PANGAEA

The Dalhousie Undergraduate History Journal 2021

PANGAEA

The Dalhousie Undergraduate History Journal

2021

Pangaea

Editors
Takdeer Brar
Hannah Wygiera

Editorial Board
Isabel Brechin
Catherine Charlton
Natasha Danais
Alex Kennedy
Adam MacLaren
Georgia Simon
Matthew Zolkivski

Faculty Advisor
Christopher M. Bell

Copy Editor
Adam MacLaren

Production Manager
Isabel Brechin

Special Thanks
The Dalhousie History Department
The Dalhousie Undergraduate History Society

Editor's Introduction

We are so pleased to present the 2021 edition of *Pangaea*! It has been a strange year, with the Covid-19 pandemic and school being entirely online. Many students were scattered across the country and even the world. Even in such 'unprecedented times,' this journal has been put together to present the research and writing of undergraduate students in Dalhousie's History Department. *Pangaea* showcases the various interests, topics, and periods that are studied in the History Department. It also presents the exceptional papers written by our fellow students, with the hope of inspiring future students to continue pursuing historical research.

When we started advertising for papers, we did not anticipate the record number of submissions we would receive. They explored a large variety of historical research and we believe the submissions included this year reflect the diversity of research in the department. Every paper submitted was unique and informative, but unfortunately, we could not include them all. We believed the papers that are presented in this journal represent the skills and diversity of research of undergraduate students as best as possible.

Pangaea 2021 also includes reflections from this year's honours students. The History Department's honours program gives senior level undergraduate students the opportunity to pick a topic that interests them and explore it in depth. Under the supervision of an advisor familiar with their topic, honours students research and write a large thesis. This is a challenging program in a normal year, but the added pandemic aspect made it even more difficult. These students spent the year writing large research papers, overcoming additional challenges such as the lack of e-books or just good old procrastination magnified by sitting in the same spot all day, to create extraordinary projects. Each honours student had diverse interests, making this year's honours theses incredibly interesting. We cannot include each thesis in the journal, but we can allow the honours students to present a brief summary and reflect on their experiences in the honours program. We hope these reflections will inspire future students to apply to the honours program.

Although this year was challenging, *Pangaea* 2021 demonstrates the strength and resilience of the History Department. We have identified an unofficial theme of resistance in each submission. We hope that readers will recognize that throughout history, challenges have arisen, and yet humans have continued to rise above them. This has been a historic year, and we are so proud of every student for getting through it. We hope you enjoy reading *Pangaea* 2021!

Hannah Wygiera and Takdeer Brar

Contents

Reflections on Writing an Honours Thesis

Takdeer Brar

As my time at Dalhousie University comes to an end, it's with great pleasure that I have the opportunity to reflect and express my gratitude over these past years. My path to the honours seminar has been unconventional in every way. I finished my first semester with a 1.67 GPA, and the most recent a 3.80. I was placed on academic dismissal three times before my sister (Dimpee Brar) saved my life. Words will never be able to do justice for the impact she has on my life. Dalhousie University has given me the opportunity to learn from my failures and rebuild myself. As I reflect back, I would extend my personal gratitude to Mrs. Dimpee Brar, Dr. David Matthias, Mrs. Carla Britten, Dr. Marcella Firmini, and Dr. Justin Roberts. The aforementioned individuals are but a few who inspired and guided me to this point in my life and academic career. Without their belief, support, and encouragement, I would never have gotten to this point. In this process of rebuilding, I was able to discover the political foundations of the United States.

In so doing, I gained an appreciation and understanding of the impact that the United States of America has on history. The United States of America is the longest-surviving democratic republic in the history of mankind, a history that is dominant with dictatorships and tyrannies which prey on individuals. Even ancient democracies and republics were unsustainable and quickly degenerated into the regimes mentioned earlier. However, the United States of America remains an anomaly of an experiment where individuals—not groups—rule under the laws they consent to creating. The Founding Fathers' view of the United States of America was pragmatic. The Founders were aware of and accounted for the good and evils of human nature. For the Founders, history has shown that we are not gods or beasts, but we can be either. What makes the United States of America so great is that they're pragmatic.

We are neither beasts as Thomas Hobbes conceives or gods like Karl Marx's believes. The Founding Fathers were well aware of the goods and evils of human nature. As such, the Declaration of Independence in 1776 constructs a government that works with human nature rather than against it. A close analysis of the Declaration reveals a universal declaration of human rights based on the

law of nature. According to Thomas Jefferson, since all men are created equal, the government is only constituted by individuals to protect their life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As such, Jefferson purposefully limits the ends of government as "happiness and security" in securing these natural rights. In so doing, Jefferson sets forth a federal limited-mixed regime with a separation of co-equal branches—executive, judicial, legislative—that check and balance each other. Under the Declaration, political power flowing from the "consent"—voting—of individuals must be separated and continuously checked by government institutions to avoid "political slavery," which George III and Great Britain's parliament imposed on the American colonists by concentrating the powers of all three branches of government within themselves. Ultimately, the first form of the U.S. government under the Articles of Confederation 1777 failed as they did not follow the Declarations outlines for the government.

The American Founding Fathers quickly realized the shortcomings of the U.S. government under the Articles of Confederation (AOC). Accordingly, in fear of political slavery by a tyrant or a group of individuals, political power was delegated entirely to states. By doing so, the federal government was only a deliberative forum in which states sent representatives to discuss issues. To such an extent was the federal government hampered that they could only "declare war" while the states retained economic, foreign policy, security, and political jurisdiction. The failures of the AOC were quickly apparent once the American Revolution was over in 1783 with the signing of the Paris peace treaty. The consequence of the accumulation of debt from the revolutionary war would see the country on the brink of civil war. First, state legislatures began circumventing the federal government by issuing local currencies to pay back their share of war debt. Second, civil rebellion erupted in Massachusetts, known as "Shay's Rebellion," led by ex-revolutionary war veterans over the Federal government imposing taxation. In response, the Federal government was unable to raise an army to put down the rebellion. They had to hire Massachusetts mercenaries as the state's had the power to levy an army. To their astonishment, the Founding Fathers understood that a new constitution founded on the Declaration must replace the Articles of Confederation. If not, the Founders wrote, their experiment where laws are king would collapse into a civil war.

Thus, in response to the failures of the Articles of Confederation, the Founding Fathers met in 1787 at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to form a new constitution. Accordingly, the middle section of the Declaration of Independence (DOI) outlines the U.S. Constitution of 1787. Specifically, the

middle section of the DOI lays out its charges against George III and the British Parliament for concentrating all three branches within themselves—executive, legislative, judicial. They argue that all three branches must remain separate as only God can be the judge, juror, and executioner. As man is not god, the three branches must be equal, separated, and continuously check each other to avoid tyranny—a concentration of political power. As such, the U.S. Constitution adopted measures such as a federal system, bi-cameral legislature, and separation of checks and balances. Indeed, the U.S. Constitution's articles I-III outline each branch—legislative, judicial, and executive role and powers. Furthermore, under the U.S. Constitution, the political power which derives itself from citizens is continuously separated and checked through the measures above to avoid a concentration of power. Ultimately, the Declaration and U.S. Constitution favor a limited government to prevent dangers of tyranny against the citizens.

However, progressivism's rejection of the interpretation, as mentioned earlier, of the Declaration and U.S. Constitution, is now dominant with politicians and academics. According to progressives, they reject the Declaration and U.S. Constitution principles in favor of a living interpretation. For progressives, individuals and governments have progressed past the Founding Fathers' fears. This living interpretation of the Declaration and U.S. Constitution argues for direct democracy and enlargement of government in welfare policies. Progressives call for the removal of various institutional checks enumerated in the Declaration and U.S. Constitution.

On the other hand, the problem with this historicism of the progressive's is simple. If ideas are limited to the age at which they are invented, then the methods and conclusions we apply today are likewise not to be relevant tomorrow. Our methods are therefore limited. Therefore, it remains extraordinarily difficult to apply today's understanding to yesterday. Ultimately, this narrative in rejecting the Declaration and U.S. Constitution for a limited government has become the dominant danger in the U.S.

It is in direct response to the progressive's attack on the American Founding that my thesis sets forth to refute. By re-examining the Founding Fathers' construction of the U.S.A. government between 1776 to 1789, we can understand the reasons why government and individual powers are limited. Moreover, we can also refute the progressive narratives of reforming, enacting direct democracy, and expanding government. For example, Elizabeth Warren, President Joe Biden, President Barack Obama, and former Secretary of State Hilary Clinton all argue for abolishing

checks in the U.S. Constitution of 1787. Most common is the mainstream media's argument for the abolition of the "electoral college." By going back to the American Founding, we can understand the reasons why the Founders set forth the U.S. Constitution upon the Declaration of Independence. The Founders were explicit in their writings that the Founding documents—Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution—are universally applicable in the fight against the tyranny of the individual or government.

Isabel Brechin

My name is Isabel Brechin, and I am currently finishing up my honours undergraduate degree in History here at Dal. This time a few years ago, I definitely didn't think it would happen. Throughout my undergrad, which began in 2017, I have been balancing school with part time work, and taking fewer courses as a result. My intention has always been to finish my undergrad slowly, (hopefully with less debt than I otherwise would have). This time last year (March 2020) I was in Glasgow, Scotland on a study exchange at the university of Glasgow. My family history is Scottish, and I had always wanted to live there for a period. This seemed like the perfect opportunity. Little did I know that the pandemic was about to hit, and that I would be heading home on an emergency flight six weeks into my placement. While the rapid change was disappointing, I consider myself lucky that I was able to go home so quickly, and that my family and I remained safe, and have been since. I like to think the pandemic brought me new opportunities. One was that, as I was working from home this spring and summer, I had the opportunity to take some credits at the same time! This means that I am, surprisingly, going to graduate from my undergrad this spring.

The pandemic also fanned the flames of my desire to study the history of women in agriculture. I have worked on a women's and non-binary led organic farm since I was 18 and have long been passionate about the essential role that women have always played in agriculture. It seems to me that women taking on powerful roles in the feeding of their families and in the commerce of food is one of the few historical universals. Women have always been prominently involved in agriculture. It is only recently in western history, that men have come to dominate the agricultural sector. The cultural assumption in the west seems to be that women and non-binary led farms are not the norm. When we picture a farmer today, it is safe to say we don't picture a woman at the helm of the tractor. Nonetheless, even in our patriarchal society, women still make up 28.7 of agricultural landowners in Canada, and this number is rising.

As a result of my work, ecofeminism has always held a particular draw for me. Throughout my undergraduate it has been difficult to find courses that integrate my interest in the history of women and gender and environmental history. I have also been focused throughout my undergrad on taking a wide variety of history courses, especially ones that study history outside of Europe, making the likelihood of the course content being gender and women oriented even slimmer. Upon taking my first course with Dr. Krista Kesselring, called "Sex and Gender in Pre-Modern Europe,"

my interest in gender and women's history in Europe was reinvigorated. The structure of the course was incredibly well organised, and the learning environment was outstanding. I knew very early on that if I could complete an undergraduate thesis, it was Professor Kesselring who I would like to guide me!

The thesis process has been a challenging but rewarding opportunity. Having never written anything of this length before this year, I was quite daunted. While I was sure that I wanted to study women in agriculture, especially poor women, in some capacity, I was unsure what I wanted to study specifically. Not only that, but I had no frame of reference for what an undergraduate thesis could be. Luckily, with excellent guidance from Professor Kesselring, I stumbled across some calls from earlier agricultural historians of Early Modern English gender and women's history for further study of dairy women in Early Modern England. I quickly realised how understudied these women were and launched wholeheartedly into the research process. Eventually, I came up with a thesis which focused on continuities and change in dairy women's lives in Early Modern England prior to and in the early stages of the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions. Dairy is a special space in the study of agricultural history as a space that has traditionally been dominated by women. It is a space where generational knowledge about economics and skills of the trade, have passed from mother to daughter over generations.

My thesis found that women held significant power as commercial and small household-producers of dairy products. Before the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions their knowledge and expertise were culturally and socially recognized and praised. They had deep networks of trade, traditional practices in the ways they worked, and many women found significant wealth, an aspect of dairying on which my thesis focuses significantly, through a transcription and analysis of a postmortem inventory. As enclosure deepened and industries changed, they were slowly but surely displaced from dairying. However, they demonstrated their power by actively resisting these changes. They did not make it easy for scientific and agricultural thinkers to make their arguments!

The process taught me a lot about how historians do research, as well as boosted my writing skills immensely. Though it may sound silly, I think that, partially out of necessity, I developed a better ability to focus for long periods of time throughout this process. This skill mostly came with a transcription I completed of an Early Modern woman's post-mortem inventory. This is a unique opportunity that I would never have had if I had not done a thesis. The work of palaeography was a challenge for me, both in my ability to budget my time and to focus and learn the intricacies of

Early Modern handwriting. The other hardest part of the thesis process for me was simply to start writing, and to continue writing consistently for a few months. One part of the process that was absolutely necessary for me was due dates, and multiple ones. I know that without a due date for each chapter, getting myself rolling would be quite difficult. These due dates kept me motivated and kept me writing and revising.

Another unique thing that comes with the thesis process is the opportunity to receive feedback from a professor and to take the corrections and resubmit. Unlike most classes, whereby the time you receive feedback you are usually moving on to a different project or a different class entirely, you have the opportunity to receive feedback, discuss it with your professor and resubmit, many times (depending on your professor's patience level, of course!). Our other required thesis course opened my mind to other ways of doing history and ensured that I was reflecting on my process and my intentions throughout the year.

Especially because there will not be a formal graduation ceremony, having a completed thesis feels like a tangible accomplishment, a marker of the work that I have put in over the last four years. I am forever grateful to my incredible advisor, to my peers in my honours class, and to my friends and family for supporting me through the process. To readers who are considering writing a thesis, my advice is to go for it! I think that taking honours has helped me in my other classes as well by encouraging better time management and better and more efficient research and writing skills. Not only that, but if you can write a thesis, you'll know that you can tackle whatever comes next after undergrad.

Catherine Charlton

If you had asked me on the last day of grade twelve where I pictured myself being in four years, I would have very comfortably answered that I would be graduating Dalhousie with a major in biology, ready to embark on a master's degree in audiology. It was a very good plan. I can just as comfortably say, however—with the wisdom of retrospect—that it was the wrong one. The beginnings of this realization probably occurred when I decided to attend the University of King's College for its liberal arts Foundation Year Program, though I still enrolled in the program as a science student. The feeling intensified, I remember, during my very first "Intro Biology" class, when I suddenly discovered that the intricacies of cell life held absolutely no charms for me. Three weeks later I found myself browsing Dalhousie's Academic Timetable, trying to drum up a shred of interest for upper-year biology courses with such scintillating names as "Microbial Eukaryotes" and "Diversity of Algae." I decided to have a peek at the history courses—not to *take* them, mind you, just to *look* at them. Two days later I was standing in the registrar's office at King's, rather sheepishly inquiring about the procedure for switching one's program. Four years later I am still content with this decision, and am all set to graduate with an honours in history and a minor in English. Let's just call it the scenic route.

For all its twists and turns, this route ultimately led to my decision to pursue an honours degree, and last September I logged onto Brightspace to begin Dr. Bell's honours course. Here, I had the opportunity to learn about subjects I had never studied, to further my understanding of more familiar topics, and to have my thoughts enriched and challenged in many helpful ways. As this class was one of only a few synchronous classes I had this year, it was a lovely opportunity to get to know my classmates as more than simply names on a discussion board, and I am grateful to them for helping to make this class such an informative and enjoyable undertaking. I am thankful, too, for the opportunity that writing the honours thesis has given me to focus my attention on a question that has interested me for some time now, namely, how did the Second World War impact student life at Dalhousie University?

Educational institutions have historically been tested and refined by global struggles, and my thesis describes how Dalhousie faced the challenge of the Second World War. To do this, I relied greatly on a fascinating primary source, the Dalhousie *Gazette*, a student newspaper published twenty times per schoolyear. My thesis organizes the wartime period into three sections.

I argue that the first schoolyear of war was essentially a year of grace, a year which eased students into the reality of wartime student life while not materially affecting or greatly restricting elements of university life. I present Dalhousie students as looking to the past war, the present war, and the post-war world in attempts to navigate their situation and argue that the developments of this year laid the practical and ideological foundations for the remainder of the war. I then consider the next two-and-a-half schoolyears of war, October 1940 to December 1942. I contend that these were the years in which the war really 'came home' to Dalhousie students, most significantly due to the demands of compulsory military training and the first instances of wartime student death. I situate the student experience in these years as one of acclimation to militarization, a militarization not only of the university but also of Halifax. Students during these years, I argue, increasingly questioned the implications of this militarization. In addition, students were encouraged by both university faculty and their peers not to forget the broader needs of a wartime world in their preoccupation with their own difficulties. Finally, I consider the last two-and-a-half schoolyears of war, January 1943 to March 1945, arguing that the primary concern during this period was to guard against complacency. Students for whom the war had become routine were urged not to let this normalization become complacency, particularly in relation to their geographical, institutional, or post-war situation.

Overall, I argue that Dalhousie students during the Second World War navigated issues of comprehensive security. By this, I mean that students perceived wartime threats to security not just in practical terms (such as fear of an invasion of Halifax), but also in less tangible arenas, such as threats to the ideological security of universities and to freedom of expression. Moreover, I argue that the wartime years were the end of an era at Dalhousie. They were the last years of Dalhousie's small-school collegiate atmosphere, which the influx of veterans in 1945-46 effectively ended. This was also a time of endings and beginnings, such as the resignation of Dalhousie's president in the last wartime schoolyear and the modernization of the *Gazette* soon after the war's culmination. Overall, the wartime years tell a story of resiliency, adaptation, and transformation.

What I appreciated most when researching my thesis was the opportunity to read so many issues of the Dalhousie *Gazette*. I quickly realized that student newspapers during this time are incredibly interesting reads. I got to know the students who appeared often in the *Gazettes*, and after a year of online classes I feel that I know more about many of these Dalhousie students from

the 1940s than I do about my own classmates. I also appreciated the ever-present humour of the *Gazettes* and am delighted with the plethora of jokes I have learned during my research, which proves that these papers still accomplish their self-stated goal of being both enlightening and entertaining. I was also very pleased to have the opportunity to read a *Gazette* in person when the staff at the Dalhousie Archives helpfully let me see a copy.

I tried to capitalize on my location in Halifax to learn about Dalhousie's history through experience. Whenever I was at the University of King's College, I pictured the campus during its wartime stint as HMCS *Kings* and mentally filled it with naval officers-in-training. After reading a particularly interesting book review in the *Gazette* I tracked down the book in question and read it myself. Visiting the Maritime Museum of the Atlantic, I walked through the Navy Gallery and thought of the many Dalhousie students who had served in this branch of the services, and later that week I went to the Halifax Memorial in Point Pleasant Park and found the names of those who were lost at sea. An employee at Dalhousie's Studley gymnasium gave me a tour of the building where the Dalhousie students in the Canadian Officers' Training Corps had spent so much time drilling, and an equally kind staff member at the Westin Nova Scotian (formerly the Nova Scotian Hotel) showed me the hotel's ballroom, where so many Dalhousie dances were held during the war. Finally, after reading exactly ninety *Gazette* advertisements which promised me that a life unsurpassed in perfection would result if I only indulged in a certain drink, I celebrated the conclusion of my thesis research with a bottle of Coca-Cola.

It has been a wonderful year, and the honours course and honours thesis have improved my thinking and writing in so many ways. I am especially grateful to Dr. Bannister for his exceptional guidance throughout this process, and to Dr. Crooks, for being my second reader and for recommending Dr. Bannister as a supervisor in the first place. I am also thankful every day for my family, who have graciously put up with me peppering my conversations with *Gazette* quotes for the past six months. Finally, it has been a privilege to experience the honours course under Dr. Bell's capable and inspiring direction, and to learn from the many insights of my classmates. My very best wishes to you all.

Natasha Danais

For me, the whole process of writing my honours dissertation has been a daunting and exhausting task.

When I learned that I had to write something about how my final year as a university student in the honours history program, I rolled my eyes a little. What do I have to say about my experience that has not already been said? Hundreds of students before me have written something like this, and hundreds more will have to write something like this. I've always been aware of my lack of originality and this has been with me throughout my degree.

What I know that I should write for this reflection piece is that I am currently a fourth-year student who is majoring in history and doing a minor in French. My dissertation topic is the Manitoba School Question. I chose this since I wanted to write about Canada's colonial history. However, I am aware of being white and therefore a product of colonization, so I chose something that was related to me and my family's history. I'm from Winnipeg and went to French public school until grade 9. All throughout my time attending a French school, I was taught, in the broadest terms, that learning in French was a privilege my family and community had fought for. I had not really given it more thought until I was faced with choosing a topic for a 100-page-long paper.

While doing research for my dissertation, I learned that at the time of Manitoba's entrance into Canadian Confederation, Manitoba was seen to be a second Québec. The French-Catholic community represented approximately half of the population. However, the ethnic demographics changed so quickly that by 1890, the French population was a shadow of what it had been. The massive influx of settlers from Ontario (who were mostly Anglo-Protestant), and the resulting changes in legislature led to changes to the public education system. Although there were clauses in both the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act to protect minority language and religious rights, Manitoba's legislative assembly ignored these clauses and abolished public French-Catholic education.

There were a few court cases following the abolition of public French-Catholic schools. After a few years of legal battles, and a country-wide debate about whether the federal government could and should intervene, the newly elected federal government with Wilfred Laurier as its head struck a deal with Manitoba's Premier, Thomas Greenway. The resulting compromise established

a bilingual school system that permitted education in other languages and in other religions if there were enough students to justify it.

As the provincial demographics changed, in 1916, the province successfully managed to abolish all non-English public education. This is the part of the Manitoba School Question that really interested me since the French-Catholic community came together and organized themselves in order to illegally teach French. Teachers had to hide French textbooks and look out for school inspectors in order not to lose their job. They also created administrative and community organizations that would promote the placement of French-Catholic teachers in their own French communities. The French-Catholic community's organized resistance is what impressed me so much and still makes me so proud to be Franco-Manitoban.

Even though I've now spent countless hours writing and reading about the Manitoba School Question, I do not know who will read, appreciate, or even know about this paper. I do not know if I have contributed any significant work to this very specific part of Canadian history. I guess these are all thoughts that university students encounter when faced with completing a project that has consumed their thoughts for a whole year. Throughout the whole process, I kept asking myself: what's the point? And although I did learn a lot, grew as a person, and have completed the single, most difficult project I've ever attempted; I only did it because I am entertaining the idea of going to grad school. I do not think this is a good enough reason to have committed a whole year to an ambition I'm not committed to. I think the amount of work I've had to do is not justified when contemplating a 'maybe'.

Additional to the difficulties of writing an honours dissertation, the difficulties of doing this in the middle of a pandemic greatly exacerbated the stress and isolation I believe I would have felt if I had written this during a 'normal' academic year. This year has been exhausting. As a student and just as a person. The pandemic has been exhausting and working from home has been exhausting. I suspect that my self-criticism and feeling of inadequacy has been made worse due to the pandemic.

Since I'm technically a student at Kings, and not Dalhousie, I always compare difficult things to the Foundation Year Program at Kings. The year that I did FYP was one of the hardest years of my life. I always think that if something isn't as difficult as FYP, it's not that bad. Now I'm not sure what was more difficult; FYP or this. Perhaps I'm hypercritical of myself, my productivity, and my coping mechanisms since I am about to graduate. I am writing this blurb

while I still have a couple of weeks left of my undergrad and of writing for my dissertation. The feeling of hopelessness and uncertainty is heightened by the prospect of my graduation during a recession. I have no concrete plans for the future and feel lost. My experience while writing my dissertation has been punctuated by the different layers of uncertainty. The natural next step for honours students is graduate school. This seems like the only logical step for my future, but I am not yet ready to commit to a couple more years immersed in academics. I feel lost.

If I were to disregard all the stress and anxiety that I've felt over the course of this year, I could say that this has been generally pleasant. My supervisor has been supportive and encouraging. I've been able to find enough literature on my topic in order to complete my dissertation. I have learned so many interesting things in class due to the guest lecturers of the seminar classes. But if I knew how difficult this was going to be and if I could visualize a professional future outside of academics, I probably would not have done this. Especially not in the middle of a pandemic. I am proud of myself and I know that I have learned lots of skills that I can take with me to the next project. I am excited to hold a complete, printed and bound copy of my dissertation. I think ensuring that I can physically see and feel the product of this year will help.

I am excited to complete and submit my final and completed dissertation. Not only that, but I am excited to have guiltless leisure time.

Alex Kennedy

Hello! My name is Alex Kennedy, and I am currently completing my Bachelor of Arts, with an Honours in History and a minor in Political Science. I started studying at Dalhousie in 2016, and I am hopeful that I will be continuing to do so, except this time working towards a master's degree in history.

To me, working on an honours thesis was the last step of an incredible journey. History has always been my interest of choice since I was a child and having the chance to study in depth an area of my choice seemed like a fitting way to end my undergraduate work. I've studied many areas of history during my time at Dalhousie, from the ancient Greeks to the considerably more recent Apartheid regime in South Africa and regretted none of it. Despite that, the chance to specialize in an area before moving towards a master's degree was one I jumped at.

I chose to specialize in the study of discipline and punishment the British Royal Navy during the Golden Age of Sail (generally regarded as the 19th century, though my specific interest was from 1750 to 1850), as my interest had been sparked by previous classes on maritime history and my own British heritage. Obviously, my first order of business was to find a slightly slimmer topic to focus on, as I had selected a very broad subject. I eventually chose to focus on courts martial during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, as I had been inspired by a book focused on that topic, *Naval Courts Martial, 1793–1815*, by Dr. John Byrn. I was specifically interested in the variables that could be found within courts martial, such as how rank could affect the verdict or how marines within the Navy were treated differently from ordinary seamen, and the purpose of my honours thesis became finding the key variables that could influence the process and outcome of a court martial, as well as drawing links between the variables.

Writing an honours thesis is certainly a challenge, but one that I think is well worth doing. My focus on the British Royal Navy led to me discovering a great deal that is seemingly unrelated to my main thesis, but that I was able to incorporate and that actually strengthened my main argument, with the tensions between the British and Irish being a good example of this. Furthermore, my focus on courts martial included topics such as drunkenness and sexual crimes, which reveal a great deal about contemporary attitude among the British. Furthermore, by focusing on a thesis essay, I found my writing skills vastly improving. At one point, my supervisor had me go back and fix several mistakes with citing that I had been unknowingly making. While somewhat

tedious, I am very glad he did, as it ensured that I would not make those same mistakes again and reminded me to pay attention to similar matters in the future. In other matters as well, however, I have seen a noticeable improvement in my writing style through working on the honours thesis.

For me, one of the greatest challenges throughout the process was finding suitable secondary literature sources. Part of that was due to my reliance on primary source material for examining courts martial record. However, my work on the honours thesis did lead to me discovering new methods and strategies of finding secondary literature, which was incredibly helpful and will serve me in good stead as I go on to do a masters in history. On a similar note, my organizational skills also saw major improvement, as I ended up keeping a separate document that listed all of the various sources I was using, as well as roughly planning out all of my chapters before writing them.

My time management skills have also seen significant development during my time working on the honours thesis, as I will readily admit to being somewhat of a procrastinator. On projects like this one, however, even I realized the necessity of setting deadlines for myself and meeting them. I actually finished writing a solid honours thesis several weeks before it was due, although I am continuing to add to it and fix problems where I find them even now. I tried to average a chapter a month, although given that my second chapter was by far the longest, it ended up taking a little longer than I had hoped. Trying to plan out the deadlines was one of my greatest challenges when working on my honours thesis, and I am incredibly grateful for the guidance that my supervisor offered me in this respect, as it enabled me to finish my first completed draft just under a month in advance of when the honours thesis is required to be submitted to my supervisor and second reader for feedback, giving me ample time to polish the essay and continue to add more literature. Regardless of how early I finished, I cannot deny that the necessity for good time management meant that I ended up developing time management skills in order to meet the requirements of the honours essay.

I'd like to finish by offering a few words of advice for anyone thinking about joining the honours program. I honestly cannot recommend it enough. I found it was an incredibly helpful process in general, and listening to the various professors who came in to speak to our class was one of the most enjoyable parts of my academic career. To anyone thinking of joining, however, perhaps the most important piece of advice I can offer you is to find a good supervisor with whom you can work well and who knows your topic. I was incredibly lucky to have Dr. Jerry Bannister

offer to work as my supervisor, and I am beyond grateful for all the help he offered me. Without him, this process would have been far more confusing than it was, and his feedback was invaluable to my work. Dr. Bannister also knew my topic extremely well (in fact, his classes were what sparked my interest in naval history), making working with him a highly enjoyable and helpful experience. Furthermore, I cannot overstate the importance of planning when it comes to your honours thesis. One of the most helpful things for me when writing the honours thesis was that I always had a fairly detailed idea of what I wanted to work on, when I wanted it finished, and the sources that I wanted to incorporate. Obviously, this is subject to some amendment. I ended up cutting off a section of my final chapter, where I had wanted to talk about discrimination against foreign Europeans within the Navy, as I could not find enough sources to make it a viable topic. Despite that, having my essay planned with rough estimates of deadlines probably saved me weeks of time. Furthermore, although it did not happen to me, looking back, it would have been very easy to fall behind when working on the essay. Deadlines are key to avoiding that. Finally, although it is somewhat incongruous with my previous remarks, taking breaks while working on your honours thesis is highly important. Sometimes, its best to just step away and think over what you want to say, rather than stress yourself out over the thesis. Speaking as someone who has experienced it while working on my honours thesis, burning out is to be avoided. Sometimes you do need to work long hours to meet deadlines, but when possible, it is better to work for shorter periods and take frequent breaks. Its far more efficient in the long run, and you are more likely to enjoy writing your honours thesis if you aren't marathoning it for days on end.

I'll end my reflections here with a few words of gratitude. First of all, I need to thank Dr. Jerry Bannister, as without him, this process would have been far more painful than it was. I honestly could not have asked for a better supervisor. Thank you so much for everything. In addition, Dr. Chris Bell deserves applause, for he made the honours program work even despite the conditions that COVID imposed on us. Furthermore, I need to extend a personal thanks for the advice he offered during our classes discussing our honours theses, agreeing to be my second reader, and for authoring a fascinating book with close ties to my topic. I also think I speak for the entire honours class when I thank all the professors who spoke to us, as your talks were fascinating. A special thank you to Dr. Ajay Parasram, who actually inspired (and suggested a few sources for) one of my chapters when he discussed our honours theses with our class. And finally, I need to

thank the fellow members of my honours class. You guys are great, and I enjoyed working alongside all of you

      To anyone who is thinking of taking the honours class, I strongly urge you to do so. It was one of the best experiences of my life, and while it was difficult at times, I don't regret a single moment. If you decide to do so, I wish you the best of luck! I promise you, its worth doing.

Adam Maclaren

Not quite a year ago, I had a conversation with my manager at work about a tax put on bread in Ireland. All bread used by the chain Subway fell into the Irish import tax category of cakes and confectionaries, rather than bread, because of the tremendous amount of sugar used in its production. This was incredibly hilarious to me because of the irony, but also incredibly telling. Why do we use so much sugar to make bread these days? When and why did this happen?

I have always been obsessed with food; I have always loved to cook, I have worked and learned in a kitchen throughout my time at university, and above all else, I love to eat.

Following three years of history at Dal, I had become increasingly curious and aware of what the story behind an object, be it material or representative, can tell about us. Foods hold so many past ideas and actions, from throughout the whole of our human existence, just beyond the surface. Individually, locally, and globally, food informs both the lines between cultures and the vast, remarkable overlap across them which maps fail to show. Thus, the history of food is one of the more diverse and insightful ways by which we may discover the past - and what it continues to say about us and Irish Subway franchises.

I am a tea-drinker; I drink about one or two cups a day, every day - but why? I know that tea comes from China, but I have never been there. I have seen plenty of cows and ears of corn, but never a tea-tree or a sugarcane. Why is it then, that even when my budget is at its tightest, I can always afford my tea and sugar?

For my thesis, I decided to investigate. Through research and over time, I discovered that just behind the story of tea and sugar (and the reason for my own habit), were the histories of great changes happening to the world at the time - changes that have influenced our societies today greatly.

It is difficult for us now to imagine a world without sugar; we expect it to be both easily available, but also present in far more foods than ever before. Prior to the Middle Ages, for example, sugar had been available only to the most wealthy. Should I had lived then, I likely never would have heard of it, let alone tasted it. It is difficult to find something without sugar today; in fact, an entire industry of 'sugar-free' foods and artificial sweeteners have been developed as sugar's antithesis. There are no 'carrot-free' soft drinks, nor any synthetic rutabaga.

Some of my earliest memories revolve around the incredibly delicious (and unbelievably sweet) tea served to me by my Grandmother when I was just a bean sprout. But those outside of eastern Asia had little-to-no idea that tea existed prior to the late-sixteenth century! How did this all change within a couple centuries, when it had been so unchanged for millennia.

I have studied the early modern period in England for the subject of my paper. This time and place saw the developments of global networks of trade, shifting prevalence of various economic theories, changing expectations of the individual in society - and above all else, the common choice of drink. Sugar and tea had been changed from rarity and novelty to cultural symbols in very little time.

Throughout the project, I discovered several unexpected elements common to the rise of tea and sugar. Firstly, I learned that both tea and sugar became very important to the English state. At this time, wealth was becoming increasingly equated with power for states, so the perpetuation of growth for tea and sugar in England was encouraged - often forceful, often self-serving. The problem of undue corporate or industrial influence in the process of politics is heavily debated today, and the study of how the commercial and political worlds became so entangled can be analyzed, critiqued, and understood through the history of tea and sugar. The debate over what rate to tax a certain bread, for example, can at least be partially explained.

Secondly, the history of tea and sugar greatly informs about how we as a society act about food. Prior to the early modern era, what we ate was generally what we could grow around us. Sure, some could afford to purchase a rare food or good from a bordering region or country, but that was the exception. Largely because of how the tea and sugar industries developed, we recognized just how profitable it could be to broaden our palates. Whereas the desire to purchase and consume a new food was initially just another way for the wealthy to assert their status, the financial gain had by those involved in the tea and sugar trades soon outgrew the market of the few to seek out the market of all. This brought tea to these people, but also a place for the common individual at the table of commerce as well.

Thirdly, I learned just how far people are willing to go to acquire these goods. At this time, England began to desire conquering and exploiting thousands in order to perpetuate their taste for foreign foods and the wealth derived from them - tea and sugar being the example here. In order to have sugar, they built sugar plantations in the Americas worked by brutally exploited unfree labour. They went to cruel lengths to acquire and subjugate parts of India and China in order to

secure lines of trade for tea. We must not forget the sometimes violent, often brutal means taken by this society in order to satisfy the expectations we carry today, so that we may avoid the consequences of their greed again.

Lastly, tea and sugar have influenced our lives as individuals. Clearly, they have become common parts of the diet of many more people than before the early modern period. Beyond what we eat, however, they have also influenced when and why we eat. For example, the workday now usually includes several breaks oriented over a good that was introduced in the early modern period; tea breaks, coffee breaks, or cigarette breaks all divide the day for most of those employed. As these goods were being introduced, the way we work did too, and the ability of letting a worker enjoy a (caffeine and calorie dense) cup of tea helped to prepare English society for the labour demands of the Industrial Revolution.

Throughout the thesis process, as I learned more and more of the grand and lasting scale of the causes and consequences of the history of tea and sugar, I still had one in the morning. I had another halfway through work. I had one to keep me alert while formatting my thesis' footnotes. The study of food history uniquely enables us to look at such informative changes across centuries, continents and cultures, all while keeping us grounded in our own worlds. There is something beautiful in the study of a shared humanity granted by the global consensus that chocolate is wonderful, for example, as opposed to doing the history that solely concentrates upon our more hateful and ugly natures.

While my thesis was limited to a specific place, and bound by a specific time, the insightfulness and multifacetedness of our food cultures and their histories reveals the best that history has to offer. It offers consensus and appreciation without foregoing distinctivity. It offers insights into what we like and demand as individuals and as societies. It demonstrates the limitlessness of ends we take to appease our appetites- for good or for ill. Above all else, through careful and extensive reflection, it holds all of these insights in harmony, all in a teacup.

Georgia Simon

Hello, I'm Georgia and unlike some I did not start my University journey at Dalhousie. For my first year I studied at Acadia University and although I met many amazing people there, I was ultimately unsatisfied with my options and made the decision to transfer. I am glad I did because I don't think I would have the same thesis topic if I hadn't. Initially, I was not that interested in Russian history. Like many, my perception was influenced by the upmost basic comprehension we tend to get in high school. It was only when I learnt the details and history from below that I became very invested in the subject, especially the intellectual and literary history.

From this, I learnt that people of the past are much more complicated than simply being 'fearful' or 'brainwashed' and I became very interested in the human experiences of the Soviet Union. How did people experience this era in history? Unlike in high school, university gave me the knowledge and know-how to read primary sources. Memoirs and diaries interested me, learning what life was like in a place and time I had never been and could not comprehend encouraged me to learn more about what life was like for the ordinary person. Of course, this changes depending on the decade in Soviet history. Ordinary life during WWII was not necessarily the same in the 1980's. This is where my thesis topic developed. In the 1930's Stalinist era state violence was frequent, shaping and dismantling the lives of millions. When you read the memoirs of these people who witnessed the whole ordeal, you begin to wonder how they made sense of it as it occurred. How has historical memory changed? In contemporary western society memory changes and develops all the time, but what about in an authoritarian regime? In 1956, Nikita Khrushchev delivered the Secret Speech, essentially denouncing Stalin, signalling a period of relaxed censorship. The Thaw, named after Ilya Ehrenburg's book by the same name, allowed public discourse to open. What now? Beginning in the 1940's millions of Gulag survivors poured back into society with voices and stories to tell. How under such historical circumstance do people remember the past? Now memoirs and literature began to be published in the Soviet Union and abroad. Underground journals allowed the illicit distribution of unpublished works. In this regard, Russian poet Anna Akhmatova once said, "two Russians will look each other in the eye: the one that sent these people to the camps and the one that came back".[1] This is the basis for my thesis. I

---

[1] Orlando Figes, *The Whisperers: Private Life in Stalin's Russia* (New York: Picador, 2008), 583.

aim to track the memory of Stalinist-era state violence that peaked in 1937, by observing diaries, memoirs, and literature from the Great Terror to the Thaw.

Researching my thesis has taught me to reconsider how I define and think about certain topics. For instance, what does resistance look like in the Soviet Union? In the traditional sense resistance can be described by protests, demonstrations, boycotts, even performance art, but in an authoritarian regime how might resistance take different forms? Passive resistance, small everyday acts of defiance were common and held meaning for those who performed them. Just because the presentation of outward resistance does not appear as frequently as we might assume, does this mean that people were willingly compliant? Of course not. By broadening what we consider to be resistance we can better understand the convictions of our historical subjects. When we contextualize diaries and memoirs in their historical framework, we can see how public discourse influences the individual, not only by the media, but the rumors and gossip of everyday life as well. Consequently, this can provide insight on how individual and collective attitudes changes and expands over time. I think these reminders helped me better understand the way people made sense of not only their lives but of Soviet society as well.

It is easy to imagine how you think you would behave in a historical setting but when you *really* think about it, it's much more difficult than at first glance. I think it's important, especially when reading the personal documents of people in the past, to remember the human element and circumstance people are under and how this influences their actions and opinions. Although we might think that the acts of denunciation, panic, and betrayal during the Terror are horrendous, we also must ask ourselves, what would *you* do in an environment where you and your family's survival is threatened. In this environment the line between perpetrator and victim is blurred, further complicating an already complex situation. Sometimes the explanation for why people do certain things is simpler than it appears. Embracing Soviet ideology and becoming part of the collective is not always a result of simple compliance but perhaps just wanting to be a part of something. Being included in society was crucial to many Soviet diarists in the 1930's, the fear of being alienated, an outsider, was often at the forefront of their minds. Reading the memoirs of people whose lives were so uprooted and shaped by Stalinist terror proved to be extremely saddening. It is amazing to me how people persevered and continued after such devastating events.

We can ask ourselves why does this matter? What is the point in studying historical memory? Although one could give many answers, I would say that it is important because it

portrays how history is understood, processed, and changes over time. Investigating historical memory also invites us to observe the primary sources themselves. Diaries, memoirs, letters, and more shape the archive, which in turn, shapes historical narrative. What is and is not available and why are questions we should be asking of the archive. Imagine if we learnt about WWII only from the perspective of the French, we would not get close to the entire scope of events. If the archive is dominated by certain groups, then the narrative is generally shaped by that information. In the Soviet context, diaries and memoirs were more likely to come from the intelligentsia or working class. The collective farms produced much less diary documentation, a product of their lifestyle. Many collective farmers simply had other things to worry about, therefore their historical voice is less noticeable in the archive and even less in English translations. Although it is impossible to gather a complete picture of history, we should consider what is and is not represented. That being said, historians should also consider *how* and *why* history is represented the way it is. People often write memoirs out of a duty to contribute to memory, but why do they depict themselves the way they do? How people decide to write about themselves, what they omit and include, also shapes the archive. To make things more complicated, public discourse can further influence people's perception of themselves. Before writing my thesis, I hadn't really thought about these issues, but now I think I've become a more mindful when examining sources.

