THE CHICO HISTORIAN
Volume XXIV
2014

Oppression, Resistance, and the Formation of Identity

The Chico Historian

History Department
California State University, Chico
400 West First Street
Trinity Hall Room 223
Chico, California, 95929-0735
(530) 898-5366

The Chico Historian is an annual publication of the Alpha Delta Omicron Chapter of the Phi Alpha Theta National History Honor Society and the California State University, Chico (CSUC) Department of History. It aims to provide students the opportunity to publish historical works, and to train editorial staff members in producing an academic journal. Issues are published at the end of each academic year. All opinions or statements of fact are the sole responsibility of the authors, and may not reflect the views of the editorial staff. The authors retain rights to individual essays.

Phi Alpha Theta states their mission is to promote the study of history through the encouragement of research, good teaching, publication, and the exchange of learning and ideas among historians. The organization seeks to bring students, teachers, and writers of history together for intellectual and social exchanges, which promote and assist historical research and publication by our members in a variety of ways.

We dedicate this volume to
Claudia Beaty

Claudia has been the Administrative Support Coordinator for the Department of History since 1995. It is with a mixture of sadness and warmth that we say our fond farewells to Claudia as she begins this new chapter in her life. She has been an integral part of our department, facilitating the effective administration of daily activities both large and small. She is a dear friend to faculty members and students alike, and a strong advocate for the success of all those seeking higher learning. We wish Claudia the very best in her future endeavors, and we thank her for the many years of indispensable hard work and enthusiastic support.

The Chico Historian
Volume 24: 2014

The Annual Publication of the
Alpha Delta Omicron Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta
and the Department of History
California State University, Chico

Editor
Joshua Bergeron

Editorial Board
Sean T. Painter   Daniel R. Thompson
Matthew Salisbury   Kylie Tomlin

Advising Faculty
Dr. Stephen E. Lewis, *The Chico Historian* & Phi Alpha Theta
Dr. Najm al-Din Yousefi, Phi Alpha Theta

Contents

<u>Articles</u>

denotes paper presented by the author at the 2014 Phi Alpha Theta Northern California Regional Conference

Acknowledgements

With sincere excitement and undeniable gratitude, I present the twenty-fourth edition of *The Chico Historian*. The product that follows represents the tireless, collaborative labor of several students, faculty, and staff members. Measuring their contributions is surely a Sisyphean task, and one can only hope that acknowledging them will suffice.

Firstly, I would like to thank the rest of the editorial board, Sean T. Painter, Matthew Salisbury, Daniel R. Thompson, and Kylie Tomlin. The trials and tribulations particular to leading this project were like none I had encountered as a junior member of the editing team in previous years. I could not have overcome them without the sage advice of our prior editor-in-chief Sean Painter and the novel contributions of our new board members. Without their collective efforts, observations, criticisms, reassurances, and color commentary, this volume would never have come together as planned.

I also extend my great appreciation to my family and close friends for urging me to take risks and lending me support in times of great stress and anxiety during the production of this volume. Particular gratitude goes to my life-partner Jesenia Chavez, for providing her valuable insight, tireless support, and extra set of eyes and ears throughout the editing process.

Special recognition is due to all of the students who responded to our call for articles with submissions of their own work for our review. We received an excellent collection of graduate and undergraduate papers on a diverse set of topics within the purview of historical inquiry. The selection process proved both incredibly difficult and rewarding. We appreciate every submission, and we sincerely encourage all those not accepted in this edition to review our suggested edits and resubmit their papers to next year's editorial board.

As always, the CSU, Chico faculty and staff was instrumental to our success. I would like to thank all of the professors in the History Department for encouraging the investigation of new topics, challenging their students to write great papers, and reviewing student essays long

before they find their way into our hands. Special thanks are in order for our Department Chair, Dr. Laird Easton, who secured funding for this volume of *The Chico Historian* and provided valuable suggestions. This project certainly would not have been possible without the advice and guidance of the publication's faculty advisor, Dr. Stephen Lewis, who monitored our progress from beginning to end and gave critical insights whenever there was need. Further thanks also go to the activities of Phi Alpha Theta and the History Club, as well as their faculty co-advisor Dr. Najm al-Din Yousefi, who made some exciting suggestions about the future direction of this publication.

The editorial board would also like to extend a warm welcome to two new additions to the Department of History: our incoming Professor of Ancient and Classical History, Dr. Dallas DeForest, and our new Administrative Support Coordinator, Heather Kilcoyne. We are very pleased to welcome you into our department, and we look forward to collaborating with you in our future academic endeavors.

Joshua Bergeron
Editor

Editor and Contributor Biographies

<u>Editors</u>

Joshua Bergeron is a graduate student at California State University, Chico. His primary interests lie in labor history, social theory, and the intersections of race, class, and gender. Josh graduated Summa Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Arts in History from Chico State in May 2013. He is a member of Phi Alpha Theta, Phi Kappa Phi, and Golden Key International Honor Society. Prior to serving as Chief Editor, Josh previously served on the Editorial Board of *The Chico Historian* in 2012 and 2013. Josh plans to pursue a doctorate at the University of Illinois at Chicago in the History of Work, Race, and Gender in the Urban World, and wants to teach at the university level. His paper was written for Dr. Laird Easton's History 690 (Historiography) in Fall 2013.

Sean T. Painter is a graduate student at California State University, Chico pursuing a Master of Arts in History. His primary interests lie in British history, Roman history, and the history of the American West. His non-academic interests include Star Trek, baseball, and his Scottish Terrier, Wally. Sean earned his Bachelor of Arts in Social Science from San Diego State in 2000, and then served in the United States Navy. He is a member of both Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Alpha Theta. Sean plans to teach history at the high school level following graduation. He previously served on the Editorial Board of *The Chico Historian* in 2010, and again in 2013 as the Chief Editor. His paper was written for Dr. Lisa Emmerich's History 630 (Graduate Seminar on United States History) in Spring 2009 and was revised and updated in Spring 2014.

