Emelife

Instructor Lillian Duck

History 17A

Honors Option

Due: Thursday November 29, 2007

The Question of Validity: Ex-Slave Interview vs. Slave Narrative

By Evelyn-Michelle Emelife

When mentioning slavery not only does it become synonymous with inhumanity, but also it becomes the institution through which the United States generated much of its financial stability and economic wealth in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Where the word slave is defined as one who is “bound in servitude as the property of a person or household,” the term slavery is the “practice of owning slaves.”¹ This definition is an understatement because slavery is the institution by which one group of people (in this case “white” people) oppressed another group (black people) by bringing them to a country where they were separated from their families, reduced to chattel, beaten severely to enforce obedience and instill fear, and denied the ability to act or speak freely, thus allowing the whites to benefit economically, socially, and maintain their superiority.

It is absurd to imply or even suggest that slavery in the south during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century was not as severe or bad as depicted through traditional historical resources. Furthermore, it is inconceivable for a former slave to imply that their experience as a slave was not as negative as one may imagine simply because it is universally known that the treatment of slaves was far from humane. From their everyday living conditions and everlasting tedious work schedules to their punishments and constant reminders that they are the inferior beings or outcasts of American society, history books, oral histories, articles, narratives, and interviews depict the harsh reality of slavery and teach people of America’s gruesome past.

¹ **The American Heritage Dictionary Fourth Edition**, New York, NY: Bantam Dell, Publisher, 2001, Page 778

Despite the fact that slaves were freed in 1865, granted the right to speak, and given the opportunity to discuss their past experience through interviews, there is a possibility that ex-slaves were prohibited from giving true accounts of their experiences as slaves. This assertion arises from the fact that Carrie Hudson an ex-plantation slave downplays the severity of slavery in an interview about her slave experience. Hudson fails to mention the gory details of being a slave and even goes as far as to boast about and commend her master for the treatment of his slaves while briefly and indirectly mentioning her true feelings about slavery. The notion that a slave would imply that her experience as a slave who worked on a plantation field, which is harsh, raises suspicions because negativity is withdrawn and there are obvious internal and external limitations on what she is permitted to say.

To the contrary, in Frederick Douglass' slave narrative everything is candid and nothing is censored to create a false impression of slavery. Not only did he note the negative aspects of slavery, but also he vocalizes what he gained from it as well. For instance, he noted the beatings he witnessed and discussed learning his ABC's and how to spell.² Essentially, he is able to openly communicate about his experience because he is the author of his work, escaped to the north where he received abolitionist support. There are no outside influences, intimidation factors, or consequences for voicing his true experience as a slave. Carrie Hudson is a prime example of how slaves were compelled to refrain from giving true accounts of their slave experience through interviews due to

² Douglass, Frederick. Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass. Boston and New York, Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1993. Pages 52 and 57

numerous limitations such as the Ku Klux Klan and racist interviewers. In fact, the only way to attain a true depiction of a slave's experience is through a slave narrative written by the slave.

A limitation that taints the validity of Carrie Hudson's interview is the concept of freedom of speech for black people and the idea that they were scrutinized for attempting to utilize this right. As found in the United States Bill of Rights ratified December 15, 1791, freedom of speech was defined as the concept of being able to speak freely without censorship or fear of punishment.³ This concept was established before slavery reached its height and continued to exist throughout slavery to the present time. Initially, the Bill of Rights did not apply to slaves simply because they were considered chattel rather than citizens of America. Essentially meaning that they were punished for voicing their opinions. However after slavery was abolished, black people were still denied the right to speak freely due fear of being terrorized or punished even though under the law they were granted access to the same rights as all other citizens of America.