Despite the lack of motivation enticed by online class, I enjoyed researching my thesis. Paradoxically, the extra time I had from learning at home did not help with my procrastination. Being in one place for most of the day and not having a set space to do schoolwork was more of a challenge than I had anticipated. I did not realize how much I relied on structure to keep me on schedule. This reminded me of the importance of good time management, a skill that I might need to further refine. I hope that anyone who also struggled with motivation during the pandemic knows that they are most defiantly not alone. Nonetheless, I am happy with my research, however, I am happy it is over. That relief one feels from finishing an essay is amplified on completing a thesis. I'd like to give a big thank you to my honours supervisor Dr. Denis Kozlov for helping me in my research and putting up with my procrastination. If you are a history major and have a particular topic you wish you could expand on, I think the honours program might be for you. The program gives you the opportunity to explore those questions you might still have from an essay written semesters ago. I know it did for me. In all, I'm pleased I made the decision to transfer to

Dalhousie 3 years ago, if not, I might not have discovered my interest in Soviet history. Good Luck!

Hannah Wygiera

If I have learned anything over my four years at Dalhousie, it is that passion is important. I have enjoyed my time in the honours program, simply because I was able to take my interests to a new level. I got to see how I could take one interesting topic and turn it into a huge project that I ended up incredibly proud of. The skills that I learned will carry me throughout my university career. I entered university thinking I would study Ancient Rome. I went to Italy earlier that year and loved seeing every cobblestone. However, I took one class on Early Modern England and my life changed. It was the one class where I absorbed everything. I called my family after every class to tell them everything I learned. I believe my honours thesis reflects my passion in this area of history. My poor family has endured a year of me talking endlessly about my research. However, they can also see why it matters to me and why it excites me.

My interest in Early Modern England and the Reformation stems from my childhood in the Anglican Church. My dad is an Anglican priest and I quickly got used to people asking me, "What is the Anglican Church?" My only answer was, "It is basically the Catholic Church without the pope." This question filtered into my research interests because I wanted to be able to find a better answer and explanation. Over the years, I have done research papers on the Elizabethan Church and the Book of Common Prayer, and on Quakers and female preachers. I uncovered an incredible world of context that led me to religious crimes and my eventual thesis topic. Dr. Krista Kesselring, who became my supervisor, recognized my interests, and suggested what ended up becoming my thesis topic.

My honours thesis unpacks the decriminalization of heresy as a capital offence in Early Modern England. The history of heresy has a large historiography, but the focus has been mostly about doctrine. I examine the crime of heresy and argue that heresy's decriminalization as a capital offence was the result of a Protestant fear of Catholicism. The statute that outlined the punishment for heresy was created in 1401, called the *Writ de Heretico cumburendo.* The *Writ* established the protocols for detecting, trying, and punishing heretics, which reflects the relationship between the English Church and state. Heretics were detected by bishops, imprisoned by the state, tried by the Church, and punished by the state. The punishment described in the *Writ* was death by burning. The 1401 statute officially made heresy not just a religious offence, but also a capital offence. The first victim of the *Writ* was John Badby, who was burned in 1410. Throughout the sixteenth

century, each monarch approached heresy slightly differently. Orthodoxy changed but so did the relationship between church and state, especially with the English Church's separation from the Roman Catholic Church. In Henry VIII's reign, both Catholics and Protestants were at risk of being heretics. In Mary I's reign, Protestants were targeted as heretics. Elizabeth I's reign differentiated between popish traitors and radical Protestant heretics. In fact, only six heretics were burned in the Elizabethan period. The last man to be put to death for heresy was Edward Wightman, who was burned at the stake in 1612. Overall, the *Writ* saw the burning of approximately 400 people in England.

Following Wightman's burning, England began debating the nature of heresy as a crime and its punishment. The Civil Wars in the 1640s saw the rise of religious diversity, as new religious groups flourished in the absence of censorship and the disruption of civil and religious authority. Members of Parliament could not agree on what beliefs were heretical, making it a period of religious debate. Many leaders still wanted heresy to be punishable by death, but they could not agree on what beliefs. It was also during this period that the separation of church and state became more apparent, especially when ecclesiastical authority was abolished. In 1648, Parliament passed an Ordinance against blasphemy and heresy. It divided heresy into two levels. The first level could be defined as religious errors; they did not deserve death, only imprisonment. The second level of beliefs deserved death. Interestingly, heresy was defined as a felony, which indicated the punishment of hanging instead of burning. As well, there was no mention of the Church's role. Heresy had become a secular crime instead of a religious offence.

The *Writ de Heretico cumburendo* was abolished by Parliament in 1677. Toleration may have been a motivating factor; it was certainly brought up in many debates about heresy and religious diversity, especially during the Civil War years. However, it was not the main reason for abolishing the *Writ.* Toleration would allow erroneous beliefs to continue. Members of Parliament may have wanted to abolish the *Writ,* but many still wanted heresy to be a crime. A constant theme throughout my thesis is the relationship between church and state. Before the *Writ* was abolished, bishops were worried that their authority to punish religious offences would be taken away. They argued that heresy fell under ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In order to maintain their authority, bishops were allowed to punish heresy with excommunication. The *Writ* was also abolished during the Exclusion Crisis, a period where many members of Parliament wanted to exclude the king's Catholic brother James from the line of succession. Protestant members of Parliament were

sensitive to the dangers of popery, and the thought of a Catholic monarch was dangerous. Members of Parliament feared a Catholic retaliation on Protestants and that Mary I's reign, where around 300 Protestants were burned for heresy, would repeat itself. If the *Writ* still existed, most Protestants in Parliament were in danger of being prosecuted as heretics and burned at the stake. Therefore, in order to protect themselves, they abolished the *Writ.*

Overall, this past year was challenging in many ways. I lived on the other side of the country and was constantly calculating time differences. I also did not have access to physical books because most libraries near me were closed. Therefore, I am very thankful for Dalhousie's document delivery service. I learned that it is entirely possible to write a thesis with only online sources. Thankfully, my topic had many accessible databases. I learned how to navigate them quite well. I gained valuable research skills but also learned that I am adaptable to crazy global situations. When I applied to the honours program, I did not anticipate that there would be a global pandemic. However, I proved to myself that no matter what life throws my way, I can still research and write a thesis. I am forever grateful to my family for their support and interest in my research. I am also thankful for my husband who listened to all my new discoveries and never complained with all my piles of research scattered throughout the living room. I am also thankful for Dr. Kesselring, who was an amazing supervisor. She helped me access books and taught me all the complicated aspects of English law. I can honestly say I learned a lot this past year and I am very excited to pursue a master's degree.

The honour's program is incredibly rewarding. I looked forward to the seminar every week and hearing from the incredible professors of the History Department. There are so many ways to approach history and so many areas of history that I had not been exposed to before this year. I appreciated the thoughtful discussions and the support of my fellow honours students. If anyone reading this is considering joining the honours program, do it. The exposure to different areas of research, the supportive environment, and the opportunity to explore your research interests in depth is a chance that should not be passed up. It is hard work, but the reward (and relief) you experience when you finish your thesis is worth it. The skills you take away from it are worth it. Above all, the chance to take your passions and turn them into a research project is perhaps the most exciting aspect.

Matthew Zolkivski

When I began, I only initially intended to take the program due to its being a requirement for my future educational plan. Once I got researching and writing, I began to understand why people would do this program. Aside from the choice of what content one focuses on, the ability to work alongside an experienced professional and write with their guidance has changed how I write and what processes I take when writing. I would define the features of growth and appreciation of the honours thesis through three categories: personal growth, rising to the challenge, and then a brief synopsis of what I personally found in my research.

The personal growth

The personal growth that comes with taking on a responsibility like this is life changing if one were to find themselves pursuing further academia following their undergrad. Aside from the benefits to be had for one's career, the honours thesis offers an opportunity to work with professors on a topic closely, helping an honours student to overcome each issue and better their writing. More than that, a project like the honours thesis forces the student to change their ways of procrastination. There is such a massive work ahead when one begins, the idea of procrastinating is madness. Beginning this project, I felt that it was so monstrous a behemoth, that it was undefeatable. The infinite peak that we honours students attempt to reach the summit of is such an amazing achievement, that we look back on it with pride. It is not that this is terribly hard, assuming one does not procrastinate, but the honours thesis is a passion piece. This project is not just a paper, but is a symbol of the writer's grit, their force of will.

Challenges

There are many challenges that one grapples with when taking on a project like this, from a changing thesis, to changing primary sources. The challenges presented are many, but those who choose to become honours students show the strength of will to rise to those challenges. One will encounter many stressful situations, be repeatedly told their arguments "need work," and will definitely have to swallow their own pride sometimes. When they feel good points coming, try to make them, but the challenges of creating clarity make the writer grow with each draft, and sigh with each revision. In the case that one does end up cramming in the last month of the thesis, they will suffer more immeasurable mental anguish than they have ever encountered as a writer before.

The shear amount of academic pressure would be enough to crush even the finest of academic spirits. Do. Not. Procrastinate.

Another challenge, external to those in the Thesis, is the challenges and inhibitions that life presents to the writer. Covid-19, work, needing to make rent, dealing with family, or dealing with any other struggles of the self, the writer will be repeatedly inhibited by the curveballs of life. With each challenge, the writer of an honours thesis will retain another piece of resolve, a piece of glue to hold themselves together through such times. Much like a finely crafted sword, the perfect techniques to create a strong unbreaking author will find their way to the writer. When the writer reaches the end and looks back upon their journey, they would not wish for another, yet they somehow know that they would be more prepared for another such challenge than ever before.

Satisfaction from suffering: The writing of my Honours Thesis:

When I began my journey, I had no idea the amount of work that was involved in the honours thesis. The only thing one knows when entering honours, is possibly what they are interested in. That interest transforms into a passion, and that passion becomes your work. Through trials and tribulations, I was able to begin my research, find my passion, and formulate my question: "To What Extent Did Revolutionary Americans View Indigenous Peoples as One, Versus as Many?" From this question, my advisor and I began to discuss: what is relevant to this, how can it be approached, and what will be most clear and understood by an uninformed reader? We eventually settled on three topics: language, treaties, and genocide, the third of which would later change to focus on the alienation of Indigenous independence.

My first chapter focused on how the governing body of the Revolutionaries during the Revolution, the Continental Congress, used the term "Indian" within their letters and during their meetings rather than using specific names of tribes. This was done for the purpose of evaluating the extent to which the Congress understood linguistically and the valuation of translators. Within this chapter I also approached how the problematic language and the term "Indian" was used in a derogatory way, as well as when proper indigenous tribe names were used with a manipulative intent.

My second chapter focused more specifically on the language used in treaties, how treaties played a role in othering indigenous peoples, and how the different treaties were used in different ways depending on which imperial government was in control, i.e. the British and later the Americans. The contents of this chapter largely pertain to: the role played by William Johnson,

the British superintendent of indigenous affairs until 1774, the events leading up to the American Revolution, the effects these events and the establishment of the Proclamation line had on settler-indigenous violence, as well as a deconstruction of several of the major treaties that were signed during the Revolutionary period.

The third chapter focused on the alienation of Indigenous independence and the role it had on manifesting the many tribes as one in law, in the eyes of settler, and in the fights that were slowly turning against the indigenous groups within the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes regions. In each chapter, I tried to recap the relevant events of the Revolution in order, within their themed contexts, i.e. military encounters from 1763 to 1795, treaties of that same period, and how language changed throughout that period. In my third chapter, this especially meant focusing on Dunmore's war, different massacres that were committed based on race, the strange way Indigenous identity was appropriated by the Revolutionaries (such as the image of America as an indigenous woman), the villainization of indigenous peoples via propaganda, the difficulties of remaining neutral, amongst many other points meant to target key changes for Indigenous peoples and how they were being delegated with.[1] These features of the Revolutionary period provided insight into how indigenous rights degraded across said period, ending in major losses of land independence, the ceding of lands, and the beginning of early Indigenous Reserve systems in North America.

My thesis concluded with a more successful flourish than I imagined, resulting in the realization that, although there was not a total assumption of an individual indigenous government to be delegated with, the loss of rights and the lack of support in the late eighteenth century led to a more united sense of oppression on the Frontier by groups such as the Mohawks. The almost universal struggle that indigenous peoples would continue to grapple with leading into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was seemingly born, somewhat ironically, in the flames of Independence.

Conclusion

Now for the sweet words all those future honours students will be wishing to write for the next year: "in conclusion." In conclusion, the honours Thesis was overall worth the struggle. It

---

[1] Dunmore's War: a war fought by lord Dunmore against indigenous people of the Frontier for not following the problematic rules laid out in the Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1763), which sold the lands of the Shawnee, Delaware, and Mingoes, out from under them.

made me grapple with sources and my writing techniques in a way that no other paper has ever made me do. This was by far the longest hamburger essay I have ever had to write, and I am certain that my masters will depart the hamburger model in favour of a more elaborate food-based metaphor for a paper structure.

To all those who approach this program, may you not be shaken by the immensity of the mountain that is the Honour Thesis, for what awaits you in the great valleys beyond will come much more quickly and much more easily from such an elevation. You will succeed in the face of those tens of thousands of words, and you whom accept the challenge, will be astonished by what you might learn about yourselves, what you might learn about the world around you, and what lies in wait for you within the echoes of history.

"Don't shoot G-Men!": The rise and fall of the FBI's G-Man Image

Connor Adsett

　　　It seems hard to imagine in the present, but from the 1930s until the 1960s the FBI agent, or "G-Man", was a cultural hero. The G-Man appeared in movies, television shows, and comic books, exciting young children and building a beloved image of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover. However, by the late 1960s and early 1970s this image had begun to crack. In 1965, 84% of Americans gave the FBI a "highly favorable" rating.[1] Yet, by 1970, this rating had dropped to 71%, and by 1973 it was down to 52%.[2] This change was well before the events of Watergate and the revelations surrounding COINTELPRO; so, what triggered it?

　　　Building on the work of scholars like Richard Gid Powers, I will argue that the FBI's popularity was in part tied to the G-Man stereotype which, by the late 60s, fell out of fashion and in part caused the FBI's popularity to diminish. I will begin by reviewing the traditional image of the G-Man as established in the 1935 film *G-Men* starring James Cagney. This film introduced Americans to the characteristics of the G-Man: tough, manly, and redeemable through action. Following this film, the G-Man character appeared in popular entertainment throughout the 1930s until the 1950s. However, I will then argue that in the late 1950s the Bureau changed the G-Man characteristics. The 1950s G-Man's values changed from action oriented to family-focused and traditional. While this was suitable for the 1950s, it was unsuitable for the changing world of the 60s. This essay will argue that the change of the G-Man character contributed to the FBI's loss of mainstream appeal.

　　　This paper will focus on examining the evolution of the G-Man character exclusively through film and television. These means of communication were important to the FBI for two reasons. First, they could control the narrative most efficiently in film and television. As Matthew Cecil details, public relations for the FBI before film and television had meant dealing with the press.[3] In this period, controlling the kind of stories that were picked up was hard given that

---

[1] Richard Gid Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI in American Popular Culture* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983), 264.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Matthew Cecil, *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate: The Campaign to Control the Press and the Bureau's Image* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2014), 268.

reporters had their own agendas, which often conflicted with the FBI's.[4] Thankfully for the Bureau, film and television, two mediums which were easily controlled and manipulated, became increasingly popular. Unlike news stories, the FBI could monitor television shows and films throughout their entire inception. In productions like *The FBI* (1965-1974) they did just this: "the Bureau assigned an agent to the set, revised and rewrote scripts, and screened every member of the cast and crew for 'subversive' ties."[5] As Hoover said, television and film were beneficial because the FBI could tell the story exactly how it wanted.[6] The second reason the FBI focused a lot of attention on film and television was because these mediums were not just accessible but very popular. In the early days of film, more Americans went to the cinema than to church.[7] Though the number of filmgoers dropped in the 1960s, American obsession with television rose. Between 1949 and 1969, the number of Americans with at least one TV went from one million to forty-four million.[8] The FBI, therefore, had the potential to influence millions of Americans through television and film and thus got involved as early as possible.

The original incarnation of the G-Man (or FBI Agent) first appeared on screen in the 1935 film, *G-Men* (1935), starring James Cagney.[9] The original G-Man is akin to the pulp detective of the 1920s, meaning he exudes a rough and ready manliness. In *G-Men,* for example, James Cagney is shown to be a good agent because of his experience growing up in a tough neighborhood.[10] He knows how to fire a gun and how to fight, and he is contrasted against the other, newer agents who are lawyers and assumed to be weak.[11] The original G-Man character, however, was not entirely a retread of the pulp detective formula. Unlike the pulp detective, the G-Man is a smart dresser, a quieter presence, and one whose attention is turned to Washington and not women.[12]

The original G-Man character followed three important cliches which were both helpful to the FBI and solidified his popularity. First, like the pulp detective, the original G-Man is redeemable through action. This means that the G-Man need not be a moral exemplar: so long as

---

[4] Cecil, *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate*, 268.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] John Sbardellati, *J. Edgar Hoover Goes to the Movies: The FBI and the Origins of Hollywood's Cold War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 1.
[8] Bill Ganzel, "Television," *Farming in the 1950s & 60s: Wessels Living History Farm,*
https://livinghistoryfarm.org/farminginthe50s/life_17.html.
[9] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI,* 94.
[10] *G-Men*, directed by William Keighley, 1935 (Burbank, CA: Warner Home Video, 14 August 2013), Youtube.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 246.

he gets the criminals, he is effective.[13] Cagney, for example, frequently disobeys his superiors, but is forgiven because of how successful of an agent he is.[14] This cliché is an important aspect of Hoover and the FBI's public relations strategy as it moves the conversation from one about the FBI's adherence to rules to one about the Bureau's effectiveness.[15] The second important cliché of the original G-Man formula was that he was "forging a new path."[16] The G-Man was presented as a new kind of law enforcement agent, one who was on the cutting edge of technology and crime-fighting. This gave him a special significance above the local police and pulp detective, who were often portrayed as inefficient and incompetent. The original G-Man was not the status quo, and that is what made him so effective and interesting. The final important cliché is that the gangsters the original G-Man pursues are always self-interested and never political. In *G-Men,* for example, Legget and his gang are only interested in robbing banks so they can become richer and indulge in a more extravagant lifestyle.[17] Criminals like this, who follow no real-world ideology, are politically neutral. They make no attempt to justify their actions and, therefore, Cagney can take them down without having to take a political stance and possibly alienate any viewers. The original G-Man rose above the pulp detective because he presented his quest to capture or kill his real-world politically neutral enemies.

Some critics argue that Hoover and the FBI's role in the production of *G-Men* is ambiguous and that it is, therefore, unfair to use this film as the source of the original G-Man character. For example, the critic E.G. Carlston argues that it was the movie studios, and not Hoover, who shaped the original G-Man.[18] Other scholars such as Richard Powers argue that Hoover was very involved in the production, and this original G-Man was based on his philosophy.[19] Regardless of the FBI's precise role in this particular production, it is certain that following the popularity of the movie *G-Men*, the G-Man character was endorsed and perpetuated by the Bureau. The G-Man stereotype saw a massive initial public success with the film *G-Men* earning $1,143,000 in the domestic box office.[20] This initial success meant that the G-Man stereotype was reproduced in films, television

---

[13] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI,* 246.
[14] *G-Men.*
[15] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 247.
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *G-Men.*
[18] E.G. Carlston, "Domesticated Masculinity and the Pink-Washing of the FBI," *Journal of Popular Culture* 50, no. 8 (28 July 2017): 514-39.
[19] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 247.
[20] "G-Men," *IMDB*, https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0026393/.

shows, and comic books throughout the 1930s and 40s.[21] This mass production happened if not always with the FBI's explicit approval, then with their implicit.[22] The decision to allow the stereotype to achieve prominence was not simply a coincidence, given how carefully Hoover and the FBI monitored their public image.[23] No matter who invented this first G-Man, he was popular and effective. Thus, the FBI had no desire to challenge this character in the 1930s and 40s, and the original G-Man was born. However, by the late 1950s, the Bureau did have a desire to reinvent the G-Man character. This is clear given that both the film, *The FBI Story* and the television show *The FBI* - two productions that the Bureau controlled - present a G-Man who is very different from Cagney's original. For the new G-Man domesticity, not crimefighting, was his defining characteristic.

The film *The FBI Story* introduced the world to the "new G-Man". Unlike *G-Men*, this production was undoubtedly influenced by the FBI's morals and guiding philosophy. The FBI approved every frame of the film and even had two special agents on set throughout the production.[24] Any changes the film made to the G-Man character were done intentionally by the FBI. The film follows the life of Chip Hardesty, played by Jimmy Stewart.[25] Chip is a family man whose life is equally divided between his domestic duties and his crime-fighting.[26] As many scholars and reviewers have noted, the film makes a point to connect every major FBI event to a different Hardesty family crisis.[27] For example, following the successful arrest of a murderous banker, Chip returns home to learn that his wife, Lucy, has had a miscarriage.[28] He vows to quit the Bureau but Lucy, played by Vera Miles, will not let him.[29] The FBI, she argues, is worth family sacrifices and ultimately contributes to the family's success.[30] By connecting the domestic world with the outer crime-fighting world, the film attempts to prove that the FBI is not an impediment to the family's success but instead is an element of it.[31] This philosophy follows a popular 1950s

---

[21] Vanessa Romo, "The FBI In Pop Culture," *Morning Edition*, NPR, July 12, 2017, https://www.npr.org/2017/07/12/536782057/the-fbi-in-pop-culture.

[22] Cecil, *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate*, 268.

[23] *Ibid*.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *The FBI Story*, directed by Mervyn LeRoy, 1959 (Burbank, CA: Warner Home Video, 17 January 2014), Youtube Rentals.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] Carlston, "Domesticated Masculinity," 526-528.

[28] *The FBI Story.*

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 241.

[31] *Ibid.*

American trend; to view a traditional home as a sign of success, stability and security both for yourself and the nation. As Elaine Tyler May explains in *Homeward Bound*, popular thinking of the 1950s argued that "traditional values, would create a feeling of warmth and security against the cold forces of disruption and alienation."[32] Traditionalism offered a point of stability in the otherwise uncertain atomic age.[33] Politicians and the government, seeing Americans flock to the suburbs, embraced this philosophy. As May says: "Nixon argued that American superiority in the Cold War rested not on weapons, but on the secure, abundant family life of modern suburban homes."[34] The home of the 1950s was place of both family security and political importance. The new G-Man hoped to protect this new American philosophy through his emphasis on domesticity.

The three clichés of the G-Man formula, which had previously ensured his critical protection and popularity, also changed in the 1950s. The first new cliché was that the revised G-Man was no longer an apolitical force, as Cagney and his criminals were. Rather, the new G-Man believed in traditional values and was willing to stick up for them. For example, in *The FBI Story*, Cagney defends traditional values in many little ways, whether encouraging his daughters to be good wives, encouraging his son to fight in World War 2, or expressing his disgust at the Communist's lack of religiosity.[35] Cagney constantly preaches the values of family, church and state. The second cliche of the new G-Man was that he defends the status quo and fights crimes only to restore normalcy. As Richard Powers says, "every week on *The FBI,* the agent's smooth office routine of paper shuffling and chitchat about wives and kids was interrupted by a crisis in the form of a crime, [...] then the team pulled together to get things back to normal."[36] The new G-Man was no longer a hero forging a new crime-fighting path, but instead a guardian of the status quo. This shift represented a fundamental change in how the G-Man was positioned in culture. The last cliché of the new G-Man was that his popularity was based not on his crime fighting, but on his virtue. He was no longer redeemable through action alone. These new cliches of the 1950s ultimately lead to the new G-Man becoming increasing unpopular in the late 1960s. In the following paragraphs, I will examine the new G-Man's three clichés' considering the negative reactions they provoked during the 1960s.

---

[32] Elaine Tyler May, and American Council of Learned Societies, *Homeward Bound American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 3.
[33] *Ibid.,* 23.
[34] *Ibid.,* 29.
[35] *The FBI Story.*
[36] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 247.

First, the new G-Man's politics were out of line with 1960s mainstream America. For example, the new G-Man viewed civil rights protest as overly disruptive, even though they were increasingly popular. In his 1965 article for the *New York Times*, "The Junior G-Man Grows Senior," Tom Wicker's argued that Hoover - the top G-Man and representative of the G-Man philosophy - had lost touch with mainstream America.[37] Hoover had recently called Martin Luther King Junior "the most notorious liar in history," which Wicker says "[o]nly Dr. King's worst enemies regarded […] as anything but an overstatement."[38] In Wicker's view, Hoover's sentiment was not widely shared, and the FBI endorsed an increasingly unpopular opinion. This was not just Wicker's feeling - Pew Research polls suggest that, in 1965, 48% of Americans supported the march on Selma and Dr. King. [39] As Richard Gid Powers details, "Hoover's public stand against King for the first time pitted the FBI director [and the G-Man] not just against outcasts from the American consensus, but millions of Americans who regarded the civil rights movement as a moral crusade, and Martin Luther King as the keeper of the American conscience.[40] The new G-Man, however, was within his character to oppose civil rights as overly disruptive. Both Chip Hardesty, from *the FBI Story*, and Inspector Lewis Erskine, from *The FBI*, craved family security and stability above *all* else. Yet, Americans were increasingly seeing some instability as necessary to change. Therefore, the new G-man's political attitude was falling out of touch with mainstream America.

Secondly, the new G-Man's passivity in the name of the status quo was unpopular. In the 1960s, popular culture became more transformative for both liberals and conservatives, all while the FBI remained committed to its traditionalist image. On the political left, there was the counterculture movement, civil rights, black power, and women's liberation movements (to name a few).[41] On the right, there were turns to conservatism, evangelicalism, and individualism.[42] These divided sides both saw political action as necessary to achieve their goals and respond to the

---

[37] Cecil, *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate*, 13.; Tom Wicker, "Washington: The Junior G-Man Grows Senior," *New York Times*, 15 July 1965, E10.
[38] Wicker, "Washington," 10.
[39] Andrew Kohut, "From the archives: 50 years ago: Mixed views about civil rights but support for Selma demonstrators," *Pew Research*, 16 January 2020, https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/01/16/50-years-ago-mixed-views-about-civil-rights-but-support-for-selma-demonstrators/.
[40] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 265.
[41] Rick Perlstein, *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America* (New York: Scribner, 2009), 21.
[42] *Ibid.*

other.[43] This was a fundamental change from the "domestic tranquility" that had been emphasized in the 1950s.[44] The 1950s G-Man valued inaction and stability above all else, which was incompatible with the 1960s desire for change. Again, the G-Man was out of touch with mainstream Americans. An example of this cultural clash can be seen in F.B.I director J. Edgar Hoover's article for the *Parent Teacher Association Magazine*, titled "A Study in Student Extremism". In this article, Hoover, taking on the new G-Man's values, argued not just against "student radicals," but against any student involved in politics on campus – liberal or conservative. As he argued:

> The vast majority couldn't care less for slogans […] in reality it is the immediate, at-hand issues inside schools that, as one lady told me, 'really turn kids on' - issues such as dress regulation […] cafeteria service and/or food, [and] disciplinary rules.[45]

Given that students of many different political persuasions had begun to mobilize, it should not come as a surprise that this article managed to alienate everyone. The *PTA Magazine* received hundreds of angry letters from parents who complained about Hoover's labeling of all student activity as inappropriate. Although they attacked Hoover by name, critics at the time are also referring to the new G-Man's philosophy more generally. This is because, as Matthew Cecil argues, Hoover never acted inconsistently with the FBI's current PR image, which is part of the reason he was frequently referred to as the "top G-Man."[46] Therefore, the new G-Man cliché to protect the status quo had begun to fall out of style with American popular culture.

Finally, the new G-Man's value preaching was seen as hypocritical. As Powers describes: "the domesticated G-Man based his claim to popular respect on his righteousness, and so, according to the unforgiving logic of popular culture, with the first stain on his cloak of moral perfection he forfeited [this] claim."[47] It did not take long for him to "stain his cloak," as popular culture began to see the hypocrisy in a hero who preached family values while spying on and threatening American citizens. The American public had long had some knowledge of the FBI's illegal activities. As early as the 1920s there was knowledge that the Bureau regularly abused Americans civil liberties by monitoring private citizens and targeting political dissidents for

---

[43] Perlstein, *Nixonland,* 21.

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] John Edgar Hoover, "The SDS and the High Schools: A Study in Extremism," *The PTA Magazine* 64 (Jan. 1970): 2-5.; John Edgar Hoover, "The SDS and the High Schools: A Study in Extremism," *The PTA Magazine* 64 (Feb. 1970): 8-9.

[46] Cecil, *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate,* 13.

[47] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI,* 254.

harassment.[48] Yet, as Powers says, this did not affect the FBI's image in part because of the popularity of the original G-Man:

> There was an enormous amount of discreditable information about the Bureau that the public knew about the FBI before Hoover's death, but that it chose to ignore. During the very years of the Bureau's greatest public relations triumphs, in fact, there had appeared a sizable volume of published material hostile to the FBI. […] [Yet,] everything was ignored or suppressed to preserve popular culture's stereotype of the heroic G-Man.[49]

The original G-Man could brush off charges of wrongdoing because cliché meant that so long as he got the criminal, he was effective. As Powers says: "The old G-Man never claimed to be a saint; if he were caught taking a shortcut around the Bill of Rights, he could always redeem himself by catching another cook or smashing another spy ring."[50] Of course, the FBI itself was not immune to criticism. Its original G-Man character helped the bureau maintain good will. On the other hand, the new G-Man could be criticized for the stereotype was no longer founded on his crimefighting, but on his morals - which he frequently contradicted. Again, as Powers says: "[b]y turning the G-Man into a symbol of morality Hoover made the bureau vulnerable to precisely the kind of allegations that began to surface during the 1960s."[51] The G-Man character, therefore, became increasingly parodied for his hypocrisy.

Take for example the portrayal of the G-Man in the *The President's Analyst* (1967), a counterculture film the Bureau hated.[52] In this film, an analyst is assigned to the President of the United States to help him deal with the stresses of his job.[53] However, the analyst himself gets too stressed out and abandons work.[54] For the rest of the film, he is pursued by the FBR and CEA – the films versions of the FBI and CIA – who fear he will leak the President's secrets.[55] In the film, the G-Men are continuously mocked for not seeing the irony in their preaching wholesome family values while spying on and threatening American citizens. A particularly memorable exchange involves a young child who reports the protagonist's whereabouts to two G-Men.[56] While the child

---

[48] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI,* 267.
[49] *Ibid.*
[50] *Ibid.*, 254.
[51] *Ibid.*, 264.
[52] Nathaniel Thompson, "The President's Analyst," *Turner Classic Movies*, retrieved 6 March 2019.
[53] *The President's Analyst,* directed by Theodore J. Flicker (Hollywood CA: Paramount Pictures, 1967), Criterion Chanel.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Ibid.*
[56] *Ibid.*

explains his story, he is twice reprimanded by the G-Men for being "bigoted" and "swearing."[57] Yet, following the story, when asked by the child if they are going to kill the protagonist, the G-Men answer: "Yes we are going to shoot him dead."[58] The scene clearly demonstrates the absurdity of the new G-Man who preaches moral purity while killing people for a living.

By the time of Hoover's death in 1972, the FBI's image was on shaky ground with the American public.[59] The FBI was seen as an increasingly political force attached to a set of values the country was quickly leaving behind. What finally killed the FBI's public image is uncertain. Critics like Matthew Cecil focus on the idea that it was the FBI's terrible PR that killed them.[60] Others like Richard Powers focus on the idea that Watergate was an inescapable mess that simply took the FBI down with it.[61] It is uncertain whether the original G-Man could have weathered any of these. It is, however, certain that the new G-Man could not. His design and values were the antithesis of the new culture and even among conservatives the saintly preaching came off poorly.

In conclusion, the domestication of the G-Man was inappropriate for the changing world of the 1960s and ultimately contributed to the FBI's loss of mainstream appeal. The hypocrisy and unchanging nature of the new G-Man's values made him increasingly distant from mainstream American culture. These values were intimately tied to 1950s culture as seen in novels like *Homeward Bound*. The new G-Man made his first appearance in the film *The FBI Story* and the television show, *The FBI*. He had changed significantly from the G-Man James Cagney portrays in the film *G-Men*. The FBI of today is widely distrusted by the American public, and while it is uncertain the extent to which any particular G-Man could have survived the turmoil of the 1960s and 1970s, it is certain that the G-Man of the 1950s could not.[62]

---

[57] *The President's Analyst.*
[58] *Ibid.*
[59] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 264.
[60] Cecil, *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate*, 85.
[61] Powers, *G-Men, Hoover's FBI*, 289.
[62] "Public Trust in Government: 1958-2019," *Pew Research Centre*, 11 April 2019, https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2019/04/11/public-trust-in-government-1958-2019/.

Bibliography

Carlston, E.G. "Domesticated Masculinity and the Pink-Washing of the FBI." *Journal of Popular Culture*, 50 (28 July 2017): 514-539.

Cecil, Matthew. *Hoover's FBI and the Fourth Estate: The Campaign to Control the Press and the Bureau's Image*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2014.

Flicker, Theodore J. dir. *The President's Analyst*. Hollywood CA: Paramount Pictures, 1967. Criterion Chanel.

Ganzel, Bill. "Television." *Farming in the 1950s and 60s:Wessels Living History Farm*. https://livinghistoryfarm.org/farminginthe50s/life_17.html.

"G-Men". *IMDB*. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0026393/.

Hoover, John Edgar. "The SDS and the High Schools: A Study in Extremism." *The PTA Magazine* 64 (Jan. 1970): 2-5.

Hoover, John Edgar. "The SDS and the High Schools: A Study in Extremism." The PTA Magazine 64 (Feb. 1970): 8-9.

Keighley, William dir. *G-Men*. 1935. Burbank, CA: Warner Home Video, 14 August 2013. Youtube.

Kohut, Andrew. "From the archives: 50 years ago: Mixed views about civil rights but support for Selma demonstrators". *Pew Research*. 16 January 2020. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/01/16/50-years-ago-mixed-views-about-civil-rights-but-support-for-selma-demonstrators/.

LeRoy, Mervyn dir. *The FBI Story*. 1959. Burbank, CA: Warner Home Video, 17 January 2014. Youtube Rentals.

May, Elaine Tyler, and American Council of Learned Societies. *Homeward Bound American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.

Perlstein, Rick. *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America*. New York: Scribner, 2009.

Powers, Richard Gid. *G-Men, Hoover's FBI in American Popular Culture*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

"Public Trust in Government: 1958-2019." *Pew Research Centre*. 11 April 2019. https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2019/04/11/public-trust-in-government-1958-2019/.

Romo, Vanessa "The FBI In Pop Culture." *Morning Edition, NPR*. 12 July 2017.
    https://www.npr.org/2017/07/12/536782057/the-fbi-in-pop-culture.

Sbardellati, John. J. E*dgar Hoover Goes to the Movies: The FBI and the Origins of Hollywood's
    Cold War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.

"The FBI Story." *IMDB*. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0052792/.

Thompson, Nathaniel. "The President's Analyst." *Turner Classic Movies*. Retrieved 6 March 2019.

Wicker, Tom. "Washington: The Junior G-Man Grows Senior." *New York Times*, 25 July 1965,
    E10.

Resisting Slavery: The Agency of African Slaves and Why it Matters

Ronald Blanchard

     *A*lthough some historians depict slaves as passive objects unable to impact the world around them and resist enslavement, scholars like Sean Stilwell, Dennis Cordell, Bruce Mouser, Jonathan Glassman, and many others disagree. These scholars argue that slaves could oppose slavery and did so in a variety of ways. In his *Slaving and Slavery in African History*, Stilwell presents slavery as a dynamic product of history that should not be viewed as static or changeless. Slavery in Africa was as diverse as the continent itself. Slaveowners used slaves in different settings and granted them different privileges and economic, social, or political opportunities, depending on the location, timeframe, and type of their service.[1] Slave-master relations were always fluctuating. Stilwell frames freedom as "belonging in" society. This is in opposition to slavery, which he defines as "belonging to" society.[2] It is within this framework that this paper places resistance to slavery. Slaves were only connected to society through their masters, meaning they often lacked social and economic benefits that came with belonging, such as kinship ties or property rights. Slaves did not always exert their agency via resistance to slavery itself, but rather to renegotiate the terms of their service if they felt they were being treated poorly; Ismail Rashid calls this the "moral economy."[3]

     This paper draws upon the scholarship on the agency of slaves to dispel myths of slave passivity, and to present their resistance as a dynamic product of history with a special focus on the agency of slaves themselves. This paper pays special attention to female slaves to emphasize the impact gender had on slavery and resistance. People rebelled against initial enslavement by fleeing or mounting rebellions and defences within their communities. During their captivity, many slaves navigated new systems of control to renegotiate with their masters for better conditions and elevate their status above that of "outsiders" – even if they remained slaves. Enslaved Africans resisted their slave status by forcing their owners and wider societies to recognize their rights to these social institutions or form alternative versions thereof.

---

[1] Sean Stilwell, "Defining Slavery, Defining Slavery," in *Slavery and Slaving in African History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 5-6.

[2] *Ibid.,* 8.

[3] Ismail Rashid, "'Do dady nor lef me make dem carry me': Slave Resistance and Emancipation in Sierra Leone, 1894–1928," *Slavery & Abolition* 19 (1998): 210.

Africans resisted their enslavement by evading and defending against being captured. In his article "The Myth of Inevitability and Invincibility: Resistance to Slavers and the Slave Trade in Central Africa, 1850-1910," Cordell challenges notions that slaves failed to establish effective resistance to slave raiders by focalizing on those who did so.[4] Similarly, Winston McGowan explores how slaves resisted the Atlantic slave trade in a variety of ways that slave traders feared. Cordell also shows that targets of slave raids sometimes defeated the raiders outright. This was the case at Kaga Kazembe when a Manza force defeated one of the most successful Muslim slave raiders of the time, al-Sanusi, in 1892 or 1893.[5] Often, potential slaves fled and relocated elsewhere, thereby depriving raiders of a successful raid because there were fewer people to cart off.[6] If they did get captured, especially during the Atlantic Slave Trade, slaves would resist going to market by abandoning slave ships and holding forts called barracoons, from which they also escaped.[7] Ships were sometimes mutinied by their cargo in an attempt to return home or sail to shore. McGowan explains that crews of European transporting ships feared such uprisings because they threatened their safety and livelihoods.[8] Slaves sought refuge and defended themselves against slave raiders and traders; they were not passive victims. Many of these precautions and evasive maneuvers failed, but it is essential to their story that slaves resisted enslavement.

Loosely populated societies were often targets of increasingly rapacious slave raids wherein raiders would use their numerical advantage to overwhelm their prey. Many scholars have falsely concluded that decentralized and sparsely populated communities were easy victims of slave raiders. Walter Hawthorne shows this is false. Both Hawthorne and Cordell show the historical processes that resulted from these "victim" societies engaging with increasingly intensified slave raids to reorient themselves accordingly. In north-central Africa, these groups, such as the Sara, gravitated toward larger, more easily defensible, and evermore centralized societies because they made logical choices to do so.[9] In West Africa, the Balanta similarly

---

[4] Dennis Cordell, "The Myth of Inevitability and Invincibility: Resistance to Slavers and the Slave Trade in Central Africa, 1850-1910," in *Sylviane Diouf*, ed., *Fighting the Slave Trade: West African Strategies* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003), 37.

[5] *Ibid.,* 38.

[6] *Ibid.,* 42.

[7] Winston McGowan, "African Resistance to the Atlantic Slave Trade in West Africa," *Slavery & Abolition* 11, no. 1(1990): 18.

[8] *Ibid.,* 19.

[9] Cordell, "The Myth of Inevitability and Invincibility," 39.

migrated their society away from their traditional plains to swamps because the plains were difficult to defend against slaver raiders. To adjust to this new environment, the Balanta reorganized their labour into a system of age-grades to utilize new agricultural technologies which allowed them to produce new crops. Similar to the Sara, they established *tabancas*, which were more densely populated and secure villages.[10] Is it essential to the history of slaves that they were not merely captured easily by "big men," but instead, they actively chose their resistance.

Even after their initial enslavement, slaves were not docile. Gordon explains that some slaves in south-central Africa could negotiate their terms of service with their masters. Slaves could leave their masters relatively easily, provided they – as kinless outsiders – could find other protection elsewhere. Slaves could even "break a Mitete," which was an act that symbolized the transfer of their loyalty from one master to another.[11] Of course, slaves still fled once enslaved. Still, more impactfully, they could also form a rebellion, as Bruce Mouser shows in his "Rebellion, Marronage, and Jihad: Strategies of Resistance to Slavery on the Sierra Leone Coast, c. 1783–1796." In Moria, groups of slaves pounced on an opportunity for rebellion when most men were out fighting.[12] The uprisings quickly expanded and lasted for three years due to the various defence and food production methods utilized by the slaves.[13] Although the rebellion was ultimately unsuccessful, it created new dynamics in the region; they forced powerful chiefs to ally to reassert their authority over the rebels of Yangekori.[14] The end result of this slave revolt was not as significant as its scale of both intensity and duration. Slaves impacted the socioeconomic structures of the area and remain a testament to the impact of slave agency.

Equally important to how is why slaves chose to exert their agency to resist and rebel using their specific methods. Slaves did not act without reason; they were engaging critically with their environment and their status as slaves. Relocation was a good option for when slave raiding was prevalent. Some slaves relocated to open woodland areas relocated that received plenty of rainfall and had sections of dense brush and light forest, meaning they could find refuge for the few days it took for raiders to retreat. Cordell notes the caves that were unique in central Sudan facilitated

---

[10] Walter Hawthorne, "Nourishing a Stateless Society during the Slave Trade: The Rise of Balanta Paddy-Rice production in Guinea-Bissau," *Journal of African History* 42, no. 1 (2001): 2-3.