Matthew Salisbury is a graduate student in history at California State University, Chico. His interests lie in Ancient History, Renaissance Europe, handlebar mustaches, and Hawaiian hibiscus shirts. He earned his Bachelor of Arts in History from San Diego State University in 2011. In his spare time, Matt enjoys disc golfing, eating sweet potato fries, and combing his mustache. Upon graduating, Matt intends to teach at the community college level or in high school. His paper was written for Dr. Laird Easton's History 690 (Historiography) in Fall 2013.

Daniel R. Thompson is a graduate student at California State University, Chico pursuing a Master of Arts in History. He earned his Bachelor of Arts

in Political Science in 2009 (graduating with highest distinction) and his Master of Arts in Political Science in 2014, both from CSU, Chico. His research interests lie in American Political History, Latin American History, Constitutional Law, American Government, International Relations, and Political Methodology. He is a member of both Pi Sigma Alpha and Phi Alpha Theta. Daniel plans to teach Political Science and American History at the community college and state university levels following graduation. His paper was written for Dr. Charles Turner's Political Science 601 (State and Local Government) in Fall 2011, and was revised and updated in Spring 2014.

Kylie Tomlin is a graduate student in history at California State University, Chico pursuing a Master of Arts in History. Her interests lie in 20th century American History and the history of the American South. Kylie earned her Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from University of California, Davis in 2012. She intends to combine this background with her love of history in pursuing a future academic career. Her paper was written for Dr. Robert Tinkler's History 446 (History of the American South) in Fall 2013.

Contributors

Michelle L. Erstad is an undergraduate student in history at California State University, Chico, pursuing a Bachelor of Arts in History with a German minor. Her primary interests lie in Medieval European history and the study of minority populations in America. She is a member of Phi Alpha Theta, Phi Sigma Iota, Alpha Sigma Lambda, Sigma Tau Delta, and Golden Key. She will be entering the concurrent credential program at the School of Education at CSU, Chico in the Fall of 2014 and plans to teach history, special education, English, and German at the high school level following graduation. She wrote her paper for Dr. Jeffrey Livingston's History 490 (Historical Research and Writing Seminar) in Fall 2013.

Emma Folta is an undergraduate in history at California State University, Chico. Her primary interests lie in Russian and Eastern European history. Emma is set to graduate in the fall of 2015 with a Bachelor of Arts and plans on attending graduate school in pursuit of a Ph.D. in Russian history. She is also planning to study abroad in Russia to work on a research project and learn the language and culture of her main area of focus. Emma is the Secretary for Phi Alpha Theta and the Vice President of the Russian Club. Her paper was written for Dr. Robert Tinkler's History 446 (History of the American South) in Fall 2013.

Kenneth Knirck is a graduate student at California State University, Chico and is currently pursuing his Master of Arts in History, writing his thesis on Cold War civil defense. His prior academic achievements include both Bachelors and Masters Degrees in Political Science from Chico State in 2008 and 2012, respectively. Ken is a member of Phi Alpha Theta and Pi Sigma Alpha. His paper was written for Dr. Kenneth Rose's History 435 (U.S. in the Age of World Wars) in Fall 2009.

Tyler O'Connell is an undergraduate in history at California State University, Chico pursuing a Bachelor of Arts in History and a Certificate of Paralegal Studies through the Political Science Department. His academic interests lie in diplomatic history, international relations, and law. He is a member of the history club and Phi Alpha Theta. Tyler plans to enroll in a graduate program in history at California State University, Chico. His paper was written while enrolled in Professor Najm Yousefi's History 464 (History of the Modern Middle East) in the Spring of 2013.

Brooke Silveria is an undergraduate at California State University, Chico, pursuing Bachelor of Arts degrees in Latin American Studies and Multicultural and Gender Studies with an option in Women's Studies, as well as a Spanish minor. Her passions include social justice and activism, fostered through her internship at the Associated Students Gender & Sexuality Equity Center. Additionally, she gained a love of traveling, especially in Latin America, after studying abroad for a year in Santiago, Chile. Brooke plans to pursue a career in women-centered non-profit work in California or Latin America. Her paper was written for Dr. Stephen Lewis' LAST 495 (Capstone Seminar in Latin American Studies) in Spring 2013.

Rodney Thomson is an undergraduate student of history at California State University, Chico. Rod's interests include studying the histories of Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, and investigating how these traditions interrelated with each other, their own societies, and the world at large. He will be graduating in Fall of 2014 with his B.A. in History. From there, Rod will pursue postgraduate work in the field of Islamic and Middle Eastern studies, with the goal of getting his Ph.D. and ultimately teaching at the university level while researching and publishing on a variety of subjects. His paper was written for Professor Jason Nice's History 290 (Historians and Historical Methodology) in Spring 2013.

Introduction

The board of editors welcomes you to the twenty-fourth volume of *The Chico Historian*. This publication is a peer-reviewed journal, managed and edited by California State University, Chico students. All submissions come from current and recent undergraduate and graduate students. Since its inception, *The Chico Historian* has published about 200 articles from nearly 150 contributing students. This year we present eleven new articles, eight of which come from new contributors. Six of these papers were presented at the 2014 Phi Alpha Theta Northern California Regional Conference at our own California State University, Chico in April. Three of them won awards for their outstanding research and contributions to their respective fields of study. The first entry in this volume, by Rodney Thomson, won first place for Phi Alpha Theta undergraduate students, and the second place winner for undergraduates, Michelle Erstad, wrote our eighth entry. Entry four, by Sean T. Painter, won the second place award for graduate students. According to several faculty members, this was perhaps our department's finest conference showing in well over a decade. With the inclusion of these award-winning articles, we trust that this year's volume continues to meet the standards of academic excellence and integrity established by preceding issues.

As we reviewed this year's submissions, a loose unifying theme began to emerge among the topics addressed therein. This theme, "Oppression, Resistance, and the Formation of Identity," is representative of not only our commitment as historians to understanding the human condition, but also our interdisciplinary effort toward that end within this volume. Though the articles that follow each fall under the purview of historical inquiry, their disciplinary foundations and methodologies are quite diverse. Some of the contributors come from outside the Department of History, originating in fields that include Political Science, Latin American Studies, and Multicultural and Gender Studies. While certain methods are unique to each department, no academic discipline stands alone. Rather, they flourish through cooperation. The publication before you is a representation of this interrelation in academic enquiry.