This leads one to believe that even after being granted freedom intimidation factors, such as implied or verbal threats, played a role in Carrie Hudson's interview. When discussing her master in an interview Hudson states, "I does 'member Marse Elbert and Miss Sally and dey was just as good to us as dey could be."⁴ This statement can be viewed from two different perspectives: one may take what she said literally and believe that she had a good master or one may suspect that she stated this out of fear instilled from the past and present. When discussing the perception a slave had of his or her

³ Liberty, Equality, Power: A History of American People Compact Edition

⁴ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

master Frederick Douglass stated, “a still tongue makes a wise head...(Slaves) they suppress the truth rather than take the consequences of telling it.”⁵ Essentially, this meant that during slavery, slaves were conditioned to withhold the truth about their master out of fear of being sold or punished. Consequently, for an ex-slave who was taught to limit the truth when being questioned and especially in a time when blacks were not fully extended the freedom of speech, it is obvious that Carrie Hudson would not speak the truth of her experience as a slave in an interview that would be made public.

Besides the fact that Carrie was limited to speak freely out of fear and limited rights, there is a possibility that her speech or literacy limited her interview, thus preventing her from giving a true account of her experience. It was not in a slave owners best interest to teach a slave how to read, write, or speech because literacy could lead to an uprising against the owners and cause chaos. Additionally, teaching them to read who take away from their economic profits of a days work. Henceforth, to ensure superiority and limit the possibility of an uprising, most slaves were not taught to read, write, or formally speak; a slave’s speech was acquired from dialogue between the slaves and their masters, overseers, parents, relatives, etc. Hudson’s limited literacy may have been a factor in her tainted interview.

Aside from the fact that she states, “dere warn’t no time to larn readin’ and writin’ on Marse Elbert’s plantation,”⁶ Hudson’s speech in the interview is difficult to follow, which may have posed some type of challenge to the editor and led to alterations in her interview. According Eugene D. Genovese, plantation field slaves were able to

⁵Douglass, Frederick. **Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass**. Boston and New York, Bedford Books of St. Martin’s Press, 1993. Page 50

⁶ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

communicate with one another in such a way that others, such as people from the towns or other regions, could not understand.⁷ Basically, meaning that if the person conducting or editing the interview did not understand what Hudson was communicating, easily her experience could have been altered. Whereas, being that Frederick Douglass learned to read and write, thus enabling to relay exactly what he desired. The literacy was as much a limitation as the inability to speak freely.

In addition to the fact that African Americans had limited freedom of speech and ex-slaves had fear instilled in them from their experience as a slave, when granted freedom, “alleged” access to American rights, and asked to have their experience as a slave recorded through an interview, they still faced terror for speaking up or challenging the superiority of whites. The south was considered the worst place to be for slaves simply because the division between blacks and whites were incredibly strong. Due to the fact that the south lost its main source of profit when the Emancipation Proclamation started the process of freeing slaves from 1862 to 1865 and whites did not consider blacks their equals, the division between blacks and whites intensified most in the south. Thus, enabling terror acts to warn and remind blacks that they were inferior and did not belong. Hence, given the time period and area in which Hudson’s interview took place may have compelled her to give an incomplete account of her slave experience to ensure her safety.

⁷ Genovese, Eugene D. **Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made.** First Vintage Books Edition. New York, 1976. Page 434

Being that Carrie Hudson's interview took place in Athens, Georgia on May 19, 1939,⁸ it is obvious that she was subjected or witnessed the everyday terrors of the conflicting race relations between the blacks and whites in the South during the 1930s. According to Jennifer Briggs, in the south during the 1930s "A large majority of the white men in the South believe blacks needed to learn their place and remain there."⁹ Essentially, she asserts that white people did not believe black people were equal to whites. She proceeds to state, "though whites never said just what this place was, they showed it to them by limiting education, by discrimination on the streets and railroads, by barring them from public parks, public libraries, and public amusements of all kinds, by insulting replies to courteous questions, by conviction for trivial offences, and, finally, by the shot gun and lynching."¹⁰ Basically, the south was not the safest place for an African American to voice their experience regarding slavery simply because it meant they were straying away from their "place" in society and challenging the ethics of white people by calling attention to the brutality of blacks during the slavery.