[11] David M. Gordon, "The Abolition of the Slave Trade and the Transformation of the South-Central African Interior during the Nineteenth Century," *William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (October 2009): 927.

[12] Bruce Mouser, "Rebellion, Marronage and Jihad: Strategies of Resistance to Slavery on the Sierra Leone Coast, c. 1783-1796," *Journal of African History* 48, no. 1 (2007): 36.

[13] *Ibid.,* 37.

[14] *Ibid.,* 40.

refuge because they were not easily approachable by external raiders and even less so on horseback.[15] The Maroons, to which Mouser refers, changed their strategy to accommodate for islands, mangrove islets, or highlands.[16] Rebel slaves on the Swahili coast asserted their rights by drawing upon the history of particular groups of slaves like the *mafundi* – who could better accumulate wealth in the past.[17] The Balanta employed specific techniques to navigate their increasingly violent setting near a powerful Mandinga slaving states.[18] McGowan shows that many slaves resisted being captured and sold into the Atlantic Slave Trade because they feared the loss of personal freedom, were ashamed of enslavement and dreaded white cannibalism, and dreaded permanent separation from their families.[19] The Chikunda interacted with their unique social space, as military slaves in the *prazo* system, in particular ways that caused the formation of their ethnic identity.[20] They chose their rituals and *makaju* (facial tattoos), patrilineage,[21] and formed their language, known as *Chi-Chikunda*, to differentiate themselves from nearby populations specifically.[22] Mouser shows that a significant factor in the Yangekori rebellion was the arrival of leaders like Fatta, who claimed to be the Prophet Muhammed's successor, which destabilized pre-extant social dynamics, thereby giving slaves a more significant opportunity for rebellion.[23] Slaves were utilizing their specific environmental and social conditions to resist dynamically. They were making active and engaged choices; they were not merely reactionary. This affected slave owners' obligations and impacted their control over their slaves.

In multiple cases, slaves developed their own versions of social institutions such as their attire or identity or negotiated for economic opportunity to show their agency. These rebellious slaves were not specifically reacting against their status as slaves, but rather their treatment and rights. During slavery and afterwards, groups such as the Chikunda resisted slave status by controlling their identities. *Prazos* military slaves, known as the Chikunda, organized themselves to influence their masters' actions or even assigned themselves new masters if they were treated

---

[15] Cordell, "The Myth of Inevitability and Invincibility," 37.
[16] Mouser, "Rebellion, Marronage and Jihad," 36.
[17] Jonathan Glassman, "The Bondsman's New Clothes: The Contradictory Consciousness of Slave Resistance on the Swahili Coast," *Journal of African History* 32, no. 2 (1991): 292.
[18] Hawthorne, "Nourishing a Stateless Society during the Slave Trade," 2.
[19] McGowan, "African Resistance to the Atlantic Slave Trade in West Africa," 21.
[20] Allen Isaacman and Derek Peterson, "Making the Chikunda: Military Slavery and Ethnicity in Southern Africa, 1750-1900," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 36, no. 2 (2003): 267.
[21] *Ibid.,* 268.
[22] *Ibid.,* 269.
[23] Mouser, "Rebellion, Marronage and Jihad," 40.

poorly.[24] Isaacman and Peterson point out that the *prazeiros* were intimidated by the Chikunda, who regularly rebelled against perceived mistreatment, but not necessarily against their status as slaves. The Chikunda forged a new identity in between the peasants – from whom they sought distinction – and their masters.[25] The Chikunda used rituals, culture, and dress, to idealize their status as military slaves to give themselves a sense of belonging.[26] Jonathon Glassman similarly argues that disobedience on the Swahili coast was formed around slaves' desire to join key social institutions such as community and kinship, which facilitated the reproduction of social life, and around their desire to access economic opportunity and *peculium* – customary property rights.[27] Slave resistance in Swahili, like the Yangekori rebellion in Moria, resulted in the alteration of the broader society because it forced the coalescence of a master class consciousness in addition to a more solidified – though often contradictory – slave consciousness.[28] The Waungwana caravan traders along the coast of East Africa negotiated more autonomy for themselves because they were valuable to their owners' profits.[29] Swahili slaves, as Glassman shows, sought economic and social rights which influenced broader institutions in society. As explained by Rashid and Glassman, the concept of the moral economy can shed light on other reasons behind slave dissent. Rashid describes the moral economy as "the balance between rights and obligations of masters and slaves" that arose historically "from the dynamic intersection of the pre-colonial mode of production, politics and customary laws and slave resistance."[30] He is referring to northwestern Sierra Leone, but similar processes occurred throughout the continent. During the rebellion in Moria, Sierra Leone, slaves felt they received poor treatment and that their masters were withholding their customary protections.[31] Many still sought protection afterwards, however. Some slaves pledged allegiance to their master's rivals, showing that they did not necessarily seek dissolution of their slave status but rather better conditions under which to serve.[32] Certain groups of slaves, such as the *Olisos* in northwestern Sierra Leone, were more likely to gain rights as a result of their closeness to their masters. These rights, however, were often still forced by resistance and

---

[24] Isaacman and Peterson, "Making the Chikunda," 274.

[25] *Ibid.,* 258.

[26] *Ibid.,* 274.

[27] Glassman, "The Bondsman's New Clothes," 277-78, 287.

[28] *Ibid.,* 288.

[29] Stephen J. Rockel, "Slavery and Freedom in Nineteenth Century East Africa: The Case of Waungwana Caravan Porters," *African Studies* 68, no. 1 (2009): 87.

[30] Rashid, "'Do dady nor lef me make dem carry me,'" 210-11.

[31] Mouser, "Rebellion, Marronage and Jihad," 36.

[32] *Ibid.,* 37.

represented their greater negotiating power.[33] Many Chikunda kept their identity after the collapse of the *prazos* system – when they were no longer legally slaves – and continued to serve under their selected warlord, Kanyemba, showing that slaves often sought to belong, not always individual freedom.[34] Furthermore, Glassman also defines slave marronage in East Africa concerning this moral economy. They did not want to reject their status as slaves outright in favour of "freedom," but rather, they wished to participate fully in social, political, and economic institutions.[35] These slaves did not structure their resistance on the basis of class struggle, but instead, they struggled to preserve their *peculium* rights.[36] They did so often without questioning their masters' language of ownership over them or their status as slaves.[37] In post-abolition Zanzibar, former slaves asserted their freedom by altering their clothes to that of elites and participating in social and religious rituals from which they were previously denied.[38] Struggles for better terms of service with the concept of the moral economy represent slaves' active struggle to change their societies and dismiss claims that slaves were merely reactionary characters.

In particular, women had unique circumstances with which to contend and chose their methods for resistance accordingly. Women were responsible for cooking, cleaning, and other domestic chores traditionally completed by women, and some became concubines.[39] Marcia Wright argues that women occupied a unique space between wife and slave, which altered their emancipation options. These women were conscious of their status as slaves and acted against it. The presence of missionaries who sought the abolition of slavery and colonial courts presented women with new options to obtain freedom, thereby challenging the moral economy. The ambiguous divide between a wife and a slave created unique struggles for women to prove their status as slave wives or free women. [40] Women navigated these challenges by fighting their status as slaves in court or repaying the price paid for them. These women sought to escape their status

---

[33] Rashid, "'Do dady nor lef me make dem carry me,'" 212.

[34] Isaacman and Peterson, "Making the Chikunda," 275.

[35] Glassman, "The Bondsman's New Clothes," 303.

[36] *Ibid.,* 288, 311.

[37] *Ibid.,* 288.

[38] Laura Fair, "Dressing up: Clothing, Class and Gender in Post-Abolition Zanzibar," *Journal of African History* 39 (1998): 65.

[39] Emily S. Burrill, "'Wives of Circumstance': Gender and Slave Emancipation in Late Nineteenth-Century Senegal," *Slavery & Abolition* 29, no. 1 (January 2008): 52.

[40] Marcia Wright, "Bwanikwa: Consciousness and Protest among Slave Women in Central Africa, 1886-1911," in Claire Robertson and Martin Klein, eds., *Women and Slavery in Africa* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1983), 266, 263.

as slaves, and not necessarily to alter their roles or expected tasks as women.[41] Women who recognized themselves as slaves worked to repay the price that had been paid for them. Bwanikwa, who was purchased with the price of a gun by her husband, utilized various methods to repay her husband to be treated as a free wife.[42] Emily Burrill argues that this intermediary space drove women in Senegal to choose slavery as a form of protection rather than remain unprotected in the increasingly violent and unstable climate caused by colonial and African conquests.[43] The agency of slave women presented itself differently than men because their options for resisting varied, but it still impacted their relationships with their owners and husbands.

The story of Chisi-Ndjurisiye-Sichyajunga (Chisi) and Samuel Ajayi Crowther of Oyo convey the different avenues women slaves had to exert their agency versus male slaves. Chisi was enslaved during a raid and taken away from her home in Biza country when she was a young girl.[44] The raiders killed all the men in her village, but spared her because she was a woman, and, therefore, a more suitable target. She was given to the chief as a slave-wife when she reached luBemba – the territory of her captors.[45] Chisi was sold several times to a variety of different men. Since female slaves were purchased as wives and their children often belonged to their masters, the threat of taking their children from them remained powerful.[46] Women were generally more connected to their children, which meant they often had to look after them and, in Chisi's case, contend with their misdeeds – such as having intercourse with another man's wife.[47] Samuel Crowther, on the other hand, was freed from a slave ship in 1822, and went on to attend several schools both in Africa and in Europe. He went on to become a teacher, missionary, and a Bishop in the Anglican Church. His life was unique and shows that slaves could achieve success if given the chance.[48] However, Crowther's adventures were only possible because he was a man. It was next to impossible to join a school of the sort Crowther did as a woman. Chisi and Crowther show the disparity in a woman's opportunity as a slave and a man's opportunity.

---

[41] Wright, "Bwanikwa," 264.
[42] *Ibid.,* 260.
[43] Burrill, "'Wives of Circumstance': Gender and Slave Emancipation in Late Nineteenth-Century Senegal," 59.
[44] Marcia Wright, ed., "Chisi-Ndjurisiye-Sichyajunga" in *Strategies of Slaves and Woman: Life Stories from East/Central Africa* (New York: Lillian Barber Press, 1993), 81.
[45] *Ibid.,* 82.
[46] *Ibid.,* 87.
[47] *Ibid.,* 88.
[48] Ade J.F. Ajayi, "Samuel Ajayi Crowther of Oyo," in *Africa Remembered*, ed. Philip D. Curtain (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), 290.

This paper has shown that many slaves actively engaged with their status as slaves to present resistance to slavery in the same manner as Stilwell – as a dynamic product of history.[49] They resisted enslavement, strove for social and economic privileges during their service, and secured their status as freed persons. It is essential to the history of slaves that they defended against slave raiders, influenced their master's obligations and control, and sought emancipation. Furthermore, this paper has situated resistance to slavery within the moral economy to convey the nuanced visions of "freedom" for which slaves struggled. Rashid, however, says this cannot be taken as an equalization between the voices of slaves and masters, and the dynamics of slavery were inherently unequal.[50] Since slaves were often denied community and kin, and their sense of dishonour and exclusion associated with slavery, there is a lack of formal oral traditions from which we can draw upon to tell the story of slaves.[51] This is why historians must reconstruct the history of slaves. However, these enslaved Africans' impact on power dynamics and in general society cannot be excluded from the history of slavery in Africa.

---

[49] Stilwell, "Defining Slavery, Defining Freedom," 8.
[50] Rashid, "'Do dady nor lef me make dem carry me,'" 210.
[51] Martin A. Klein, "Studying the History of Those Who Would Rather Forget: Oral History and the Experience of Slavery," *History in Africa* 16 (1989): 213, 211.

Bibliography

Ajayi, Ade J.F. "Samuel Ajayi Crowther of Oyo." In *Africa Remembered,* edited by Philip D. Curtain, 289-316. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Burrill, Emily S. "'Wives of Circumstance': Gender and Slave Emancipation in Late Nineteenth-Century Senegal." *Slavery & Abolition* 29, no. 1 (January 2008): 49–64.

Cordell, Dennis. "The Myth of Inevitability and Invincibility: Resistance to Slavers and the Slave Trade in Central Africa, 1850-1910." In *Fighting the Slave Trade: West African Strategies,* edited by Sylviane Diouf, 31-49. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003.

Fair, Laura. "Dressing up: Clothing, Class and Gender in Post-Abolition Zanzibar." *Journal of African History* 39 (1998): 63-94.

Glassman, Jonathan. "The Bondsman's New Clothes: The Contradictory Consciousness of Slave Resistance on the Swahili Coast." *Journal of African History* 32, no. 2 (1991): 277-31.

Gordon, David M. "The Abolition of the Slave Trade and the Transformation of the South-Central African Interior during the Nineteenth Century." *William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (October 2009): 915-38.

Hawthorne, Walter. "Nourishing a Stateless Society during the Slave Trade: The Rise of Balanta Paddy-Rice production in Guinea-Bissau." *Journal of African History* 42, no. 1 (2001): 1-24.

Isaacman, Allen and Derek Peterson. "Making the Chikunda: Military Slavery and Ethnicity in Southern Africa, 1750-1900." *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 36, no. 2 (2003): 257-81.

Klein, Martin A. "Studying the History of those who would rather Forget: Oral History and the Experience of Slavery." *History in Africa* 16 (1989): 209-17.

McGowan, Winston. "African Resistance to the Atlantic Slave Trade in West Africa." *Slavery & Abolition* 11, no. 1(1990): 5-29.

Mouser, Bruce. "Rebellion, Marronage and Jihad: Strategies of Resistance to Slavery on the Sierra Leone Coast, c. 1783-1796." *Journal of African History* 48, no. 1 (2007): 27-44.

Rashid, Ismail. "'Do dady nor lef me make dem carry me': Slave Resistance and Emancipation in Sierra Leone, 1894–1928." *Slavery & Abolition* 19 (1998): 208–31.

Rockel, Stephen J., "Slavery and Freedom in Nineteenth Century East Africa: The Case of Waungwana Caravan Porters." *African Studies* 68, no. 1 (2009): 87-109.

Stilwell, Sean. "Defining, Slavery, Defining Freedom." In *Slavery and Slaving in African History*, 1-28. New York: Cambridge UP, 2014.

Wright, Marcia. "Bwanikwa: Consciousness and Protest among Slave Women in Central Africa, 1886-1911." In *Women and Slavery in Africa,* edited by Claire Robertson and Martin Klein, 246-67. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1983.

Wright, Marcia, ed. "Chisi-Ndjurisiye-Sichyajunga." In *Strategies of Slaves and Woman: Life Stories from East/Central Africa*, 81-90. New York: Lillian Barber Press, 1993.

"The Old Faith:" Insular Catholicism and the Protestant Reformation

Lucy Boyd

Along with Catholicism, cultural and religious resistance to British imperialism are integral aspects of Ireland's history. Ireland's medieval insularity and its indigenous culture profoundly influenced the development and spread of Christianity on the island, and the resulting faith was culturally distinct from—and at times even heretical to—other manifestations of Catholicism in Europe. The rich local culture would also prove critical to Ireland's ability to withstand England's sweeping imposition of the Protestant Reformation in the British Isles during the sixteenth century. At the same time, Henrician repression helped galvanize Catholicism as a foundational element of Irish identity.

While some scholars have suggested that it is misleading to characterize the Irish religious experience as a unified faith removed from broader Latin Christendom, Ireland's folkloric differences and its relative physical isolation from the rest of Europe during the Middle Ages gave rise to a unique form of "insular Christianity."[1] As legend goes, Christianity came to Ireland in 432 when Pope Celestine sent the future St. Patrick to covert the Gaels.[2] The importance of local culture is already evident in the popular hagiographic legend, in which Patrick uses the shamrock to explain the concept of the Holy Trinity to converts.[3] Regardless of the veracity of this story, Patrick left behind a rich monastical network.[4] As a result of their unique physical and geographic context, the Irish developed a distinct and vibrant Christian culture from the start. Because they were never a part of the Roman Empire, Ireland (unlike the rest of Western Europe) lacked cities through which to build an ecclesiastical structure of bishops and dioceses.[5] Monasteries, therefore, assumed many of the bishop's responsibilities and played a central role in the development and spread of the church.[6] As Judith Bennett and Sandy Bardsley note, while some bishops were

---

[1] Judith M. Bennett and Sandy Bardsley, *Medieval Europe: A Short History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 48.
[2] John Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," *The Crane Bag* 7, no. 2 (1983): 106.
[3] Tarlach O'Raifeartaigh, "Saint Patrick," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2019, accessed 2 Nov. 2020, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Saint-Patrick.
[4] Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 106.
[5] Bennett and Bardsley, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, 48.
[6] *Ibid.*

present in Ireland during the sixth and seventh centuries, their duties were "spiritual and sacramental only" and, notably, in some cases "they even lived in monasteries."[7]

The Irish monastic network also differed from that in broader Latin Christendom in other important ways. One was the great success of "pilgrimage-as-mission," in which monks left their communities to convert pagans; some of the new monastic centres that resulted from these efforts (such as St. Columba's Iona Abbey, St. Finnian's Clonard, and St. Brigid's Kildare) remain famous.[8] In these compounds, monks and nuns would generally each have a distinct single stone cell, called a *clochán*, or "beehive hut."[9] Lloyd Laing suggests that *clochán* were inspired by secular Celtic dwellings that pre-date the spread of Christianity, which underlines the impact of local culture on the faith.[10]

Irish churches also differed from those in the Roman tradition in important aspects, such as in the administration of baptism, episcopal consecration, monastic tonsure, and most contentiously, in the method of calculating Easter.[11] The Ionians used a set of tables known as the *Latercus* to determine the date of Easter, while the papacy drew on a series of tables devised by Victorius of Aquitaine in the fifth century.[12] As such, the date of celebrations differed most years, and would sometimes be up to a month apart.[13] This variance was of great concern to the Roman Catholic Church, as it suggested not only Christian disunity but mathematical ineptitude. These tensions would come to head at the Synod of Whitby, where the English Abbot of Ripon accused the Irish monks of "preferring the authority of St. Columba to that of the See of Peter."[14] The Roman method would win out, and by 800 the Irish church would conform to the broader practices of the papacy.[15]

Up until the ninth century, the Irish monastic system would flourish as centers of culture and learning and produce illuminated works such as the celebrated *Book of Kells*. Beginning in the

---

[7] Bennett and Bardsley, *Medieval Europe: A Short History,* 48.
[8] Bennett and Bardsley, *Medieval Europe: A Short History,* 48.; Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 106-7.
[9] Bennett and Bardsley, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, 48-9.
[10] Lloyd Laing, *The Archeology of Celtic Britain and Ireland: C.AD 400-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 222.
[11] Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 107.
[12] E.T. Daily, "To Choose One Easter From Three: Osiwu's Decision and the Northumbrian Synod of AD 664," *Peritia* 26: 50-1.
[13] Daily, "To Choose One Easter From Three," 51.
[14] Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 107.
[15] *Ibid*.

ninth century, however, Irish monasteries became targets for Viking raids.[16] *The Annals of Ulster* describe an attack on Rathlin Island, in what is now Northern Ireland, where the monastery was "burned by the heathens."[17] The chronicles reveal the spread of the violence and chaos. An entry from 798 details "the burning of Inis Patraic by the heathens," with Vikings taking "the cattle-tribute of the territories" and the "shrine of Do-Channa," while making "significant incursions in both Ireland and Alba."[18] Even as the Norsemen would eventually become Christians and integrate into Irish society through the establishment of "seaboard towns," their trade connections with England would contribute to the breakdown of the existing monastic structure of the Irish church.[19] The Norman connection with the English would bring England and Ireland closer together, with the Norse Kingdom of Dublin relying on Canterbury for ecclesiastical guidance and support.[20]

As John Jordan notes, while the "Otsman" contributed to the breakdown of the existing monastic system, the major reforming influence came from within.[21] Most central to this project was the future St. Malachy, an Abbott from Northern Ireland, who was passionate about restoring the church in Ireland, and complained that the people were neglecting proper sacramental rituals.[22] Bernard, author of St. Malachy's hagiography, paints a grim portrait of the state of Irish Christianity in the Middle Ages:

> Never before had [Malachy] known the like, in whatever depth of barbarism; never had he found men so shameless in regard of morals, so dead in regard of rites, so impious in regard of faith, so barbarous in regard of laws, so stubborn in regard of discipline, so unclean in regard of life. They were Christians in name, in fact pagans.[23]

While the scholarly consensus concludes that several elements of the *Life of St. Malachy of Armagh* were exaggerated, the Irish church was greatly enfeebled at the beginning of the twelfth century.

What the *Life of St. Malachy* does offer is a portrait of a zealous champion of Christianity who would be a central player in the Irish church councils of the High Middle Ages. To address the spiritual issues of the country, the Church held national synods in Cashel (1101 and 1172), Kells-Mellifont (1152), and Ráth Breasail (1111).[24] At Ráth Breasail, the Irish church shifted from

---

[16] Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 107.

[17] Roger Atwood, "The Vikings in Ireland," *Archeology* 68, no. 2 (2015): 47.

[18] University College Cork, *The Annals of Ulster*, 253.

[19] Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 107.

[20] Francis Young, "Making Medieval Ireland English," *History Today* 70, no. 3 (2020): 19.

[21] Jordan, "Irish Catholicism," 107.

[22] St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Life of St. Malachy of Armagh*, trans. H. J. Lawlor (2008), 162.

[23] *Ibid.,* 38.

[24] John Mac Erlean, "Synod of Raith Breasail: Boundaries of the Dioceses of Ireland [A.D. 1110 or 1118]," *Catholic Historical Society of Ireland* 3 (1914): 2.

a reliance on its existing monastic structure to a more typical system of diocesan bishops found elsewhere in Western Europe.[25] Even as these reforms brought more widely accepted devotional structures to Ireland, however, Irish Catholicism would retain an element of its insular flavour. Young argues that St. Malachy's efforts helped stabilize Irish monasticism, and it is notable that St. Bernard devotes much space in his hagiography to Malachy's restoration of a monastery in Bangor destroyed during a Viking raid.[26]

It is important to consider these local movements of reform—such as those championed by St. Malachy—in light of the first Anglo-Saxon campaign to enforce English religious conformity on Ireland. Starting in October 1171, King Henry II of England would proclaim himself "Lord of Ireland" and invade.[27] While there were political and military motivations for this invasion, Henry II cited religious reform as justification.[28] Not only had the Synod of Kells-Mellifont turned the bishops of Dublin into archbishops—thus ending the only religious influence England had on Ireland—but Henry was looking to publicly atone, through acts of faith, for the murder of St. Thomas Becket one year earlier.[29] The Anglo-Norman barons established churches dedicated to English saints in the territories they conquered, including St. Werburgh (Dublin), St. Edmund (Althassel), and St. Edward the Confessor (Limerick) in what Francis Young calls an act of "sacred imperialism."[30]

Despite extensive attempts to "Anglicize" the Irish faith, however, this project would not ultimately succeed, and its failure foreshadows later unsuccessful attempts during the Reformation. The religious houses and the language installed by the English struggled: locals would recapture dioceses in the fourteenth century and established Anglo-Saxon lords increasingly adopted both regional religious customs and language.[31] While a handful of English settlers continued to celebrate a handful of Anglo-Saxon saints, the legacy of insular monasticism and ongoing internal reform movements meant that these devotional practices found no meaningful foothold with the indigenous population of the island.

---

[25] Young, "Making Medieval Ireland English," 18.
[26] Young, "Making Medieval Ireland English," 18.; St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Life of St. Malachy of Armagh*, 31.
[27] Young, "Making Medieval Ireland English," 18.
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *Ibid.,* 19.
[30] *Ibid.*
[31] *Ibid.,* 19-20.

The "Anglicizing" projects of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are an important precursor to the events of Tudor England, with a few key differences. Most importantly, despite regional devotional differences, both the Anglo-Normans and the Irish in the Middle Ages would have understood themselves to be a part of Latin Christendom that practiced the same faith. Similarly, modern conceptions of national identity did not exist at this time. Nevertheless, Anglo-Norman Ireland's church history reflects the lasting influences of the island's insularity and its unique cultural environment, both of which gave rise to a nationalized faith that would help resist the spread of English Protestantism during the Reformation.

The full conquest of Ireland by England began in 1536, the year in which King Henry VIII formally broke with Rome.[32] Opposition to both Henry's religion and his politics in Ireland found expression during the Kildare Rebellion, whose leader Lord Thomas Fitzgerald renounced his allegiance to the King and had his followers swear obedience to the Pope, the Holy Roman Emperor, and himself.[33] The English would crush the rebellion, however, and in 1536-1537 Henry was recognized as the head of the Church of Ireland.[34] A flurry of reformation activities swiftly followed Henry's victory. The English shut down abbeys and monasteries in the Pale—a region of Ireland that included Dublin and Ulster—"despoiled" their relics, and converted St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin into a Protestant Church.[35] As in England, the dissolution of monasteries in Ireland was central to the Henrician project: despite great local opposition, its actions suppressed roughly half of the religious houses in the country.[36]

While Henry's reign marked the beginning of a series of attempts to Protestantize Ireland, Edward VI, who took the throne upon his father's death in 1547, radicalized the Reformation project.[37] A nine-year-old boy, he was little more than a figurehead, and a regency council led by his uncle Edward Seymour, the Duke of Somerset, governed England in practice.[38] Under the Somerset Protectorate, while English Protestantism increasingly committed itself to Zwinglian theology, England would ignore the situation in Ireland for the first year and a half of Edward's

---

[32] Karl S. Bottigheimer, "The Reformation in Ireland Revisited," *Journal of British Studies* 15, no. 2 (1976): 140-1.
[33] Henry A. Jeffries, "Unreformamble Ireland? The Failure of the Reformation in Ireland," *Marginalia* (19 January 2018): 11.
[34] Henry A. Jeffries, "Why the Reformation Failed in Ireland," *Irish Historical Studies* 40, no. 158 (2016): 151-70.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] Brendan Scott, "The Dissolution of the Religious Houses in the Tudor Diocese Meath," *Archivium Hibernicum* 59 (2005): 286.
[37] John S. Morrill, "Edward VI," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2020.
[38] *Ibid.*

reign, due in large part to the Protectorate's preoccupation with its war in Scotland.[39] Reformation activities would begin in earnest under Edward with the help of Archbishop Browne of Dublin, an Englishman that Henry VIII appointed to promote Protestantism.[40] Historical records reveal that Browne devised and spread a "book of reformation" to the local populace; while no copies have survived, some historians have theorized that this book is similar to the "Order of Communion" that was released in England that year.[41]

Moderate attempts to spread the faith soon gave way to more zealous forms of reform. Starting in November 1548, Protestant priests were encouraged to wage war on idolatry—and on many of the traditions that distinguished the insular Christian faith.[42] Purges of relics, images, sacramentals, and "all expressions of veneration for saints or sacred objects" followed.[43] These changes were not well received by the local congregation, who complained that "[Archbishop Browne] ha[s] taken open part with the Scot, that false heretic, and preached against the sacrament of the altar, and den[ied] saints."[44] Amid the unrest in the Dublin diocese, the Archbishop wrote to an unnamed lord deputy that he feared for his life.[45]

This religious unrest was coupled with the serious material challenges that Reformationist promoters faced. The Lord Deputy of Ireland, Anthony St Leger, bemoaned the scarcity of texts with which to teach the reformed liturgy.[46] Copies were in short supply and written in English, a language that few locals could understand and fewer still could read.[47] As such, attempts to introduce a new vision of Christianity in Ireland were met at best with indifference, and at worst, active hostility.

St Leger's efforts were notable for his willingness to make concessions to encourage the spread of Protestantism: he introduced the printing press to Ireland and negotiated with the Anglican Church to publish the *Book of Common Prayer* in Latin, a language more familiar to the Irish.[48] This project was modestly successful, with St Leger reporting an increased interest in the

---

[39] Brendan Bradshaw "The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland, 1547-53," *Archivium Hibernicum* 34 (1977): 83.
[40] *Ibid.,* 85.
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *Ibid*., 87.
[47] *Ibid.*
[48] *Ibid.,* 91-2.

book in the diocese of Limerick.[49] Given the intensity of the Reformation under Edward, however, St Leger's liberal attitudes placed him in some difficulty. In January 1551, he was forced to defend himself against several charges—including "neglecting the Reformation" and being a "Papist"—and was formally deposed four months later.[50]

The troubles of the Edwardian project in Ireland were not merely textual. The English authorities struggled to find suitable English clergyman for the Irish bishoprics.[51] This was not an easy task, as rumours of unrest in Ireland—and notions of its backwards people—made it an unattractive posting.[52] The protectorate eventually found champions of the faith in form of Hugh Goodacre and John Bale; however, both of their careers went disastrously. Goodacre, who was stationed in Armagh, evangelized fruitlessly to a congregation that largely could not understand English, and died only five months into his posting, possibly poisoned by his own clergy.[53] At his station in Ossory, Bale wrestled with the local customs of Irish Catholicism, writing in horror of the "prodigious howling and patterings" at Irish funerals, a tradition of keening that stemmed from the earliest insular practices in Ireland.[54] Furthermore, parishioners recited traditional Catholic prayers for the deceased and were devout believers in the doctrine of Purgatory, which the Anglican Church firmly rejected.[55] The King's death in 1553 put brought an abrupt halt to the Edwardian project.[56] As a whole, it was a largely unsuccessful attempt to instill a culturally and linguistically foreign faith. The Protectorate's attempts to enforce Protestantism on such absolute terms only bred hostility and resentment in the local population.

Edward's sister Mary succeeded him in 1553 and temporarily halted the Reformation in Ireland.[57] A devout Catholic, she sought to restore the "old faith" to both countries that she ruled. As Henry Jeffries notes, while Mary's projects in England have attracted significant scholarship, there has been much less focus on her impact in Ireland.[58] While Ireland's population was mostly Catholic, her religious policies also helped it resist the Reformation.

---

[49] Bradshaw, "The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland," 91.
[50] *Ibid.*, 93.
[51] *Ibid.*, 94.
[52] *Ibid.*
[53] *Ibid.*, 95.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Ibid.*
[56] Jeffries, "Why the Reformation Failed in Ireland," 151-70.
[57] Eric Norman Simons, "Mary I," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2020.
[58] Jeffries, "Why the Reformation Failed in Ireland," 151-70.

Mary's efforts to undo the work of her brother began in September 1553, when she released a declaration stating royal toleration of the Mass.[59] Much to the chagrin of Bishop Bale, this declaration and the restoration of traditional altars in the churches were met with great joy and local support.[60] Furthermore, Mary sought to replace Protestants that Edward had appointed to powerful clerical positions with Catholics.[61] In her letters to Archbishop Reginald Pole of Canterbury, she asked about how she might support Catholic clergy quickly without undermining the papacy.[62] When he failed to respond, Mary established a royal commission in April 1554 to remove members of the Irish clergy who had married.[63] This was, she wrote, a way of "purging" the church of those who had "sown heresies and schisms away from the true Catholic faith."[64] The result of this commission was one of massive ecclesiastical turnover: all but one of the removed clergymen was English.[65] As Henry Jeffries points out, that Mary's replacements were all local Irish men acknowledged the continued dominance of Catholicism among the population, even in the face of years of pro-Reformation activities.[66]

It is undeniable that Mary's activities in service of the Catholic revival in Ireland were far less intense than those in England. In spite of the Henrician and Edwardian Reformations of the sixteenth century, the insular particularities of Irish Catholicism enabled a consistent (if not cohesive) resistance to Protestantism. While brief, Mary's reign would centre the Irish on their own Catholic project, which would prove vital to their continued resistance to subsequent Protestant projects, including those of Elizabeth I.

Elizabeth I ascended to the throne in 1558, and her attempts to promote Protestantism in Ireland met with swift opposition.[67] Attempts to have local elites take the Oath of Supremacy—in which public officials swear allegiance to the Queen as the Supreme Governor of the Church of England—met a quick end in the face of overwhelming resistance, including from the most Anglicized parts of Ireland.[68] Furthermore, Elizabeth also faced the struggle to find Protestant preachers that plagued her predecessors. Letters between church officials and Elizabeth reveal that

---

[59] Henry A. Jeffries, "The Marian Restoration in Ireland," *British Catholic History* 33, no.1 (2016): 1.
[60] *Ibid.*, 16.
[61] *Ibid*. 17.
[62] *Ibid.*
[63] *Ibid.*
[64] *Ibid.*, 18.
[65] *Ibid.*
[66] *Ibid.*
[67] Morrill, "Elizabeth I," 1.
[68] Jeffries, "The Marian Restoration in Ireland," 27.

by 1564, among the roughly 2,500 parishes in Ireland, only three officials preached Protestantism: an Englishman, an Irishman, and a vicar briefly visiting from London.[69] The English were unable to evangelize effectively in their attempts to convert the local populace: Protestantism spread poorly on the ground, and local church hierarchs and secular elites firmly rejected it.[70] The Protestant Archbishop of Armagh noted this dissent in a letter to the Queen: "[the Irish nobility] condemn [..] your majesty's most godly laws and proceedings more manifestly than the rest."[71] Attempts to impose the *Book of Common Prayer* met with steadfast opposition, including boycotts of parishes that attempted to use it.[72] This unrest led to the establishment of the Irish Ecclesiastical High Commission in 1564 with a mandate to address "disturbances and misbehaviour" against "church, chapel […] or divine service."[73] Nevertheless, attendance at Protestant services remained low, and most nobles and peasants were regulars at Mass.[74] As Henry Jeffries suggests, boycotts revealed a coordinated approach to religious resistance also visible in underground networks that smuggled Catholic priests out of Ireland to religious colleges in mainland Europe.[75] These priests would later return and further solidify the faith in their home country.

Catholic reformation and revival was in full swing in central Europe during Elizabeth's reign. The Council of Trent (1545-1563) had met to define Catholic doctrine and revitalize the Church in light of the Protestant threat.[76] Among the decrees the Council released were statements on spiritual cultural issues, such as guidelines for sacred art.[77] These decrees would push many Catholic-majority countries such as Spain, Italy, and France into a period of rich artistic growth and, through the founding of spiritual orders, the development of new forms of devotional mysticism.

While Catholicism was always dominant in Ireland, a comparison with contemporary Catholic developments in central Europe highlights the island's unique religious insularity. The Celtic-rooted faith that had held strong against the English would not go through a similar period of artistic revival: indeed, Irish Catholicism was conservative and even archaic. The visual and

---

[69] Jeffries, "The Marian Restoration in Ireland," 27.
[69] *Ibid.*
[70] *Ibid.*, 28.
[71] *Ibid.*
[72] *Ibid.*
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] *Ibid.*
[75] *Ibid.*, 28-9.
[76] "The Council of Trent," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2020.
[77] *Ibid.*

literary arts were slow to develop in Early Modern Ireland—partly due to the English suppression of the aristocracy—and as such, the populace relied more heavily on their distinctive medieval traditions.[78] Similarly, the broader trend of founding new spiritual orders (such as the Jesuits) also eluded Ireland. The impact of this medievalist emphasis has shaped a faith that is distinct, even today, in its continuous draw upon ancient rites, art, and mythology.

Fundamental to a modern understanding of Irish history is consideration of its dominant faith: today, approximately 78% of the population is Catholic.[79] It is a Catholicism unique in its devotional practices and culture, and it emerged from years of insularity and successful resistance to various English Protestant expansionist projects. Indeed, the Protestant Reformation, as introduced by Henry VIII, would only serve to galvanize the faith. This resistance, coupled with Ireland's isolation, resulted in Irish devotional practices that are culturally distinct from other manifestations of Catholicism in Europe.

---

[78] Dorothy Walker and Simon Walker, "Indigenous Culture and Irish Art," *The Crane Bag* 1, no. 2 (1971): 47-51.
[79] An Phriomh-Oifig Staidrimh, Central Statistics Office, "Census of the Population 2016".

Bibliography

An Phriomh-Oifig Staidrimh Central Statistics Office. "Census of the Population: 2016." 2016. Accessed 15 Nov. 2020. https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cp8iter/p8iter/p8rroc/.

Atwood, Roger. "The Vikings in Ireland." *Archeology* 68, no. 2 (2015): 47-53.

Bennett, Judith M. and Sandy Bardsley. *Medieval Europe: A Short History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Bottigheimer, Karl S."The Reformation in Ireland Revisited." *Journal of British Studies* 15, no. 2 (1976): 140-49.

Bradshaw, Brendan. "The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland, 1547-53." *Archivium Hibernicum* 34 (1977): 83-99.

Daily, E.T. "To Choose One Easter From Three: Osiwu's Decision and the Northumbrian Synod of AD 664." *Peritia* 26: 47-64.

Jeffries, Henry A. "The Marian Restoration in Ireland." *British Catholic History* 33, no. 1 (2016): 2-31.

Jeffries, Henry A. "Unreformable Ireland? The Failure of the Reformation in Ireland." *Marginalia,* (19 January 2018).

Jeffries, Henry A. "Why the Reformation Failed in Ireland." *Irish Historical Studies* 40, no. 158 (2016): 151-70.

Jordan, John. "Irish Catholicism." *The Crane Bag* 7, no. 2 (1983): 106-16.

Laing, Lloyd. *The Archeology of Celtic Britain and Ireland: C.AD 400-1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Mac Erlean, John. "Synod of Raith Breasail: Boundaries of the Dioceses of Ireland [A.D. 1110 or 1118]." *Catholic Historical Society of Ireland* 3, (1914): 1-33.

Morrill, John S. "Edward VI." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2020. Accessed 12 Nov. 2020. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Edward-VI.

Morrill, John S. "Elizabeth I." *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 2020. Accessed 15 Nov. 2020. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Elizabeth-I.

O'Raifeartaigh, Tarlach. "Saint Patrick." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2019. Accessed 2 Nov. 2020. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Saint-Patrick.

Scott, Brendan. "The Dissolution of the Religious Houses in the Tudor Diocese Meath." *Archivium Hibernicum* 59 (2005): 286.

Simons, Eric Norman. "Mary I." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2020. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mary-I.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux. *Life of St. Malachy of Armagh*. Translated by H. J. Lawlor, 2008. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/25761/25761-h/25761-h.htm#Page_1.

"The Council of Trent." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2020. Accessed 14 Nov. 2020. https://www.britannica.com/event/Council-of-Trent.

University College Cork. *The Annals of Ulster*. Accessed 6 Nov. 2020. https://celt.ucc.ie/published/T100001A/.

Walker, Dorothy, and Walker, Simon. "Indigenous Culture and Irish Art." *The Crane Bag* 1, no. 2 (1971): 47-51.

Young, Francis. "Making Medieval Ireland English." *History Today* 70, no. 3 (2020): 18-20.

The Green Agenda of the Red Power Movement: Public Reception of Indigenous vs. Institutional Environmentalists in 1960s America

Anna Gaudet

Introduction

On a warm spring morning in 1970, busy cities across the United States fell silent. Pedestrians and cyclists invaded Fifth Avenue in New York, congregating in masses. Demonstrators in Miami, Florida, dumped brightly coloured dye into sewage systems in order to track where toxic effluent pooled throughout the city.[1] In Fairbanks, Alaska, community organizers held a "teach-in" to educate their peers about proposed government pipelines through the northern state.[2] Community gardens were planted in Ann Arbor, Michigan, as young children skipped across roadsides collecting trash.[3] Students, lawyers, Members of Congress, teachers, and children marched, rallied, worked, listened, and learned on a national level. The date was 22 April 1970, and twenty million Americans across the country were marking the first ever "Earth Day."

Following the devastating aftermath of the 1969 oil spill in Santa Barbara, California, US State Senator Gaylord Nelson inspired the day of action through his creation of environmental "teach-ins."[4] Student learning thrived as a result of Nelson's plan, and the movement quickly developed into a major initiative. The mass demonstration came after the turmoil of the 1960s, during which social movements such as civil rights coalitions and anti-Vietnam rallies gave university students a taste of the power of protest. As a result, many of these activists soon moved on to support the call for environmental justice in North America. Interestingly, these cries to action in the early 1970s closely echoed those of 'Red Power' movement activists in the decade prior. Throughout the 1960s, activists on reservations such as Pine Ridge, New Mexico and other locations across the country fought for environmental conservation alongside inherent Indigenous rights, as defined by centuries old treaties. Indigenous Americans were responsible for organizing the earliest forms of environmental protests; however, they are often omitted from contemporary articles chronicling the genesis of environmentalism. Curiously, few scholars have united the two

---

[1] Keith Woodhouse, "Review: After Earth Day: The Modern Environmental Movement," *Reviews in American History* 42, no. 3 (2014): 556-7.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] E. W. Kenworthy, "For the Real Story, Look Beyond Earth Week: Pollution Protest," *New York Times,* 25 April 1971, E1.

[4] Terra Green, "Earth Day: The History of a Moment," *New Delhi* 7, no. 2 (2014): 1.

advocacy groups to compare their intentions, actions, and treatments. This raises an important question – to what degree were the Red Power movement and the Environmentalism movement similar, and how were they portrayed by the media as different? By chronicling key events that lead to the formation of the groups, combined with a close reading of contemporary articles and files, it becomes clear that the two groups shared kindred values of sustainability, but received different treatment. Ultimately, youth advocates in the environmental movement were often depicted as being inherently 'good' activists, despite having closely allied goals and partaking in similar demonstrations to those of their 'radicalized' Indigenous American peers.