Our cover image, unique in the journal's history, reflects the interdisciplinary nature of our project. It is composed of eleven individual images, each illustrative of one of the articles contained herein, though their boundaries, colors, and subjects blend and flow together, just as the

disciplines, scopes, and topics of their respective essays do in the pages that follow. Each image reappears to preface the articles they represent, with a short caption explaining their relevance and origin.

In exploring "Oppression, Resistance, and the Formation of Identity," our articles jump both geographically and temporally, though their order is largely chronological. We begin with Rodney Thomson's examination of the controversies surrounding religious dissent in 17th century England. In his analysis, Rodney discusses the formation of public opinion, the question of nonconformity among Christian communities in Restoration London, and the struggle for an expression of identity and faith. In our next two entries, Emma Folta and Kylie Tomlin explore the tragedies of forced labor, harsh punishments, and sexual exploitation intrinsic to the institution of American slavery. In discussing the often-overlooked plight of slave women, Emma and Kylie expose a gendered gap in historical understanding. These contributions are particularly relevant with the Emancipation Proclamation's recent 150th anniversary.

In our next entry, Sean Painter presents a historiography of the representation of Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer in film. Over the decades, as Sean shows, Custer's role in the Battle of the Little Bighorn has shifted to serve differing purposes for the American public. Our fifth entry, by Brooke Silveria, examines the efforts of *indigenista* activists across Latin America to both celebrate and assimilate native peoples in modern society, often without the participation or consent of indigenous communities. The sixth article, by Kenneth Knirck, discusses the rationalization behind the decision to firebomb Dresden in World War II, and explores difficult questions of morality concerning the death of civilians as collateral damage in a war to end the slaughter of other innocents.

Tyler O'Connell, in our seventh entry, presents the political process by which President Truman, with the help of various activists and lobbying groups, came to recognize the State of Israel in 1948. In our eight article, Michelle Erstad examines the legal, political, and social history of the Disability Rights Movement, showing how advocates and activists battled incredible injustices in the treatment of people with disabilities and mental illnesses in the fight for equality and acceptance. Next, Daniel Thompson provides a historical analysis and research proposal for California's Proposition 8, which banned same-sex marriage, and the role that mass media played in its passage in 2008. Freshly revised, Daniel's paper includes recent legal developments, including 2013's overturning of the proposition.

Our final two essays concern theoretical trends in historiography. Matthew Salisbury examines the focus and objectives of postcolonial history and Subaltern Studies, while Joshua Bergeron explores debates between Marxism and Postmodernism over the role and legitimacy of history as a field of study. The theme of this volume, "Oppression, Resistance, and the Formation of Identity," as explored and debated in these eleven articles, reaffirms our commitment to social justice and the exposure of struggles for liberation, equality, and affirmation across the ages.

The Editorial Board enthusiastically presents these articles in the following pages, and hopes that you find them as stimulating and informative as we did. The board sincerely thanks you for taking the time to read the 2014 edition of *The Chico Historian.* It was truly a rewarding experience to put together, and we hope it satisfies your scholarly interest.

The Chico Historian Editorial Board

This image is a depiction of Lodowicke Muggleton, an infamous and influential religious dissenter in 17th century England, and founder of the Muggletonian sect of Protestantism. Muggleton was just one of numerous theological nonconformists in Restoration London. This portrait was painted by William Wood, circa 1674, and currently resides in the primary collection at the National Portrait Gallery in London.

MONSTROUS OPINIONS: MUGGLETONIANS AND THE QUESTION OF DISSENT IN RESTORATION LONDON | Rodney Thomson

The year 1677 did not start well for Lodowicke Muggleton.[1] Tried at the Old Bailey on January 16, his indictment accused him of – among other things – being, "a man pernicious, blasphemous, seditious, heritical (sic), and a monster in his opinions."[2] At the sessions one month before, Lord Chief Justice Rainsford, not able to find any legal grounds on which to deny Muggleton bail while awaiting trial, commented that it was a pity he could not burn him at the stake as a heretic.[3] To Muggleton's continuing misfortune, Rainsford presided over his trial, alongside Justice Atkins and Sir Thomas Davis, lord mayor of London.[4] Facing a hostile judiciary and armed only with an unwilling and ineffective defense counselor, Muggleton was found guilty and sentenced to three days in the pillory and time in jail until he could pay a fine. Meanwhile, his books were to be confiscated and burned.[5] There are several surviving accounts of Rainsford's summation after the delivery of the verdict, but they all agree in tenor. The chief justice saw Muggleton as "a superlative monster of wickedness," and considered his punishment a "moderate sentence," concluding that previous lawmakers had not foreseen a man of Muggleton's nefarious character, and therefore had not legislated a harsher and more fitting punishment for his crime.[6]

Muggleton, a self-proclaimed prophet, reflected bitterly on his legal misadventures in his autobiography.[7] Lord Chief Justice Rainsford, upon hearing the testimony of a man named Garratt, insisted that the

---

[1] All dates are New Style, except for publication dates of primary sources, which have been left unmodified.

[2] Lodowicke Muggleton, *The Acts of the Witnesses of the Spirit, in Five Parts* (London: 1699), 157, http://muggletonian.org.uk.

[3] Ibid., 159.

[4] Nathaniel Powell, *A True Account of the Trial and Sufferings of Lodowicke Muggleton, One of the Two Last Prophets and Witnesses of the Spirit* (London: Morris and Reeves, 1808), 2-3.

[5] *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, last modified 05 March 2013), January 1677, Trial of Lodowicke Muggleton (t16770117-1); and J. B. [pseud.], *The Blasphemer Tried and Cast: Or a more full Narrative of the Tryal of Lodowicke Muggleton* (London: Roger L'Strange, 1676), 4, http://muggletonian.org.uk.

[6] Powell, *True Account*, 4. The four surviving first-hand accounts of Muggleton's trial, two sympathetic to him and two hostile, vary in detail but agree on all major points.