Carrie Hudson's interview took place during the "Jim Crow Era."¹¹ This was an era illustrated by the battle for equality and life in the black community. Although the Ku Klux Klan came into existence in 1865, during this time period in the south, atrocious acts of brutality were committed by this white supremacist group to make an example of any black person who attempted to stray away from their allotted "place" in society. Even

⁸ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

⁹ Briggs, Jennifer. 1930's Race relation in the American South: Relationship of Grace McCune and Mirriam McCommons. March 3, 2004

¹⁰ Briggs, Jennifer. 1930's Race relation in the American South: Relationship of Grace McCune and Mirriam McCommons. March 3, 2004

¹¹ Davis, Ronald F.L. From Terror to Triumph. <http://www.jimcrowhistory.org/history/overview.htm>

though the number of lynchings died down in the late 1930s, black brutality still occurred. Essentially, this meant that black people were physically attacked for speaking up or stepping out of order. This implies that if Hudson were to give a true account, she would be straying away from her inferior “place” in society and could be threatened if not attacked for doing so.

Additionally, given the place and time period, the selection of Hudson as an interviewee to depict a true account of slavery is trivial because those selected were to part take in the Federal Writer’s project were those who fit into the white person’s concept of the ideal black person: one lacking ambition. While analyzing race relations in the south in the 1930s, Jennifer Briggs asserts that from the time preceding the American Civil War, the whites emerged with three different views on the social placement of blacks in American society. The first group being deemed the illiterate superstitious group of blacks who worked railroads, farms, steamboat, etc and just wanted to be left alone. The second group being composed of businessmen and professionals who sought to be more educated. Finally, the third group composed of “antebellum” blacks that posed no threat because they lacked ambition; essentially the type of black man the whites preferred.¹² During this time period in the south the motivation behind groups who tried to record slave experiences was not to obtain a true account of a slave experience, rather it was to attain an account that conformed to what was believed to be fitting slavery account. In preferring this type of account, they used ex-slaves from the third category of blacks who had no motivation or ambition to stray away from what the whites perceived

¹² Briggs, Jennifer. 1930's Race relation in the American South: Relationship of Grace McCune and Mirriam McCommons. March 3, 2004

them to be. Briggs states, these blacks were the ones mainly being interviewed for the Slave Narratives Collection.¹³ Carrie Hudson's interview may be an example of this type of manipulation of true accounts; biased selection of ex-slaves.

Nevertheless, Hudson may not have been a part of the third category of blacks. Instead, her interview may have been manipulated or tampered with due to intimidation enhanced by the interviewer or a massive amount of reconstruction to her interview. The Federal Worker's Project was a byproduct of the New Deals' Worker Progress Administration. The WPA sought out to create jobs for the needy people, so they made jobs through employing people to record ex-slaves' memories of their slave experience.¹⁴

Carrie Hudson's interview may not be a true account of her slave experience because the vast majority of the interviewers were white. Essentially, meaning she may have felt constrained to tell the truth; meaning, she was intimidated by her interviewer and the message she would be sending out if she spoke about slavery from a negative perspective. Even in the event that she did feel compelled to tell the truth, her interviewer may not have completely understood the account she was giving: meaning the interviewing could have been lost in translation. As mentioned before, slaves did not receive formal education in literacy, so often slaves could be understood by one another but not by others who had received formal training.¹⁵ Hence, the interviewer would write what he or she thought the ex-slave was communicating.

¹³ Briggs, Jennifer. 1930's Race relation in the American South: Relationship of Grace McCune and Mirriam McCommons. March 3, 2004

¹⁴ Azi, Patrice. Psychoanalysis of Institutional Slavery

¹⁵ Genovese, Eugene D. **Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made.** First Vintage Books Edition. New York, 1976

In addition to the interviewers mistaking what they have heard or intimidating their interviewee, the editors who were also white could have changed what they read to fit their understandings and knowledge about life for the slaves. According to the Library of Virginia, slave interviews underwent “extensive editing procedures.”¹⁶ This can be validated by the amount of people who edited Hudson’s interview. Not only was the interviewers’ understanding of what Hudson said noted, but also three more people edited it. According to Carrie Hudson’s cover page for her interview, Hudson’s interview was written by Sadie B. Hornsby, edited by Sarah H. Hall, edited again by Leila Harris, and edited one final time by John N. Booth.¹⁷ It is more than obvious that Hudson’s interview underwent an extreme transformation and was biased because her interview was written and edited several times by white people who could have easily, consciously or not, changed the deposition of her slave experience to fit their beliefs of what really occurred during slavery or what Hudson experienced.