Chronicling the Formation of 'Red Power' and 'Environmentalist' Groups

In order to fully grasp the similarities and differences of the two groups, it is useful to first investigate the motivations behind their formation. In doing so, the depth and breadth of their influence can be evaluated, in order to determine how and why they came to be viewed differently in the court of public opinion.

To begin, the unrest that led to the formal advent of the Red Power Movement was a slow burn over the course of a few decades. Although Indigenous peoples have struggled with sovereignty as nations since the colonization of America in the 15th century, there were some key events that sparked the wave of activism in the 1960s. For example, following the passing of House Resolution 108 in 1953, development on reservation lands was legally permitted across the country. Indigenous peoples were being relocated from their ancestral lands to urban centres in large numbers.[5] Left alone and unsupported by government assistance, Resolution 108 heavily fueled Indigenous dissatisfaction with the government and triggered widespread backlash. However, as noted by scholars such as Bruce D'Arcus, participants in the movement and the academic community can generally agree upon the occupation of Alcatraz Island in 1964 (and later in 1969) as being the catalyst for the formalization of the movement.[6] Alcatraz Island is located in the middle of the San Francisco Bay, and served as a notoriously brutal maximum-security prison until its closure in 1963.[7] The following year, Indigenous activists of the Sioux Nation organized a siege of the vacant island and proposed to purchase it for the same rate at which their land had

---

[5] Troy Johnson, "The Occupation of Alcatraz Island: Roots of American Indian Activism," *Wicazo Sa Review* 10, no. 2 (1994): 63.
[6] Bruce D'Arcus, "The Urban Geography of Red Power: The American Indian Movement in Minneapolis-Saint Paul, 1968-70," *Urban Studies* 47, no. 6 (May 2010): 1244.
[7] *Ibid.*

been acquired (47 cents per acre).[8] The Alcatraz demonstration lasted approximately four hours, and swiftly came to an end after law enforcement threatened to charge all those present with a felony. After a few years of unsatisfactory deliberation with state officials, activists commandeered the island once again in 1969. However, this time the occupation was exponentially longer and louder. Local student advocates such as Richard Oakes had mulled over the idea of formally re-occupying the island for months, but when the San Francisco Indian Centre burnt to the ground, the plan was set into motion.[9] The advocacy group Indians of All Tribes soon began their nineteen-month long occupation. In January of 1970, the following proclamation was published in the newspaper *The Movement*:

> We, the native Americans, re-claim the land known as Alcatraz island in the name of all American Indians by right of discovery. We wish to be fair and honorable in our dealings with the Caucasian inhabitants of this land, and hereby offer the following treaty: We will purchase said Alcatraz Island for 24 dollars ($24) in glass beads and red cloth, a precedent set by the white man's purchase of a similar island about 300 years ago.[10]

Alongside this statement, the group specified their development plans for the island. Their goals were to create a series of Indian institutions, such as a spiritual centre, an ecology centre, and a heritage centre.[11] The second demonstration came to an end in June of 1971 when government officials removed the remaining individuals following years of hardship and failed negotiation. The occupation of Alcatraz Island was a momentous event in comparison to the local and more grassroots protests that had occurred in the years prior. For the development of what would soon be coined the 'Red Power Movement,' Alcatraz was ground zero. As noted by scholars such as Troy Johnson, many participants went on to form other influence advocacy groups such as the American Indian Movement (AIM) or the National Indian Youth Council.[12]

While the Red Power movement has roots extending back centuries, the environmental movement was active for years in the academic community but only reached a younger demographic towards the end of the 1960s. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, small groups such as Organization for Environmental Quality, Fast for Life, and guerilla theater group ENVI-ROMENTI staged protests against.[13] There were a plethora of proposed events that led to the rise

---

[8] D'Arcus, "The Urban Geography of Red Power," 1245.

[9] *Ibid.*, 67.

[10] Indians of All Tribes, "Proclamation: To The Great White Father and All His People," *The Movement*, January 1970, 10.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] Johnson, *The Occupation of Alcatraz Island*, 75.

[13] A. Youngeman, "Fast for Life," *The East Village Other* 5, no. 46 (13 October 1970): 17.

of the movement, such as the introduction of US forest management in the 1920s, but the publication of Rachel Carson's blockbuster book *Silent Spring* in 1962 undeniably improved environmental awareness. Carson's book detailed the adverse effects pesticides had on localised flora and fauna, accentuated by her remarks on the absence of bird calls near agricultural lands.[14] To further stoke the fire of environmental concern, Carson also included the adverse effects of pesticides on air and water quality, directly relating the issue to human health.

The somber yet illuminating book sparked a new concern for the natural world amongst populations that were previously sheltered from the environmental degradation Indigenous nations had witnessed for years. In the years following, events such as 'Earth Day' flourished, and environmental legislation supporting inherent rights to clean water and air were passed across the country. However, scholars such as Lawrence Mastron have noted that the complexity of the environmental movement cannot be traced back to a precise genesis, given the aforementioned gradual acts of small conservation groups leading up to the publication of *Silent Spring*.[15] Nevertheless, Carson was able to accomplish what many were not – delineating the dire state of the natural world to the general public.

Thus, the Red Power movement and the environmental movement had drastically different beginnings, with one fueled by racial injustice and the other the dissemination of academic literature. Though the movements spawned at different times and locations, their courses of action over the 1960s would eventually reach a junction. After having simply reviewed their motivations for coalescing, the similarity of the two movements is not overtly evident. However, chronicling the 'why' behind the group's formation is an important first step to understanding their organizational choices. By next examining their actions as social movements, their likeness becomes conspicuous.

The Rise of Environmental Demonstrations in the 1960s

Long before crowds marched down 5th Avenue on 22 April 1970, Indigenous activists had been organizing demonstrations in the name of environmental protection for decades. Though many scholars have evaluated concerns of the American Indian Movement, such as identity and sovereignty, few have managed to recognize the overarching environmental concerns that

---

[14] Lawrence Mastron, "Rachel Carson's Silent Spring (review)," *Film & History* 38, no. 1 (2008): 75.
[15] *Ibid.*

penetrate nearly all facets of Indigenous decision making. Unlike Western Judeo-Christian thought that explicitly dictates man's 'dominion' over nature, Indigenous cultures have had a spiritual connection to the environment, recognizing its inherent right to thrive - as opposed to its ecosystem services for humans. While both cultures privilege the aesthetic and psycho-spiritual value of the natural world, Indigenous peoples in the Americas live in harmony with the land and nature, not removed from it.[16] As noted by contemporary scholar Dee Brown in her 1971 *New York Times* article "The First Environmentalists," environmental protests by Indigenous peoples in the United States date back to as early as 1867.[17] Apart from localized negotiations, protests, and clashes with industries, certain environmental actions started to gain mainstream media attention over the course of 'the long sixties'. In the state of Washington, 'The Great Fish War' went on for over three years in the mid 60's due to industrial intervention on Indigenous fishing grounds. The interferences by industries were directly threatening the viability of aquatic species and infringed on Indigenous livelihood.[18] This type of standoff with industrial powers would continue as the country developed well into the 1970s. In 1970, the Navajo and Hopi Nations were approached by an Arizona coal company looking to acquire strip mining rights on their ancestral land of Black Mesa.[19] Fearful of irreversible degradation, the nations formed an agreement that at the end of the company's occupation of the land "the terrain would be replaced, and the native vegetation replanted."[20] This event is illustrative of how the environment has historically been the ultimate priority for Indigenous Americans. As noted by Brown, the Navajo and Hopis Nations were incredibly poor, having family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.[21] Regardless of their hardships, the 1970 negotiations never foregrounded monetary compensation. Rather, preservation of native biodiversity emerged as the supreme value at stake for Indigenous negotiators. Even Indigenous activists who did not overtly target conservation made sure to include it. For example, in the height of the tensions surrounding the occupation of Alcatraz Island, the Indians of All Tribes group announced in the newspaper *The Movement* that one of their goals on the island was to construct an Indian Ecology Centre, to "train and support our young people in scientific research and practice

---

[16] Dee Brown, "The First Environmentalists," *New York Times,* 15 June 1971, 43.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Homer Bigart, "Indians are Pitted Against Game Wardens in Great Fish War of Northwest," *New York Times,* 14 August 1966, 68.
[19] *Ibid.*
[20] *Ibid*.
[21] Brown, "The First Environmentalists," 43.

to restore our lands and waters to their pure and natural state."[22] Indigenous activism has historically been synonymous with environmental activism, regardless of this omission by contemporary scholars. This is very plainly demonstrated in the popular 1974 article by Buttel and Flinn "The Structure of Support for the Environmental Movement: 1968-1970" that never once uses the word 'Indian.' Given that this article had the goal of conveying how "over time [the] concern with pollution and support for the environmental movement were drawn from increasingly broader bases of social structure," its failure to address Indigenous activism is even more striking.[23] This omission highlights the strong and absolute correlation of environmentalism with white students, even when Buttel and Flinn were explicitly studying diversity within the movement. Moreover, Indigenous activists were never put in leadership positions during the height of the environmental movement, regardless of the years of experience they had accomplishing the same goals of environmental conservation and protection.

As opposed to the longstanding omission of Indigenous activism from environmental discourse, mainstream environmental demonstrations in the 1960s and 1970s generally received more attention and acclaim. As was common in the period, the majority of the actions were initiated by college students. As described by Gladwin Hill in 1969, concerns over pollution of the natural world were "sweeping the nation's campuses with an intensity that may be on its way to eclipsing student discontent over the war in Vietnam."[24] For example, students at the University of Minnesota held a mock funeral burying a gasoline engine to protest against air pollution.[25] Nearby, students dumped over 26,000 empty beverage cans on the front lawn of a local manufacturer, calling attention to unnecessary packaging. At the University of Texas, environmental groups filed formal complaints against local industries and the university, asking them to claim responsibility for polluting a local lake.[26] Similar disruptions such as blockades, marches, artistic demonstrations, and formal complaints occurred at the University of Hawaii, University of Illinois, University of California Berkley, and the University of Nebraska in the late 1960s.[27] This is all to say that the tangible actions of the environmentalists were similar to those

---

[22] Brown, "The First Environmentalists," 43.
[23] Frederick H. Buttel and William L. Flinn, "The Structure of the Environmental Movement, 1968-1970," *Rural Sociology* 39, no, 1 (Spring, 1974): 56.
[24] Gladwin Hill, "Environment may Eclipse Vietnam as College Issue: ' Environmental Crisis' may Eclipse Vietnam as College Issue," *New York Times,* 30 November 1969, 1.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] *Ibid.*

of Indigenous activists. Both groups worked with intensity and purpose, looking to change the status quo. They both physically disrupted industrial action and tried to renegotiate institutional contracts for the sake of the planet's health. However, a closer read of the aforementioned articles highlights a critical difference that would permanently shape the legacy of the two groups – how they were treated by the media.

Public Reception

"I doubt you'll find many anarchist ecologists," commented Steve Berwick, a 28-year-old Yale environmentalist. "Ecology is a system, and anarchy goes against that."[28]

While there exists a plethora of similarities between the 'Red Power' and 'Environmentalist' social movements, no difference is as striking and telling of the period as the different ways they were perceived by the general public. The 1960s saw the creation of a belief that went on to be held for generations – that Indigenous activists protected the land for their own interests, while environmentalists did it for the collective good. To begin, since its creation, the environmental movement has been seen as inherently 'good' in the eyes of the general public. The movement was often described in language that painted it to be more refined and methodical than other coalitions such as Black civil rights groups. For example, a 1969 *New York Times* article on the student environmentalist movement described the Boston University picket lines as being "friendly" and not "hippy in appearance."[29] While important activists such as Earth Day organizer Denis Hayes tried to stress that "environmentalism was as radical as any movement," scholars such as Thomas Woodhouse argue that environmentalists continued to be seen as mild threats to the status quo in the public eye.[30] The movement was appealing to respectable students and those who "wanted to show the good side of students for a change."[31] The polished and attractive descriptions of the environmental movement in its early days undoubtedly accounted for why it was more graciously treated by reporters. Furthermore, a Ken Faboski article on an Atlantic-Richfield Oil Company luncheon very graciously described the presence of student picketers surrounding the building. The protest came in response to company owner Thorton Bradshaw's plan to construct an Alaskan pipeline to transport crude oil across the state. Faboski describes the

---

[28] Hill, "Environment may Eclipse Vietnam as College Issue," 1.
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] Woodhouse, *After Earth Day*, 558.
[31] *Ibid.*

protest as being diplomatic and quiet, with protestors not "wanting to crash the meeting."[32] Considering that the picketers went on to state their plans of constructing a blockade in Alaska regardless of the law (with one even stating, "if we get arrested, all the better"), their portrayal as being benevolent is an interesting angle to take.[33] This repeated emphasis on the passiveness of environmentalists as opposed to their temper contributes to the narrative that white student activists were more attractive to report on than Indigenous land protectors.

This attitude held by the media was drastically different than that towards Red Power activists. In aforementioned cases such as the 1966 Washington state fish-ins, over one half of a contemporary *New York Times* article focused on detailing the threats and violence that occurred at the event rather than the important reasons why it was happening in the first place. Another striking example of these reports occurred in March of 1970, when Indigenous activists organized a demonstration at Fort Lawton in Seattle. Activists were lobbying the state government to turn the fort into an Indian Education, Ecology, and Cultural centre, as opposed to the plans to establish a new park.[34] The protest garnered a plethora of media attention, mainly because it was attended by actress Jane Fonda who was arrested on site. Demonstrators set up a series of tepees around and inside the fort, intending to camp out until the government accepted their proposal.[35] More than seventy-seven Indigenous activists were arrested about an hour later. A 1970 article on the event described the activists as "invaders" who "attacked" Fort Lawton.[36] The article even included a photograph of a protestor being restrained and dragged out of the fort, with the caption reading that he was being "escorted."[37] The article goes on to state that "Several Indians contended that they had been beaten. But the only violence witnessed by a newsman came when an Indian youth was shoved against a desk in an office."[38] Even when reporters witnessed the use of excessive force on demonstrators, it occupied only two sentences. However, there were some leftist newspapers that did acknowledge Indigenous American activists as being foundational to the environmentalist movement, notably *The Movement*, which often foregrounded Red Power voices. There is one notable example of mainstream media shining a light on Indigenous

---

[32] Ken Faboski, "Oil President Picketed," *Berkeley Bob*, 3 August 1973.
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] "Indians Seized in Attempt to Take Over Coast Fort," *New York Times,* 9 March 1970, 22.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *Ibid.*

environmentalism. In 1971, Dee Brown wrote an article for the *New York Times* entitled "The First Environmentalists," which foregrounded the history of grassroots environmentalism amongst Indigenous activists.[39] Nevertheless, the most widely consumed contemporary publications undoubtedly crafted a narrative of intentional deviance amongst Red Power activists – a decision that has permanently changed how historians' study and evaluate mid-century environmentalism.

Unlike the articles on student activists, reports failed to mention the expertise of Indigenous youth on conservation issues, and instead painted them in a negative and selfish light. This was a stark contrast to reports on environmentalists (also by the *New York Times*), such as the 1969 article "Environment May Eclipse Vietnam" that only dedicated two sentences to mentioning the arrest of twenty-nine University of Texas students who attempted to block workers cutting down trees on campus to make way for a new building.[40] The rest of the large article was devoted to the impressive dedication of student advocates. Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s, media outlets reported on a plethora of environmental demonstrations, but framed their reports very differently. Activists on both sides were often working towards the same goals, taking the same actions, and initiating the same level of conflict. However, the attractive and educated look of the student environmentalist was much more favourable to news outlets who were recovering from the long and difficult reporting on the social turmoil of the 1960s. This harmful framing of Indigenous land protectors as violent and self-indulging would permanently change the history of the environmental movement.

Conclusion

"Ecology has become an overnight issue. Everyone is climbing on the bandwagon – including the major polluters themselves" – Radical Coalition for Environmental Action, 1970 [41]

In conclusion, the Red Power and American Environmentalist social movements both tried to instill a new appreciation for the natural world through their demonstrations. The two groups held similar values and passions, with the Indigenous activists having strong cultural motivations and the environmentalists excited over the start of something new. Looking back through the lens of contemporary conservation politics, it is academic to nominate Indigenous activists as some of the first environmentalists. In the 1960s, however, they did not receive the same treatment. As

---

[39] Brown, "The First Environmentalists," 43.
[40] Hill, "Environment May Eclipse Vietnam," 1.
[41] Radical Coalition for Environmental Action, "Pollution Protested Coopted!," *Swill and Squeal,* 1 June 1970.

demonstrated by their exclusion from leadership in the environmental movement and their unjust media backlash, Red Power activists were critiqued for their cries for sovereignty instead of consulted by conservationists looking for allies. Luckily, modern day environmentalists have begun to realize the value of the knowledge of the natural world that Indigenous nations across North America held, and the movement has become more intersectional. The omission of Indigenous activists from scholarship in the 1960s has yet to receive a suitable degree of attention, however publications on sustainability continue to grow. Moving forward, Indigenous activists of the Red Power movement should be seen as an important part of environmentalism, given their long history of protecting the land through demonstrations analogous to those of university students in the 20th century.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bigart, Homer. "Indians are Pitted Against Game Wardens in Great Fish War of Northwest." *New York Times,* 14 August 1966, 68.

Brown, Dee. "The First Environmentalists." *New York Times,* 15 June 1971, 43.

Buttel, Frederick H. and William L. Flinn. "The Structure of Support for the Environmental Movement, 1968-1970." *Rural Sociology* 39, no. 1 (Spring, 1974): 56.

Faboski, Ken. "Oil President Picketed." *Berkeley Bob*, 3 August 1973.

Hill, Gladwin. "Environmental Concern: Not a Passing Fad." *New York Times,* 5 January 1975.

Hill, Gladwin. "Environment may Eclipse Vietnam as College Issue: 'Environmental Crisis' may Eclipse Vietnam as College Issue." *New York Times,* 30 November 1969, 1.

Indians of All Tribes, "Proclamation: To The Great White Father and All His People." *The Movement*, January 1970, 10.

"Indians Seized in Attempt to Take Over Coast Fort." *New York Times,* 9 March 1970, 22.

Kenworthy, E. W. "For the Real Story, Look Beyond Earth Week: Pollution Protest." *New York Times,* 25 April 1971, E1.

Kifner, John. "Indian Against Indian, Indian Against Whites: The Pine Ridge Reservation: A Colonial World of Hatred." *New York Times,* 6 July 1975, 122.

Kifner, John. "The Ghosts Dance Once again at Wounded Knee." *New York Times,* 4 March 1973, 194.

Radical Coalition for Environmental Action. "Pollution Protested Coopted!" *Swill and Squeal,* 1 June 1970.

Waldron, Martin. "Tribal Exhibition Arouses Protests: Rowdy New Mexico Event is 'red power' target." *New York Times,* 17 August 1970, 34.

Youngeman, A. "Fast for Life." *The East Village Other* 5, no. 46 (October 13, 1970).

Secondary Sources

D'Arcus, Bruce. "The Urban Geography of Red Power: The American Indian Movement in Minneapolis-Saint Paul, 1968-70." *Urban Studies* 47, no. 6 (May 2010): 1241–55.

Johnson, Troy. "The Occupation of Alcatraz Island: Roots of American Indian Activism." *Wicazo Sa Review* 10, no. 2 (1994): 63-79.

Mastron, Lawrence "Rachel Carson's Silent Spring (review)." *Film & History* 38, no. 1 (2008): 75-6.

Pulido, L. *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006.

TerraGreen. "Earth Day: The History of a Moment." *New Delhi* 7, no. 2 (2014): 8-9.

Woodhouse, Keith. "Review: After Earth Day: The Modern Environmental Movement." *Reviews in American History* 42, no. 3 (September 2014): 556-63.

The Curse of *Cinema Verité:* How Robert Drew Failed the Counterculture and Changed Documentary Filmmaking Forever

Lane Harrison

The term *cinema verité* was created by the French filmmaker Jean Rouch and the sociologist Edgar Morin in the early 1960s. However, when *The New Yorker* published an article entitled "The Godfather of *Cinema Verité*" in 2014, it was to celebrate the life of the recently passed American filmmaker Robert Drew.[1] "No filmmaker has changed his branch of cinema more drastically, enduringly, or quietly than did Robert Drew," Richard Brody writes, although this impact would not have the immediate mainstream effect Drew had hoped. At the beginning of the 1960s, Drew set out to change the way documentary films (and television news-programs) were made in America, and the way they impacted American citizens. Drew, an editor and photographer for *Life,* took a year off in the 1950s to be a Neiman fellow at Harvard, "to try and figure out how journalism could work," Drew said in 1962.[2] After completing his fellowship, he decided on the following journalistic philosophy: "I'm determined to be there when the news happens. I'm determined to be as unobtrusive as possible. And I'm determined not to distort the situation."[3] This philosophy became *cinema verité.* A method of documentary filmmaking and broadcast journalism without hosts, interviews, or narration; a film that was simply constructed of what could be filmed and recorded on the scene.

In 1960, Drew formed the production company Drew Associates, enlisting other filmmakers who would later become renowned documentarians to produce films that followed his new vision of broadcast news. The most successful among them included Don Allan (D.A.) Pennebaker and Richard Leacock, who later formed the Leacock-Pennebaker company and produced films such as *Don't Look Back* and *Monterey Pop*, as well as Albert Maysles, who along with his brother David later made *Salesman* and *Gimme Shelter,* among other films. To make their films, Drew Associates had to create their own equipment. To achieve their goal of being an objective fly-on-the-wall, they needed quiet mobile cameras and the ability to record synchronized

---

[1] Richard Brody, "The Godfather of Cinéma Verité," *New Yorker*, 31 July 2014.
[2] Hanley Norrins, "Filmmaker Robert Drew discusses his ideas that created American cinema verité," *Vimeo*, uploaded by Jill Drew, 15 January 2014.
[3] Jeanne Hall, "Realism as a Style in Cinema Verité: A Critical Analysis of 'Primary,'" *Cinema Journal* 30, no. 4 (Summer, 1991): 24.

sound to limit a voice-over narration that lectured audiences, which Drew detested.[4] They were able to achieve this through Pennebaker's experience as an engineer and Drew's ability to sell his ideas, as the "equipment may eventually have cost Time, Inc. a half-million dollars," according to author P.J. O'Connell.[5]

These founding fathers of the American *cinema verité* movement sought out to change the way broadcast news was made and the way it influenced the American people. The filmmakers became too concerned with their *cinema verité* ideologies, and failed to create the impact they had hoped, in both changing the way Americans consumed news and aiding the political causes they focused their lenses upon during the 1960s. Despite this failure, their films and the films they influenced others to create serve as extremely useful historical documents when examining 1960s America. This paper will argue that it was impossible for *cinema verité* to succeed under the philosophy Robert Drew used to create it. This is supported by the rejection of Drew's filmmaking philosophy by filmmakers and theorists in the 1960s; the incompatibility of Drew's philosophy with that of the New Left; Drew's high expectations for the media literacy of most Americans; and fatally, the inability to follow his own rules for filmmaking.

Scholars have largely attributed the lack of impact American *cinema verité* filmmaking had on the American public to Drew's philosophy. Thomas Waugh saw the style Drew developed as ineffective in supporting the various other political movements of the decade. Robert C. Allen attempted to explain why this contribution fails, attributing it to the philosophy of Robert Drew. Allen wrote that Drew and his associates believed that by documenting the realities of oppressed people in America, they would be able to change American minds. Allen interpreted the filmmaker's ideologies in the following way: "The advocacy of a specific program of change is not the filmmaker's task; it is enough to reveal the 'truth' of a social situation to the viewer."[6] As Waugh pointed out, this did not work. The objectivity that Drew and others strived for simply translated to impassivity. Bill Nichols took issue with the authorial point-of-view that was held by *cinema verité* filmmakers. He wrote that they saw themselves as observing history from the periphery, instead of acknowledging that they were a part of history. He wrote: "For a film to fail

---

[4] Hall, "Realism as a Style," 28.
[5] David Resha, "Selling Direct Cinema: Robert Drew and the Rhetoric of Reality," *Film History* 30, no. 3 (Fall 2018): 34.; P.J. O'Connell, *Robert Drew and the Development of Cinema Verité in America* (Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992).
[6] Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery, *Film History: Theory and Practice* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1985), 234.

to acknowledge this and pretend omniscience — whether by voice-of-God commentary or by claims of 'objective knowledge'— is to deny its own complicity with a production of knowledge."[7] *Cinema verité* was unable to have the impact it desired on the American public because of the filmmakers' inability to bridge the gap between this objectivity they so desired, and the subjective social commentary that was needed to support alternative politics. At the root of this inability was Robert Drew's philosophy, both in how he viewed American society and his filmmaking.

The philosophers that Drew studied while he was at Harvard provide some insight into his political intentions in making his documentary films.[8] Providing insight into Drew's political and philosophical beliefs allows for better understanding as to why his films lacked the social commentary that could have aided the counterculture movement. Although Drew did not share which specific philosophical ideas influenced him at Harvard most, it is known which philosophers he studied.[9] One of which was Walter Lippman, who wrote that western democracies were not prepared for coming modern problems. At the heart of this problem was: "The failure of journalism to inform the populous about complex social issues in such a way that rational decisions could be made, and, once made, acted upon by a unified nation."[10] According to Allen, Drew's studies and work were most in line with the political philosophy of American liberalism.[11] Allen cites Irving Howe's definition of the theory as a "reformist tendency in American twentieth-century politics, which has sought to improve the lot of the disadvantaged in modern society through government regulation and intervention, rather than through a radical restructuring of society or the economic system."[12] Operating under this philosophy, Drew's films possessed the notion that any issues being shown to the audience on screen could be "solved by adjustments in the social system."[13] This idea was practically antithetical to the philosophies of the counterculture, who favoured revolution over reformation.

It goes without saying that Drew was not alone in his belief that government reform could solve societal issues. Therefore, examples exist where Drew's philosophy faced off against that of the counterculture. One example is the 1970 U.S. Naval War College Seminar on Current Views

---

[7] Bill Nichols, "The Voice of Documentary," *Film Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (Spring, 1983): 20.
[8] Allen and Gomery, *Film History,* 235.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.,* 233.
[12] *Ibid.,* 234.
[13] *Ibid.,* 237.

and Attitudes, which included students from the Naval War College as well as Brown University and the University of Rhode Island. Naval students presented a philosophy akin to Drew's when speaking with their more radical counterparts from Brown and Rhode Island.[14] The naval students believed: "changes occurred because voters requested them, laws were passed, and thereafter citizens' conduct and values changed accordingly."[15] Additionally, they viewed their academic education as a part of the path towards professional success, financial wealth, and ultimately power.[16] The students at the seminar who were from Brown and Rhode Island, as well as some junior naval officers, rejected this idea. They saw education "as an open-ended process, the aim of which was the development of the ability to take advantage of many different alternatives."[17] Essentially, instead of viewing university as a way to join the commercial world that their parents lived in, the students involved in the counterculture saw education as a way to help them overthrow that world, which would solve issues of societal inequality in the process. In direct opposition to this, Drew's films present the idea that America's problems could "be corrected by the action of the government or concerned citizen."[18]

William F. Averyt, a faculty member at the Naval War College who participated in the seminar, wrote that the philosophy of the counterculture, as presented at the seminar, was largely informed by three main philosophers: Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud and Herbert Marcuse.[19] All three of whom advocated for the upheaval or reorganization of the society they lived in.[20] For the purpose of this paper, Marcuse is the most useful to examine, as he was both living and writing during the 1960s. While Lippman may have influenced Drew to think about the ways institutions could solve the problems that faced democracy, Marcuse told students of the counterculture that these institutions were actively working to make them unaware of the systemic issues that they themselves were creating in society.[21] As a means of social change, it is evident that Marcuse would disapprove of Drew's films. In 1964, Marcuse wrote: "the struggle for the solution has outgrown the traditional forms. The totalitarian tendencies of the one-dimensional society render

---

[14] William F. Averyt, "The Philosophy of the Counterculture," *Naval War College Review* 23, no. 7 (March 1971): 18.
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Allen and Gomery, *Film History,* 237.
[19] Averyt, "The Philosophy of the Counterculture," 25.
[20] *Ibid.*, 17-25.
[21] *Ibid.*, 22.

the traditional ways and means of protest ineffective – perhaps even dangerous because they preserve the illusion of popular sovereignty."[22] It is clear that Drew believed in the popular sovereignty and its power to make change. He also believed that by showing audiences an unmediated view of American issues, they would become concerned citizens and take whatever actions they could to make change.

Drew's critics, such as Waugh, wrote that his films struggled to influence tangible change because they failed at their opportunity to provide "explicit sociopolitical analysis to support the momentum of alternate politics."[23] This explicit analysis was necessary to avoid the counterculture's inevitable failure, as the movement was criticized for providing the emotions of change, but not the practical ideas for it.[24] This problem was recognized by Theodore Roszak in his seminal text, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition.* He wrote that the counterculture could end up as "a temporary style, continually sloughed off and left behind for the next wave of adolescents: a hopeful beginning that never becomes more than a beginning."[25] For the counterculture to avoid this predicted trajectory, Roszak called for the further development of the counterculture's ideas so that they could become more suited for adult discussion.[26] This development could have been aided by Drew, whose Drew Associate films were broadcast for an adult audience as a part of ABC's news programming.[27] There were many liberal Americans who lived through the 1960s without joining a protest or experimenting with a new lifestyle.[28] Waugh argued that the failure of *cinema verité* is made more embarrassing considering this fact. He wrote: "This failure of Leacock, Wiseman, et al. was a particularly bitter one, because of their widespread reputation as social critics, and because of the broad-based, potentially activist, liberal audience they addressed."[29]

---

[22] Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), accessed through *Pacifica: Marxists Internet Archive*, 2012.
[23] Waugh, "Beyond verité," 35.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counterculture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1969), 72.
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] Allen and Gomery, *Film History,* 230.
[28] Nadya Zimmerman, *Counterculture Kaleidoscope: Musical and Cultural Perspectives on Late Sixties San Francisco* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008), 2.
[29] Waugh, "Beyond verité", 35.

One example where the Drew Associates failed to provide the political analysis that Waugh called for can be found in *The Children Were Watching*.[30] A "Drew Associates classic," according to the Criterion Collection, that was shown on ABC.[31] The film chronicles the 1960 New Orleans School Crisis, which took place in November of 1960 when four Black children—three third graders and one first grader—were selected to begin the desegregation of the New Orleans public school system. The film focuses on two of these Black children, Tessie Prevost and Ruby Bridges, two six-year-olds forced to walk to school in the protection of U.S. Marshalls as racist white parents viciously harass and attempt to attack them. The filmmakers sought to demonstrate the passing of prejudice between generations.[32] To do so, they juxtaposed the raw racial hatred of the white parents against the oblivious faces of white and Black children; the white children were confused as to why their parents are so upset, and the Black children did not understand why they were being attacked walking to school. In one powerful scene, Tessie's grandmother explains that the latter is because the six-year-old was raised to see all races as equal. "I thought when people saw how vicious and awful, they were in front of their own children, they'd all be converted," Drew said of the film.[33] This was decidedly not the case, as schools in New Orleans were not desegregated for another 10 years.[34] That is not to say Drew's film could have dramatically hastened the proceedings of desegregation, but more to illustrate that Drew believed his films had the power to truly sway people's opinions. Allen quotes reviewer William Bluem as one of the critics of Drew Associate's method of showing audiences the problem but not explaining it to them. "While others were trying to explain the meaning of these events in order to invoke the sobriety of the reason, he was predisposed to show only hate and fear at its most tumultuous level, leaving us no room, no avenue, for thoughtful action."[35] The "he" Bluem referred to in this case is Leacock, as he directed the film while Drew served as executive producer. Drew was convinced that the image itself could sway audiences. As Jeanne Hall remarked: "With characteristic audacity, Robert Drew once invited viewers to turn off the sound on their television sets and

---

[30] Richard Leacock, "The Children Are Watching" (1961, ABC TV and Drew Associates), Film.
[31] "The Children are Watching," Film description, *The Criterion Channel*, https://www.criterionchannel.com/videos/the-children-were-watching.
[32] Drew Associates Website, https://drewassociates.com/films/the-children-were-watching/.
[33] Allen and Gomery, *Film History,* 236.
[34] Nikki Brown, "New Orleans School Crisis," *64 Parishes*, undated, https://64parishes.org/entry/new-orleans-school-crisis/.
[35] Bluem in Allen and Gomery, *Film History,* 231.

'follow the logic—even drama—of the show in what evolves visually.'"[36] While this was specifically impossible with *The Children Were Watching,* as a main thematic concern of the film is what children hear from their parents and how that informs future generations. It was impossible to watch any Drew Associates film that way because many still included narration. The narrator in *The Children Were Watching* tells the audience that they may "discover another story, deeper than words. Of how prejudice is passed on and how hope is planted in children."[37] As mentioned earlier, Drew purported to be against the lecturing narrator of mainstream television news. But Drew broke his own rules of *cinema verité* almost as often as he followed them. Thus invalidating the very style of realism he talked about creating, by demonstrating his films did not meet the criteria Drew created when he conceived *cinema verité*.

By not following his own rules, Drew proved that the impact he had hoped to make with *cinema verité* was not possible, constrained by the limitations of observation-driven narrative that he created. This aided in the downfall of the *cinema verité* movement. Other filmmakers who hoped to sway public opinion "felt the need to move beyond *verité* and develop a more polemical style of filmmaking."[38] Drew and Drew Associates departed from their own rhetoric in their first film, *Primary,* which followed John F. Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey as they campaigned for the 1960 presidential primary in Wisconsin. [39] Dave Saunders remarked that *Primary* fails as a *cinema verité* film because it is forced to rely on "the filmed practices of, and recorded responses to, other journalists who plainly had to ask questions of their subjects."[40] This proves how unrealistic Drew's dreams of creating a new form of broadcast news were, as it demonstrated the inability for a *cinema verité* film to tell a complete and comprehensible story without relying on the very forms of journalism it attempted to replace - a far cry from a documentary that can provide a complete story through its images alone, which Drew claimed his films did.[41] Additionally, Saunders wrote that "*Primary* does nothing to upset the longstanding images of Kennedy and Humphrey already disseminated by the press and on television."[42] Displaying that Drew's "claim

---

[36] Hall, "Realism as Style," 27.
[37] Leacock, "The Children Were Watching."
[38] Allen and Gomery, *Film History,* 237
[39] Robert Drew, "Primary," (1960, Drew Associates and Time), Film.
[40] Dave Saunders, *Direct Cinema: Observational Documentary and the Politics of the Sixties* (London: Wallflower Press, 2007), 27.
[41] Hall, "Realism as Style," 27.
[42] Saunders, *Direct Cinema*, 22.

to a new privileged grasp of reality," was ultimately false, and that audiences did not gain a new perspective through his film.[43]

Aside from using the processes of traditional news mediums to further the narrative in Drew's films, Hall pointed out another way *Primary* undermined its philosophies; specifically, the idea that *cinema verité* films are an accurate depiction of reality. Proving a criticism leveled by Nichols that "documentaries always were forms of re-presentation, never clear windows onto reality," as every director, cinematographer or editor might present something differently.[44] In her writing, Hall coined the phrase "the match game" to describe the way Drew possibly distorted reality in *Primary*.[45] Hall describes this method as follows: "Appropriate (if not ontologically linked) images are offered as illustration or explanation for certain sounds. The more likely the sound-image match appears, the more credible the film becomes on its own terms."[46] One example Hall referenced is a moment at a Kennedy rally where an announcement has been made that smoking will no longer be permitted, following a complaint from a woman whose dress was burned by a cigar. While this announcement takes place, Drew shows the audience a man smoking a cigar and a disgruntled looking elderly woman. By doing this, the audience forms a narrative in their mind that the man burned the woman's dress, despite the fact "there is no shot establishing spatial proximity between the two."[47]

The "match game" remains an issue in later Drew Associate films, such as the third Drew-Kennedy endeavor after *Primary* and *Adventures on the New Frontier* (which followed Kennedy through a day in the Oval Office), in *Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment*.[48] This film followed John F. Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy as they faced off against Alabama Governor George Wallace, who was attempting to prevent the integration of the University of Alabama. The film also followed the two Black students enrolled at the university, Vivian Malone and James Hood, however, they are not as central in the film as they should be. The bulk of the film took place inside the Oval Office and RFK's office in the Justice Department, where the camera contemplated its contemplating subjects, focusing upon the faces of the Kennedy brothers for nearly 10-seconds at a time as they formulate decisions and hear new information. One example

---

[43] Waugh, "Beyond vérite," 34.
[44] Nichols, "Voice of Documentary," 18.
[45] Hall, "Realism as Style," 30.
[46] *Ibid.,* 27.
[47] *Ibid.,* 33.
[48] Robert Drew, "Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment," (1963, ABC News and Drew Associates).

of the "match game" appeared near the end of the film, when John F. Kennedy addressed the nation and made his commitment. The audience is shown various shots of the main stakeholders of the film: Robert F. Kennedy is shown listening and then nodding; Wallace is shown frowning; Malone and Hood are shown eyes-wide and hopeful. However, none of these shots pan to a television set or offer any other indication that the subjects are in fact watching John F. Kennedy as he made the speech, and there are multiple other instances throughout the crisis where Wallace would have been frowning and Robert F. Kennedy listening intently. Another example can be found in *The Children were Watching,* where Leacock and Drew matched images of innocent children's faces with the sounds of white-suburban mothers spewing hate speech. The message the filmmakers were trying to send is clear, however, it is unclear if these children were actually hearing the words the audience is while being filmed.

However, as Hall notes, the "match game" is a product of "an attempt to show that *Primary* can cover not only the planned political drama on stage, but the spontaneous mini-drams in the audiences as well."[49] Covering these smaller, more nuanced aspects of massive historical events is something *cinema verité* excelled at and is a reason its films serve as useful historical documents today. Nichols says, "such films seldom offered the sense of history, context or perspective that viewers seek."[50] When reconsidering these films as historical documents, the context already exists due to other forms of scholarship. This meant that, despite the fact that there may be little contextual information in Drew's films, today's students of history can gain valuable insights into the decade by attending lectures, reading books on the topic, and then watching Drew's on the ground account of an event. These films can provide a unique perspective or show otherwise unremarked upon moments during historical instances that those interested in the 1960s may not find elsewhere. One great example of this comes in *Crisis: A Presidential Commitment,* when RFK is speaking to Nicholas Katzenbach, his deputy in Alabama. RFK's children had come by the office for a visit, and he asked his young daughter, Kerry, if she would like to say hello to Katzenbach. Cutting the tension with cuteness, the quick interlude was filmed perfectly. Pennebaker was holding the camera in Washington and Leacock in Alabama. Incredibly, both men correctly trusted their instincts, as neither of them knew the other end was being filmed.[51] This

---

[49] Hall, "Realism as Style," 33.
[50] Nichols, "Voice of Documentary," 17.
[51] Drew Associates Website, https://drewassociates.com/films/crisis-behind-a-presidential-commitment/#watchfilm.

instinctive decision making that led to the filming some of the most interesting details during historical events began with Drew's ability to recognize the way history was unfolding in front of him while filming *Primary.*

Saunders raised one example of this, wherein the camera paid special attention to Jacqueline Kennedy, as Drew recognized her importance as the perfect First Lady for the moment.[52] As Saunders wrote: "Jackie assiduously combined the attributes of the pinup (or 'babe'), the homemaker and the princess, a sense of synthesis that appealed to a public weary of familial breakdown."[53] Drew saw this and asked Albert Maysles to focus his camera on her as she stood by Kennedy's side at a rally. Kennedy himself appreciated the work that Drew Associates were doing for future generations. According to Drew's handwritten notes while editing *Primary,* he suggested the idea of documenting a crisis at the White House to Kennedy, who in agreement, replied: "What if I could look back and see what went on in the White House in the 24 hours before Roosevelt declared war on Japan?"[54] Displaying that those alive in the 1960s understood the possible benefits of Drew's filmmaking for future generations. By watching *Crisis,* Drew's access affords audiences a glimpse into every form of discussion the President and his advisors have, including the Kennedy brothers discussing what they should do if Wallace followed through on his threat to block the doors of the university to keep it segregated. "He can't cover all three doors," Robert said, as John looks on intensely, swaying in his rocking chair.[55]

Drew wanted his films to show audiences a "Strong experience of what it is like to be somewhere else, seeing for yourself into the dramatic developments in the lives of people caught up in stories of importance."[56] Drew Associates succeeded at doing exactly that, as in *Primary* with a nearly 90-second continual shot with synchronous sound of Kennedy splitting a sea of supporters to reach the stage. The sequence, which was shot by Maysles, helps modern audiences understand the power of his presence; "Kennedy's youth and potency were mirrored perfectly in the film's agile camerawork," Adam Nayman wrote.[57]

---

[52] Saunders, "Direct Cinema," 18.
[53] *Ibid.,* 16.
[54] Drew Associates Website, https://drewassociates.com/cinema-verité/.
[55] Drew, "Crisis."
[56] Allen and Gomery, "Film History," 235.
[57] Adam Nayman, "States of the Union, Part 1: The High Hopes (and Eventual Dread) of Kennedy-Era Filmmaking," *The Ringer*, 19 March 2020.