[7] Muggleton, *Acts of the Witnesses,* 167-72.

publication date for Muggleton's book, *The Neck of the Quakers Broken*, was falsified, and therefore did not fall under the protection of the Declaration if Indulgence of 1672.[8]   Yet Justice Atkins did not share Rainsford's opinion, and, in fact, came to Muggleton's defense on this point, asking whether Garratt had any proof of his claim. When the latter admitted he did not, Atkins said, "gentlemen of the jury, you see there is no proof against Mr. Muggleton, either of his writing or making sale of any of these books since the Act of Grace; therefore I do not understand how he can be denied the benefit of it, since we have no law for it."[9] Rainsford, unhappy with this conclusion, declared, "If we have no law for it, I make it a law."[10] Muggleton may have been guilty of many things under contemporary English law, but he was not guilty in this instance. Rather than representing the enforcement of any codified law, Lodowicke Muggleton's trial, conviction, and sentencing in 1677 reflects the confused and conflicting nature of public opinion on dissent and how to properly deal with those who are accused of it.[11]

Attitudes towards those who identified themselves as existing outside the Anglican Communion were in flux throughout the Restoration. At times, intolerance was codified by acts of Parliament; at others, nonconformists found themselves allowed to worship more-or-less freely. Throughout the period – and regardless of any laws in effect – individuals and groups held their own opinions on the matter, a condition readily seen in Muggleton's case. Atkins was unwilling to bend the law to punish an avowed nonconformist, but Rainsford stood ready and willing to indulge in legal irregularities to deal with Muggleton and his "monstrous" opinions. These two men represent opposing ends on the spectrum of popular opinion about how to deal with dissenters and other religious nonconformists, and between them were an abundance of intermediary opinions. This lack of consensus – a product of England's long-running religious turmoil – resulted in inconsistent treatment of dissenters within Restoration London society.

Recognition of these inconsistencies is not new. While historians such as John Coffey take a teleological approach, seeing the treatment of

---

[8] William Lamont, *Last Witnesses: The Muggletonian History, 1652-1979* (Hampshire, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 96; and Powell, *True Account*, 3-4.

[9] Powell, *True Account*, 4.

[10] Ibid.

[11] The terms "dissent" and "nonconformism," and their permutations, are used synonymously herein.

dissenters during the Restoration as "a dramatic movement" towards modern notions of toleration, others see it as part of a larger, organic interaction occurring on all levels of contemporary London society.[12] Alexandra Walsham interprets the Restoration as "part of a complex continuum that could flow in both directions," with tolerance and intolerance often exhibited at the same points in time. For her, the apparent inconsistencies in how those outside the Anglican Communion were treated were at least partly the result of "an abstract commitment to confessional hatred of an illegitimate faith," juxtaposed with "a charitable disposition to love one's neighbors in spite of their religious idiosyncrasies."[13] This dichotomy is reflected in the behavior of the justices in Muggleton's trial. Tim Harris interprets persecution of nonconformists as an inconsistent phenomena – at times harsh, at others absent – concluding that "the problems facing nonconformists were not the same at all times."[14] Bernard Capp makes the unequivocal claim that Venner's uprising in 1661 "destroyed any chance of toleration," yet admits that "there was severe persecution under Charles II and James II, but it varied from time to time according to the fluctuations of royal policy, and from place to place according to the attitudes of local officials."[15]

By the time of the Restoration, proper practice of the Christian faith had been a matter of ongoing public concern and controversy, dating back to the beginnings of the English Reformation in the early sixteenth century. Though the country was once almost uniformly Roman Catholic, by the time Charles II returned to England and assumed the crown in 1661, the Church of England had long since been the religious heart of the realm. Yet it was only one religious option among many, and the Restoration provided an environment that fostered theological dissension.[16] For those not satisfied with the Church of England's practices and doctrines there were scores of options, from relatively large movements like those of the Puritans, Quakers,

---

[12] John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689* (Harlow, UK: Longman Publishing Group, 2000), 7-10.

[13] Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 231.

[14] Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 65.

[15] Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 201 and 195-6.

[16] Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography, or, a Description of the Hereticks and Sectaries Sprang up in these Later Times…,* 5th ed. (London, 1654), EEBO Editions. In this penultimate edition of his catalog of English dissenting sects, Pagitt lumps nonconformists into more than 50 groups, some of them quite broad and inclusive of sub-groups that considered themselves distinct.

and Baptists, to those with small followings, such as the Hetheringtonians, Divorcers, and Muggletonians.[17] Being a dissenter in Restoration London frequently also defined one as a scofflaw. Nonconformists were labeled as antisocial, as the state considered uniformity of faith essential to its success.[18] Parliament passed anti-nonconformist laws more frequently than Charles II could pass those promoting toleration. Charles II passed the Declaration of Indulgence, which should have resulted in Muggleton's acquittal, during a period when Parliament did not meet, making it one of the few spans of time during which he was able to act without having to seek parliamentary approval.[19] Rainsford's circumvention of that declaration and his statements about the punishment he desired to mete out to Muggleton stand in opposition to the king's intentions towards the non-Anglican community. He was essentially fulfilling what he perceived to be his duty, one which Walsham describes as, "a solemn responsibility to punish those who departed from orthodoxy, to use any means necessary to uphold the true religion and reclaim those who strayed from the straight and narrow way."[20] In spite of all these factors, London's opinions on dissent and dissenters varied as much as its population. At one extreme, there were those who favored an Erastian solution to dissent, at the other were those satisfied to let their neighbors practice the faith of their choosing, and in-between were the many who were willing to be tolerant of nonconformists to some degree. In Muggleton's case, Rainsford represents the former group, Atkins the later.

Being a dissenter meant that one worshipped outside the established Church. It did not necessarily mean that one avoided weekly worship at the local parish church, however. This practice would have a double benefit for the nonconformist, in that it might help to maintain some veneer of secrecy in regards to religious practices outside the Church, and avoid the payment of the fine levied upon recusants established by the Act of Uniformity of 1558.[21] When dissenters did meet to worship, they tended to do so discretely so as not to attract undue and potentially unhealthy attention. The Anglican faithful referred to these meetings derisively as

---

[17] Pagitt divides Catholics into "Jesuits" and "Papists," seeing the former as a much greater threat to Christendom; he ends his commentary on the Jesuits with "from this sect the Lord deliver us." Pagitt, *Heresiography*, 125.