Another aspect that makes Hudson’s interview trivial compared to the narrative written by Douglass is the fact that Hudson was seventy-five years old when she recounted her experience as a slave, whereas Douglass was between twenty-seven and twenty-eight years old. Essentially, this means that Hudson may have been too old to fully recount her experience as a slave. Stephanie Shaw asserts this in *Using the WPA Narratives to Study the Impact of the Great Depression* by stating “(referring to slaves) those who were adults at the time of the emancipation were so old at the time of the

¹⁶ The Library of Virginia: About the WPA Life History Collection
<http://www.lva.lib.va.us/whatwehave/gov/wpalabout.htm>

¹⁷ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

interviews that their memories were questionable.”¹⁸ To further enforce this idea Hudson states in the beginning of her interview, “I’se done most forgot ‘bout dem days.”¹⁹ Consequently, this suggests that Hudson’s interview was not a full account of her experience as a slave because she can barely recall that period in her life. By far, time is a limitation in Hudson’s interview.

To the contrary, Douglass was able to maintain the validity of his narrative not only because he wrote it himself but also because he was young enough to recall his experiences as a slave. Unlike Carrie Hudson who had to be asked specific questions, which may have coerced or lead her to answer in a particular way, Frederick Douglass is able to recant specific moments in detail. He is able to recall his childhood to the time in which he was writing. Nonetheless, he is able to reflect on his experiences as he records the events. This is evidenced by his ability to write about each of his masters, the settings, the overseers, his responsibilities, and observations of other people’s treatment. Fundamentally, age and ability to recall played a role in whether an ex-slave’s account was valid or engulfed with false memories.

Carrie Hudson’s interview contradicts itself and the traditional perception of slavery as illustrated by historical resources, thus deeming it unbelievable compared to Frederick Douglass’ slave narrative. Hudson states, “Our white folkses b’lieved in good eatin’s. Dey give us bread and meat wid all de cabbage, colla’d and turnip greens us wanted, and us had ‘matoes, ‘tatoes, chickens and duck.”²⁰ Hudson relaying that her

¹⁸ Shaws, Stephanie J. *Using the WPA Narratives to Study the Impact of the Great Depression*. *Journal of Southern History*, Volume 69 No. 3 (August 2003) page 625

¹⁹ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

²⁰ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

owners treated their slaves extremely well; well enough to provide a hearty meal composed of all the necessary nutrients and a sufficient amount of it. Whereas Douglass states, “the men and women received as their monthly allowance of food, eight pounds of pork, or its equivalent in fish, and one bushel of corn meal.”²¹ Not only is Douglass confirming that his owners gave their slaves a feeble amount of food, but also that the food lacked variety and the necessary nutrients that would make a good meal. Douglass’ account of the type and amount of food slaves were fed is far more consistent with the picture history books paint when discussing slaves’ living conditions. Based on some slave narratives written by slaves in *Slavery in the South* edited by Harvey Wish, often slaves worked extremely long hours on the field only to return home and end their day with a scanty meal.²² Furthermore Genovese in *Roll Jordan Roll* states that the typical meal for a slave consisted of corn meal or a meal called “mush.”²³ He proceeds to say that the amount of food a slave consumed depended on how fast they could eat. In essence, placed into the typical historical context, it was out of the ordinary for slaves to say that they were fed well, simply because they were not. Often in order to satisfy their hunger they would have to risk punishment for stealing fruits from their masters’ gardens otherwise they would have to be satiated with their meager meal allowances. Carrie Hudson’s account is not consistent with the story history tells.