Later *cinema verité* films, by Drew Associates and others, offer valuable windows into the past, such as the Maysles brothers' *Salesman,* as it follows four salesmen from the Mid-American Bible Company. It is known through historical studies that America faced a crisis of religion during the 1960s, especially amongst the younger generations. A poll in 1971 that asked people if they had been to church in the past week returned an average response of 40% yes across all ages, but only 28% of the youngest demographic said yes.[58] Through the Maysles' film, audiences got to be in the living rooms of the people who made up these numbers to watch salesmen who were possessed by the spirit of capitalism, not Christ, enter the homes of a generation of Americans who had begun to drift from religion, and often could not afford the $50 luxury Bibles being sold to them. The camera followed the salesman as they forcefully talked their way into the middle-class homes of Catholics who had begun to de-prioritize their church.

With intimate shots of both the salesman and their prey, audiences see the small facial expressions of middle-class Catholics preparing to say no, and the salesman realizing they will once again leave a home unsuccessful. Reviewing the film for the *New York Times* in 1969, Vincent Camby wrote, "It may not be the entire story of America or even of the salesmen themselves (whose private lives are barely touched), but it is a valuable and sometimes very funny footnote to contemporary history."[59] A footnote that has become more valuable as it is now understood that "parenthood and political conservatism" attracted Americans back to church in the following decades.[60]

Outside of Drew's orbit, filmmakers such as Shirley Clarke challenged his vision of an objective *cinema verité* film, while still creating a powerful historical document. Clarke's most well-known film, *Portrait of Jason,* is a 2-hour portrait of Jason Holiday (born Aaron Payne), a larger-than-life gay Black man who sits in Clarke's living room for 12-hours, while drinking and smoking his way through his life's story for the camera. Holiday has lived many lives and played many parts, he was a former houseboy, prostitute and all-around hustler who aspired to be a nightclub performer. Instead of observing Holiday and the various characters he played throughout his life, the white Clarke and her partner, the Black actor Carl Lee, provoked Holiday from behind the camera. The worst of this provocation came from Lee, who called Holiday: "a great con artist,"

---

[58] Hugh McLeod, "The Religious Crisis of the 1960s," *Journal of Modern European History* 3, no. 2 (2005): 225.
[59] Vincent Canby, "Screen: 'Salesman,' a Slice of America," *The New York Times,* 18 April 1969, 32.
[60] McLeod, "The Religious Crisis of the 1960s," 228.

who did not "give a shit about anyone or anything."[61] This was purposely antithetical to Drew Associates *cinema verité* ideologies, as Melissa Anderson wrote "Clarke herself has noted that *Portrait of Jason* was made to 'show Richard Leacock and D.A. Pennebaker the flaws in thinking about *cinema verité*.'"[62] Clarke criticized these filmmakers for only showing the climaxes of events and not the ways those climaxes were reached.[63] As Anderson notes, if Clarke simply used Holiday to prove a point, it was exploitative as Holiday faced intersectional oppression.[64] Yet, Clarke and Lee's provocations "are complicated by the fact that Jason is a masterful manipulator, skillfully playing his 'victim' status as a trump card."[65] In this interaction between Clarke, Lee and Holiday, audiences are able to learn the ways that some Black and LGBTQ+ people were able to construct a life where they could proudly exist as gay outside the heteronormative society. "*Portrait of Jason,* then, can be seen as a document that reanimates the voice of the previously silenced, challenging the spectator to include this voice within the discourses of blackness, maleness, and sexuality," Anderson writes.[66] *Portrait of Jason* also demonstrates that filmmakers wanted to emulate Drew's filmmaking methods, but not his entire philosophy. Which resulted in his immense impact on the form of documentary.

In conclusion, Robert Drew's lofty goals for the *cinema verité* movement to both transform broadcast news and sway the American public's opinion, were ultimately unattainable under the philosophical constraints he created for the medium. The credibility of *cinema verité* was undermined by Drew Associates, as they regularly defied their own ideologies. The movement failed to immediately change the way Americans visually consumed news due to its reliance on the traditional news gathering strategies it had positioned itself against. Drew failed to sway people's opinions due to his overconfidence in the way the American people would view his films. As the films of Drew Associates found themselves bound by a "pretense of impartiality" that inhibited them from providing a social message to support political momentum.[67] Despite this, Drew, his team of filmmakers, and the other filmmakers they influenced, captured important

---

[61] Carl Lee, *Portrait of Jason,* directed by Shirley Clarke (1967; New York City: Film-Makers' Distribution Center, released on video by Milestone films; 2013), film.
[62] Melissa Anderson, "The Vagaries of Verities: On Shirley Clarke's Portrait of Jason," *Film Comment* 35, no. 6, (November/December 1999): 58.
[63] *Ibid.*
[64] *Ibid.,* 59.
[65] *Ibid.,* 57.
[66] *Ibid.,* 59.
[67] Waugh, "Beyond Verité," 34.

historical moments with revolutionary access and nuance. Providing modern audiences with important historical documents to accompany the contextualizing scholarship that now exists. According to Richard Brody, seeing a Drew film now, "it looks far less revolutionary than in fact it was—because more or less everything that Drew and his associates did has become standard procedure in documentaries."[68] This is important to consider, as although Drew may have been premature in his rhetoric when first discussing *cinema verité*, he was able to permanently alter his medium.

---

[68] Brody, "The Godfather of Cinéma Verité," 2.

Bibliography

Allen, Robert C. and Gomery, Douglas. *Film History: Theory and Practice*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1985.

Anderson, Melissa. "The Vagaries of Verities: On Shirley Clarke's Portrait of Jason." *Film Comment* 35, no. 6 (1999): 56-9.

Averyt, William F. "The Philosophy of the Counterculture." *Naval War College Review* 23, no. 7 (March 1971): 17-25.

Brown, Nikki. "New Orleans School Crisis," 64 Parishes, undated. https://64parishes.org/entry/new-orleans-school-crisis/.

Canby, Vincent. "Screen: 'Salesman,' a Slice of America." *New York Times*, 18 April 1969, 32.

Clarke, Shirley. *Portrait Of Jason*. Graeme Ferguson Productions and Shirley Clarke Productions, 1967. Film.

Drew Associates Website. https://drewassociates.com/cinema-verité/.

Drew Associates Website. https://drewassociates.com/films/crisis-behind-a-presidential-commitment/#watchfilm.

Drew Associates Website. https://drewassociates.com/films/the-children-were-watching/.

Drew, Robert. *Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment.* ABC News and Drew Associates, 1963. Film.

Drew, Robert. *Crisis: Behind A Presidential Commitment*. Drew Associates and ABC News, 1963. Film.

Drew, Robert. *Primary*. Drew Associates and Time, 1960. Film.

Hall, Jeanne. "Realism as a Style in Cinema Verite: A Critical Analysis of 'Primary.'" *Cinema Journal* 30, no. 4 (1991): 24-50.

Leacock, Richard. *The Children Were Watching.* ABC TV and Drew Associates, 1961. Film.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society.* Originally published: Boston: Beacon Press, 1964. Accessed through: *Pacifica: Marxists Internet Archive*, 2012. https://www.marcuse.org/herbert/pubs/64onedim/odmcontents. html.

Maysles, Albert, Zerwin, Charlotte, and Maysles, David. *Salesman*. Maysles films, 1969. Film.

McLeod, Hugh. "The Religious Crisis of the 1960s." *Journal of Modern European History* 3, no. 2 (2005): 205-30.

Nayman, Adam. "States of the Union, Part 1: The High Hopes (and Eventual Dread) of Kennedy-Era Filmmaking." *The Ringer*, 19 March 2020.

Nichols, Bill. "The Voice of Documentary." *Film Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (Spring 1983).

Norrins, Hanley. "Filmmaker Robert Drew discusses his ideas that created American cinema verité." *Vimeo*. Uploaded by Jill Drew, 15 January 2014.

O'Connell, P.J. *Robert Drew and the Development of Cinema Verité in America*. Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992.

Resha, David. "Selling Direct Cinema: Robert Drew and the Rhetoric of Reality." *Film History* 30, no. 3 (2018): 32-50.

Roszak, Theodore. *The Making of a Counterculture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1969.

Rusell, Duncan. "The Summer of Love and Protest: Transatlantic Counterculture in the 1960s." In *The Transatlantic Sixties*, edited by G. Kosc, C. Juncker, S. Monteith and B. Waldschmidt-Nelson, 152. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Saunders, Dave. *Direct Cinema: Observational Documentary and the Politics of the Sixties*. London: Wallflower Press, 2007.

Waugh, Thomas. "Beyond verité: Emile de Antonio and the new documentary of the 70s." *Jump Cut: A review of contemporary media*, no. 10-11 (1976): 35.

Zimmerman, Nadya. *Counterculture Kaleidoscope: Musical and Cultural Perspectives on Late Sixties San Francisco*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008.

Dr. Zhivago: Humanism and the Spirit of Revolution

Gideon Morton

At the end of WWII, the lofty idealization and utopian vision of world communism had been dashed by the repressed violence of the period 1917-1922 and was haunted by the spectre of Stalinism. Upon this backdrop, Boris Pasternak published *Dr. Zhivago*. The Soviet canonical memory regarding the October Revolution was an assertion of a singular ethos, one of grandiosity and self-assured righteousness, and the necessity of the revolution itself. The Soviet canon is starkly contrasted to Pasternak's vision of the Russian Revolution. This contrast displays the absurdity captured in the stories of Pasternak's characters. Their chance meetings and miraculous survival, or precipitant deaths, sets *Dr. Zhivago* apart from the assuredness of the Soviet canon. A comparison between the official narrative of the revolution, and the narrative presented in *Dr. Zhivago,* reveals the incongruity which caused a generation of Soviet citizens to reject Pasternak's notion.

Pasternak describes a feeling within Russia in 1917, a feeling of boundless possibility; the tensions which had for nearly a century plagued the whole of Russia finally erupted in February of that year. The deposition of Tsar Nicholas II left a country full of disparate intentions, keenly aware of both a pure sense of freedom and an impossible future. During the summer of 1917, Pasternak's alter ego, Dr. Yurii Zhivago, worked at a hospital in a small town in the black soil country of European Russia.[1] In the summer after the February Revolution, Zhivago saw those endless possibilities and notes the sense that "the whole of Russia has had its roof torn off" as a symbol of a (hopefully) freer future.[2] Few would have predicted, in those halcyon days, that five years of bitter civil war lay ahead. It is prudent to note in any discussion of great events that the realities of these events were not then, and should not be now, described in generalities. This feeling of freedom had its caveats: it was sectarian, ethnic, and geographical, and depended upon much more than simply being a member of those peoples who inhabited the now-collapsing Russian Empire. These particularities go beyond the scope of this essay but demonstrate a conflict between the Bolshevik vision of the revolution and Pasternak's contention, which this essay will

---

[1] Boris Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago*, trans. Max Hayward and Manya Harari (New York: Pantheon Books, 1958), 111.
[2] *Ibid.,* 123

demonstrate. It is clear in retrospect that this newfound sense of freedom in Russia left opportunity for ideology to take hold like a wildfire. In fact, Ronald Suny's observation, in his book *The Soviet Experiment*, that the Chinese characters for *crisis* "can be translated as 'dangerous opportunity,'" incredibly relevant in the context of Russia's uncertain summer before the Civil War of 1917-1922. [3] The various strains of revolutionary sentiment which were bubbling in Russia represented a great variety of opinions, with regard to the old Imperial infrastructure, culture, symbolism, language, and custom. Historian Richard Stites describes these developments:

> The making of a revolutionary culture and way of life required clearing away old forms (iconoclasm) and fashioning new myths, rituals, and moral norms through revolutionary festival and atheist "godbuilding;" a surge to establish social justice through equality; and the compulsion to transform Russian work habits and revise Russian notions of time, space, motion, and order with the goal of introducing the Revolution to the culture.[4]

As Stites makes clear, the construction of a particular memory of the period of revolution and Russia's past was part of the many different viewpoints associated with the Revolution in Russia. The violence inherent to revolution notwithstanding, it is imperative for a revolutionary group to establish itself within a framework of memory. The Bolshevik notion was fundamentally oriented towards establishing themselves as both rightful successors to power, and as emblematic of progress - progress that most Russians were vying for. The popular revolution of February 1917 and the deposition of the Tsar bore witness to this fact. The old was no longer preferable. This, therefore, meant finding a position between the iconoclasts and those whose progressive ideals were founded in the existing cultural and physical infrastructure of late imperial Russia. Lenin and the Bolsheviks fell among those whose aspirations were closer to iconoclasm but upheld the cultural significance of Imperial objects and symbols within a broad definition.[5] The Revolution, as harbinger of a reconstitution of history, foreshadows the cultural conflict which is exemplified by *Dr Zhivago*'s reception. This perception of historical actors, their purpose, and on what basis they took such and such an action, are questions which Pasternak answered unsatisfactorily for many Soviet people.

Lenin was, in the years preceding the summer of 1917, planning and waiting for a moment to assert Bolshevism on a national scale. He was well aware of the fact that, to create an enduring

---

[3] Ronald Suny, *The Soviet Experiment,* 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2011).

[4] Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (Oxford University Press, 1988), 61.

[5] *Ibid.,* 76-8.

legacy with his revolution, he would need to place it within a particular historical frame. Within the Bolshevik leadership, there was some disagreement as to the exact constituents of this historical constitution *in utero*. The iconoclasts were not, however, to find allies with the Bolsheviks. Stites noted this fact stating, "the Bolshevik leaders also felt ambivalent about the destruction of monuments, but their ambivalence led to a policy and action."[6] The Bolsheviks began a program of protecting art and symbols within their own definition of historical and aesthetic value.[7] This action indicates the Bolshevik assertion of control and its relationship to Russia's past; in Sites's words, "the negational [iconoclastic] broom was plucked away by the state for its own exclusive use."[8] The example of imperial monuments is also particularly important, as the monuments stand for much more in the eyes of the iconoclasts, and their destruction is symbolic of the destruction of intangible aspects of a society. The state grasp of memory, as a means to cultivate political legitimacy, was imperative for the Bolsheviks.[9] As Frederick Corney - a noted contemporary scholar of the early revolutionary years - points out, "It was widely agreed from the very beginning by Bolshevik leaders that personal and group reminiscences about October would inevitably play a major role in preserving it."[10] By grasping the imperial monument as a tool of memorialization, the Bolsheviks were able to achieve their goals. Lenin and his cohort carried this plan to fruition with programs of memorializing and framing numerous vestiges of imperial power within the Bolshevik canon, with museums and exhibitions created to this end.[11] Corney asserts that the revolution itself was, "above all, a *remembered* event, an event constituted as cultural and historical memory intended to legitimize the young Soviet regime."[12] Lenin's program of preempting the reception of the Revolution had an extremely enduring impact. So enduring, was this program, that even during the *glasnost* years, historians did not readily criticize the memory of the Revolution as a legitimate assertion of state power. This may have been prudent for much of Soviet history as such a critique would have been treated predictably: all differing viewpoints would have been consumed and out as the work of rogue *intelligentsia.* Instead, their critique

---

[6] Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams,* 65.
[7] *Ibid.,* 76.
[8] *Ibid.,* 78.
[9] Frederick C. Corney, "Rethinking a Great Event: The October Revolution as Memory Project," *Social Science History* 22, no. 4 (1998): 399-400.
[10] *Ibid.,* 397.
[11] Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams,* 77.
[12] Corney, *Rethinking a Great Event,* 397.

functioned only as the "retrieval of suppressed historical memory."[13] Memory may eventually have been acknowledged as a tool of the state, but the legitimacy of Lenin's program as an extension and affirmation of state power was not questioned.

Lenin did effectively assert the legitimacy of the Bolshevik seizure of power in the minds of many Russians, now Soviet people, who soon believed that Lenin's vision had been justified. It follows that a system which draws its power – that inherits its very legitimacy - from a memory project would be quite sensitive to anyone who would call that legitimacy (memory project) into question. Certainly, during the Stalin years it would have been tantamount to suicide for one to question the legitimacy of Soviet power; the Revolution was the action which had freed Soviet people from Tsarist autocracy, delivered them from their slavery at the hands of the bourgeoise and nobles, and asserted the worker as the head of a dictatorship of the proletariat. It was a history not that was not easily questioned. Moreover, it was a notion of history that, within the framework of Bolshevik ideology, represented the "'natural' ways of telling their story and of persuading others of its relevance to their daily lives."[14] The nature of the Revolution made it worth killing and dying for. For those who had fought in the civil war, and who knew the cost, it was an incredibly important justification; For the heads of Soviet power, it was unquestionable because it provided legitimacy to their power; For the members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) it was necessary to orientate themselves within the post revolution landscape. It should not be assumed that the people accepted this version whole cloth, however the necessity for image building in the absence of a formerly accepted state power should not be underestimated. The importance of this national memorialization is enough to explain why *Dr. Zhivago*, in placing the human toll of revolution in the spotlight, was roundly rejected, once by the state and again by the people of the USSR. Bolshevik power asserted itself amid a struggle for total destruction of all vestiges of imperial power; as such, this assertion was tenuous and relied on Bolshevik power, and "power in Bolshevik hands of course [often] meant the power of the bullet."[15] Imperial power had been rejected wholly by the population, as the past was unacceptable.

The Bolshevik legitimacy within history, as an heir to the national legitimacy of Russia, was fundamentally tied to the Revolution. By grasping for themselves the memory making

---

[13] Corney, *Rethinking a Great Event,* 397.
[14] *Ibid.,* 398.
[15] *Ibid.*

apparatus, the Bolsheviks placed their revolution as a definitive break from the imperial past. It is particularly this definition of eras that Pasternak would call into question with *Dr. Zhivago*. Within Russia, the impression given by the Bolsheviks with regards to the significance of the Revolution was to separate it from Russia's past; their position, however, in a tradition of revolution was also important. The Bolsheviks drew some power from the French Revolution, as a legitimation of their place within history.[16] As an enduring symbol of people's power (and therefore a legacy from which the Bolsheviks could build), the French revolution was an obvious choice. The marchers in 1905 and in strikes in 1917 had all sung the Marseilles. Revolution as a force for change within Russia was accepted, however the revolution was definitive within her borders, as evidenced by the fact that any fundamental criticism of the Bolshevik version of history was swiftly adjudicated. The aforementioned discontinuity between the conception of history in *Dr. Zhivago,* and that which was championed in the Bolshevik canon, is critical to understanding why not just the established political actors rejected the book's message. Despite a general appeal to historical continuity, the Bolsheviks presented an aesthetic break from the past, a fact affirmed by the desperate grasp at shaping the memory of the new Soviet people. It is a trite observation, but the innocent have nothing to hide. Nearly half a century later, when *Dr. Zhivago* was published, it threatened to reveal a continuity in Russian history, at the time an open secret which must not be spoken of.

From his early adulthood, Pasternak's impression of the ruling elite in Russia was dim. He was also critical of the present political mode, in which expression could be limited on the ruler's whims, and tens of thousands struggled to find food. Pasternak was exposed at a young age to the "wretchedness of rural Russia;" an experience which influenced his impression of the stark inequalities present within the empire.[17] Aged fourteen, when the Russo-Japanese war began in 1904, the young Boris Pasternak began to develop an awareness of the rapidly unraveling hegemonic Russian empire, and he began to associate himself with an indistinct but certainly progressive strain of political opinion. Despite some limited engagement with protests and political action, however, Pasternak was self-ascribed apolitical.[18] Pasternak's family too, being members of the *intelligentsia* and of a liberal progressive persuasion, were socially acquainted with left-

---

[16] Corney, *Rethinking a Great Event,* 398.

[17] Christopher J. Barnes, *Boris Pasternak: A Literary Biography*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 55.

[18] *Ibid.,* 1:56-61.

wing activists, but did not engage in direct action themselves.[19] His experiences of the period 1905-6—particularly the events of 9 January 1905, 'Bloody Sunday'—began to create a man who was highly sensitive to the political world and the ramifications of its actions, especially to the human component.[20] He is both critical of the excesses of a dying way of life, and sympathetic to the plight of disenfranchised Russian citizens. In Pasternak's first autobiography, *Safe Conduct* (written in 1931 but not published until 1958), he belies his impressions of the disintegrating upper class in Russia, "winks were exchanged by the lacquered smirks of a way of life that was cracking apart."[21] Pasternak's invocation of images of decay, facades, and inside jokes suggests his personal disenchantment with the hegemony of Russia's aristocracy.

While it is inaccurate to claim that at a young age, Pasternak ever courted revolutionary status, or indeed came anywhere close (as Barnes notes, he and his family were deeply impacted and disturbed by all acts of violence), and although Pasternak is sympathetic to the problems within Russia, he did not advocate for total revolution.[22] As Barnes notes, and Pasternak's own work testifies, Pasternak was keenly aware and quite sensitive to violence. Pasternak's own Yurii Andreyevich Zhivago, the titular character of *Dr. Zhivago* and Boris' alter-ego, though an idealized one, shares this trait with Pasternak.[23] A poignant moment in chapter three of Pasternak's *Dr. Zhivago* captures the particularities of this sensitivity for Pasternak; while Yurii Zhivago is working in a morgue, he describes the "naked bodies of unidentified young suicides and drowned women."[24] The stark contrast of tragedy and groundlessness, a theme which is central to Pasternak's criticism of the Soviet revolutionary canon, is explicit in this prose. The senselessness and surreality reflected in this short quotation reflect a continuity between Pasternak's opinion of the Tsarist regime, and the Bolshevik government which succeeded it. Pasternak uses this contrast of groundless tragedy to describe the individual's plight in the face of a state which fails to consider them, a theme which is present throughout Pasternak's *Dr Zhivago*. An example within *Dr Zhivago* which explicitly displays the political criticism present within this thematic contrast occurs at the very end of the book. Larisa 'Lara' Guishar Antipova, Zhivago's lover and confidant, disappears

---

[19] Barnes, *Boris Pasternak,* 1:54.
[20] *Ibid.,* 1:56.
[21] *Ibid.,* 1: 55.
[22] *Ibid.,* 1:57.
[23] Evgenii Pasternak, "'For Pasternak, Communication Was, Like Creativity, a Way to Give of Himself': Interview Conducted by E. Kalashnikov," *Russian Studies in Literature* 48, no. 2 (2012): 82-95.
[24] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 58.

and is presumed to have died in a Gulag, but her fate is ultimately left unclear.[25] This particular example displays Pasternak's own anguish at the senselessness of the violence which characterized the Stalinist period; Lara Guishar is a character who embodies (among other things) human goodness and altruism in the face of adversity. For Pasternak, the Bolshevik's were insensitive to the individual.

The loss of humanity is a theme fundamentally important to Pasternak's criticism of the Revolution. It is a theme not exclusively linked to the Bolsheviks, but to each actor who Pasternak interpreted as hindering expression, agency, and life. Pasternak confronts these actors in *Dr. Zhivago* unequivocally and without prejudice. From the first chapter of the book, Pasternak displays the tension between the lower classes in Russia and the Imperial hegemony most starkly in terms of humanity. The image of dragoons routing protesters in the snow and their whips and sabres falling indiscriminately among the assembly displays Pasternak's anguish.[26] It is events such as these, chronicled through the eyes of many different characters in *Dr. Zhivago,* for which Pasternak constitutes a legitimate political grievance. Those who assembled in protest are the disenfranchised and abused members of a system which has failed them. Their protestations are justified. This is hardly surprising considering Pasternak's aforementioned upbringing, as a member of the liberal *intelligentsia,* he felt a certain duty to be aware of current events, but equally was not particularly taken with offering commentary. This is a character trait which Pasternak and Yurii Zhivago share, and it seems their reaction to the fall of the Tsarist autocracy was much the same. Zhivago's Russia with no roof is Pasternak's Russia too. Barnes notes that Pasternak's summer of 1917 was marked by euphoric happiness and even contentment - an emotion seemingly out of place in a time of such shifting realities.[27] Yurii Zhivago and Boris Pasternak felt the righteousness of the fall of the Tsar, and believed it to herald, "'an ocean of blood and filth [beginning] to give out light.'"[28] It was, however, a double-edged sword. In a whirlwind of excitement, the apparent enthusiastic beckoning of the future quickly turned to confused horror, and in this chaos the Bolshevik assuredness that this was part of the plan became appealing. Just how this chaos settled upon people is masterfully reflected in Pasternak's prose on the occasion of Yurii Zhivago's return to Moscow. Yurii Zhivago, having been sent to the front as part of the

---

[25] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 416.
[26] *Ibid.,* 35-6.
[27] Barnes, *Boris Pasternak,* 1:224.
[28] *Ibid.*

Imperial effort in WWI, had spent the summer of 1917 working at a hospital far southwest of Moscow in the aforementioned black soil country.[29] It was here that Zhivago experienced that summer, and here that he made his observation of Russia with her roof torn off, that then seemed to promise something new and good. The train ride home to Moscow introduces the conflict with which Yurii Zhivago grapples - between those whose ends would destroy him and anyone else, destroy humanity, and his yearning for change:

> The doctor [Zhivago] was concerned about this life, he wanted it safe and whole and in his night express was impatient to get back to it after two years of separation. In the same group were his loyalty to the revolution and his admiration for it. This was the revolution in the sense in which it was accepted by the middle classes [left-liberal intelligentsia] and in which it had been understood by the students, followers of Blok, in 1905.[30]

It was this understanding of the Revolution which Pasternak himself deeply believed; an understanding he shares with Yurii Zhivago. It is this understanding too that threatened the Bolsheviks. This sense of the revolution was, quite simply, not enough to be accepted in the all-encompassing frame that the Bolsheviks had placed it in. There could be no guarantee of safety; the revolution must come first and above all else. Despite this, during his train ride home, Yurii Zhivago still maintained belief in his Revolution, the revolution that promised real change from the oppressive ways of the Empire. It was not to be. Even during Zhivago's train ride, amid his continual hope for a truly better future, a conversation with a stranger fills him with misgivings.[31] Upon Yurii Zhivago's arrival in Moscow, foreshadowing warns of the tough winter ahead, and a sense of absolutism continues to pierce any conversation of the revolution.[32] The pervasion of this absolutism is heralded by detachedness, calculation, and embodied in Pasternak's narrative by Yurii Zhivago's uncle, a man whom Zhivago holds in the deepest regard as an artist and scholar.[33] A parallel can be drawn here between the trajectory of the revolution in Pasternak's (and Yurii Zhivago's) eyes. Pasternak and Zhivago share a common understanding of the Revolution, and this understanding is clearly different from Zhivago's uncle. The euphoria of the February Revolution, and the summer of 1917, were replaced with consternation and horror as the civil war began, reflected in Zhivago's happiness when he sees his uncle only to discover his uncle is now

---

[29] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 111.
[30] *Ibid.,* 134.
[31] *Ibid.,* 136-8
[32] *Ibid.,* 143-44.
[33] *Ibid.,* 149-51.

unbearable in political conversation.[34] As 1917 wears on, Yurii Zhivago becomes increasingly anxious about the future, misgivings which are not misplaced. Yurii Zhivago's initial reason for returning to Moscow becomes his reason for leaving, and concerns about the wellbeing of his loved ones comes to a head. Material conditions and the threat of violence eventually convince Zhivago to take his family to Yuriatin, in the foothills of the Ural Mountains. It is here that the direct confrontation between Bolshevism and Pasternak's own notions of progress occurs, chronologically situated during the proceeding four years of vicious civil war.

The train ride from Moscow to Yuriatin was long and harrowing. The violence of the civil war had already caused chaos in the countryside, causing delays to the journey and affirming the worst. During Yurii Zhivago's train ride to Yuriatin, the demarcation between actors (Whites, Bolsheviks, etc.) begins to break down with regards to the impact of their actions. They are not described as Whites, as Bolsheviks, but as violent. The violence is characterized as it is, the human toll and loss of normalcy, the very ability for those who once inhabited the burned-out villages to eke out an existence has been taken from them; it is this that Pasternak bemoans, via Yurii Zhivago. This journey also brings Zhivago into contact with characters whom Pasternak's opinion of Bolshevism is directly confronted through. Upon arrival in Yuriatin, the husband of one of Zhivago's previous acquaintances and favorite interlocutors, Larisa Guishar Antipova, makes his appearance. He was responsible for some of the destruction that Yurii Zhivago witnessed during his travels, and he had transformed himself from a teacher to one of the Red Armies most dependable commanders in a remarkably short time.[35] Pasha 'Strelnikov' Antipov is at once the mouthpiece of Bolshevik sentiment and an absolutely 'unaffected' man.[36] On the occasion of their first meeting, Zhivago is struck by Strelnikov's confidence. Strelnikov is, in effect, the embodiment of the revolution in the Bolshevik sense; he represents the necessity of purism. His character is uncompromising and confident because it must be, there is no room for error and no room for second guessing, as to do so would be antithetical to the commitment to fundamentally break with the imperial past in aesthetic sense. As previously discussed, this commitment cannot be questioned or it becomes self-referential, and indeed Strelnikov's ultimate fate reflects this. Strelnikov had been committed fully to the Revolution, but the Revolution itself, in the Bolshevik

---

[34] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 151.
[35] *Ibid.,* 208-9.
[36] *Ibid.,* 206-7.

sense, was nothing but totality. Total belief was the commitment to itself for commitment's sake. For Strelnikov, the Revolution became his final commitment, and stripped him of all he held dear. After Yurii Zhivago and Strelnikov met in the last days of the civil war, two men had lost nearly everything representing their humanity to that war. Zhivago is saved by the last shred of his humanity to survive the war - his art. Strelnikov can do nothing but run from his former masters. Strelnikov had given up his life voluntarily, during the malaise of World War I, and when the Revolution had called, he answered. For freedom, he thought he would fight, and "When I'd won it [freedom], I thought, my hands would be untied, and I could belong to my family. And now, all my calculations have come to nothing."[37] Stripped of his utility to the Soviet regime by the end of the war, and disabused of his commitment to the Revolution, Strelnikov shot himself. In his final act, Strelnikov maintained more agency than most of those unfortunate victims of the Bolshevik Revolution. The end result, however, is fundamentally the same.

Pasternak's critique of Bolshevism grows more defined as the civil war rages on, and from Zhivago and Strelnikov's first meeting to their last, Zhivago spent some time with a band of Bolshevik insurgents. Zhivago was kidnapped for his practical knowledge of medicine and made to spend two years with the guerillas. During this time, and to his chagrin, Zhivago made the acquaintance of the group's commander, Liberious Mikulitsyn - the son of Zhivago's families' landlord in Yuriatin. Coincidences aside, Liberius was, unlike Strelnikov, a character who becomes repulsive to Yurii Zhivago. A cocaine addicted revolutionary fanatic, he bores Zhivago with his incessant dialogue.[38] To Zhivago, his character is totally disconnected from any sort of reality, and despite his acknowledgment that some practical measures proposed by Liberious are sound, he is anything but enthusiastic about his fanatical aspirations. For Pasternak, human life and history are not as easily shaped as Liberious claims them to be.[39] It is here that ideology clashes; for Pasternak, the absolutism and naivete of Liberius represent the totality of belief present in the Revolution personified.[40] It is particularly the necessity of absolutism in the Bolshevik sense of revolution, which as previously discussed is due to their control of the memory apparatus, which makes Liberius a repulsive character. For Pasternak one cannot change human life in such a fundamental sense through action. Yurii Zhivago sees Liberious as attempting to do just that: "The

---

[37] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 383.
[38] *Ibid.,* 279-82.
[39] Barnes, *Boris Pasternak,* 1:132.
[40] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 281.

people you worship go in for proverbs, but they've forgotten one proverb—'You can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink'—and they've got into the habit of liberating and of showering benefits on just those people who haven't asked for them."[41] The Revolution is uncalled for, and those who have made it their motive maintain that it was always imminent, a necessity, when in reality it is their own construction of what the revolution should be that they call imminent. The construction of memory as belief is a phenomenon which also induces in its believers the confidence in the necessity of that construction. It is this that the Bolshevik's actions are explained by violence in service of a construction.

Pasternak's own vision of history, from a letter to his family upon concluding his studies at Marburg, Germany, describes history as anything but ordained. Distinct from the Bolshevik notion, Pasternak views history as a series of serendipitous events (albeit with dark moments) which each follow precipitously,

> I realized that the history of a culture is a chain of equations in the shape of images which form pairs linking the already known with the next unknown. And this known element which remains constant for the whole series, is the legend underlying the tradition, whereas the unknown which is new each time is that actual moment in the stream of a culture.[42]

Pasternak contends that history is fundamentally unpredictable, with the best possible tool to understanding the future being the past. It is a version of history which is highlighted in the many chance encounters of Pasternak's characters in *Dr. Zhivago*, relationships which give one a headache to try and understand. Most truthfully, it is this which defines history for Pasternak, and for many Soviet people, for whom the only official version was that of the October Revolution was unpalatable. The occasion of *Dr. Zhivago*'s publication, an event with a storied history all its own, caused great turmoil within (and outside of) the Soviet Union. Pasternak first attempted to publish the book within the Soviet Union, but when this failed, he took the project to Western Europe. Besieged by the Soviet officials and press, Pasternak was forced to deliver a conference rejecting the decision to publish abroad.[43] Pasternak also received many letters, both at his home, and addressed to literature journals within the Soviet Union condemning his work.[44] As Denis Kozlov notes in his book *The Readers of Novy Mir*, "Most letter writers indeed viewed Pasternak's

---

[41] Pasternak, *Doctor Zhivago,* 281.
[42] Barnes, *Boris Pasternak,* 1:132.
[43] Christopher J. Barnes, *Boris Pasternak: a Literary Biography*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 348-50.
[44] Barnes, *Boris Pasternak,* 2:349.; "'Doctor Zhivago': Letter to Boris Pasternak from the Editors of 'Novyi Mir.'" *Daedalus* 89, no. 3 (1960).

behavior as treasonable, seeing Doctor Zhivago as an act of calumny against the Soviet order, the Revolution, and "our achievements."[45] Kozlov also notes that it is not possible to accurately deduce the totality of the Soviet reader's reaction to Pasternak, the volume of letters both received to Pasternak's home and those received by journals and newspapers does give an idea of the reception.[46] Pasternak's vision was incompatible with the memory of the Revolution as Lenin and his party had established it, as was it necessary for its long term legitimacy, and it was a threat.

Pasternak himself died soon after *Dr. Zhivago* was published. The legacy of the book today is no longer threatened so severely by the Revolution as the Bolshevik's defined it, but the conflict it created is a testament both to the great subtlety of Pasternak's work, and the enduring legacy of the Bolshevik vision. Pasternak's emphasis on the human element of the Revolution, the toll in terms of human lives and human suffering and the very degradation of life as it was known, called into question the legacy of a moment in history which defined the Soviet Union. It is not simply that people were brainwashed; for many the Revolution truly became what Lenin defined it to be. For many, the ends did in fact justify the means, and the belief in the necessity of the Revolution rang true for many people. Pasternak's own notion of history was perhaps too based in circumstance to uphold the legitimacy of Soviet power, and thus it faced a great deal of backlash. The very self-assuredness which Pasternak critiqued was in 1958 still very present in Russia.

---

[45] Denis Kozlov, *The Readers of Novyi Mir Coming to Terms with the Stalinist Past* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 116.
[46] *Ibid.,* 116.

Bibliography

Barnes, Christopher J. *Boris Pasternak: a Literary Biography*. 2 Volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Corney, Frederick C. "Rethinking a Great Event: The October Revolution as Memory Project." *Social Science History* 22, no. 4 (1998): 389-414.

"'Doctor Zhivago': Letter to Boris Pasternak from the Editors of 'Novyi Mir.'" *Daedalus* 89, no. 3 (1960): 648-68.

Kozlov, Denis. *The Readers of Novyi Mir Coming to Terms with the Stalinist Past*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Pasternak, Boris. *Doctor Zhivago*. Translated by Max Hayward and Manya Harari. New York: Pantheon Books, 1958.

Pasternak, Evgenii. "'For Pasternak, Communication Was, Like Creativity, a Way to Give of Himself': Interview Conducted by E. Kalashnikov." *Russian Studies in Literature* 48, no. 2 (2012): 82-95.

Stites, Richard. *Revolutionary Dreamsw: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution*, Oxford University Press, 1988.

Lockean Just-War Theory, Slavery, and Colonialism

Graham O'Brien

In *The Second Treatise of Government*, first published in 1689, John Locke primarily discusses the natural liberty of man and government. Early in the text, before he discusses property, Locke addresses slavery; this address barely exceeds the length of a page. His treatment of slavery seems to be a justification of the institution. This is in conflict with his earlier remark, from the *First Treatise*, that "slavery is so vile and miserable an Estate of Man."[1] Moreover, his treatment is inconsistent with the varying aspects of his political philosophy. These connections reach into his own life, where he had active involvement in the slave trade in Carolina. Scholars have hotly debated Locke's relationship with slavery and seems that they have not reached any definitive consensus on this relationship. In this essay, I will argue that "slavery should be seen as part of the fabric of Lockean philosophy," as Wayne Glausser writes in "Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade".[2] It is worth noting that this is the third approach that he outlines and commentates upon in his essay, and it is not one that he takes as his own. I will make this argument, however, on the basis of Locke's historical colonial interests, his treatment of the state of war, and waste land. In this, I will be focusing my attention on his political philosophy exclusively. Alongside *The Second Treatise* and Glausser's essay, I will be looking to Brad Hinshelwood's *The Carolinian Context of John Locke's Theory of Slavery* and James Farr's *'So Vile and Miserable an Estate':The Problem of Slavery in Locke's Political Thought*.

The first and easiest contradiction addressed is that between his *First* and *Second* treatises. James Farr writes, "Slavery is so vile and miserable an estate of man and so directly opposite to the generous temper and courage of our nation, that tis hardly to be conceived that an Englishman, much less a Gentleman, should plead for it."[3] In this, Locke is not referring to the slave-trade, but to absolute monarchy, particularly Sir Robert Filmer. As Farr notes, Locke is accusing absolute monarchists of "rationalizing the 'enslavement' of Englishmen 'under arbitrary power.'"[4] To Farr,

---

[1] Brad Hinshelwood, "The Carolinian Context of John Locke's Theory of Slavery," *Political Theory* 41, no. 4 (2013): 563.

[2] Wayne Glausser, "Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51, no. 2 (1990): 200.

[3] James Farr, "'So Vile and Miserable an Estate': The Problem of Slavery in Locke's Political Thought," *Political Theory* 14, no. 2 (1986): 269.

[4] *Ibid.,* 264.

this is the sole indictment of slavery that Locke is making. This is, as Farr notes, one he makes in order to take a moral high ground against monarchists, to cast them as slavers, and not as a categorical opposition to slavery.[5]

It is important and necessary to remark on Locke's history with slavery for context. Locke was involved in the slave trade in the American colonies. Hinshelwood writes: "Locke also helped author the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina, which guaranteed Englishmen 'absolute power and authority' over African slaves in the colony and created a just-war theory of legitimate slavery in the *Second Treatise*.[6] Moreover, Locke was known to have invested money in two slave trading companies; Glausser writes "the Royal African Company, and a company of adventures formed to develop the Bahama Islands. The first of these was explicitly a slave trading enterprise. Locke invested six hundred pounds in the Royal African company."[7] These passages raise many of this essay's questions. For the moment, it is essential to focus on this "just-war" theory of slavery and its relation to the Carolina colony, and his investments of time and money into the slave trade. This connection is relevant, as the following passage suggests "in Carolina just-war arguments over slavery were part of a regular dialogue [...] due to the massive trade in Indian slaves and their method of capture—war."[8] This kind of justification for slavery is essential to Locke's philosophy from the *Second Treatise*—which he wrote alongside the Fundamental Constitutions—and its apparent contradictions.[9]

Before looking to Locke's views on slavery, as presented in the *Second Treatise*, I wish to explain what exactly a just war is. For this we ought to look to "Of the State of War," as he writes, "And hence it is that he who attempts to get another man into his absolute power does thereby put himself into a state of war with him [...] reason bids me to look on him as an enemy to my preservation."[10] War, in this sense, is the aggression of one person against another, where the aggressor compels the target to self defense. In Farr's words: "A just war is one waged against unjust aggressors by an innocent people defending its rights and property."[11] Importantly, a just war extends to the defense of one's property, not just their life. This is evident by Locke's

---

[5] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 269.
[6] Hinshelwood, "The Carolinian Context of John Locke's Theory of Slavery," 563.
[7] Glausser, "Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade," 200.
[8] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 565.
[9] *Ibid.,* 565.
[10] John Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government; And A Letter concerning Toleration* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2002), 8.
[11] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 270.

supposing that it is lawful to kill a thief, regardless of whether they have threatened life.[12] Any use of force against your person or property is unlawful and serves as lawful grounds for retaliation, according to Locke. It is in the use of retaliatory force, against an unlawful aggressor, that makes a war just. In other words, a war is just insofar as you are not the initial aggressor.

What is Locke's philosophical position on slavery? Firstly, Locke thought of man as naturally free, and that he ought not to be under the will of another.[13] Alongside this, it is the natural right of humans to own property.[14] The only legislative power, created through consent, one ought to be under the commonwealth, and does not subject man to an arbitrary will.[15] Moreover, humans cannot, by any means, surrender their power over their own life to another; in other words, one cannot "enslave himself to anyone."[16] How could these principles be consistent with slavery? To this, Locke writes the following: "Indeed, having by his fault forfeited his own life by some act that deserves death, he to whom he has forfeited it may [...] delay to take it, and make use of him to his own service."[17] In this sense, a conqueror may spare the life of a defeated person, or group, and press them into service as a form of mercy. As Farr writes "Mercy, not right, is the condition of their existence."[18] In this state, they are no longer at war, and have become "a lawful conqueror and a captive."[19] Locke supposes that they have formed a compact of "limited power on the one side, and of obedience on the other" as a means of sparing the captive's life.[20] Furthermore, Locke makes it apparent that the only alternative the slave has is to resist the master and die.