[18] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 39 and 47-48.

[19] George Clark, *The Later Stuarts, 1660-1714,* 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), 79.

[20] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 1.

[21] Tim Harris, *London Crowds*, 64.

conventicles, a term implying that nonconformist meetings were small, secretive, and somehow sinister. That some groups chose to meet in taverns or alleyways likely did nothing for dissenters' reputations, although some dissatisfied Anglican ministers used their positions within the Church to preach dissenting sermons from their parish pulpits.[22] Those religiously outside the Anglican Church came from all levels of London's social strata, including members of Parliament.

Dissenters made up a significant proportion of London's population. Estimates range from eight to twenty percent of the total post-plague population of three hundred thousand.[23] Favoring the higher percentage based on more recent scholarship, this yields some sixty thousand dissenters in Restoration London. Thanks to attempts to enforce laws promulgated to address nonconformism, it is possible to get a sense of the extent to which the orthodox majority persecuted this significant portion of London's population for its faith. During the 1680s, some four thousands of these nonconformists would find themselves fined five shillings for attending a conventicle.[24] Discounting the possibility that the four thousand figure might include individuals counted multiple times for multiple offenses, this calculation implies that fifty-four thousand nonconformists were *not* persecuted by the law for their dissenting beliefs. This rather striking result – that the state punished less than seven percent of London's nonconformists – is indicative of the lack of consensus on how to treat dissenters. Harris neatly typifies the situation in saying, "local people often placed loyalty to their neighbors above loyalty to the strict letter of the law."[25]

Muggleton's trial, juxtaposed with other contemporary events, reflects this unsettled and often mercurial approach to the question of religious nonconformism during the Restoration. The Baptist preacher, Benjamin Keach, was tried in 1664 at the Aylesbury assizes for the same crime Muggleton would be thirteen years later: the publication of

---

[22] Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 61-64.

[23] W. R. Powell, ed., "Analysis of Bishop Compton's census of 1676: Ongar Hundred," *A History of the County of Essex*: Volume 4: Ongar Hundred, British History Online, http://www.british-history.ac.uk; Harris, *London Crowds,* 66; and Liza Picard, *Restoration London: Everyday Life in London 1660-1670* (London: Phoenix, 2004), 3. The Compton census suffers from ambiguous parameters and, Harris argues, a bias toward "showing dissent was a spent force." Harris, *London Crowds*, 65.

[24] Harris, *London Crowds,* 64-66. The fine was increased to 10 shillings for second and subsequent offences.

[25] Ibid., 71.

blasphemous materials. Like Muggleton, Keach was found guilty, fined, and put into the stocks while his books burned. In a further parallel to Muggleton, Lord Chief Justice Hyde railed against Keach, saying, "I know your religion, you are a Fifth Monarchy Man… I shall take such orders as you shall do no more mischief."[26] Had he known he was not alone in his persecutions, Muggleton might have taken some solace. Further, had his alleged prophetic powers been tuned to the following year, he would have definitely found reason to be thankful for his comparatively light sentence. In 1678 the Popish Plot, simultaneously one of England's more horrifying and embarrassing moments, began.[27]

During this wave of intense anti-Catholic hysteria, more than thirty innocent people were made victims of judicial murder thanks to Oates's fabricated conspiracy.[28] Yet even within this environment of open, public hostility to Catholics, there was a remarkable lack of consistency in how the Protestant majority treated them as a religious group. At the Old Bailey on April 13, 1681, three individuals were tried for religious crimes against the king. Two, John Bully and John Francis Dickason, were accused of being popish priests.[29] The latter was sentenced to be hung, drawn, and quartered; the former's sentence is unrecorded. Joseph Hindmarsh was yet another example of someone tried for the same crime as Muggleton. Hindmarsh's sentence, however, was merely to be taken into custody until he could pay bail, a feat that he accomplished later that day.[30] It is true that this session was Francis Pemberton's first sitting as lord chief justice, but he was a member of the Old Bailey court since 1679, so this variation in sentence from those of Muggleton and Keach cannot be explained away by any inexperience on the part of the justice. The different outcomes of these trials are another example of the lack of any unified, coherent opinion on religious toleration, at least on the part of the judiciary. In this regard, they echoed Muggleton's experience before Rainsford and Atkins four years prior.

This variance in opinion on how best to deal with dissent was not

---

[26] Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men*, 201.

[27] During Oates' trial for perjury in 1685, Lord Chief Justice Jeffreys remarked "I cannot but bewail… that so many innocent persons (to the reproach of our nation be it spoken) have suffered death upon this [Oates' fabricated] account." *State Trials*, eds. W. Cobbett and T. C. Howell (London: T. C. Hansard, n.d., ca. 1815), 10:1298-99, quoted in John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (London: Phoenix Press, 2000), 291.

[28] Clark, *The Later Stuarts*, 94.

[29] Dickason's last name is also spelled "Dickison" in the *Proceedings*.

[30] *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, last modified 27 April 2013), April 1681 (16810413A).

limited to the justices of the Old Bailey. At the highest levels of London society, king and Parliament were battling over what to do about the issue. Parliament generally saw persecution as a valid and justified means of controlling religious nonconformists, groups that might turn to social unrest in accomplishing their goals that in turn were often informed by proactive millenarian beliefs. Charles II attempted to fulfill the promises made in the Declaration of Breda in regards to allowing religious toleration for his dissenting subjects, through legislation such as the Declaration to Tender Consciences.[31] Citing that the portions of the Clarendon code passed to date were doing more to incite civil unrest than quell it, the Lords passed the King's legislation 1663, but it faced insurmountable resistance in the Commons, where they feared "it would lead to Popery and increase the number of sectaries."[32] This battle raged back and forth during Charles's reign, and Parliament often came out the better. Yet even laws designed to enforce conformity provided loopholes to dissenters. Walsham notes that the recusancy laws "gave tacit approval to lay people who were prepared to make a minimal gesture of obedience to the state and to keep their dissident opinions to themselves," regardless of their sectarian views.[33] Even in the absence of loopholes, the king was often willing to bend laws to the point of breaking. In August of 1662, he ordered the release of dissenters imprisoned for illegal assembly if they swore obedience. Three months later imprisoned Quakers received a similar offer, modified to accommodate their proscription against the swearing of oaths.[34] Pepys sums up the situation in the May 30, 1668 entry to his diary: "The business of religion do disquiet every body, the Parliament being vehement against the nonconformists, while the king seems to be willing to countenance them."[35]