At times Hudson’s testimony is consistent with Douglass’ account of slavery and history’s depiction of slave treatment, however she backs out whenever she feels like she

²¹ Douglass, Frederick. **Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass**. Boston and New York, Bedford Books of St. Martin’s Press, 1993. Page 44

²² Wish, Harvey, *Slavery in the South*, Farrar, Strauss, and Company. New York 1968

²³ Genovese, Eugene D. **Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made**. First Vintage Books Edition. New York, 1976. Page 62

if attacking her master's character. In example Hudson says, "Didn't no chillun wear but one piece of clothes in summer. Wintertime us wore de same only dey give us a warm undershirt, and rough red brogan shoes. Didn't no Niggers wear shoes in warm weather durin' slavery times."²⁴ This statement is confirmed by Douglass' account that slaves yearly clothing consisted of "two coarse linen shirts, one pair of linen trousers, like the shirts, one jacket, one pair of trousers for the winter, made of coarse Negro cloth, one pair of stockings, and one pair of shoes...Children unable to work in the field...their clothing consisted of two coarse linen shirts per year."²⁵ Although, Hudson attempts to be honest about her living situations, she goes back and contradicts herself by stating her masters were "just as good as dey could be." Essentially, this statement undermines the fact she was not treated or cared for properly. It is an attempt to reaffirm that her masters were good; a result of the intimidation factor. Whereas with Douglass he does not recant what he says because there was no intimidation factor.

Furthermore, Hudson's account of slavery is inconceivable as the truth because she undermines everything history tells us about the role of an overseer on a plantation by claiming her overseer did not have the power to punish and that the power to punish was reserved solely for her master. Hudson states "Marse Elbert's overseer was a Mr. Alderman. He got de slaves up early in de mornin' and it was black night 'fore he fotched 'em in. Marse Elbert didn't 'low nobody to lay hands on his Niggers but his own self. If

²⁴ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>

²⁵ Douglass, Frederick. **Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass**. Boston and New York, Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1993. Page 44

any whuppin' had to be done, he done it."²⁶ This account is far from true simply because history books and slave narratives suggest that it was the overseer that made slavery so gruesome and inhumane. In fact, it was the overseer who instilled fear in slaves for any mishap, lack of work, or anything he thought was deemed punishable. This allowed the master to be the "good guy."

Although overseers were fired for being too cruel, they still reserved the power to punish because it was the way a master kept all his slaves in check especially when it came to field slaves. In *Roll Jordan Roll*, Genovese explains that plantations were far too large for masters to regulate slave activity, thus they hired overseers who could ensure slave executed their tasks efficiently. He asserts that overseers were permitted to punish slaves because masters were often occupied with other affairs and also to make an example of anyone who misbehaved.²⁷ Douglass' narrative confirms this by describing various events in which an overseer maliciously beat slaves for acting out of place or being inefficient. For instances, in one of his accounts he wrote about an event in which an overseer, named Mr. Gore, shot and murdered a slave, Demby, who did not follow instructions. Frederick explained how Mr. Gore justified his actions by claiming that the slave was setting a bad example for the other slaves and that he could not go unpunished because others would follow.²⁸ To maintain order, it was necessary for overseers to exercise their right to punish. Even though, it was part of the overseers job description to

²⁶ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>. Page 3

²⁷ Genovese, Eugene D. **Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made.** First Vintage Books Edition. New York, 1976. Page 7-23

²⁸ Douglass, Frederick. **Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass.** Boston and New York, Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1993. Page 51

regulate slave activity it was also their duty to punish when necessary. Thus, Hudson's testimony about her overseer is unrealistic because it would defeat the purpose of his employment in addition to her extended enslavement. Essentially, an inefficient overseer meant slaves could do as they please, meaning escape enslavement rather than await freedom, which Hudson did.

According to *Slavery in the South*, "masters and slaveholders were literally insensible to claims of humanity."²⁹ It was not of a slaveholders' nature to be nice or treat their slaves well because it could backfire on them and cause them everything they acquired from slavery and challenge their superiority to slaves. Basically, the slaveholders and masters were inhumane and cruel to prove a point: that slaves were only property and did not deserve the same treatment as the white people. The masters and slaveholders' strategy pertaining to the care of slaves was to deprive and punish them to maintain order and keep them in their "place."³⁰ Being that taking good care of their slaves was not on a master's agenda, one cannot believe Hudson when she mentions her conditions and then undermines her statement by praising her master.