How is this a just-war formulation of slavery? Farr writes the following: "The captive slave is wholly to blame because he had 'quitted reason' by violating the rights of innocents and so rendered himself 'liable to be destroyed by the injur'd person.'"[21] As I noted before, the master conquers the slave and could kill them, but instead spares their life and puts them in bondage. They are, as Farr says, at fault for their enslavement because they were the initial aggressors, if the conflict is a just one. Moreover, Farr notes that the save, before their defeat, was a free and rational

---

[12] Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government,* 8.
[13] *Ibid.,* 10-11.
[14] *Ibid.,* 11.
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 270.
[19] Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government*, 11.
[20] *Ibid.*
[21] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 271.

person "who violated the rights and property of other free men."[22] In Farr's sense, the slave has lost their rights because they have violated another's, which makes the just-war enslavement consistent with Locke's natural rights theory.[23] In this sense, it is precisely because of the slave's actions that they have become a slave.[24]

This is not, however, all we need to know about Lockean slavery, as he sets up four more important constraints to make slavery just.[25] They are as follows: firstly, that those who conquered alongside him, as allies, cannot suffer conquest and must remain free.[26] Secondly, that the conqueror may only take possession of property to "make reparation for the damages received."[27] The seizure of land is excluded, barring one exception, as Farr writes:

> The seizure of land itself is explicitly excluded by this constraint, for land is by right inheritable property of future innocent generations, especially in any part of the world, where all the Land is possessed, and none lies in waste.[28]

Thirdly, the conqueror may only enslave those who "actually assisted, concurred, or consented to that unjust force" and not any innocent parties.[29] This claim extends to future generations; Farr notes: "Children born of slaves cannot themselves be retained as slaves, for slavery 'reaches no further than the Persons' of those who acted unjustly, and 'thus it dies with them.'"[30] The last condition of lawful slavery, in Lockean theory, is that the conqueror cannot subject the slave to "an absolute and 'purely despotical' power" if the prior three conditions are met.[31] Moreover, no act of a master, under these conditions, "can violate the rights of a slave, who, through an earlier [aggressive] act of his own, has no rights."[32] By these conditions, it is clear that Locke's conditions for lawful slavery remain consistent with natural law theory. This is because, by these constraints, the captive, in having been an aggressor, has waived their natural rights to freedom and property.

So far, my focus has been on showing that Locke's political theory remains consistent with his just-war treatment of slavery. It my hope that I have adequately achieved this end and have set

---

[22] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 271.
[23] *Ibid.*
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Ibid.* It is worth noting that Farr only outlines three, but I have isolated four from Locke in conjunction with Farr.
[26] Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government*, 82.
[27] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 83.
[28] *Ibid.,* 272.
[29] Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government*, 83.
[30] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 273.
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *Ibid.*

the proper foundation for discussing Afro-American slavery and Native American slavery. Importantly, the four conditions I have laid out are essential to understanding how Locke's just-war theory of slavery applies more accurately to North American colonialism than to Afro-American slavery. I will discuss, in conjunction, Locke's view of property waste land in order to help substantiate these claims.

First, however, I quickly want to rule Afro-American slavery out of Locke's philosophy, because they are antithetical. As Farr notes, there are three reasons why Afro-American slavery violates his political theory and the four conditions I laid out earlier. As Farr writes, "three facts of Afro-American slavery [...] violate Locke's just-war theory of slavery: (1) the methods of capture, (2) the demography of enslavement, and (3) the institution of hereditary bondage."[33] Of the first, Farr notes that methods of capture were varied, but direct capture in slave raids was common, and unjust in a Lockean sense.[34] Furthermore, the demography of enslaved Africans included women and children.[35] Locke was, verifiably, aware of this fact. Farr states:

> Locke read to the council [of trade] an official letter he had endorsed from Sir Peter Colleton reporting on the importation of slaves to Barbados. In his letter, Colleton noted the slave population at that time, measured conservatively, included 11,914 women, 5,827 boys, and 5,207 girls. Such capture violated just-war premises—not to mention the natural rights of the innocent.[36]

The method of capture and the inclusion of women and children, in Afro-American slave-trading directly violate Lockean conditions for lawful slavery. This is based on unjust procurement, and the enslaving of innocents. Moreover, lattermost of the three main violations, hereditary enslavement, was certainly the case for many of the children.[37] By these violations, Lockean slavery is not a justification of Afro-American slavery, and that their enslavement was unlawful on Lockean terms. It is essential to note that this is, under no circumstances, justification for Locke's own involvement in the Afro-American slave-trade.

With Afro-American slave-trading out of the way, I wish to turn my attention to Locke's property theory. Property for Locke is a natural right of man, as I have noted earlier in this essay. His theory of property begins with the world, as he writes: "God gave the world to men in common

---

[33] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 274.
[34] *Ibid,*
[35] *Ibid.,* 275.
[36] *Ibid.,* 276.
[37] *Ibid.*

[...] for their benefit."[38] This is, in more specific terms, is the land upon which man labours to support his life.[39] What man labours on, according to Locke, is "properly his."[40] This labour removes the property from "that common state" that it was previously in.[41] In this sense, land is either cultivated or uncultivated. He notes that uncultivated land is wasted land in the following: "yet there are still great tracts of ground to be found which [...] lie waste, and are more than the people who dwell on it do or can make use of, and so still lie in common."[42] By this, land that remains in common, and is yet uncultivated by the people who live there, is wasted. Moreover, Locke has the Americas in mind when he says this. He explains, "as it doth the Americans now, are generally things of short duration, such as, if they are not consumed by use, will decay and perish of themselves."[43] To Locke, it is imperative that the land be cultivated so as not to be wasted. Moreover, should one have more than they themselves needs, they may give it away.[44] To this effect, giving away what you have is, to him, a wise use of the land according to the following passage: If he gave away a part to anybody else [...] he did no injury; he wasted not the common stock, destroyed no part of the portion of goods that belonged to others, so long as nothing perished uselessly in his hands.[45]

By this, it does no harm to share that common land or property which would go to waste if it was held on to. Moreover, it is only in established society that this property is divided into "parts and parcels" in order to be distributed between private persons by common consent.[46] It is from this base of property theory that Locke's philosophy can justify colonialism of the Americas, and Locke's own hand in it.

On this note, Lockean politics allows the conquering of uncultivated land to be a variant of lawful war. As Hinshelwood, citing Martin Seliger, writes: "war between the planters and the natives was assumed as a matter of course … the natives' resistance to the conquest of their waste territory turns them into aggressors and the Europeans as 'just conquerors' of the natives' 'waste.'"[47] This assertion finds its root in Locke's theory of property and just-war. As mentioned

---

[38] Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government*, 15.
[39] *Ibid.,* 12-13.
[40] *Ibid.*, 13.
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] *Ibid.*, 21.
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*, 21-22.
[46] *Ibid.*, 21.
[47] Hinshelwood, "The Carolinian Context of John Locke's Theory of Slavery," 563.

before, to Locke unused land ought to be cultivated. If one were to colonize and cultivate that unused land, they would not count as aggressors in Lockean terms, because "waste land is common land."[48] As Glausser, citing Locke and Kathleen Squadrito, explains, "'where there being more Land, than the Inhabitants possess, and make use of, any one has liberty to make use of the waste'[...] Thus, if a native population should 'resist conquest of their waste land, they become aggressors in war,' and the developers may justly kill them."[49] In this way, Lockean theory allows for a war over conquering waste land to be a just war.

It is my view that Locke was interested in portraying the capture of land to explicitly justify the colonialism he was taking part in by supporting the Carolina colony. As I noted before, just-war theory was a topic of discussion in this colony, and during this time Locke was working on *The Second Treatise* and the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina.[50] Prior to his two *Treatises*, however, there had been conflict between Carolina and the native Coosa people, whereby several of these people were taken prisoner.[51] Prior to their capture, however, the colonists used the retaliation by the Coosa as a means to declare a just-war.[52] Moreover, these Coosa captives were "shipped to the West Indies as slaves" almost immediately.[53] At this time as well, the Carolinas were widely known as "the Indian slave traders of the North American continent."[54] Carolinians, as I have said, used just-war rhetoric as justification for their war and enslavement of native Coosa, as Hinshelwood writes, "Over the course of this period, the Proprietors began to speak of Indian slavery in Just war terms that resonate with Locke's theory of Slavery."[55] As a secretary that drafted the 1682 amendments to Fundamental Constitutions, Locke was no doubt aware of this history in the colony. I am of the mind that Locke must have intentionally written *The Second Treatise* as a means to justify his colonialist participation in Carolina, particularly in relation to the enslavement of Native Americans.

It is on these grounds that I would conclude that Locke, in his just-war treatment of slavery, distances himself from Afro-American slavery, while simultaneously justifying colonialism in the Americas. Moreover, I hope that I have shown that Locke's theory remains consistent with itself,

---

[48] Glausser, "Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade," 215.
[49] *Ibid.,* 208.
[50] Hinshelwood, "The Carolinian Context of John Locke's Theory of Slavery," 565.
[51] *Ibid.*, 568.
[52] *Ibid.*
[53] *Ibid.*, 569.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Ibid.*

and that it is consistent with his practice, aside from the association he had with the Royal African Company. It is worth noting, however, that to my mind, echoing Farr, that "*Locke knew this.*"[56]

---

[56] Farr, "So Vile and Miserable an Estate," 264.

Bibliography

Farr, James. "'So Vile and Miserable an Estate': The Problem of Slavery in Locke's Political Thought." *Political Theory* 14, no. 2 (1986): 263-89.

Glausser, Wayne. "Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51, no. 2 (1990): 199-216.

Hinshelwood, Brad. "The Carolinian Context of John Locke's Theory of Slavery." *Political Theory* 41, no. 4 (2013): 562-90.

Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government; And, A Letter concerning Toleration*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2002.

How the Spanish Influenza Influenced the Rise of Public Health

Amy M. Paleczny

The effects of World War I are well-known and well-publicized today; it is nearly impossible to find anyone who has not heard about trench warfare and the mass amounts of casualties that resulted from the Great War. The even deadlier killer that followed the First World War does not have the same notoriety, however. The Spanish Influenza killed an estimated forty to fifty million people in a short period of time and revolutionized public health care across the globe.[1] The Spanish Flu was largely overshadowed by the First World War, and as a result many European nations, particularly England, did not dedicate enough effort, resources, or workers to protect against the incoming pandemic. The advancement and innovation of public health services between 1917 and 1921 played a crucial role in the fight against the flu and how pandemics are contained today.

Contrary to what the name suggests, it is unclear as to where the Spanish Influenza originated from. There have been many theories that attempt to specify where the influenza started, however none have been proven yet. Initially, it was believed that the flu travelled from Spain to Boston on a ship where it then migrated to the Western Front through American soldiers.[2] It has also been theorized that Spain's neutrality allowed it to report more frequently on the influenza than other countries that participated in the war, which is where the name most likely originated.[3] Spain's informative approach to the pandemic contrasted with other European countries and contributed to the perception that Spain had significantly more cases of the virus than anywhere else. Spain did not have remarkably more cases than any other country in Europe, nor was there any strong evidence to suggest that it originated there. The Allied Powers, particularly England and France, did not have the resources to fight the illness because of their involvement in the war, and instead chose to conceal the pandemic from the public to avoid panic and chaos. The different approaches to the communication of the disease were what led to the virus being named after Spain. Another plausible theory is that the Spanish Influenza originated in Camp Funston, Kansas

---

[1] Andrea Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London: The Influenza Pandemic 1918-1919," *The London Journal* 27, no. 2 (2002): 51.

[2] Irene Kalnins, "The Spanish Influenza of 1918 in St. Louis, Missouri," *Public Health Nursing* 23, no. 5 (2006): 479.

[3] Mark Honigsbaum, "Spanish Influenza Redux: Revisiting the Mother of All Pandemics," *Lancet* 391, no. 10139 (2018): 2493.

in March of 1918. Albert Gitchell, a cook in the army, was diagnosed with the influenza on the morning of 11 March and was prescribed bed rest until he felt better – a typical recommendation for people ill with the flu. By noon the same day, 107 other soldiers had fallen ill and 522 were incapacitated within the next two days.[4] The doctors at the base camp reported unusual symptoms among patients that align with what is now known to be the Spanish flu. Within a week, every state in the United States reported similar cases. There were also cases of what may have been the Spanish Flu dating as far back as the winter of 1916.[5] A British army base in Northern France had an outbreak of what they called "purulent bronchitis" that infected many soldiers at the camp.[6] The conditions were ideal for the spread of a respiratory virus as the hospitals were tightly packed, soldiers already had weakened lungs from gas attacks, and there were thousands of soldiers passing through the camp on their way to other destinations.[7] This respiratory disease was also almost identical to the illness that swept the Aldershot barracks in March 1917.[8] Unfortunately, there is no way of finding exactly where or when the influenza started. Its virulence was due to the extensive movement of troops during the war, making it nearly impossible to locate an exact date or location of origin.

The Spanish Influenza was unlike any sickness that the world had experienced before. It killed forty to fifty million people and appeared to target even the healthiest.[9] One-third of all people under the age of thirty-five fell ill during the first outbreak in the summer of 1918.[10] This was unique as most viral infections mainly affected the elderly and infants because they had weaker immune systems than the rest of the population. The Spanish Influenza infected everyone, regardless of age – a characteristic in diseases that is still uncommon to this day. Two other waves followed in the autumn and winter, each with their own characteristics. The second wave arrived in autumn and is widely known to have been the deadliest of the three; it was followed by the final wave in the winter of 1919.[11] The Spanish Influenza killed very quickly (often within days or even

---

[4] James Armstrong, "When the Flu Killed Millions," *RN* 62, no. 12 (1999): 33.
[5] J.S. Oxford, *et al.,* "A Hypothesis: The Conjunction of Soldiers, Gas, Pigs, Ducks, Geese and Horses in Northern France during the Great War Provided the Conditions for the Emergence of the 'Spanish' Influenza Pandemic of 1918–1919," *Vaccine* 23, no. 7 (2005): 940.
[6] *Ibid.,* 941.
[7] *Ibid.,* 942.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 52.
[10] *Ibid.,* 53.
[11] Robert Webster, "1918 Spanish Influenza: The Secrets Remain Elusive," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 96, no. 4 (1999): 1164.

hours of the first sign of illness) and was extremely contagious.[12] Some of the most severe symptoms included marked cyanosis, which caused a blue tinge to appear on the lips, ears, and cheeks and fluid to fill the lungs, profuse muscle production, and respiratory failure.[13] Post-mortem autopsies found that victims of the Spanish Flu had a solid red, jelly-like substance filling their lungs, and many died by drowning from the liquid build-up in their respiratory system.[14] The famous artist Edvard Munch painted a self-portrait after recovering from the virus that showcased the ghastly, pale features that often accompanied the flu (see appendix A). In it, he is featured in a chair next to a bed which displayed his weakened state. Recovering from the influenza often took many weeks and the sheer physical demands of recovery were exemplified in Munch's painting.[15]

The Spanish influenza was an airborne illness that thrived in the over-crowded and over-worked country of England. The packed cities and public transportation created the perfect environment for the flu to spread. The viral disease infected people through airdrops; in highly populated areas, this meant that simply breathing put people at risk of infection. The factories that young women worked in during the war were filled with people and the conditions that they worked in contributed to the spread of the virus. This explains why the mortality rate for young women between 1918 and 1919 was 26% higher than young men.[16] It is no surprise that the Spanish Influenza spread so quickly and freely in England, as the government did not embrace the growing public health sector the same way that other nations did. The most consistent recommendation supplied by the government and public health sector in England was to ignore the pandemic (although this word was rarely used) because of the fear that it would contribute to the chaos.[17] They believed that panic and fear increased the likelihood of contracting the virus.[18] In England, public health lacked the authority to impose the extreme regulations that were necessary to stop the spread of infection; they did their best by showcasing public films that focused on educating the public about proper hygiene and updating the media about the disease.[19] This underwhelming advice stemmed from a government that refused to provide the attention and care that civilians needed at the time, and instead chose to prioritize the war effort. The government

---

[12] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 52.
[13] Kalnins, "The Spanish Influenza of 1918 in St. Louis, Missouri," 479.
[14] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 54.
[15] Edvard Munch, *Self Portrait with the Spanish Flu*, oil on canvas, Nasjonalmuseet, The Fine Art Collections.
[16] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 56.
[17] *Ibid.,* 58.
[18] *Ibid.*
[19] *Ibid.*

in England failed to recognize the damage caused by the pandemic and did not take the necessary public health measures and precautions to save countless English lives.

It was difficult to find available nurses in England during this period, as they were both in high demand and simultaneously falling ill because of their continuous exposure to the disease.[20] For the first time, nurses were called upon more than doctors because most people did not need a diagnosis or a cure for the influenza - they simply needed care.[21] Unfortunately, most civilians either could not afford a health practitioner of any kind or they were unable to get one because of the high demand. Many people who fell ill relied on friends and family for care. It was not uncommon for entire households to contract the virus and oftentimes helpful neighbours would step in to care for them as well.[22] The lack of professional health care in 1918 was so prevalent that, in Manchester, 63% of the 208 fatal cases of Spanish Influenza had absolutely no contact with any healthcare professionals.[23] People in Manchester and all over England had to rely on other sources of care when they fell ill, and many nurses were overworked because of the long, strenuous hours that they worked during the outbreak.

Many areas in England also had significantly higher influenza rates than average which left all fields of work understaffed and underperforming. Most industries faced mass absenteeism and scrambled to continue functioning. The London Police force, for example, saw 1400 policemen fall ill at once during the crisis.[24] Schools often had many children missing from classes because of the virus, with an average of 70% of school children present on any given day during the pandemic; in some areas where the influenza was particularly bad, school attendance dropped to as low as 30%.[25] The particularly harsh effect that the influenza had on school children and young adults (who were usually healthiest when it came to other influenzas) may have been a result of the wartime restrictions on food.[26] Children were directly affected as nutrition was necessary for growth and young adults who did not go to war were still likely to work strenuously in factories every day.[27] Both of these age groups were likely not getting the nutrition required by their immune system to fight the Spanish Flu.

---

[20] Armstrong, "When the Flu Killed Millions," 34.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 67.
[23] *Ibid.*, 68.
[24] *Ibid.*, 55.
[25] *Ibid.*, 54.
[26] *Ibid.*, 53.
[27] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 56.

There was no obvious link between socio-economic class and the Spanish Influenza, which left many doctors and government officials perplexed at the time. The Registrar General in London attempted to find a correlation between wealth and vulnerability to the influenza during the first wave in 1918. They correlated the number of domestic servants a household had in the 1911 census with the influenza death rates but the results were inconclusive. He found that two of the wealthiest boroughs in London - Kensington and Hampstead - had fairly low death rates, while Chelsea (which was also a wealthy borough) had influenza death rates second only to one other.[28] Many historians and scientists alike have now concluded that the flu was "socially neutral" because "the pandemic introduced a new virus that few, if any, had the immunity to fight."[29] The lack of social boundaries that the pandemic faced contributed to the severity of the virus. It meant that the Spanish Influenza affected everyone which contributed to the panic as people became aware that no one could prevent themselves from being infected.

Europe as a whole did not have a unified response to the influenza crisis, and each nation reacted differently. Unlike England, many other European countries and British colonies attempted to contain the Spanish Influenza. In France, quarantine measures were enacted, public places like schools, cabarets, churches, and theatres were closed, and most public areas were fumigated daily. They also enlisted extra staff to clear rubbish and garbage from the street in an attempt to keep the country clean and safe. France also took extra care to promptly clear any potential health hazards.[30] Australia responded to the Spanish Influenza by making masks mandatory in all heavily crowded areas such as public transportation, busy streets, and churches.[31] The United States of America attempted to counter the influenza by placing a limit on the number of people who were allowed to attend an event or gathering. They also banned bargain and clearance sales and placed a strict price control on influenza medication to ensure that families could access the remedies that they needed.[32] France, Australia, and the United States all clearly attempted to take necessary action to limit the spread of the Spanish Flu. Public health measures were used to an extent that had never

---

[28] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 57.

[29] Svenn-Erik Mamelund, "A Socially Neutral Disease? Individual Social Class, Household Wealth and Mortality from Spanish Influenza in Two Socially Contrasting Parishes in Kristiania 1918–19," *Social Science & Medicine* 62, no. 4 (2006): 924.

[30] Tanner, "The Spanish Lady Comes to London," 57-58.

[31] *Ibid.,* 58.

[32] *Ibid.*

been seen before to help reduce the spread of infection. Places that took measures to protect their civilians tended to have lower influenza-related death rates than those that did not.

St. Louis, Missouri was one of the most successful places in the world at controlling the virus and limiting the death toll.[33] They utilized extreme public health measures to contain the Spanish Influenza. The Health Commissioner of St. Louis, Dr Max C. Starkloff, vowed to take a series of steps to "keep the epidemic out of the city, if possible, and if that failed, to use every means to keep it down to the lowest number of cases."[34] Starkloff went on to define the disease by asking the Board of Alderman of St. Louis for an ordinance to make the influenza a reportable disease (to ensure that the proper data could be collected), and took extreme preventative measures to stop the spread.[35] On 6 October 1918, the number of cases rapidly increased in the district which led to the creation of the Influenza Advisory Committee on 7 October. The committee included members from the Chamber of Commerce, public schools, hospitals, and a variety of health services and volunteer organizations.[36] Starkloff made sure to include a wide variety of people on the committee so that it represented everyone in the city. The Advisory Committee closed all public areas, including schools, entertainment venues, and churches, to limit citizen's exposure to the virus. At this time businesses remained open.[37] Educating all citizens about the Spanish Influenza was prioritized through a special publication called the "monthly '*Health Department Bulletin.*'"[38] St. Louis regularly broadcasted necessary information about the virus because they knew that education was a key part of prevention. The press was utilized to keep citizens of St. Louis optimistic and was asked to constantly remind them that although death rates were significant, they were still much lower than other cities.[39] Starkloff enlisted the police force to enforce the strict ban on public gatherings and to ensure that patients who contracted the virus quarantined for at least two weeks.[40] He also offered free vaccinations made from "pneumonia and influenza cultures" – although this tactic was virtually ineffective against the Spanish Flu.[41] Though not all of Starkloff's tactics were effective, his dedication to limiting the spread of the Spanish Influenza was necessary

---

[33] Kalnins, "The Spanish Influenza of 1918 in St. Louis, Missouri," 479.
[34] *Ibid.*
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*, 480.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] *Ibid.*, 481.
[40] *Ibid.*, 480.
[41] *Ibid.*

in keeping cases low. His attempted vaccinations showed his willingness to go to the extremes to keep death rates low.

The control measures that were enacted on 7 October appeared to halt the increase in cases by 13 October, but the effects did not last. During the first eight weeks of the influenza, the death rate in St. Louis was 179.4 per 100 000.[42] In Boston, which was a very similar city in many ways, the death rate was 554.4 per 100 000.[43] Obviously, the extreme public health measures that the Advisory Committee instituted helped to keep the death rate lower than it was in other cities. On 9 November 1918, Dr Max Starkloff and the Advisory Committee forced businesses to close for four days to prevent the viral spread of the influenza.[44] The federal government of the United States objected to this as the war was still ongoing, and resources and workers alike could not be spared. Businesses in St. Louis reopened on 13 November, and schools opened again the following day. Only two weeks later, the second wave of the Spanish Influenza hit the city and the ban on gatherings, as well as the closure of schools, was reinstated. It was very important to Dr Starkloff to keep the schools closed until after the winter holidays because school-aged children made up thirty to forty percent of new cases during the second wave of the flu.[45] Unfortunately, the temporary lift on public health measures still had a massive effect on the population. The death rate in St. Louis increased to 386.8 per 100 000 by the end of 1918. Even though the measures were mostly re-enacted after the next influenza wave it still was not enough to keep the final toll down. The death rate for the September 1918 to April 1919 population was approximately 521.2 per 100 000.[46]

St. Louis also made use of nurses to help reduce infant mortality during the Spanish Influenza. This marked the first time that nursing services were used as a part of a public health plan, where they play a crucial role still today.[47] Between 21 October and 15 December 1918, nurses made 14 359 visits in St. Louis alone, and they visited each patient received an average of five times.[48] There were more nurses than doctors, which allowed for more patients to receive treatment and care. The level of care that patients received also helped to keep some alive, and all

---

[42] Kalnins, "The Spanish Influenza of 1918 in St. Louis, Missouri," 480.
[43] *Ibid.*, 481.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*, 479.
[46] *Ibid.*, 482.
[47] *Ibid.*, 481.
[48] *Ibid.*

of them comfortable. It set a precedent for the great importance that nurses have in healthcare systems today.

The Spanish Influenza resulted in an enormous loss of lives across the globe, but it also brought about a revolution for public health everywhere. England failed to recognize the necessary change that the pandemic demanded, and they suffered the consequences of their poor response. Meanwhile, St. Louis' dedicated action against the pandemic and innovative methods helped to keep their death rate remarkably low in comparison to other similar cities. The influenza created and refined public health sectors in nearly every country and prepared the world to better handle every pandemic that followed.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Munch, Edvard. *Self-Portrait with the Spanish Flu*. Oil on canvas. 1919. National Museum of
　　Norway. http://samling.nasjonalmuseet.no/en/object/NG.M.01867#.

Secondary Sources

Armstrong, James. "When the Flu Killed Millions." *RN* 62, no. 12 (1999): 32-35.

Honigsbaum, Mark. "Spanish Influenza Redux: Revisiting the Mother of All
　　Pandemics." *Lancet* 391, no. 10139 (2018): 2492-495.

Kalnins, Irene. "The Spanish Influenza of 1918 in St. Louis, Missouri." *Public Health Nursing* 23,
　　no. 5 (2006): 479-83.

Mamelund, Svenn-Erik. "A Socially Neutral Disease? Individual Social Class, Household Wealth
　　and Mortality from Spanish Influenza in Two Socially Contrasting Parishes in Kristiania
　　1918–19." *Social Science & Medicine* 62, no. 4 (2006): 923-40.

Oxford, J. S., R. Lambkin, A. Sefton, R. Daniels, A. Elliot, R. Brown, and D. Gill. "A Hypothesis:
　　The Conjunction of Soldiers, Gas, Pigs, Ducks, Geese and Horses in Northern France
　　during the Great War Provided the Conditions for the Emergence of the 'Spanish' Influenza
　　Pandemic of 1918–1919." *Vaccine* 23, no. 7 (2005): 940-45.

Tanner, Andrea. "The Spanish Lady Comes to London: The Influenza Pandemic 1918-1919." *The
　　London Journal* 27, no. 2 (2002): 51-76.

Webster, R. "1918 Spanish Influenza: The Secrets Remain Elusive." *Proceedings of the National
　　Academy of Sciences, USA* 96, no. 04 (1999): 1164-166.

Appendix A

Munch, Edvard, *Self-Portrait with the Spanish Flu*, oil on canvas, 1919 (National Museum of Norway), http://samling.nasjonalmuseet.no/en/object/NG.M.01867#.
Self-portrait while in recovery from the Spanish Influenza.

Rise to Independence, Fall to a Coup D'état: Ghana's New National Military Under Kwame Nkrumah

Alec Rembowski

Decolonization presented many challenges to new post-colonial African governments. One of the most essential was the question of national defense. The new state governments had to build new militaries from their existing colonial inheritance. These militaries were often poorly funded, under equipped and under manned. However, Ghana experienced initial success as a newly decolonized nation that marked a swift change from a colonial administration and accelerated the decolonization of Africa. By analyzing Ghana's approach to strengthening its military, we gain insight into the post-colonial struggles and decisions the Ghanaian government faced.

Examining Ghana's military provides insight to understanding the national fabric of Ghana from 1957 through to 1966. Kwame Nkrumah was a new militant leader of Pan-Africanism.[1] Rising to power in 1952, he became the first Prime Minister of the Gold Coast from 1952 to 1957. He then created a new national identity for the Gold Coast by renaming the country Ghana and becoming the first Prime Minister of Ghana from 1957 to 1960. Initially, Nkrumah showed interest in working with Western and former colonial powers in the decolonization efforts.[2] However, in 1960 Ghana transitioned into a Republic and Nkrumah became the first President of Ghana, replacing the Queen of the United Kingdom and Commonwealth Realms as the head of state. As president, he had the power to shape his nation as he chose in accordance with his Pan-African ideology, with only limited or controlled political opposition. Ghana became the pacesetter of the decolonization movement.[3]

In the midst of decolonization, strengthening national self-defense was a priority, not necessarily from physical invasions, but from armed insurrections. Already by 1960 there had been a series of conflicts in decolonized African states as new national governments established independence. This trend would continue throughout Nkrumah's presidency, in particular the Congo Crisis (1960-1965) and the Rhodesian Bush War/Zimbabwe Liberation Struggle (1964-

---

[1] Denis Laumann, *Colonial Africa 1884-1994. Second Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 73.

[2] Ebere Nwaubani, "Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis," *Journal of Contemporary History* 36, no. 4 (2001): 601.

[3] *Ibid.,* 600.

1979). While Nkrumah was not worried of such conflict in Ghana, playing an active military role throughout African conflicts was seen as a necessity to promote his Pan-African ideology.

Eventually Nkrumah's Pan-African ideology caused his demise because it directly contradicted the colonial legacy, values and traditions of the Ghanaian military. Nkrumah was deposed in 1966 by his own military and police forces. The manner in which Nkrumah sought to strengthen his military, the fallout of the Congo Crisis, accompanied by a swift change in domestic policy in 1961, eventually led to the old guard of Ghanaian British-trained officers to lead the coup against Nkrumah's government.

Nkrumah's aggressive deposal of the Ghanaian colonial legacy was a threat to those who benefitted from, or identified with, the colonial system. The Ghanaian military was the only institution powerful enough to challenge Nkrumah's authority. When their colonial identity and culture was being replaced by Nkrumah's and the Convention Peoples Party (CPP) Africanization of Ghanaian identity and culture, the military determined that the only way to preserve themselves was to depose of Nkrumah.

General Alexander and the Ghanaian Army 1957-1961

Nkrumah set upon strengthening his military in three major ways: modernize the Ghanaian military to be equipped with the best technology available, adequately train the Ghanaian Army to field this equipment for combat and increase the overall size of the Ghanaian military. In doing so, Nkrumah had to find adequate numbers of recruits. The critical step towards this was the Africanization of the military. In 1957 the army was 7000 strong and had an officer corps of 211; of the 211 officers, only 12.8 percent were Ghanaian.[4]

At this time there was an established pattern of coups in former African colonies, in particular French West Africa. However, this was not anticipated in the former British African colonies.[5] Nkrumah's concern was the strengthening of the military to become the teeth of his continental vision of liberation and unification.[6] He needed an army to maintain internal security and be available to maintain the Pan-African ideals, promoting African sovereignty and limiting

---

[4] J.M. Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order* (London: Chatto and Windus for the Institute for Strategic Studies, 1969), 44.

[5] David Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah: The Father of African Nationalism* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1998), 110.

[6] *Ibid.,* 88.

external dependence.[7] To battle neo-colonialism, Nkrumah needed to be able to facilitate coercive power (physical force), to establish and maintain, if necessary, the means of African authority and sovereignty. Nkrumah believed a stronger military would eventually be justified, as his frustrations grew because of the Congo Crisis and growing change in Rhodesia, Portuguese Africa, and South Africa. He believed that these political challenges could only be confronted with military force.[8]

The task of building Nkrumah's military fell onto British Major-General H. T. Alexander. General Alexander was a World War Two veteran having served in various theatres throughout the war. Before arriving in Ghana, he was formally the commanding officer of the 26 Gurkha Brigade from 1955 to 1957. He had vast experience interacting with soldiers from every corner of the British Empire. Upon arriving in Ghana in 1960, General Alexander was appointed Chief of Defence Staff of the Ghanaian Armed Forces. Nkrumah, like most civilian politicians, lacked the knowledge to fully comprehend the costs and complexities of a functioning military.[9] Nkrumah demanded a modern military to the same standard of western European nations believing that it would make Ghana an equal contributor to international affairs. Yet, Ghana's wealth only represented four percent of the wealth of Britain or France.[10] Ghana also had a limited source of literate manpower available for military employment. Through coercive power, Ghana could become a dominant force in the fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism on behalf of Pan-Africanism. General Alexander had to bridge the gap between Nkrumah's Pan-African vision and the realities of military bureaucracy.

General Alexander's biggest problem was finding sufficient manpower, and then training them to a professional standard. This was a problem inherited from the late colonial administration. The former British colonial administration found it extremely challenging to recruit the best secondary school-educated young men.[11] These young men were indifferent to prospects of military life and would rather serve the state in other capacities. The vast majority of the Ghanaian officer corps came from areas of the highest educated coastal areas of Ghana, where there was a longer colonial presence and legacy in terms of infrastructure and educational opportunities.[12]

---

[7] Claude Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Military Intervention and Political Change* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970), 180.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 89.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order*, 36.

[12] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 182.

However, the majority of the Ghanaian rank and file was recruited from the economically stagnant Northern territories.[13]

From 1945 to 1957, the colonial military of the Gold Coast served to maintain domestic security and assist the colonial administration. This role built a wedge between the nationalists and the Gold Coast military personnel, who were perceived as puppets of the colonial administration. Despite some Gold Coast officers being trained at some of the highest military institutions in the British Empire, the civilian masses regarded them with fear and disdain. These sentiments were extended to the first Ghanaian officers and aided in the difficulty of recruiting post-secondary students.[14] General Alexander estimated that Ghana was producing approximately 700 young men per year that were capable of serving in the new Ghanaian military.[15] General Alexander came up with an aggressive plan to extract 100 young men per year, extracting 14 percent of the graduate pool for military service.[16] This would enable the majority of the British Officer Corps to leave by 1965-1966.[17] Nkrumah wanted to speed up the militarization efforts and instead sent 400 new students, 57 percent of the graduate pool, to join military training.[18] By April of 1961, the Ghanaian Officer Corps consisted of 150 Ghanaians and 230 British officers.[19]

Another problem experienced by General Alexander was the training of the Ghanaian officers to the standards of their British counterparts. Throughout the late colonial and early post-colonial periods. many Ghanaian officer cadets were sent to the Royal Military Academy in Sandhurst, Eaton Hall, as well as Mons Officer Cadet School in Britain.[20] Up until 1957, 26 officer cadets from the Gold Coast attended these programs, however between 1958 and 1962, a total of 68 Ghanaians participated.[21] This created discrepancies between the British and Ghanaian educational standards. To ensure that the Ghanaians were adequately prepared for the programs in Britain, the Ghanaians received six months of education before they entered the program.[22] This meant that Ghanaian officers could spend up to three and a half years completing educational

---

[13] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 182.
[14] Simon Baynham, "Soldier and State in Ghana," *Armed Forces & Society* 5, no. 1 (1978): 156.
[15] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 89.
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Ibid.*
[19] Baynham, *Soldier and State in Ghana*, 157.
[20] Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order*, 125.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] *Ibid.,* 36.

programs in Britain.[23] This would require increased Ghanaian expenditure and time prolonging the Africanization of the military.

To lessen the training time and travel, the Ghanaian military established a two-year officer training program in Teshie, based on the structure of the British Royal Military Academy in Sandhurst.[24] The British model that General Alexander and his predecessors were employing was designed to build the Ghanaian military under the same ideological principles as their British counterparts. The military would be dedicated to a unitary democratic state, with strict loyalty and a high standard of service to the government, serving the general public.

Nkrumah quickly became frustrated with the slow pace and cost of implementing British training standards and began looking for alternatives to quicken the militarization process and rid Ghana of all signs of its colonial past.[25] Since Nkrumah was now president of Ghana, Britain had no means to stop him from this path of action. Upon returning from visiting the Soviet Union in 1961, who openly criticized the British presence in Ghana, Nkrumah fired General Alexander and removed all British officers serving in the Ghanaian military.[26] He was replaced by a Ghanaian - recently promoted Brigadier Otu. The official reasoning behind the replacement of Alexander was the desire to fully implement the Africanization of the Ghanaian military and end growing distrust between Britain and Nkrumah caused in the Congo Crisis.[27] Nkrumah then turned to the Soviet Union who promised they could mobilize the Ghanaian military faster with reduced financial cost.[28] Ghana formed ties with the Soviets by purchasing four Soviet aircraft.[29] This rejection of British educational practices established in the colonial period transcended the Ghanaian military and extended throughout Ghanaian secondary education systems.[30] Nkrumah strived to abolish all neo-colonial influences.

As a result of this transition, the Soviet model of militarization saw a rapid rate of premature promotions within the military. The removal of British officers left major gaps in the

---

[23] Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order,* 36.
[24] *Ibid.*, 124.
[25] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 89.
[26] Henry Alexander, *African Tightrope: My Two Years as Nkrumah's Chief of Staff* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1965), 91-93.
[27] Nkrumah to Gen. Alexander, 22 September 1961, reprinted in Alexander, *African Tightrope*, Appendix E, 149.
[28] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 90.
[29] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 605.
[30] John Harrington, & Ambreena Manji, "'Africa Needs Many Lawyers Trained for the Need of their People': Struggle over Legal Education in Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana," *American Journal of Legal History* 59, no. 2 (2019): 166.

Ghanaian leadership complex. This resulted in Ghanaian junior officers who lacked experience, tradition, and training, being placed in higher command and staff duties.[31] A rivalry was formed between the old guard of Ghanaian officers trained in the colonial and immediate post-colonial period under General Alexander, and the new generation of Nkrumahists trained under the Soviets with Nkrumah's Pan-African values.[32] This rivalry was incited by the events of the Congo Crisis and its effects on the Ghanaian military.

The Congo Crisis 1960-1965

The Congo Crisis presented Nkrumah and the Ghanaian military with a unique opportunity to take a leading role in continental affairs. As the Belgian Congo neared independence, Belgian companies made massive withdrawals of capital, while maximizing the export of Congolese resources and minimizing Congolese imports.[33] This caused extensive economic strain in the Congo, that was itself on the verge of decolonization. Before the crisis, the Congolese Army consisted of 24,000 soldiers and 1,000 Belgian officers.[34] After independence was declared, the Belgian colonial administration did not demonstrate its desire to leave the Congo, as the Congolese military was still under the control of Belgian officers.[35] In early July 1960, Congolese soldiers rebelled against their Belgian commanders, demanding that Belgium leave the Congo.[36] In this process, the rebelling Congolese military promoted violence against white Belgians in the Congo.[37] This violence prompted a Belgian intervention in the Congo. At the same time, the mineral rich region of Katanga attempted a secessionist movement from the rest of the Congo.[38] Between the internal turmoil, Belgian intervention, and Katanga secession, the Congo was teetering on the edge of a total collapse.

When the crisis broke out in the Congo during July 1960, the leader of the new state was Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba, a socialist and Pan-African like Nkrumah. Lumumba asked the United Nations (UN) for assistance. The United States (US) saw Lumumba as a communist puppet

---

[31] Baynham, *Soldier and State in Ghana*, 157.
[32] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 90.
[33] K. Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism* (New York: International Pub., 1966), 219.
[34] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 607.
[35] Charles Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo: A Pan-African Explanation," *Third World Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2020): 472.
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] Ludo De Witte, "The Suppression of the Congo Rebellions and the Rise of Mobutu, 1963-5," *International History Review* 39, no. 1 (2017): 107.
[38] Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo," 472.

and the driving force behind the crisis, while Nkrumah saw him as a nationalist serving the Pan-African cause.[39] Nkrumah's decision to participate in the crisis was driven by undermining colonial and neo-colonial influences, his desire to trigger independence movements, project African solidarity and unity, and grow his influence in African affairs.[40] By mid-July 1960, the vanguard of the UN force had arrived in the Congo. The mission was led by US diplomat Ralph Bunche and Swedish General Carl von Horn, but until their arrival General Alexander was to command the UN force.[41] The vanguard consisted of General Alexander and 25 Ghanaian soldiers.[42] They were accompanied by Ambassador Djin and (then) Colonel Otu.[43] Djin was a prominent political asset to Nkrumah, and held multiple important positions throughout Nkrumah's rule.[44] By the end of the month, the Ghanaians made up the largest UN contribution with 2,340 soldiers and 370 police.[45] Nkrumah was anxious to fight for the new freedoms achieved by newly decolonized African state. This also presented an opportunity for Ghana to make an alliance with Lumumba's Congo and continue to develop Nkrumah's Pan-African intentions.[46] The shared political ideology between Nkrumah and Lumumba made an alliance based on Pan-African principles feasible. Congo's resource rich export economy would aid in African political leverage if in the hands of African governments rather than neo-colonial powers.

Initially, the Ghanaians were met with some success in the Congo. Their initial mission statement was to prevent attacks on civilians in Léopoldville, convince the Congolese Army to return to barracks, and replace the presence of the Belgian military in the region.[47] The shortcomings in the Ghanaian army became apparent early on. They did not have adequate means of radio communications to Léopoldville nor adequate transport planes able to fly soldiers into the Congo.[48] Luckily for the Ghanaian Army, General Alexander was able to use his status and affiliations to allow the Ghanaian forces to enter the Congo. General Alexander was able to borrow transport from the British Royal Air Force that happened to be in Accra, with permission from the

---

[39] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 620.
[40] Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo," 474-5.
[41] *Ibid.,* 472.
[42] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 105.
[43] Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo," 477.
[44] Paul Darby, "Politics, Resistance and Patronage: The African Boycott of the 1966 World Cup and its Ramifications," *Soccer and Society* 20, no.7-8 (2019): 939.
[45] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis,* 612.
[46] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 105.
[47] *Ibid.,* 105-6.
[48] *Ibid.,* 106.