Reflecting the confusion among the government and the aristocracy, the middle and lower levels of London society were likewise embroiled in the inconclusive dissension debate. In spite of the economic incentives provided for informing on nonconformists by the Conventicle Act of 1670, persecution of dissenters was inconsistent.[36] Members of smaller

---

[31] Jenny Unglow, *A Gambling Man: Charles II's Restoration Game* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009), 35.

[32] Ibid., 205.

[33] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 258.

[34] Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil*, 106.

[35] Samuel Pepys, *Diary of Samuel Pepys – Complete*, *ed.* Henry B. Wheatley (London: George Bell & Sons, 1893), Kindle edition.

[36] Harris, *London Crowds*, 71.

sects found ill treatment by conformist society to be sporadic and often unorganized. Years before his fateful encounter with Lord Chief Justice Rainsford, Muggleton was physically attacked and struck about the head multiple times by a man named Penson, who believed that Muggleton's cursing powers had caused him to fall ill.[37] Shortly before that encounter, John Reeve, Muggleton's comrade in dissension and fellow prophet, found himself chased by a mob of young boys who threw stones and insults at him.[38] By contrast, Mary Cundy, a Muggletonian widow excommunicated for her beliefs, was supported by members of her local parish in spite of the Anglican Church's official doctrine that excommunicants were to be shunned by the faithful.[39] Although they were willing to treat her with compassion in life, however, her parish supporters drew the line when she died in 1686, and she "was accorded 'the burial of an asse' outside the churchyard walls."[40]

The nonconformist debate regularly made its way into contemporary literature. Catalogs of dissenting sects, such as Pagitt's *Heresiography* and Featley's *The Dippers Dipt*, provided critical, one-sided descriptions of nonconformist groups, often favoring fiction over fact in making their judgments. It is not unlikely that some of the sects described therein are the result of pure fabrication.[41] Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, published in three parts over the period 1663 to 1678, took a satirical look at dissent through its protagonists Sir Hudibras and his squire Ralpho. Butler takes every opportunity to poke fun at the state of religion in England. Chastising some villagers for engaging in bear-baiting, the comic hero cries, "shall we that in the cov'nant swore, / each man of us to run before / another, still in reformation, / give dogs and bears a dispensation? / How will dissenting brethren relish it? / What will malignants say? Videlicet, / that each man swore to do his best, to damn and perjure all the rest!"[42] The irony of the situation was not lost on Butler, nor on his readers; the poem was extremely popular, to the extent that it was almost immediately published in several pirated editions.[43] Political theorist John Locke entered the debate

---

[37] William Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (London: UCL Press, 1996), 31.

[38] Muggleton, *Acts of the Witnesses*, 49.

[39] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 276.

[40] Ibid., 73.

[41] Ibid., 122.

[42] Samuel Butler, *Hudibras*, lines 626-33.

[43] Treadway Russel Nash, introduction to *Hudibras*, by Samuel Butler (London:

with *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, in which he argued that "toleration of those that differ from others in matters of religion is so agreeable to the Gospel of Jesus Christ," that to persecute others for dissenting beliefs that do no harm to society ran contrary to the faith professed by the persecutors.[44] In spite of this egalitarian-sounding claim, Locke's desire for religious toleration did not extend to all groups, evidenced by his participation in anti-Catholic rhetoric during the Exclusion Crisis.[45]

There were many who sympathized with Locke, as evinced by the fact that no religious group was persecuted more consistently than were the Catholics. While they did not conform in the sense that they did not participate in the Anglican Communion, they were not referred to as nonconformists or dissenters, which were terms reserved for nominally Protestant sectaries. Instead, to these Catholic groups they applied adjectives like "popish." Regardless, Catholics were simultaneously seen as being similar to, yet distinct from, Protestant dissenters. They were similar in the sense that they were engaged in what the Anglican faithful perceived as heresy, but they were different in that the Roman Church had been demonized for so long in England that Protestant perception of Catholicism had a life of its own.[46] Walsham suggests that events such as the Popish Plot and the memory of those executed under Mary indicate that "the specter of persecution by an uncompromising Catholic regime remained close to the forefront of many contemporary minds."[47] As a result, Catholics were less tolerated, and were persecuted with greater regularity, than were the members of any other religious tradition. Yet even they were not persecuted consistently, making their experiences relevant to the present discussion.

Anti-Catholic persecution during the Restoration could take on an almost pageant-like quality. Even before the Popish Plot, the pope was burned in effigy every November from 1673.[48] Large crowds paraded these

---

W. Nicol, 1885), 1: viii.

[44] John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (London, 1689), www.constitution.org.

[45] William Uzgalis, "John Locke," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, last modified July 10, 2012, http://plato.stanford.edu.

[46] Pagitt compares "papists" and "sectaries," noting their similarities and differences. In the end, he concludes that there are some dissenting groups that are more egregious in their heretical practices than the Catholics, an interesting conclusion considering the generally negative view of Catholics prevalent in this period. Pagitt, *Heresiography*, 145-6.

[47] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 16.