Fundamentally, Hudson contests that her living conditions were good and then goes back and indirectly leads the reader to believe otherwise; illustrating how contradictory and invalid her interview is. As mentioned earlier, first Hudson states that she and the other slaves were well fed, she then implies that they were not well clothed, and proceeds to say that her masters were overall good. All these statements are indicators that she is hiding something for unknown reasons. It is event that Hudson did

²⁹ Wish, Harvey, *Slavery in the South*, Farrar, Strauss, and Company. New York 1968. Page 66

³⁰ *The New Book of Knowledge* Volume 17. Grolier Inc. New York 1991. Page 199

not have the good slave experience she is trying to depict through her interview because other historical texts confirm that slaves were not treated as she describes. Additionally, she says it herself in the end of her interview, “Don’t give me dem slavery days ‘cause I would have to wuk anyhow if I was a slave again.”³¹ Meaning she would not want to relive slavery again because it was hard and unpleasant. Had she thought slavery was as good as she depicted it to be, her response would have been a little different.

Conversely, while it is obvious that Hudson’s interview was tainted by external and internal influences, there is a slight possibility that she believed her experience was as decent as she implies. Hudson may have believed her treatment was better compared to other slaves, she may have had a good relationship with her master given that her family had been enslaved with them for many generations, or she may have been an obedient slave who did not have to suffer the malicious wraths of slavery, thus deeming her experience decent. As witnessed through the relationship the Sally Hemings family had with Jefferson’s or Frederick Douglass’ with his master, Mr. Hugh’s, when he moved to Baltimore, good relations with one’s master can be rewarding or safe. Sally Hemings was given good treatment and Frederick Douglass acquired numerous skills and trades that allowed him to escape slavery. Hudson could have been a lesser example of this kind of treatment. Because her family had been enslaved with her master’s family for so long some type of special relationship may have formed leading her master to treat her well.

Furthermore, Hudson may have just been obedient. According to *Roll Jordan Roll* and *Slavery in the South*, a slave could avoid being terrorized by doing as they were

³¹ Plantation Life as viewed by Ex-Slave Carrie Hudson: <http://memory.loc.gov/mss/mesn/042/214211.gif>.
Page 7

told.³² Although the likelihood of never suffering the wraths of punishment was slim, there was a possibility. Finally, Hudson may have just thought highly of her master and that she was getting better treatment than other slaves. According to Frederick Douglass' narrative, often slave would defend their master's claiming that their master was superior to another. He claims that he measured the kindness of his master by the standard of other slaveholders. When discussing slaves and their perception of their masters he states, "(Slaves) they think their own masters are better than the other masters."³³ He proceeds to explain how often slaves would get into arguments about who had the better master or who was treated better. Hudson may have been one of these slaves who simply thought she was getting better treatment than other slaves. Although these are all possibilities, the chances that Hudson's interview is a real depiction of her life as a slave is unlikely because it undermines the story history tells about slavery.

It is safe to conclude that Carrie Hudson's account did not illustrate a valid depiction of her experience as a slave because it was an interview. Not only was it an interview, but also it was interview conducted by someone who was white during a time in which black people were limited to freedom of speech. Besides that fact that Hudson was conditioned or influenced to speak highly of her masters, Hudson's interview was edited extensively; thus contributing to the notion that her testimony was tainted. By and far, it is fair to say that the only way to secure a valid depiction of a slave's experience is by referring to a slave narrative written by the slave themselves, like Frederick Douglass'. Compared to an interview, a narrative is inspired by the writer and not

³² Roll Jordan Roll and Slavery in the South

³³ Douglass, Frederick. **Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass**. Boston and New York, Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1993. Page 50

prompted by an interviewer. Additionally, there is no pressure to conform out of fear neither is there any consequences of speaking one's mind. Most importantly, as witnessed in Douglass' account as opposed to Hudson's, a narrative is more inclined to confirm what the traditional texts tell us about history. Although, Carrie Hudson's interview is categorized as a slave account, it is not a complete account because it is limited to the time period, inferiority to her interviewer, massive editing, and inconsistency with history.