British government.[49] Once on the ground, the Ghanaians and the British officers had to navigate a language barrier.[50] The logistical support that the American Embassy offered to General Alexander was not adequate, and Alexander was forced to look for other means of support. As more UN forces entered the country, the Congolese prepared for a civil war.[51] Stability was impossible for Lumumba as the Katanga secessionist movement, supported by the Belgians, and his own government's turmoil, brought the country to the precipice of war.

By September 1960, the Congolese Colonial Joseph Mobutu took control of Léopoldville and in December ordered the kidnapping and execution of Lumumba.[52] Mobutu was able to maintain power because of his staunch anti-Communist policies that gained the support of the US.[53] As the Congo Crisis continued, the Ghanaian Army experienced decreased success after General Alexander and the British officers were relieved by Nkrumah in December of 1961.

Through the Congo Crisis, Nkrumah began believing that the international community was only interested in the Congo for neo-colonial purposes. Neo-Colonialism, as defined by Nkrumah, is when a sovereign state is economically and politically dependent and directed by external powers.[54] The ultimate goal of the neo-colonial state is to maintain power without responsibility, thus increasing the gap between rich and poor nations.[55] Nkrumah's own General Alexander was accused of neo-colonial influence when he ordered his soldiers to disarm the Congolese soldiers in an attempt to quell violence against white Belgians in the Congo, which led to concerns that General Alexander was pro-Belgian.[56] As previously mentioned, British sympathies for the Katanga separatists created strife between Nkrumah and the British presence in Ghana.[57] Nkrumah was becoming frustrated with the political friction between General Alexander and Ambassador Djin.[58] Djin would repeatedly undermine General Alexander's authority by getting Colonel Otu and Colonel Ankrah to act without General Alexander's or the UN's authority.[59]

---

[49] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 106.
[50] *Ibid.*
[51] *Ibid.*
[52] Laumann, *Colonial Africa*, 80.
[53] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 610.
[54] Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, x.
[55] *Ibid.,* x-xi.
[56] Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo," 472.
[57] Nkrumah to Gen. Alexander, 22 September 1961, reprinted in Alexander, H. T, *African Tightrope*, Appendix E, 149.
[58] Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo," 479.
[59] *Ibid.*

By this point. Nkrumah began to realize that Ghana's involvement in the crisis through the UN was slow, complex, and frustrating. In comparison to the European and Western states involved in funding the UN, Ghana's influence was minimal.[60] The Congo Crisis prompted Nkrumah to remove General Alexander and the British officers from the Ghanaian military by December of 1961. Without General Alexander and the support of British officers, the Ghanaian Army had to weather the trials of combat on their own and soon realized that the cost of taking part in peacekeeping missions such as the Congo was not worth Nkrumah's Pan-African vision.

Nkrumah saw Ghana's inability to influence the Congo Crisis as a threat to his Pan-African objectives.[61] Despite being the first UN soldiers in Léopoldville, they were totally dependent on the Western and colonial powers to achieve this objective.[62] When Western support withered in the Congo, Nkrumah turned to the Soviets who volunteered two large transport aircraft.[63] In 1960 the US had little investment in the Congo but as the conflict prolonged US investment dramatically grew.[64] Nkrumah became suspicious of US interests in the Congo, driving a wedge between Nkrumah and the West. By backing Mobutu over Lumumba, the US contributed to Nkrumah's resentment of neo-colonialism and confirmed his suspicions.[65] The Congo Crisis became dreaded by the militaries from Pan-African idealist states. This Pan-African failure fueled Nkrumah and the CPP's leadership to pursue socialist policies domestically and internationally.[66]

1961 A Swift Change in Policy

Due to the setbacks and frustrations Nkrumah was facing because of the ongoing Congo Crisis, he began a radical shift in domestic policies in 1961. This shift affected all of Nkrumah's branches of government.[67] As mentioned, in late 1961 Nkrumah set upon the Africanization of the army.[68] This materialized in the firing of General Alexander and the displacement of the British Officer Corps by December of 1961. After Ghana became a republic in 1960 with Nkrumah as its first president, he and the CCP had more power to intervene in bureaucracy by bringing

---

[60] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 107.
[61] Asante, "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo," 480.
[62] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 613.
[63] *Ibid.*
[64] Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 212-214.
[65] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 618.
[66] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 172.
[67] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 69, 90.
[68] Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order*, 124.

departments directly under the presidents control.[69] Between 1963 and 1965, only 12 cadets were sent to the Royal Military Academy in Sandhurst, Eaton Hall and Mons Officer Cadet Schools.[70] Nkrumah began practicing non-alignment, which is based on co-operation with all states whether their political policies were capitalist, socialist or a mix of both.[71] This policy involved foreign investment from all political spheres. This explains the rapid decrease of British support but not the total severing of support. The Ghanaian officer program in Teshie under British guidance was intended to graduate a maximum of 30 officers per year.[72] However, under new pressures from the government and the necessity to replace the British officers, the program was streamlined to provide platoon commanders for the Ghanaian Army.[73] The lack of platoon commanders was crippling for the Ghanaian Army that was fighting in the Congo at the time.

This fundamental shift in policy in 1961 resulted in the removal of dependence on the British and the Africanization of Ghanaian society, with the support of Soviet programs. This new Soviet relationship was not limited to the military, as it included cultural and academic exchange agreements between 1960 and 1966.[74] Through this new relationship with the Soviet Union, the Ghanaians were able to develop with increased independence from British support and still maintain a large footprint in continental affairs. This did not sit well with the US, whose policy was to ensure that Ghana neither sought nor accepted assistance from any country who rivalled American interests.[75] The US was concerned by Nkrumah's policies of "positive neutralism," paired with his non-alignment policies, Pan-Africanism ideology, and Nkrumah's relationship with the Soviet bloc.[76]

Nkrumah believed that Ghana would not become fully independent of Britain until they became decolonized in their minds, which involved the destruction of the colonial mentality.[77] He set upon reshaping the Ghanaian nationalist psychology by imbedding Pan-African characteristics

---

[69] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 174.
[70] Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order*, 125.
[71] Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, x.
[72] Lee, *African Armies and Civil Order*, 124.
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] Derrick Charway, & Barrie Houlihan, "Country Profile of Ghana: Sport, Politics and Nation-Building," *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics* 12, no. 3 (2020): 499.
[75] Nwaubani, *Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis*, 600.
[76] *Ibid.,* 602, 604.
[77] De-Valera N.Y.M. Botchway, "'There is a New African in the World!' Kwame Nkrumah and the Making of a 'New African (Wo)Man' in Ghana 1957-1966," *Comparative* 28, no. 5 (2018): 61.

and attitudes.[78] Nkrumah targeted the education system to indoctrinate this ideological training. He also did so through the establishment of the Ghana Youth Pioneers Movement (GYP) and the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute (KNII) in 1960 and 1961 respectively.[79] These programs trained to youth and adults alike. Such programs were implemented by the Armed Forces Bureau and used to lecture the military about Nkrumahist philosophies.[80] The senior Ghanaian officers were dissatisfied with Nkrumah's efforts to implement the CPP as a partisan political institution within the Ghanaian military.[81] Nkrumah's psychological strategy was present in all aspects of Ghanaian life.[82] As a result the Nkrumahist officer cadets had a fundamentally different ideological foundation compared to their older British trained counterparts. This shift in ideology was designed by the CCP to directly challenge the old guard who favoured western ideological practices.[83] Many of the Nkrumahist officers were educated solely in Ghana, while the old guard had witnessed and experienced the ideological practices passed down by the British colonial and post-colonial training programs.

By the end of 1961, economic difficulties began adding significant political pressure to Nkrumah's government.[84] With increased political opposition to Nkrumah's policies, his government had to utilize constitutional and extra-constitutional means to maintain control and continue developing Ghana's Pan-Africanism.[85] In response to the questionable legality of Nkrumah's policies, the US and Britain began seeing Nkrumah as a dictator with Soviet sympathies.[86]

A critical component of Ghanaian military subculture was its exposure to British military professionalism, through British military institutions and professional development.[87] Most Ghanaian officers respected their British counterparts and were not prepared for nor desiring of the sudden Africanization of the Ghanaian military.[88] Their educational background, economic status and sense of military professionalism made the old guard of the Ghanaian officer corps a

---

[78] Botchway, "There is a New African in the World!," 61.
[79] *Ibid.,* 62.
[80] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 185.
[81] Baynham, *Soldier and State in Ghana*, 158.
[82] Botchway, "There is a New African in the World!," 65.
[83] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 170.
[84] Harrington, & Manji, *Africa Needs Many Lawyers*, 159.
[85] *Ibid.*
[86] *Ibid.*
[87] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 182.
[88] *Ibid.*

socially conservative group.[89] These were not only in military norms, but also in ideology and life styles.[90] This was especially the case in the officers with training experience in the UK and other parts of the Commonwealth.[91] These shared views of professionalism and culture were disdained by the CPP, as a result Nkrumah and his regime were regarded by the old guard as self-serving, corrupt, repressive, and dictatorial.[92]

The Later Years 1962-1966

Part of Nkrumah's Pan-African vision was to rid Africa of white minority rule. The Pan-African vision was being suppressed by white minority governments in southern Africa. This was demonstrated by South Africa's refusal to allow South West Africa to decolonize, and the Portuguese persistence in defeating rebel forces in Angola starting in 1961 (Angolan War of Independence 1961-1974).[93] Nkrumah believed that Portugal was only able to maintain these colonies because of the strength it gained from NATO support.[94] In 1965, white settlers in Southern Rhodesia rebelled and established a white minority state independent from the British called Rhodesia. Facing too many logistical problems in a proposed military campaign, and a lack of political and general will in the aftermath of the Mau Mau Rebellion in Kenya (1952-1960), the British chose to let their colony fall to the settlers. Unlike the Mau Mau Rebellion, the British soldier would not have been fighting Kikuyu indigenous people, they would have been fighting white settlers who were perceived as their former kin.[95] Nkrumah was shocked that the British would not intervene in this armed resurrection but believed that it served as a critical opportunity for his Pan-African vision.

Britain did not support any African attempts to intervene against the white minority government.[96] Nkrumah believed that Britain was influenced by neo-colonial interests since they still benefitted from trade relations with Rhodesia.[97] This essentially created a second South Africa in the heart of white minority-ruled southern Africa.[98] Birmingham describes that "this was where

---

[89] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 182.
[90] *Ibid.*
[91] *Ibid.*
[92] *Ibid.*
[93] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 107.
[94] Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 21.
[95] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 109.
[96] Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 22.
[97] *Ibid.*
[98] *Ibid.*

Nkrumah met his ultimate challenge."[99] Nkrumah believed that the job of ridding Africa of this white rogue state fell to all fellow Africans.

Nkrumah began preparing his army for a new military campaign that was believed to be similar to the Congo Crisis. The Ghanaian military was in disbelief that Nkrumah proposed this military campaign. Unlike the Congolese, the white settlers in Rhodesia were well equipped, well trained, determined, and strategically located three thousand miles from Ghana in the heartland of sympathetic white minority colonies and states.[100]

The Army, Why They Did It

Nkrumah wanted people to learn about Africa's precolonial past to guide them through the problems of post-colonial society.[101] However, this narrative neglected the history, traditions and standards that the old guard of the Ghanaian military was built upon. Without the inclusion of the colonial history, the old guard was facing an identity crisis. Instead, Nkrumah's Pan-African vision, mortared with the blood of the military in the Congo Crisis, was taking hold in the new Nkrumahist junior officers who were rapidly being promoted to fill the British void.

Nkrumah believed that the colonial mentality exposed Ghana to neo-colonialism. He purged Ghana of colonial symbols and replaced them with images of himself and other influential Pan-Africanists.[102] Due to the high illiteracy rates in the country he believed that Ghanaians needed to be physically shown that they were completely independent.[103] Part of this strategy of showing Ghanaians their independence was expelling the British Officer Corps and General Alexander. This rejection of British military education transcends the Ghanaian military and was a radical shift in all aspects of Ghanaian society especially secondary education.[104] This was a battle over Ghanaian nationalism, development and social progress, that was threatened by the ambivalent legacy of the British, and the growing influence of the US and Soviets in African affairs.[105]

Nkrumah's dictatorial tendencies became more pronounced after 1961. The legacy of the Preventive Detentions Act 1958 in particular raised suspicions of Nkrumah's dedication to liberal democracy. The Preventive Detentions Act allowed Nkrumah to arrest political opponents without

---

[99] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 108.
[100] *Ibid.*, 109.
[101] Botchway, "There is a New African in the World!," 65.
[102] *Ibid.*, 62.
[103] *Ibid.*, 66.
[104] Harrington, & Manji, *Africa Needs Many Lawyers*, 157.
[105] *Ibid.*, 151.

trial.[106] By 1966, over 1,000 people had been detained. Former United Gold Coast Convention and independence leader J.B. Danquah died in custody in 1965, cementing the disdain for this Act in the hearts of Ghanaians who favoured liberal democratic values.[107] The Preventive Detentions Act opposed the liberal democratic values that the British had instilled in the old guard of the Ghanaian military throughout their colonial and post-colonial relationship. Reflecting upon Nkrumah's policies in Ghana, in 1965 General Alexander stated that, "We have been through the period of arbitrary power and of confining our enemies to the Tower (of London): Ghana is now going through that period."[108]

Nkrumah banned political parties based on ethnic, religious, and regionalism, centralizing his political opponents into the United Party.[109] He then linked the expanding government with CPP authority, including the military. After 1961 the Ghanaian military's old guard had become increasingly alienated by Nkrumah's government after the removal of the British officers. This directly interfered with the Ghanaian military's internal decision-making abilities. By January of 1964, Nkrumah had created a one-party state with the CPP monopolizing legitimate authority of all aspects of Ghanaian government practices.[110]

Nkrumah had established the President's Own Guard Regiment (POGR) in 1960, and a military counterintelligence agency was formed to spy on the military.[111] The POGR was completely separate from the regular chain of command and was loyal directly to Nkrumah.[112] This unit was equipped and trained by the Soviet Union.[113] These units were actively challenging the authority and legitimacy of the military centralizing loyalty strictly with Nkrumah.

Outside of the military realm there was a host of domestic political grievances that undercut support for the president in the civilian populace.[114] These grievances ranged from electoral manipulation and corruption to a deteriorating economy.[115] Many of these grievances were also affecting Ghanaian military personnel. By 1966 the old guard of the military and the police were

---

[106] Harrington, & Manji, *Africa Needs Many Lawyers*, 159.
[107] *Ibid.*
[108] Alexander, *African Tightrope*, 96.
[109] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 169.
[110] *Ibid.,* 170, 175.
[111] *Ibid.,* 185.
[112] Baynham, *Soldier and State in Ghana*, 158.
[113] *Ibid.*
[114] *Ibid.*, 159.
[115] *Ibid.*

the only remaining institutions capable of challenging Nkrumah's regime.[116] With the growth of the POGR and the promotions of Nkrumahist officers this ability was ever decreasing. The old guard of the Ghanaian military speculated that removing Nkrumah would be widely accepted throughout the Ghanaian populace. In February 1966, Nkrumah was in Vietnam negotiating peace when the National Liberation Council (NLC) led by (now) Major General Ankrah overtook the government and POGR. The NLC led the Ghanaian government until 1969 with Western support. Nkrumah never returned to Ghana and lived in exile in Guinea until his death in 1972.

Conclusion

The methods by which Nkrumah tried to strengthen his military eventually turned the old guard of the Ghanaian military against him. By seeking the support of the Soviets as part of the Africanization of the military, Nkrumah began alienating himself from the old guard which was built on the colonial legacy. This radical and forceful change in tradition, paired with Nkrumah's firm control of the army, broke bonds between the old guard of the Ghanaian Officer Corps and Nkrumah. The Africanization of the Ghanaian military led to poorly trained and unexperienced junior Nkrumahist officers getting promoted to important command and staff duties within the military, impeding Ghana's military effectiveness and causing a rivalry with the old guard.

As Nkrumah took on more dictatorial characteristics, the British officers, Ghanaian military, and Ghanaian society became subject to Nkrumah's rigid Pan-African demeanour, causing strife within Ghanaian military, society and the international community. With the prospects of going into a new African conflict, the old guard of the Ghanaian military perceived the only way to survive Nkrumah's Pan-African ideology was to sever him from his leadership position. While Nkrumah's Pan-Africanism was a primary character trait and attributed to his rise to power, it also became his final ruin when he attempted to detach Ghana from its colonial legacy.[117]

---

[116] Welsh, *Soldier and State in Africa*, 180.
[117] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 109.

Bibliography

Alexander, Henry T. Major-General. *African Tightrope: My Two Years as Nkrumah's Chief of Staff*. London: Pall Mall Press, 1965.

Asante, Charles. "Ghana and the United Nations' 1960s mission in the Congo: A Pan-African explanation." *Third World Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2020): 470-486.

Baynham, Simon J. "Soldier and State in Ghana." *Armed Forces & Society* 5, no. 1 (1978): 155-68.

Birmingham, David. *Kwame Nkrumah: The Father of African Nationalism*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1998.

Botchway, De-Valera N.Y.M. "'There is a New African in the World!'- Kwame Nkrumah and the Making of a 'New African (Wo)man' in Ghana 1957-1966." *Comparative* 28, no. 5 (2018): 59-76.

Charway, Derrick, and Barrie Houlihan. "Country Profile of Ghana: Sport, Politics and Nation-Building." *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics* 12, no. 3 (2020): 497-512.

Darby, Paul. "Politics, Resistance and Patronage: The African Boycott of the 1966 World Cup and its Ramifications." *Soccer and Society* 20, no. 7-8 (2019): 936-47.

De Witte, Ludo. "The Suppression of the Congo Rebellions and the Rise of Mobutu, 1963-5." *International History Revie,* 39, no.1 (2017): 107-125.

Harrington, John, and Ambreena Manji. "'Africa Needs Many Lawyers Trained for the Need of their Peoples': Struggles over Legal Education in Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana." *American Journal of Legal History* 59, no.2 (2019): 177.

Laumann, Denis. *Colonial Africa 1884-1994*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019

Lee, J. M., and Institute for Strategic Studies. *African Armies and Civil Order*. Studies in International Security; 13. London: Chatto and Windus for the Institute for Strategic Studies, 1969.

Nkrumah, Kwame. (1966). *Neo-Colonialism : The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International Pub, 1966.

Nwaubani, Ebere. "Eisenhower, Nkrumah and the Congo Crisis." *Journal of Contemporary History* 36, no. 4 (2001): 599-622.

Welch, Claude. *Soldier and State in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Military Intervention and Political Change*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

The Warren Court and the Constitutional Revolution of the 1960s

Daniel Kirtley Simpkin

The Civil Rights and Anti-Vietnam War movements largely characterize the 1960s, respectively. However, the historically significant political mobilizations have often overshadowed the constitutional revolution that took place in the United States Supreme Court during the same time. The Supreme Court responsible for the aforementioned constitutional revolution was known as the Warren Court. Headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren between 1953 and 1969, the Warren court was the most impactful Supreme Court in United States history. Earl Warren's influence dominated the Supreme Court and the seventeen men that alongside him during his sixteen-year tenure.[1] The majority of the Warren Court Justices maintained an innovative and socially responsible mindset towards constitutional legal thinking. Furthermore, the Warren Courts' strong-willed support of civil rights laws adhered to the needs of a modernizing and increasingly secular American population.[2] Leigh Ann Wheeler, author of *How Sex Became a Civil Liberty*, writes "the Supreme Court, presided over by Chief Justice Earl Warren, was known for its eagerness to employ judicial review to overturn state statutes that violated the bill of rights".[3] This statement captures the essence of the Warren Court, and serves as a symbolic mission statement for what Warren and his fellow Justices were trying to achieve while presiding over some of the most influential cases in United States history. Important cases that the Warren Court presided over include: *Loving V. Virginia,* which saw the legalization of marriage between persons of different ethnicities; *Brown v. Board of Education*, resulted in the desegregation of schools nation-wide; *Reynolds v. Sims*, received a ruling which mandated the reapportionment of state legislatures- giving voting power to urban and diverse cities; *Miranda v. Arizona,* resulted in the formation of the Miranda Rights, which mandated police officers to recite a list of basic legal rights to perpetrators during arrest: *Gideon v. Wainwright*, which ensured that all American's receive a court-appointed attorney during their legal proceedings.[4] These cases represent significant

---

[1] Melvin Urofsky, *The Warren Court: Justices, Rulings, and Legacy* (Santa Barbara, CA: California Press: 2001), 29.

[2] Morton J. Horwitz, "The Warren Court and The Pursuit of Justice," *Washington and Lee Law Review* 50, no. 1 (1993): 1.

[3] Leigh Ann Wheeler, *How Sex Became a Civil Liberty* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 102.

[4] *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967).; *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).; *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964); *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966); *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963).

innovations in the realms of civil rights, human liberties, women's rights, black civil rights, and the impact that federal laws have on states and municipalities.

In the history of the American judiciary, two Supreme Courts have instigated constitutional revolutions. The first was the New Deal Court, which in 1937 fundamentally restructured the relationships between the government, the states, and the economy.[5] The New Deal Courts' successes came through mechanical jurisprudence, that was less a revolution towards socially inclusive modernity, as it was a strict reliance upon neutral concepts derived from a static understanding of the constitution, primarily focused on economic re-development.[6] Between 1953 and 1969, the Warren Court instigated a constitutional revolution through two key conceptions that were centered around modernizing the core values of American constitutional law. The first conception was to implement a *living constitution.*[7] The philosophy of a *living constitution* is, as author and legal scholar Bernard Schwartz writes, "Underlying the courts approach to justice, was the belief that the constitution was a living document, and that the Justices had a responsibility to facilitate its evolution and development."[8] The Courts' interest in a *living constitution* came from a desire to evolve with changing values and circumstances, rather than reiterating static and outdated constitutional laws that could not grasp the scope of modern situations.[9] The second conception was to reinvigorate the *discourse of rights* as a dominant fixture of constitutional law.[10] Earl Warren was essential to the reinvigoration of the Supreme Court's effect on American society, however strong backing from multiple influential Justices bolstered Warren's efficacy as Chief Justice.

The most senior Justice on the Warren Court was Hugo Black.[11] Black was a well-educated lawyer and career politician prior to his tenure on the Warren Court.[12] Black was also a member of the Ku Klux Klan before he was a Supreme Court Justice. Black publicly opposed the groups' racist activities. His membership, however, greatly benefitted his chance of being elected to the United States Senate as the representative of Alabama - a state in which the group had large

---

[5] Horwitz, "The Warren Court and The Pursuit of Justice," 1.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Barnard Schwartz, *The Warren Court: A Retrospective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: October 10, 1996), 299.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] Horwitz, "The Warren Court," 2.
[10] *Ibid.,* 3.
[11] "Hugo L. Black," *Oyez*, accessed 26 November 2020, https://www.oyez.org/justices/hugo_l_black.
[12] *Ibid.*

political sway.[13] Despite Black's resignation from the KKK in 1925, he retained close connections with Klan leaders to protect his political career, a fact which justly creates concern for his motivations and influences within the Supreme Court. Despite the reputation and continued relationship with the KKK, Black was a vocal champion of bills that favoured civil liberties, and racism did not impinge upon his legal practices.[14] The second most senior Justice on the Warren Court was William Douglas.[15] Douglas' early life was plagued by financial troubles that, during his tenure a Supreme Court Justice, inspired him to advocate on behalf of people of low-economic status.[16] Douglas was a blunt and strong willed proponent of New Deal legislation, particularly in regard to individual rights, free speech, the rights of illegitimate children, labour laws, and the regulation of markets.[17] The third most senior and Chief Justice of the Warren Court was Earl Warren.[18] Like Douglas and Black, Warren was a lawyer. In his youth, he had witnessed crime and violence which, upon personal reflection, he deemed was due to the countenance of a corrupt government and judiciary.[19] Warren also served as the district attorney of California for thirteen years.[20] During his time as district attorney, Warren never had a conviction overturned by a higher court.[21] In reference to the tenure of Earl Warren as Chief Justice, author Melvin Urofsky sings his praises, stating "presiding over a judicial battlefield, Earl Warren clearly deserves to be ranked among the strong chief Justices."[22] Warren was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in 1953 by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a position he maintained until his retirement in 1969.[23]

In the late eighteenth century, the consensus understanding of constitutional legal thinking was that it should be in accordance with religious ideologies, and remain fixed in a precise way that would never need changing.[24] However, this static idea of constitutional law disregards any possibility that society would secularize, or that a fixed constitution could become inconsequential. Moreover, the constitution was not being rebranded under a fancy new slogan, it was being

---

[13] "Black," *Oyez*.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] Horwitz, "The Warren Court," 11.
[16] "William O. Douglas," *Oyez*, accessed 25 November 2020, https://www.oyez.org/justices/william_o_douglas.
[17] "Douglas," *Oyez*.
[18] Horwitz, "The Warren Court," 11.
[19] Urofsky, *The Warren Court: Justices, Rulings, and Legacy*, 20.
[20] *Ibid*.
[21] "Earl Warren," *Oyez,* accessed 27 November 2020, https://www.oyez.org/justices/earl_warren.
[22] Urofsky, *The Warren Court: Justices, Rulings, and Legacy*, 29.
[23] "Earl Warren," *Oyez.*
[24] Horwitz, "The Warren Court," 10.

critically reviewed and expanded upon in order to fit the times.[25] For example, *Lochner v. New York* forced the Supreme Court to expand upon the parameters of contract law in the constitution because they did not account for corporate industrialization.[26] *Lochner v. New York* was a proto-revolutionary case in U.S constitutional history because it identified faults in the American constitution's ability to provide accurate legal consult without expansion.

When the Warren Court began to exercise its full judicial power, they were heavily criticized by racist conservatives for trying to reorient certain constitutional laws to protect African-American citizens.[27] The Warren Court was taking the power of certain constitutional laws that conservatives had leaned on to further racist agendas.[28] There are two important instances wherein the Warren Court relied upon the 14th Amendment to the constitution to provide rulings that were beneficial to civil rights. The 14th amendment guarantees all American citizens equal protection of the law.[29] However, as seen in *Dred Scott v. Sanford,* the notion of equal protection of the law had been violated because slave-owners believed the enslaved to be property and not people.[30] Having realized that certain constitutional amendments has been manipulated by racist ideologies, the Warren Court alternatively sought to do the same but with an emphasis on promoting civil rights. By recognizing the ambiguous way that certain constitutional rights were being exercised to restrict the mobility of African Americans, the Warren Court promptly began interpreting the constitution as a fluid and living document that could benefit all Americans, not just white Americans.

Accordingly, this reformation process saw the Warren Court develop constitutional law into a more fluid, modernized legal institution. An important fixture of bringing constitutional law into modernity would be through reopening human rights as a dominant mode of discourse. In 1954, the Warren Court made its first major ruling that was sympathetic to the African-American struggle. Justice Warren declared that the notion of 'separate but equal' had no place in modern America.[31] Warren denounced segregation as unconstitutional because there was simply no way that black students could attend segregated schools and not have a lesser quality education. The

---

[25] Schwartz, *The Warren Court: A Retrospective,* 200.

[26] *Lochner v. New York*, 198 U.S 45 (1905).

[27] Fred Rodell, "The 'Warren Court' Stands Its Ground," *The New York Times,* 27 September 1964, SM23.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] 14th Amendment, United States Constitution, 1868.

[30] *Dred Scott v. Sandford,* 60 U.S. 393 (1856).

[31] Robert Longley, "The Warren Court: Its Impact and Importance," *ThoughtCO,* 13 August 2019.

subsequent Supreme Court case was *Brown v. Board of Education,* which the Warren Court presided over and ultimately ruled that racial segregation violated the Equal Protections Clause of the 14th Amendment.[32] As a result, public schools in America were mandated to desegregate. Author and scholar Robert Longley writes, "the unanimity Warren achieved in *Brown v. Board* made it easier for congress to enact legislation banning racial segregation and discrimination […] Warren clearly established the power of the courts to stand with the executive and legislative branches."[33] Such an unprecedent move in favour of civil rights and against racist structures was a defining moment in the Warren Court's proactive effort to help govern the nation.[34]

The overarching significance of the Warren Court comes from their expansion of constitutional legal thinking, the living constitution, and the reopening of the rights discourse. The Warren Courts' impact upon American society was furthered by coinciding with the Civil Rights Movement, and the presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson. Johnson assumed the Presidency after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Johnson was quick to pick up where Kennedy left off, and on November 27[th,] 1963, Johnson clarified the importance of passing the *Civil Rights Act* and the tax bill that had been focal points of the Kennedy administration prior to his death.[35] Johnson became the Oval Office's champion on civil rights in the place of Kennedy.[36] In conjunction with the Warren Court, Johnson would end state laws that were discriminatory and racially biased.[37] Building off the previous ruling of *Brown v. Board,* the Civil Rights Movement was able to garner substantial attention from the American congress in regard to the legitimacy of their struggle and the necessity of racial equality.[38] In 1964 the *Civil Rights Act* was passed, and in 1965, the *Voting Rights Act* was passed.

The Warren Court facilitated the widespread success of the *Voting Rights Act* by removing voting impediments placed on African-Americans, abolishing state poll taxes, removing mandatory residency qualifications, and allowing third party political groups on to the voting ballot.[39] Furthermore, the Warren Court upheld the *Voting Rights Act* by cancelling complicated

---

[32] *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
[33] Longley, "The Warren Court: Its Impact and Importance".
[34] *Ibid.*
[35] Ted Gittinger and Allen Fisher, "LBJ Champions the Civil Rights Act of 1964," *Prologue Magazine; The National Archives* Vol. 36, no. 2. (2004).
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] "Reynolds v. Sims," *Oyez,* accessed 10 December 2020, https://www.oyez.org/cases/1963/23.

and unnecessary literacy tests that racist deep south states forced upon African-Americans. The *Voting Rights Act* greatly boosted African-American voting power by ensuring protections at the polls, and protection from state tampering.[40] Additionally, Earl Warren was a proponent of the 'One Man, One Vote' system.[41] Hinging form Warren's belief in equal representation, in 1964 the Supreme Court began taking state reapportionment cases.[42] The same year, *Reynolds v. Sims* was passed by the Warren Court, and the ruling sanctioned the reapportionment of state legislatures.[43] This meant that state legislatures would have to apportion in accordance with population instead of geographical area.[44] Reapportionment took voting power away from rural areas where racism was more prevalent, and placed it in more densely populated urban cities that were representative of the diversifying American population.[45] All of this success on behalf of the Civil Rights Movement stems from the first major ruling by the Warren Court - *Brown v. Board*. Had it not been for the Warren Courts' ruling of *Brown v. Board,* there is a strong possibility that the Civil Rights Movement would have had a substantially harder time gaining sympathy from legislators, governors, senators, or the White House.

Beyond race and poverty, the Warren Court also strongly advocated on behalf of women's rights. As author Mortin J. Horwitz writes, "the Warren Court was the first Supreme Court that identified with the stigmatized … not only blacks, but women, religious minorities, political dissenters, poor people, and prisoners."[46] In other words, the Warren Court was the first in constitutional history to value the expansion of rights to all Americans. In 1962, a Connecticut activism group approached the American Civil Liberties Union urging them to help substantiate a reform on contraception laws.[47] This case became *Griswold v. Connecticut,* and the Warren Court presided over its ruling in 1965. Previously, in 1959, the Court had worked on *Poe v. Ullman*, which had opened a discourse on behalf of privacy, contraception, and sexuality.[48] The ACLU cited *Poe v. Ullman* to contest legal inconsistencies, like men being allowed to openly purchase condoms, when women were not allowed to purchase diaphragms.[49] Furthermore, the ACLU

---

[40] "*Voting Rights Act*," 1965.
[41] "Earl Warren," *Oyez.*
[42] *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964).
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] "Earl Warren," *Oyez.*
[46] Horwitz, "The Warren Court," 10.
[47] Wheeler, *How Sex Became a Civil Liberty,* 114.
[48] *Ibid.,* 102.
[49] *Ibid.*

referenced record breaking numbers in teen pregnancy and poverty as a strong point for the inclusion of female contraception as a right. Equally, the ACLU used the research done by Alfred Kinglsey which stipulated abstinence as not a viable solution for married couples to stop having children.[50] The reality of growing poverty pressured the government, as did the mainstream media's routine publishing about couples that used contraception.[51] True to form, the Warren Court ruled in favour of *Griswold v.* Connecticut, and lead to the legalization of contraception. The Warren Court deemed it a violation of marital privacy to designate contraception and birth control illegal, or to impose regulations upon a man and wife's sexual freedom.[52] The favourable ruling of *Griswold v. Connecticut* opened the door for many female rights issues, but it did not guarantee federal funding, a fact that re-divided liberal politics based on fear regarding breaches of privacy, black rights, and women's rights.[53] In 1971, the ruling on *Griswold* directly affected the proceedings of one of the biggest Supreme Court cases in American history: *Roe v. Wade* (1971). The Warren Court's strong-willed advocacy of civil liberties deeply aided the struggle of oppressed women.

Some further instances where the Warren Court won on behalf of civil liberties by using the 14th amendment include *Gideon v. Wainwright* and *Miranda v. Arizona.* In 1962, *Gideon v. Wainwright* served as a ground-breaking Supreme Court case in regard to the federal government's protection of indigent peoples of all backgrounds and ethnicities.[54] Justice Douglas, who had suffered great financial troubles, had grown determined to be on the side of the downtrodden American people. The ruling of *Gideon v. Wainwright* made it into law that all Americans in need of legal counsel would have it appointed to them by the court, regardless of their ability to pay for it.[55] The results of this ruling are two-fold: American citizens achieved protection under their court system, and federal laws began to impact the proceedings of lower level or state court trials. *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) implemented laws on behalf of the fifth amendment which addresses criminal procedure.[56] The ruling of *Miranda v. Arizona* is the embodiment of the mission statement of the Warren Court: protecting and developing rights in adherence to a living interpretation of the

---

[50] Wheeler, *How Sex Became a Civil Liberty,* 102.
[51] *Ibid.*, 103.
[52] *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965).
[53] Wheeler, *How Sex Became a Civil Liberty,* 165.
[54] Jerold H. Israel, "Gideon v. Wainwright: The Art of Overruling," *Sup. Ct. Rev*, 1963.
[55] *Gideon v. Wainwright,* 372 U.S. 335 (1963).
[56] *Miranda v. Arizona,* 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

constitution. Through what are now commonly known as the 'Miranda Rights,' the Warren Court made it federal law that all police officers performing arrests must make the perpetrator aware of their rights, otherwise their information cannot be used in a court of law.[57]

The Warren Court capitalized on an opportunity to advocate on behalf of the American people. Instead of adhering to conventional legal practice, the majority of the Warren Court used their power of judicial review to overturn legislation that violated civil liberties and breeched constitutional amendments. Furthermore, the notion of a *living constitution* separated the Warren Court from outdated constitutional deliberation, which had previously been commonplace in previous Supreme Courts. In turn, the court modernized the Supreme Court and re-defined its role in the American judiciary. Earl Warren, Douglas Williams, and Hugo Black were the most senior justices on the Warren Court, and were themselves strong proponents of civil, indigent, and women's rights. Collectively their Supreme Court tenure oversaw some of the most important cases, trials, and rulings of the twentieth century regarding American civil, gender, and racial equality. The Warren Court adhered to an increasingly secular American population that needed laws which could apply to changing modern situations. Accordingly, the Warren Courts' secular approach to the practice of constitutional law allowed them to review and overturn constitutional vagaries that racist, southern conservatives had used to defend their actions. The Warren Court propelled United States constitutional law into a state of on-going evolution that works and adapts with the American people. As a result of the Warren Courts' actions as a rational and innovative Supreme Court, it deserves to be heralded as the most influential Supreme Court in American history.

---

[57] *Miranda v. Arizona,* 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

AGO. No. 171. 12 December 1955. https://www.atg.wa.gov/ago-opinions/legislative-reapportionment-and-redistricting-use-united-states-census-tracts-define.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. 347 U.S. 483, 1954. Accessed 8 October 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/347/483/.

Dred Scott v. Sandford. 60 U.S. 393, 1856. Accessed 11 November 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/60/393/.

Gideon v. Wainwright. 372 U.S. 335, 1963. Accessed 8 October 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/372/335/.

Griswold v. Connecticut. 381 U.S. 479, 1965. Accessed 8 October 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/381/479/.

Lochner v. New York. 198 U.S. 45, 1905. Accessed 11 November 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/198/45/.

Loving v. Virginia. 388 U.S. 1, 1967. Accessed 8 October 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/388/1/.

Miranda v. Arizona. 384 U.S. 436, 1966. Accessed 8 October 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/384/436/.

Reynolds v. Sims. 377 U.S. 533, 1964. Accessed 20 December 2020. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/377/533/.

Rodell, Fred. "The 'Warren Court' Stands Its Ground." *The New York Times,* 27 September 1964, SM23.

"14th Amendment." *United States Constitution*. 1868.

Secondary Sources

"Earl Warren." *Oyez.* Accessed 26 November 2020. https://www.oyez.org/justices/earl_warren.

Gittinger, Ted., and Allen Fisher. "LBJ Champions the Civil Rights Act of 1964." *Prologue Magazine; The National Archives* 36, no. 2 (2004).

Horwitz, J, Morton. "The Warren Court and The Pursuit of Justice." *Washington and Lee Law Review* 50, no. 1 (January 1993): 5-13.

"Hugo L. Black." *Oyez.* Accessed 26 November 2020. https://www.oyez.org.

Israel, Jerold H. "Gideon v. Wainwright: The Art of Overruling." Sup. Ct. Rev. 1963.

Longley, Robert. "The Warren Court: Its Impact and Importance." *ThoughtCO,* 13 August 2019, 1.

"Reynolds v. Sims". *Oyez.* Accessed 10 December 2020. https://www.oyez.org/cases/1963/23.

Schwartz, Bernard. *The Warren Court: A Retrospective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Urofsky, Melvin. *The Warren Court: Justices, Rulings, and Legacy.* Santa Barbara, CA: California Press: 2001.

"*Voting Rights Act.*" 1965. https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=100.

Wheeler, Leigh Ann. *How Sex Became a Civil Liberty.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

"William O. Douglas." *Oyez.* Accessed 10 December 2020. https://www.oyez.org/justices/william_o_douglas.

Dulce bellum inexpertis: **Re-contextualizing Italy's inefficacies in the First World War and the Battle of Caporetto**

Francesca Sivilotti

On 24 October 1917, during the First World War, Austria-Hungary backed by German forces launched what would quickly become the "greatest military defeat in Italian history."[1] The Central Powers decisively broke through the Italian Isonzo front at Caporetto, triggering a precipitous Italian retreat, first to the Tagliamento River, then even further back to the Piave; 14,000 square kilometers of land, artillery, warehouses, and over one million Italian lives were left in enemy hands in the span of a few weeks.[2] Far from being an unpredictable and isolated failure, the Italian defeat at the battle of Caporetto was the direct result of years of deficiencies within the Italian army and state that had culminated by 1917. Indeed, this ignominious defeat, I argue, was the crown jewel of several systemic issues within Italy, specifically its estranged political-military relationship, material, and territorial disadvantages, and a flawed chain of command. Whereas Italian memory and history generally emphasize WWI as a "moment in which the country came together, when national identity and unity were forged among the citizenry for the first time," less patriotic historians see an "authoritarian regime at odds with an oppressed population for whom the war exercised little if any patriotic appeal."[3] Some, such as British historian Mark Thompson, go as far as to denounce the war's "futility," arguing that "instead of forging a stronger nation-state, the furnace of war… almost dissolved it."[4] The latter stance is far more compelling; Italy's role in WWI was clumsy and ineffective, rather than a source of national pride or identity. I will argue that due to its three principal flaws listed above, Italy would have been better off not entering WWI, a war whose role in uniting the young country has been romanticized to the point of abstraction.

---

[1] Brian Sullivan, "Caporetto: Causes, recovery, and consequences," in *The Aftermath of Defeat: Societies, Armed Forces, and the Challenge of Recovery*, ed. George Andreopoulos & Harold Selesky (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 60.

[2] Vanda Wilcox, "Generalship and Mass Surrender During the Italian Defeat at Caporetto," in *Beyond the Western Front*, ed. Ian F. W. Beckett (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2009), 26-7.

[3] Roberta Pergher, "An Italian War? War and Nation in the Italian Historiography of the First World War," *Journal of Modern History* 90 (December 2018): 867-70.

[4] Mark Thompson, *The White War: Life and Death on the Italian Front, 1915-1919* (London: Faber and Faber, 2008), 3, 326.

There are two main reasons for which Italy's entrance in WWI was a mistake. The first and larger systematic problem was the estranged nature of the relationship between Italian political and military leaders by the time global warfare broke out. In the years leading up to 1914, when politicians and army leaders met, "they showed a marked tendency to be at odds… with one another" on all matters, including "strategy, fortification, and armaments policy."[5] For instance, in 1915 Prime Minister Giovanni Giolitti said that "the generals are worth little, they came up from the ranks at a time when families sent their most stupid sons into the army because they did not know what to do with them."[6] This rather pejorative and dismissive attitude towards military leaders from the Prime Minister himself underlines the tension between the two sectors. Italy was also politically distanced from its allies in the Triple Entente, having had no binding prewar diplomatic understandings with them. Italy sought to achieve decisive victory "more or less alone" using General Luigi Cadorna's conventional strategy, instead of co-ordinating strategies with France, Russia, and Britain.[7] This lack of strategic integration fundamentally stemmed from Italian national sensitivity; instead of becoming actively involved in Allied strategy, Italy "fought its own battles and clung doggedly to a military design which doomed it to attrition."[8] The Italian political arena's condition was simply not conducive to the young country assuming a functional role in an alliance within the context of global warfare.