[48] John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 183-83. The practice had begun in 1641, but had been suspended for some time prior to 1673. The favorite day for these events was November 5 – in remembrance of the Gunpowder Plot – but they were also held on November 17 to remember Queen

effigies through the streets to great and often costly ceremony. In case there was any question as to the crowd's intended message, they shot some of these effigies before igniting them. In 1680, at the height of anti-Catholic hysteria in the midst of Oates's fabrication, as many as two hundred thousand people turned out for the spectacle. The king and Parliament feared a riot. Charles II ordered a halt to the effigy burnings, but the mayor was powerless to enforce the king's will in the face of such overwhelming numbers. Catholic residents braced for the worst, but, when all was said and done, the mobs dispersed without further ado.[49] In fact, these events tended to have more of a festival atmosphere, with the effigies at times analogous to modern parade floats with regard to their decoration and cost. Fireworks and the consumption of large quantities of alcohol, often funded by generous persons of means, accompanied these burnings.[50] In discussing some of the paradoxes involved with the study of persecution in this era, Walsham points out that Catholics could live in the same community as their Protestant neighbors, yet be "transformed overnight into sinister figures," and targets for intolerance.[51] Though they were persecuted more often and more harshly than any other sect, Catholics were not universally or consistently targeted in Restoration London, something they shared with contemporary Protestant dissenters.

The Anglican clergy was not immune to the inconsistencies exhibited by the rest of contemporary London. Interestingly, William Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's, wrote in 1683 about the importance of unity in society. He accepted Catholics as conforming to this ideal, while rejecting dissenting Protestant sectarians.[52] Anglican bishops and clergy of a more Laudian bent had helped to engineer the successful implementation of the Clarendon acts. Yet others, primarily Cambridge-educated men such as Edward Stillingfleet and Simon Patrick, Bishops of Worcester and Ely respectively, saw nothing to be gained from the dissension controversy and took a complacent stance on the issue, earning them the sobriquet of "latitudinarian."[53] Some of the clergy used the pulpit as a place from which

---

Elizabeth's ascension to the throne, and, on one occasion, November 26, 1673, to express the crowd's displeasure at the arrival of the new Duchess of York. Harris, *London Crowds*, 93.

[49] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, 185.

[50] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, 184; and Harris, *London Crowds*, 93.

[51] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 148.

[52] Derek Hirst, "Bodies and Interests: Toleration and the Political Imagination in the Later Seventeenth Century," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (September 2007): 405-6.

[53] John Richard Humpridge Moorman, *A History of the Church in England*, 3rd ed.

to preach against nonconformism, and others to support it.[54]   Anthony Sparrow, Bishop of Norwich, joined Sherlock in writing about the value of religious uniformity versus sectarianism, noting that there were many who complained that the law was not treating dissenters harshly enough.[55]   At least one Anglican clergyman, John Shaw, expressed concern over nonconformists who outwardly complied with the Act of Uniformity by attending public service, believing it to allow the spread of dissenting beliefs among the faithful.[56]

Perhaps the only segments of the London population that came close to consensus on the question of dissent were the dissenters themselves. As has been seen, what landed Muggleton in trouble at the Old Bailey was his book, *The Neck of the Quakers Broken*.   Part of an ongoing polemical dialogue with the Quakers Edward Bourne, Samuel Hooten, Richard Farnesworth, and one W. S., there was no love lost between these two dissenting groups. Muggleton declared Bourne "the seed of the serpent, and appointed to eternal damnation."[57] Hooten and W. S. accused Muggleton of slander, deceit, lying, and – hitting closest to home for Muggleton – being a "false witness."[58] To this, Muggleton responded by calling all Quakers "children of the devil."[59] In spite of sharing similar views on such issues as the Anglican liturgy, the *Book of Common Prayer*, providence, and the value of secular versus scriptural education, nonconforming sects tended to eye one another with suspicion.[60] As a result, there were no noteworthy attempts by dissenting groups to form a unified front.

Lodowicke Muggleton's trial is a microcosm representative of Restoration London's unresolved attitudes towards dissent. The lack of any consensus by the aristocracy is found in the behavior of the two justices presiding over his trial. Conflicting behavior was reflected in the words and deeds of the rest of the community: from Penson who physically attacked Muggleton for his religious practices, to the parishioners who provided support for Mary Cundy in spite of her dissenting beliefs; from Charles II,

---

(Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1980), 255.

[54] Greeves, *Deliver Us from Evil*, 61-64.

[55] Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 139.

[56] Ibid., 203.

[57] Lodowicke Muggleton, *The Neck of the Quakers Broken* (1663), 6, http://muggletonians.org.uk. Citations refer to the 1756 reprint edition.

[58] Ibid., 7.

[59] Ibid., 15.

[60] Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men*, 185-88.

who favored religious toleration, to Parliament, which generally did not. This conflict – as much social as it was religious – was carried out at all levels of London society. Rainsford's undisguised vehemence for Muggleton dominated Atkin's more temperate juristic arguments, resulting in Muggleton's harsh sentencing. Yet, for the same crime, Joseph Hindmarsh received a slap on the wrist and subjective commentary by the author of the *Proceedings* notable only for its complete absence. While the ebb and flow of public opinion may have resulted in inconsistent persecution, for those who were on its receiving end, "the suffering was real enough."[61] Muggleton, though not guilty of the crime of which he was accused, was, like many of his contemporaries, a victim of the vagaries of public opinion.

---

[61] Richard Greaves, *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 161.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras.* London, 1805. Kindle edition.

J. B. [pseud.]. *The Blasphemer Tried and Cast: Or a more full Narrative of the Tryal of Lodowicke Muggleton.* London: Roger L'Strange, 1676. http://muggletonian.org.uk.

Locke, John. *A Letter Concerning Toleration.* London: 1689. http://www.constitution.org.

Muggleton, Lodowicke. *The Acts of the Witnesses of the Spirit, in Five Parts.* London: 1699. http://muggletonian.org.uk.

———. *The Neck of the Quakers Broken.* 1663. http://muggletonian.org.uk.

Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org. Version 7.0. Last modified 27 April 2013). April 1681 (16810413A).

——— (www.oldbaileyonline.org. Version 7.0. Last modified 05 March 2013). January 1677. Trial of Lodowicke Muggleton (t16770117-1).

Pagitt, Ephraim. *Heresiography, or, a Description of the Hereticks and Sectaries Sprang up in these Later Times….* 5th edition. London, 1654. EEBO Editions.

Pepys, Samuel. *Diary of Samuel Pepys – Complete.* Edited by Henry B. Wheatley. London: George Bell & Sons, 1893. Kindle edition.