The second reason why Italy should not have entered the war is that its wartime goals were impossible to achieve. An unfortunate result of the distance between political and military leaders, Italian decision-makers discounted military advice, causing their wartime goals to be "set without any reference to their military capacity to attain them."[9] The comments of the Marquis di San Giuliano, Italy's foreign minister at the outbreak of the war, suggest that this disjunction was not lost on all Italian figures in power. A few months after the July Crisis of 1914, he remarked that "the ideal situation for us would be if Austria and France were both beaten."[10] Unbound by the Triple Alliance—as its quondam partners were engaged in an offensive, rather than defensive, war—Italy in fact initially maintained a neutral position, which was "neither surprising nor

---

[5] John Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," in *Military Effectiveness*, ed. Allan R. Millett and Williamson Murray (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd, 1988), 158-59.
[6] Olindo Malagodi, *Conversazioni della guerra, 1914-1919*, Vol.1 (Milan and Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi Editore, 1960)*,* 58.
[7] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 158.
[8] *Ibid.,* 169-70.
[9] *Ibid.,* 170.
[10] Malagodi, *Conversazioni*, 20.

blameworthy."[11] Indeed, the foreign minister was disinclined to change this initial declaration, being "acutely skeptical of the argument that the addition of Italian military power might decisively tilt the European military balance;" this would imply that not only did Italy have no real need to join the war, its eventual allies had no real need for it to join either.[12] Rather than enter a war to chase unattainable goals, it would have been in Italy's best interest, then, to remain neutral.

Despite these two compelling reasons to stay out of the conflict, however, Italy nonetheless entered WWI for two manifestly poor reasons. Italy primarily entered the war to achieve territorial gains, specifically to recapture the regions of Trieste and Trentino, as well as out of interest in the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea; yet these goals, as discussed above, were predicated upon an impossible outcome.[13] But even more alarmingly, as with most other belligerents in WWI, Italy's entrance into the war was at its core a matter of national hubris. Italy was the only major belligerent for which this was an "expansionist war, fought to gain new land," and which could not even "claim to be acting defensively."[14] Civilian and troop support of the war effort depended upon people buying into the "myth that Italy was a Great Power," and believing that the only way to "be or remain" one was to enter this Great War.[15] It has even been argued that the honour of the Italian people demanded that their territorial gains "should be won and sanctified by blood."[16] Whether or not this vain glorification of warfare truly reflected the attitudes of most Italians, it played a strong role in motivating their leaders to join WWI for the sake of national honour and self-assertion—arguably a poor reason to join a long and costly war. Perhaps this attitude offers some insight as to why, decades after it ended, WWI remains prominent in Italian memory as a founding moment. Yet, as Pindar mused over two thousand years prior, *dulce bellum inexpertis* – war is sweet to those who have never experienced it.

Italy did join the war, however, and throughout its course, WWI revealed and exacerbated several of Italy's most notable flaws as a self-professed Great Power. In addition to estranged military and political spheres, these flaws also included Italy's material and territorial disadvantages. In the years leading up to and including the war, Italy struggled with supply issues,

---

[11] Frank Chambers, *The War Behind the War, 1914-1918: A History of the Political and Civilian Fronts* (New York: Arno Press, 1972), 91.
[12] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 160.
[13] *Ibid.,* 157-58.
[14] Pergher, "An Italian War?," 865.
[15] Richard Bosworth, *Italy and the Approach of the First World War* (London and Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1983), 123, 126.
[16] Chambers, *The War Behind the War*, 97.

economic dependencies, resource, and manpower shortages. Moreover, most of the hostilities took place in the Alps, on treacherous terrain incompatible with modern warfare. Italian forces faced and launched attacks along an 800-kilometer mountainous frontier which seemed to have been drawn with the "express purpose of giving an attacking force the strategic disadvantage at every point."[17] Unlike its allies on the Western and Eastern fronts, the Italy army was limited by year-round snow and impregnable defenses at "every pass and peak."[18] Trentino's *altopiano* terrain made it impossible in many places to move supplies and munitions. The development of *teleferiche*, suspended cableways used to transport supplies up and wounded men down, helped mitigate the challenge of supplying troops on this rugged, vertiginous terrain. Yet taking into account the new technology's own deficiencies and maintenance requirements, the "logistical obstacles remained immense."[19] Not only was it difficult to move supplies to the front lines, but it was also difficult to acquire them in the first place. Both the army and the navy had at best weak, and at worst corrupt, procurement policies, causing inordinate delays in obtaining necessary materials like guns and ammunitions and forcing generals to limit artillery use.[20] Moreover, Italy was economically dependent upon its quondam partners in the Triple Alliance, and its army had been neglected in the antebellum years, facing shortages in everything from winter clothing to coal, iron, and steel.[21] Italy also had limited manufacturing capabilities, and thus was also dependent upon Britain, Russia, and the United States for metal and grain imports.[22] As a result, by 1917, the young country was facing heavy material scarcity. Coal imports had been halved since 1911.[23] Deficient harvests on the home front meant that many cities, especially southern ones, were on the brink of famine and exhaustion; soldiers' wives and families were granted a pittance of an allowance, and "subsisted at starvation level."[24] Manpower was as scarce as supplies from farms and factories to the fighting front, where teenaged boys were being called to the trenches.[25] The Italian economic picture was becoming an increasingly desperate one; not only

---

[17] Chambers, *The War Behind the War*, 99.
[18] *Ibid.*
[19] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 168.
[20] *Ibid.,* 162.
[21] Chambers, *The War Behind the War*, 96-7.
[22] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 162.
[23] *Ibid.,* 168.
[24] Chambers, *The War Behind the War*, 334.
[25] *Ibid.,* 335.

was the situation dire before the war, the strain WWI inflicted on the nation dragged Italy's goals of national glory and territorial acquisition further and further out of reach.

The third notable flaw in the Italian state, only further revealed throughout its participation in WWI, was the weakness of its chain of command. As the Supreme Command's headquarters were far from the front, the resulting command isolation alienated the troops' military functions from their humanity in the eyes of their leaders.[26] The Command "refused to credit stories of disaffection in the trenches," and had a history of sacking officers for vague and gratuitous reasons such as being "alarmist" or showing a "lack of offensive spirit."[27] The army's structure was one of "extreme authoritarianism," and its Chief of Staff, General Luigi Cadorna, commanded with egocentricity and capriciousness.[28] Beyond simply being abrasive, Cadorna's mental rigidity also had the effect of preventing a coherent Italian operational doctrine from evolving as was happening in other armies; individual successes could be attributed to the judgement of individual commanders, and not the Supreme Command.[29] The effectiveness of Cadorna's own military strategies was also dubious. The "cult of the offensive" mentality was entrenched to a fault in the general's approach to warfare, leading him to "place all his faith in exclusively offensive combat," at the inevitable expense of the ability to fend off enemy attack.[30] The absence of a coherent operational doctrine further hindered the effective employment of artillery, as the commanders' guiding principles were in a "state of continual confusion," leading them to withhold fire to spare ammunition in moments when it was most needed.[31] Worse yet, by 1917 the morale amongst senior officers was nearing a state of crisis, largely thanks to the culture of blame and defeatism widespread at senior levels; this led to what has been called a "paralysis of will" amongst Italian high command.[32] In armies, low morale tends to be contagious; indeed, it didn't take long before it infected the troops as well. Italian soldiers, who'd been fighting for two years and—largely due to the lack of propaganda—still had "no idea what Italy was fighting for," exhibited a plain lack of commitment to the war.[33] Men on the front line with a yet underdeveloped sense of national

---

[26] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 175.
[27] Chambers, *The War Behind the War*, 335.; Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 176.
[28] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 175-6.
[29] *Ibid.,* 171.
[30] Paolo Alatri, "L'Italia nella prima guerra mondiale," *Studi Storici* 2, no.1 (January – March 1961): 137-8.
[31] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 170.
[32] Wilcox, "Generalship and Mass Surrender," 39, 46.; Roberto Bencivenga, *La sorpresa strategica di Caporetto*, ed. Giorgio Rochat (Udine: Gaspari, 1997), 85.
[33] *Ibid.,* 40.

loyalty were fighting a war for unclear reasons under the orders of commanders who were at best confused, and at worst narcissistic, while their families were starving back home. Ultimately, the Italian Supreme Command's mistakes, especially those of General Cadorna, as well as the military's overall frailty, crippled the efficacy and morale of the whole Italian war effort.

All these factors culminated disastrously in October of 1917 at the battle of Caporetto, leading American historian Brian Sullivan to argue that the origins of this "catastrophe lay at least as much in Italian history as in German military skill."[34] Italy's territorial disadvantage at Caporetto took the form of upper Isonzo's high mountains, presenting "both military and psychological obstacles."[35] Its material disadvantage manifested itself primarily as a manpower shortage, with teenagers conscripted into the army to remediate the situation. One inhabitant of Friuli recalls that her brother was called to fight when he was still wearing *i pantaloni corti*, short pants which unmistakably indicated boyhood: "the 'Boys of '99,' as they were known, were called at a time when … the military ranks were decimated and one final, great effort was needed to resist German invasion."[36] Additionally, the deficiencies in the Italian state's bureaucracy and cooperation amongst military commanders outlined above undercut General Cadorna's opportunity to implement the amphibious strategy he'd been considering on the Isonzo front; Cadorna never got the naval support he'd requested, and found himself instead locked into a "bitter and costly land campaign."[37] This rather more imaginative scheme might have yielded more favourable results and fewer casualties, but once again Italy found itself enfeebled by its internal difficulties and had to resort to sending boys to fight on a rapidly collapsing front.

But Italy's flaw that had the most devastating impact on the battle of Caporetto was the weakness of its Supreme Command and Chief of Staff. When a small-scale breakthrough leads to an entire front folding in on itself, massive inadequacies in leadership structure and communication become impossible to deny.[38] The most significant problem was an utter lack of defensive preparations, despite Cadorna having received ample warning that an Austro-Hungarian offensive was coming. Reports of an impending attack had reached high command a month in advance, but Cadorna dismissed the idea of the Austrians launching a mountain-based offensive before winter;

---

[34] Sullivan, "Caporetto: Causes, recovery, and consequences," 68.
[35] Wilcox, "Generalship and Mass Surrender," 40.
[36] Nicla D'Anna Sivilotti, *La Nonna Racconta* (Kingston: self-pub., 2010), 7.
[37] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 164.
[38] Wilcox, "Generalship and Mass Surrender," 27.

then, on the very eve of the attack, two Romanian deserters leaked the Austrian battle plans, and again, Cadorna "refused to react."[39] He instead expected only a diversionary attack, while the main thrust would supposedly hit Trentino. While Cadorna did call for some defences to be implemented, his subordinates shared his belief that "no serious attack was intended in the upper Isonzo," and consequently implemented only "half-hearted" defences.[40] The general's overconfident egoism stood in the way of common sense and cemented his legacy; after his dismissal from the army, "the phrase 'doing a Cadorna' became British soldiers' slang for… perpetrating an utter fuck-up and paying the price."[41] It is worth noting that Luigi Capello, the general in charge of the Italian Second Army—the one hit hardest at Caporetto—had initially recognized his sector as an ideal location for a decisive breakthrough; however, he had hoped his army would be the aggressor and not the victim of such an attack.[42] Italian command suffered from a "total lack of a shared conception of the battle."[43] This massive inefficacy and confusion infected a command structure already weakened by its Chief of Staff's arrogance, thereby playing a significant role in the defeat that ensued at Caporetto.

The casualties at Caporetto were devastating, and the defeat unambiguous. In addition to the 14,000 square kilometers lost, the million civilians abandoned to the enemy, and the artillery lost in battle, nearly 12,000 men died, 30,000 were left wounded, 294,000 taken as prisoners, and 350,000 disbanded.[44] Altogether, by the time of the armistice in 1918, the First World War had claimed an estimated 2.2 million Italian casualties, an exorbitant price to pay for some slivers of new territory and for the title of 'Great Power,' to say nothing of the war's subsequent ideological ramifications.[45] Much like the battle of Caporetto, WWI hurt Italy far more than it helped it, and much like Caporetto, this outcome was both foreseeable and preventable. Before entering the war, Italy already had a problematic political configuration, an economy highly dependent on soon-to-be severed foreign ties, a disastrous material procurement policy and bureaucracy, and doubt among senior officers as to whether it should join the conflict at all. Patriotic Italian history muses

---

[39] Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 176.
[40] Wilcox, "Generalship and Mass Surrender," 29.
[41] Thompson, *The White War*, 324.
[42] Wilcox, "Generalship and Mass Surrender," 28.
[43] *Ibid.,* 29.
[44] Thompson, *The White War,* 324.
[45] William Hosch, ed., *World War I: People, Politics, and Power* (New York: Britannica Educational Publishing, 2009), 219.

that "Caporetto was an expensive lesson, but it purified Italy like a fire."[46] Yet such portrayals of what was unmistakably a national embarrassment with disastrous consequences are both excessively romantic and deceptive, as is thinking that Italy was thereafter vindicated by "snatching its victory from the jaws of near total defeat;" although Caporetto saw a victorious aftermath at the battle of Vittorio Veneto one year later, by then the Austro-Hungarian army was "already disintegrating" and hardly capable of putting up a good fight.[47] These idealized, vainglorious recollections of an abject defeat and devastating war do little but mitigate its lessons and perpetuate a false memory in Italian consciousness. History, as well as Italian memory, would do well to rethink Italy's role in WWI, and Caporetto's role in Italian national identity. If Caporetto was a fire, it was one that could and should have been swiftly extinguished.

---

[46] Chambers, *The War Behind the War*, 337.
[47] Pergher, "An Italian War?," 865-66.; Gooch, "Italy during the First World War," 161.

Bibliography

Alatri, Paolo. "L'Italia nella prima guerra mondiale." *Studi Storici* 2, no. 1 (January – March 1961): 137-38.

Bencivenga, Roberto. *La sorpresa strategica di Caporetto*. Edited by G. Rochat. Udine: Gaspari, 1997.

Bosworth, Richard. *Italy and the Approach of the First World War*. London and Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1983.

Chambers, Frank. *The War Behind the War, 1914-1918: A History of the Political and Civilian Fronts*. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Gooch, John. "Italy during the First World War." In *Military Effectiveness*, edited by A. R. Millett and W. Murray, 157-85. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1988.

Hosch, William, ed. *World War I: People, Politics, and Power*. New York: Britannica Educational Publishing, 2009.

Malagodi, Olindo. *Conversazioni della guerra, 1914-1919*. Vol. 1. Milan and Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi Editore, 1960.

Pergher, Roberta. "An Italian War? War and Nation in the Italian Historiography of the First World War." *Journal of Modern History* 90 (December 2018): 863-99.

Sivilotti, Nicla D'Anna. *La Nonna Racconta*. Kingston: Self-published, 2010.

Sullivan, Brian. "Caporetto: Causes, recovery, and consequences." In *The Aftermath of Defeat: Societies, Armed Forces, and the Challenge of Recovery*, edited by G. Andreopoulos and H. Selesky, 60, 68. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Thompson, Mark. *The White War: Life and Death on the Italian Front, 1915-1919*. London: Faber and Faber, 2008.

Wilcox, Vanda. "Generalship and Mass Surrender During the Italian Defeat at Caporetto." In *Beyond the Western Front*, edited by I. F. W. Beckett, 25-46. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2009.

The Haitian Revolution: A Microcosm of Atlantic Slave Resistance

Jamieson Urquhart

Introduction

Edmund Burke, Irish statesman and philosopher upon visiting the French Caribbean colony of Saint-Domingue in the mid 1750s, upon witnessing the heinousness of slave treatment, affirmed the need for slavery reform "or else they will liberate themselves."[1] The latter proved prophetic. On 22 August 1791, thousands of slaves massacred their slave owners marking Saint Domingue's eruption into what would become a 13-year long revolutionary conflict. The major forces of the Haitian Revolution included black slaves (creole and otherwise), free-coloureds, whites (loyalists and otherwise), and French, British and Spanish militias. The revolutions was originally led by charismatic ex-slave Toussaint Louverture - the most successful black commander - and later helmed by Jean-Jacques Dessalines, who completed the quest for independence on 1 January 1804.[2] The name 'Haiti' was finally adopted as a symbolic erasure of its colonial past. If you count its repercussions on Guadalupe and Guyane, the Haitian Revolution essentially freed one fifth of the American enslaved population.[3] During the Transatlantic slave trade, black skin was a badge of enslavement, but the Haitian Revolution revamped that badge as a sign of resilience and freedom.[4]

The Haitian Revolution, by all accounts, was a watershed moment of unprecedented scale. Its remarkability has often separated it from the experiences of other enslaved peoples. Academically, the Haitian Revolution was left out of early seminal projects such as R. R. Palmer's *Age of the Democratic Revolution* and Jacques Godechot's *France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century.* Perhaps this is a result of an ignorance of Haiti's applicability to the revolutionary paradigm, an implicit bias based on race, or a chosen omission due to its paramountcy. Likewise, previous pedagogical practice and common knowledge has largely marginalised study of the transformative impacts of the Haitian Revolution; luckily, that is

---

[1] E. Burke, *An account of the European settlements in America in six parts* (England: Printed for R. and J. Dodsley, 1758).

[2] Franklin W Knight, "The Haitian Revolution," *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 1 (2000): 103-4.

[3] David Geggus, "The Haitian Revolution in Atlantic Perspective," in *The Atlantic World c.1450-c.1820*, ed. Nicholas Canny and Philip Morgan (Oxford Handbooks series, Oxford University Press, 2011), 544.

[4] Afua Cooper, "Acts of Resistance: Black Men And Women Engage Slavery In Upper Canada, 1793-1803," *Ontario History* 99, no. 1 (2007): 7.

beginning to change.[5] This paper attempts to discuss how the Haitian Revolution was a microcosm of slave resistance, and thus pertinent to constructions of resistance experience in the Atlantic Slave trade era as a whole and not solely an extraordinary irregularity. In using the term 'microcosm' this paper hopes to champion history, and resistance, as a continuum. To ensure moments of particular gravitas are not confined to only certain time frames; 'microcosm' implies innate exemplification of, connection to, and interplay with broader slave resistance narratives and not a facsimile. The Haitian Revolution's complexity, performance and its existence as a manifestation of freedom all point to the Haitian Revolution as a microcosm of slave resistance as a whole.

Epitomizing the Complexity of Resistance.

Slavery itself is simultaneously a labour, carceral, legal, sexual and gender system.[6] Thus resistance to it materializes in these same spaces, which indubitably manacles resistance to complexity. The Haitian Revolution's display of agency and converging aspirations embodies the complexity of resistance. Firstly, the display of Haitian agency is paradoxically exuded by foreign intervention in that the ex-slaves fighters (led by Louverture) sided with whomever was offering them the 'best' option. Put briefly, the ex-slaves first acquired Spanish aid against the Kingdom of France, later siding with France against Spain and the United Kingdom (when it was said they had abolished slavery), and finally siding with the British against the French and Spanish (Napoleon's intervention).[7] Their loyalties were flexible as they deliberated their future, a notable display of agency and pragmatism that was only concerned with self-determination and abolition, not broader geopolitics. Enslaved populations were subjected to the most heinous of acts, an incomparable callousness that history should not delimit the slave fighters, particularly its leadership, to simply oppressed peoples with no mediation. The Haitian Revolution is a manifestation of agency within context. Therefore, rejecting, to some extent, Orlando Patterson's notion of 'social death' and total powerlessness.[8] The success of Toussaint and others, in concert with the nature of resistance,

---

[5] John D Garrigus, "White Jacobins/Black Jacobins: Bringing the Haitian and French Revolutions Together in the Classroom," *French Historical Studies* 23, no. 2 (2000): 260.

[6] Dr. Afua Cooper, personal communication, 13 September 2020.

[7] Laurent Dubois, and American Council of Learned Societies, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005).

[8] Orlando Patterson, and American Council of Learned Societies, *Slavery and Social Death a Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).

conforms to Max Webster's discussion of power dynamics being 'sociologically amorphous.'[9] The agency of the slave fighters epitomizes the complexity of resistance as a whole.

Secondly, the notion of sovereignty and revolution proved complex, as whites and blacks both desired change, and even amongst those groups aspiration was not homogenous. The poor and elite white population of Saint-Domingue frequently toyed with autonomy from the French king, a prospect of which's desirability grew commensurately with the wealth of the free-coloured population due to racist societal dogma. Saint Domingue accounted for 80% of slaves sold in the French colonies, and three fourths of the French exhibitions as a whole. It was a prime market, and thus French settlers desired a monopoly over it.[10] Colonists had rebelled against metropolitan rule and reform in the 1720s and 1760s, proving unrest was common. Moreover, only a few years before the Haitian Revolution, there had been a white-settler revolution in 1788-1792, calling for socially exclusive self-government.[11] Additionally, initial British intervention was an appealing alternative to conservative white settlers who opposed the regime, although ironically later they would find themselves fighting against the British. Historian David Geggus posits that the Haitian Revolution was several revolutions in one.[12] Although its outcome adhered to only certain aspirations, notably enslaved black people, the prospect of revolution was shared.

Amongst Saint Domingue's Black population, there were around 500,000 slaves, but also approximately 30,000 free-born, wealthy planters of mixed descent, commonly known as mulattos (although there were a multitude of other terms based later on their degree of blackness).[13] Since procured wealth and power was built upon slavery, not all free-coloureds were in favour of abolition, and thus at times fought with those working against emancipatory aims. Trinidadian writer C.L.R. James trenchantly notes the color-consciousness and power struggles between blacks and mulatto was contrary to the ideals of independence and revolution.[14] Interestingly, Dessalaines was killed *after* independence, quelling a mulatto uprising in 1807 and encapsulating the imbroglio that was the Haitian Revolution and subscribing to a larger phenomenon that even after

---

[9] Max Weber, *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations* (London; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1976).

[10] David Geggus, "The French Slave Trade: An Overview," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (2001): 126.

[11] Geggus, *Haitian Revolution*, 534.

[12] *Ibid.*, 535.

[13] *Ibid.,* 534.

[14] Andrew McIntosh, "C. L. R. James and The Black Jacobins Revisited," *Society* 40, no. 4 (2003): 69-71.

"successful" revolutions unrest does not evaporate.[15] The reason for enslaved participation in the revolt varied too, stemming from revenge, abolition, or simply self-determination. Rumours that leaders had been 'conceding to black slaves' were the most prevalent methods of burgeoning support, a common place in Caribbean uprising as a whole.[16]

Division existed even amongst slaves, as tensions between Creole-born and African-born slaves emerged as a result of the incessant influx of slave ships, and Creoles maintaining an upper class within the slave community, again exemplifying that it was not an immutable race war.[17] The chronicle of the Haitian Revolution lacked rigid cleavages. The flexibility of the slave belligerents was on display as they sought abolition, which proved increasingly corkscrewed. Haitians persisted even as abolition was rumoured, applied, revoked, and finally taken. It was war fought on racial, gendered, and class lines, but the materialization of these notions varied immensely just as in other moments of resistance where lines were blurred because of social, political and economic self-interests. Therefore, it denies generalisation of resistance histories that suggest it only occurs on solely a dichotomous clash of victims and perpetrators. Said categories existed in Haiti, but were nuanced, therefore suggesting the revolution to be a microcosm of slave resistance.

Performing the Revolution the Role of the Subaltern

The Haitian Revolution also exemplifies the role of the subaltern groups, such as women and slaves, within the performance of resistance. Needless to say, this paper is an analysis of a slave revolt, rendering it a subaltern history in and of itself. That being said, histories have focused on Toussaint and his generals (a 'great men' trope of the Late Modern period) positioning them as the dominant social group of this particular history. It is worth noting that beyond the confines of this paper, Toussaint Louverture has been marginalized within the spheres of common knowledge and historical thought, despite his centrality to the archives of the Haitian Revolution. This section looks to shed light on the subaltern - women and specifically Saint Domingue slaves - within a wider subaltern study of the time, which would be enslaved people. Indeed, the Haitian microcosm does conform to R. R. Palmer's notion that 'aristocratic revolution' was a catalyst for democratic

---

[15] Carolyn E. Fick, and American Council of Learned Societies*, The Making of Haiti the Saint Domingue Revolution from Below*, 1st ed. (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1990), 205.

[16] Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, *Slavery, Freedom, and Abolition in Latin American and the Atlantic World* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2011), 238.

[17] Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 21.

revolution.[18] However, the subaltern populations of black women and slaves were the ones that maintained its momentum. The conflict between the whites and mulattoes awoke the 'sleeping slaves,' a phenomenon not limited to Haitian case of resistance.[19]

First, we look at the historical appraisal of the Haitian revolution, and how it connects to subaltern performance of slave resistance. Barbara Bush outlined the 'invisibility' of black women in the history of the West Indies due to historical misconfigurations of black women accepting slavery more readily, being 'attached' to white men on the basis of sexual relations and conforming to stereotypical characterizations of slaves. Such one-dimensional assessments, as Bush makes evident, limit the exploration of the role of black women in slave resistance.[20] This analytical shortcoming is made clear with the black women of Saint Domingue, within the context of the *mulattoes* (and other various terms) and free-coloured peoples, in that the master/slave schism is muddled, thus linking the recollection of resistance performance in Haiti to wider slave resistance narratives.[21]

The centrality of women to the successfulness of the institution of slavery is embodied by the legal doctrine *partus sequitur requiem*.[22] It is an adaptation of Roman law, literally translating to 'that which follows the whom' that suggests the children of a slave shall inherit the status of the mother, especially stark in a largely patriarchal society. This pernicious doctrine was upheld by most slave holding colonies; it rid women of their reproductive rights and allowed for the perpetuation of brutality.[23] Women in Saint-Domingue were routinely subjected to rape, and withheld them from pursuing monogamous relationships as a part of heinous colonial attempts to combat the high infant mortality and low fertility rate.[24] Moreover, slave ships to Saint-Domingue

---

[18] R. R. Palmer, and American Council of Learned Societies, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959).

[19] C.L.R. James as quoted in Kadish, Doris Y, "The Black Terror: Women's Responses to Slave Revolts in Haiti," *The French Review* 68, no. 4 (1995): 668.

[20] Barbara Bush and American Council of Learned Societies, *Slave Women in Caribbean Society, 1650-1838* (Kingston; Bloomington; Heinemann Caribbean: Indiana University Press, 1990).

[21] Arnold A. Sio, "Race, Colour, and Miscegenation: The Free Coloured of Jamaica and Barbados," *Caribbean Studies* 16, no. 1 (1976): 8.; David Greggus, "The Haitian Revolution in Atlantic Perspective," in *The Atlantic World c.1450-c.1820*, ed. Nicholas Canny and Philip Morgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 540.

[22] Jennifer L. Morgan, *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 4.

[23] Afua Cooper, "Slavery and Freedom in the Americas," *HIST 3380*, Online Lecture, 13 September 2020.

[24] Jayne Boisvert, "Colonial Hell and Female Slave Resistance in Saint-Domingue," *Journal of Haitian Studies* 7, no. 1 (2001): 66.

carried more men than women and children, proliferating reliance on women. Slavers often relied on imports to replace dead slaves, creating a brutal revolving door.[25]

Women also participated on all levels of the revolution.[26] It is safe to assume that women participated during the massacre of white slavers over the course of the revolution, as there was a pent up anger shared amongst slaves. Not only did women actively serve in the revolution, they also held high ranks. Marie-Jeanne Lamartinière, who led Toussaint-Louverture's army in the Battle of Crête-à-Pierrot, is one such example.[27] Additionally, black women were given no special treatment upon capture, being subjugated to the same punishment as other forces, thereby suggesting widespread female participation.[28] Along with the physical importance, the Haitian revolution exemplifies the symbolic importance of women in the performance of resistance. Catherine Flon is a national heroine, reportedly being responsible for stitching the first flag of Haiti in 1803 - a visual expression of sovereignty - and thus outlining the axial role of women in slave resistance.[29] Whilst Haiti has its own examples, it remains a microcosm of resistance in that the often subaltern groups bear the responsibility of the personalised and prevalent resistance performance.

Manifestations of Freedom

The chronicle of the Haitian revolution epitomized the unrest experienced by enslaved people throughout the Transatlantic slave trade in that Haiti did not pioneer slave resistance, but was the revolt with the most tangible success and concrete ramifications. Slave revolts have existed for as long as slavery itself. Rebellions have proven to take many shapes and forms, differing in scale and even in aspiration. Slavery was a diversified labour system, facilitating diverse manifestations of freedom.[30] Therefore, this section will look at the personalization of resistance, examples of resistance that preceded the Haitian Revolution, and those that followed it in order to highlight the correlations between said Haiti's experience with her contemporaries.

---

[25] Geggus, *French Slave Trade*, 126.

[26] Boisvert, *Colonial Hell and the Female Slave*, 71.

[27] Jana Evans Braziel, "Remembering Defilee: Dedee Baziles as Revolutionary Lieu de Memoire," *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism* (2005): 59.

[28] Philippe Girard, "Rebelles with a Cause: Women in the Haitian War of Independence, 1802–04," *Gender & History* 21, no. 1. (2009): 73.

[29] Nicole Willson, "Unmaking the Tricolore: Catherine Flon, Material Testimony and Occluded Narratives of Female-led Resistance in Haiti and the Haitian Dyaspora," *Slavery & Abolition* 41, no. 1 (2020): 32.

[30] Fick, *The Making of Haiti,* 237.

The success of the Haitian Revolution is in large part due to the personalized manifestation of freedom and resistance of religion - in this case, Haitian Vodou. According to Luarent Dubois, Vodou is a syncretic mixture of Catholicism and West African religions, which rejected Africans' status as slaves.[31] Versions of this blending, syncretism or cultural hybridity, are present globally. A partial appropriation and partial subversion to the values and culture of the colonised power is crucial part of identity building and the human story.[32] This cultural resistance renders Haiti a microcosm of slave resistance as a whole. It is said that the larger revolt was initiated by a secret Vodou ceremony, called Bois Caïman on 14 August, allegedly led by Vodou high priests and maroons Dutty Boukman and Cecile Fatiman, in which thousands of slaves attended and later on 21 August began to kill their masters, subsequently taking control of the Northern Province.[33] Even before the revolution of 1791, Haitian Vodou proved a medium of resistance. For example, a Vodou priest named François Mackandal sparked a rebellion from 1751-57 by uniting the maroon bands and establishing a network of secret organizations among plantation slaves.[34] Religion, in general, served as a refuge, and thus resistance, for many slaves.[35] Historian Patricia Gómes-Cásseres categorizes the various Cuban religions that emerged during times of slavery as resistance to acculturation, a so-called "spiritual marronage."[36] Of course, Haiti had a distinct manifestation of freedom, but the medium of religion, especially a personalized one, remains constant throughout the Atlantic colonies.

Along with 'spiritual marronage,' slaves repeated physical marronage. This was the practice of running away from slavery, a frequent occurrence in enslaved societies.[37] Fugitivity was not only integral to the success of the Haitian Revolution (it was catalysed by maroons, and morale was largely sustained by them) but also essential to resistance moments in the Atlantic.[38] The most well-known (yet still sparsely discussed in standard curricula) community of maroons

---

[31] Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 40-4.

[32] Homi K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994), 83.

[33] Perry James, *Arrogant Armies: Great Military Disasters and the Generals Behind Them* (Edison, NJ: CastleBooks, 2005), 60.

[34] Jan Rogoziński, *A Brief History of the Caribbean: From the Arawak and the Carib to the Present* (New York: Facts on File, 1992), 80.

[35] Katharine Gerbner, "Religion, Community, and Slavery on the Colonial Southern Frontier," *The Journal of Southern History* 82, no. 4 (2016): 906.

[36] Patricia Gómes-Cásseres, "Afro-Cuban Religions: Spiritual Marronage and Resistance," *Social and Economic Studies* 67, no. 1 (2018): 118.

[37] Cooper, *Slavery and Freedom in the Americas*.

[38] Neil Roberts, *Freedom as Marronage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 4.

was Quilombo dos Palmares, located in North-Eastern Brazil, whose history was adapted to film by Carlos Diegues in 1984. The prevalence of marronage as a whole deteriorates early scholarly machinations of slavery that posited it was intrinsically unfree, just as the Haitian Revolution epitomizes agency and resistance within the context of slavery. The mythos the maroon leaders' capacity for freedom, exemplified by Nanny of the maroons in Jamaica, and Zumbi of Palmares, was also widespread.[39] Perhaps this inspiration was a latent form of resistance that was to make itself clear within other revolts, similar to how white colonists feared the Haitian Revolution would embolden other black diaspora slave societies to pursue their own freedom.[40] Revolts after 1804 highlight Haiti's suitability as a microcosm in that they persisted until slavery was universally abolished, notably the series of revolts in 1812 in Puerto Rico and in Cuba.[41]

Moreover, the 1823 Demerara Revolt and Busas Rebellion, in concert with other maroon communities that were to emerge, especially in Brazil which was late to abolish slavery.[42] Even the American Civil War echoes the Haitian chronicle, regardless of debate over its causes.[43] Therefore marronage, both spiritual and physical, as well as the emergence of other revolts, parallel the aspirations of sovereignty exhibited by Toussaint-Louverture and Dessaliane.

Conclusion

The Haitian Revolution exists as a microcosm of Transatlantic slave trade-era resistance due to its complexity, performance, and the multiplicity of resistance events beyond Haiti, such as marronage. Its global ramifications are also worth mentioning, as it quashed Napoleon's dream of an Atlantic empire, forcing him to sell Louisiana in hopes of financing the Napoleonic Wars. It proved the racist apprehensions and superiority complexes of the 'civilised' whites to not only be unjust and flawed, but also abhorrent. The Haitian microcosm pertains to slave resistance in the Transatlantic slave trade era, but also of other anti-colonial struggles. Once we understand colonialism as the method of empire, we can then position the Haitian revolution as the underlying historical blueprint for the collapse of empires.[44] This rings especially true for the struggles of

[39] Roberts, *Freedom as Marronage,* 100.
[40] Geggus, *The Haitian Revolution,* 545.
[41] Schmidt-Nowara, *Slavery, Freedom, and Abolition*, 230.
[42] Cooper, *Slavery and Freedom in the Americas*.
[43] Geggus, *Haitian Revolution*, 544.
[44] Deborah Cowen, "Following the Infrastructures of Empire: Notes on Cities, Settler Colonialism, and Method," *Urban Geography* 41, no. 4 (2020): 469-86.

independence in Africa during the 20th century.[45] Although this analysis does emphasize similarity, it should not be taken as platitudinous. The Haitian Revolution remains a moment worthy of celebration and is continuing to be more commonly commemorated outside of the black diaspora.[46] Its French or American counterparts get more recognition, but the Haitian Revolutions of 1804 stands alone amongst nations of her time as the only nation-state truly committed, even if only for an instant, to freedom. It shall be immortalized by textbooks and retaught globally to ensure not only its history is enshrined within memory, but also its lessons.

---

[45] Branwen Gruffydd Jones, "From Rupture to Revolution: Race, Culture and the Practice of Anti-colonial Thought," *African Identities* 13, no. 1 (2015): 4-17.
[46] Charles Forsdick, "Interpreting 2004: Politics, Memory, Scholarship," *Small Axe*, no. 27 (2008): 1-13.

Bibliography

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London; New York: Routledge, 1994.

Braziel, Jana Evans. "Remembering Defilee: Dedee Baziles as Revolutionary Lieu de Memoire." *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism* (2005).

Burke, E. *An Account of the European settlements in America in six parts*. England: Printed for R. and J. Dodsley, 1758.

Bush, Barbara, and American Council of Learned Societies. *Slave Women in Caribbean Society, 1650-1838*. Kingston; Bloomington; Heinemann Caribbean: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Cooper, Afua. "Acts Of Resistance: Black Men And Women Engage Slavery In Upper Canada, 1793-1803." *Ontario History* 99, no. 1 (2007): 5-17.

Cooper, Afua. "Slavery and Freedom in the Americas." *HIST3380*. Online Lecture, 13 September 2020.

Cowen, Deborah. "Following the Infrastructures of Empire: Notes on Cities, Settler Colonialism, and Method." *Urban Geography* 41, no. 4 (2020): 469-86.

Dubois, Laurent, and American Council of Learned Societies. *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Fick, Carolyn E., and American Council of Learned Societies. *The Making of Haiti the Saint Domingue Revolution from Below*. 1st ed. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1990.

Garrigus, John D. "White Jacobins/Black Jacobins: Bringing the Haitian and French Revolutions Together in the Classroom." *French Historical Studies* 23, no. 2 (2000): 259-75.

Geggus, David. "The French Slave Trade: An Overview." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (2001): 119-38.

Geggus, David. "The Haitian Revolution in Atlantic Perspective." In *The Atlantic World c.1450-c.1820*, edited by Nicholas Canny and Philip Morgan, 533-49. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Girard, Philippe. "Rebelles with a Cause: Women in the Haitian War of Independence, 1802–04." *Gender & History* 21, no. 1 (2009): 73.

Godechot, Jacques Léon. *France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, 1770-1799*. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Gómes-Cásseres, Patricia. "Afro-Cuban Religions: Spiritual Marronage and Resistance." *Social and Economic Studies* 67, no. 1 (2018): 117-44.

Gruffydd Jones, Branwen. "From Rupture to Revolution: Race, Culture and the Practice of Anti-colonial Thought." *African Identities* 13, no. 1 (2015): 4-17.

Kadish, Doris Y. "The Black Terror: Women's Responses to Slave Revolts in Haiti." *The French Review* 68, no. 4 (1995): 668-80.

McIntosh, Andrew. "C. L. R. James and The Black Jacobins Revisited." *Society* 40, no. 4 (2003): 69-71.

Morgan, Jennifer L. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Palmer, R. R., and American Council of Learned Societies. *The Age of the Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Patterson, Orlando, and American Council of Learned Societies. *Slavery and Social Death a Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Perry, James. *Arrogant Armies: Great Military Disasters and the Generals Behind Them.* Edison, NJ: CastleBooks. 2005.

Roberts, Neil. *Freedom as Marronage.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Rogoziński, Jan. *A Brief History of the Caribbean: From the Arawak and the Carib to the Present.* New York: Facts on File, 1992.

Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. *Slavery, Freedom, and Abolition in Latin American and the Atlantic World*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 2011.

Sio, Arnold A. "Race, Colour, and Miscegenation: The Free Coloured of Jamaica and Barbados." *Caribbean Studies* 16, no. 1 (1976): 5-21.

Weber, Max. *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*. London; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1976.

Willson, Nicole. "Unmaking the Tricolore: Catherine Flon, Material Testimony and Occluded Narratives of Female-led Resistance in Haiti and the Haitian Dyaspora." *Slavery & Abolition* 41, no. 1 (2020): 13.

Contributors

Connor Adsett

Connor Adsett is graduating this fall with an honours in English, a minor in History, and a certificate in Art History. He is interested in 20th century American History.

Ronald Blanchard

Ronald Blanchard is going into the fourth year of his combined Honours in History and International Development Studies. His academic interests lie in colonialism in Africa and South Asia, the history of development, and the global history of slavery.

Lucy Boyd

Lucy Boyd is in her third year at the University of King's College and Dalhousie, studying Early Modern Studies and History. She is particularly interested in the historical intersections between gender and religion, and the social and personal impacts of convents.

Anna Gaudet

Anna Gaudet is a third-year student completing a Combined Honours degree in ESS (Environment, Society, and Sustainability) and History, with a minor in Early Modern Studies.

Lane Harrison

Lane Harrison is a third-year Journalism student at the University of King's College and Editor-in-Chief at the Dalhousie Gazette. He is most interested in film history and the history of journalism.

Gideon Morton

Gideon Morton is in my fourth year of a History major, with a HOST minor. He is interested in the history of radical politics and post-colonial history, as well as the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Graham O'Brien

Graham O'Brien is in his final year at King's and Dal where he took a Combined Honours in Early Modern Studies and Philosophy, with a minor in Contemporary Studies. While his interests are largely in the history of philosophy, he particularly likes the early modern period and, like so many others, WWII (and its impacts on post-war philosophy).

Amy M. Paleczny

Amy Paleczny is currently in her second year at Dalhousie University. She is pursuing a Bachelor of Arts with a major in History and a minor in Political Science.

Alec Rembowski

Alec Rembowski is a fourth-year student, working towards his BA with Honours in History and Political Science. The focus of his studies is Russian and African history with an interest in military history.

Daniel Kirtley Simpkin

Daniel Simpkin has just completed his fourth year at Dalhousie where he is working towards an Undergraduate degree in History with a minor in Political Science. His favourite areas of study are 1960s American sociopolitical culture, and North American mass-incarceration.

Francesca Sivilotti

Francesca Sivilotti is a second-year student studying Law, Justice & Society and Economics. She enjoys learning about the history of law in Canada as well as the history of powerful ideas like capitalism on the global stage.

Jamieson Urqhart

Jamieson Urquhart is in his second year of a double major in History and Sustainability. His favourite facets of history to study are moments of cultural pluralism and identity display.

Cover Illustration: Power to the People, an Early Soviet Propaganda Poster, from a collection of soviet propaganda posters by Alex Ward.[1]

Cover Design: Isabel Brechin

---

[1] Alex Ward, *Power To The People*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Israel Museum, 2007.