Powell, Nathaniel. *A True Account of the Trial and Sufferings of Lodowicke Muggleton, One of the Two Last Prophets and Witnesses of the Spirit, left by our Friend Powell.* London: Morris and Reeves, 1808.

Secondary Sources

Capp, B. S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism.* London: Faber and Faber, 1972.

Clark, George. *The Later Stuarts, 1660-1714.* 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Coffey, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689.* Harlow, UK: Longman Publishing Group, 2000.

Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

———. *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration Until the Exclusion Crisis.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hirst, Derek. "Bodies and Interests: Toleration and the Political Imagination in the Later Seventeenth Century." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (September 2007): 401-26.

Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot.* London: Phoenix Press, 2000.

Lamont, William. *Last Witnesses: The Muggletonian History, 1652-1979*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.

———. *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*. London: UCL Press, 1996.

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Morgan, John Richard Humpridge. *A History of the Church in England*. 3rd edition. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1980.

Nash, Treadway Russel. Introduction to *Hudibras*, by Samuel Butler. London: W. Nicol, 1885.

Picard, Liza. *Restoration London: Everyday Life in London 1660-1670*. London: Phoenix, 2004. First published 1997 by Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Powell, W. R., ed. "Analysis of Bishop Compton's census of 1676: Ongar Hundred." *A History of the County of Essex:* Volume 4*:* Ongar Hundred, British History Online. http://www.british-history.ac.uk.

State Trials. Edited by W. Cobbett and T. C. Howell. London: T. C. Hansard, n.d., ca. 1815.

Unglow, Jenny. *A Gambling Man: Charles II's Restoration Game*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2009.

Uzgalis, William. "John Locke." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Last modified July 10, 2012. http://plato.stanford.edu.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

This image depicts J. Marion Sims preparing to examine a slave girl named Lucy. Sims was infamous for performing experimental operations on slave women, often without consent or anesthesia. Illustration by Robert Thom, titled "J. Marion Sims: Gynecologic Surgeon." In *A History of Medicine in Pictures*, by George A. Bender. Parke Davis and Company, 1961.

INTIMATE DEGRADATIONS: THE EXPLOITATION OF SLAVE WOMEN IN THE ANTEBELLUM SOUTH | Emma Folta

American history has long overlooked the exploitation of women within the institution of slavery. Mostly written by white men, the literature often portrayed the bondwoman as happy. Further, as George Fitzhugh, a proslavery Virginian put it, women "did little hard work" and were "protected from the despotism of their husbands by their masters."[1] Because of the false stereotype of the jezebel and the incorrect assumptions of native African life, many southerners had the impression that female slaves were sensuous, open with their sexuality, and driven by wild sexual urges. For white southerners, the connection between sexual promiscuity and reproduction, coupled with the desired increase of the slave population, seemed to be proof of the validity of their assumptions about the sexual nature of their female slaves.

Yet their portrayal stands in stark contrast to the dark reality of what bondwomen faced. Most endured sexual exploitation on a constant basis. In her autobiography, Harriet Jacobs, a mulatto female slave, recounts, "Slavery is terrible for men; but it is far more terrible for women. Superadded to the burden common to all, *they* have wrongs, and sufferings, and mortifications peculiarly their own."[2] Slavery for women was exceedingly worse than it was for men because the female slave was "both a *woman* and a *slave* in a patriarchal regime where males and females were unequal, whether white or black."[3] Not only did bondwomen suffer the same manipulation and humiliation from their masters as their male counterparts, they also faced sexual assault and enforced motherhood through violent and degrading means. This especially added to her hardship in a society where a child's status was determined by that of its mother. In addition, the female slave was subject to harsh ridicule and anger for these unwanted sexual relations

---

[1] George Fitzhugh, *Cannibals All! Or, Slaves Without Masters* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, [1859] 1960), 18.

[2] Harriet A. Jacobs, *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, ed. Lydia Maria Francis Child (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, [1861] 1973), 79.

[3] Thelma Jennings, "'Us Colored Women Had to Go Though a Plenty'": Sexual Exploitation of African-American Slave Women," *Journal of Women's History* 1, no. 3 (1990): 45.

by the white mistress of the slave master, and, occasionally, by the bondwoman's own male counterparts.

Though the antebellum South did not tolerate interracial couplings and even had laws forbidding such cases, mulattoes were a reality on almost every plantation in the antebellum South; proving that the sexual exploitation felt by bondwomen was not an isolated event, but in fact a widespread phenomenon. To say African American women were treated indecently would be an understatement; in fact, the extent of their suffering even went to the extremes of "experimental gynecological operations and cesarean sections performed on them— without benefit of anesthesia."[4] While the struggles of African American slave women should not be surprising, what has remained unclear are the social implications of the relationships between these women and the slave owners. This paper will explore the different extreme cases of the bondwomen's exploitation. It will show how the sexual relations between master and slave were an issue for white society as it confused the rigid social order, and it will explore the reaction and responses of white society to such sexual relations.

Since the founding of the North American colonies, slavery was an integral part of colonial society, and slave women bore the brunt of the institution's injustices. They toiled in the fields, performed household duties, and faced constant sexual exploitation. Their struggles began immediately upon the Middle Passage, where sailors allowed black women and children a limited amount of mobility on board the ships so that they could have unlimited sexual access to them.[5]

What enabled slaveholders to take such advantage of their slaves were the two myths whites propagated in the South that, though contradictory, were wholeheartedly accepted: the Jezebel and the Mammy. The myth of the Jezebel suggested that African American women were naturally promiscuous and that they invited the sexual advances of vulnerable white men. By claiming that female slaves were pursuing sex and encouraging men to sleep with them, the slaveholders freed themselves of guilt and placed the blame squarely on the women's shoulders. As Deborah Gray White argued:

---

[4] Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I a Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South* (London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 10.
    [5] Ibid., 19.

> The idea that black women were exceptionally sensual gained credence when Englishmen went to Africa to buy slaves. Unaccustomed to the requirements of a tropical climate, Europeans mistook seminudity for lewdness. Similarly, they misinterpreted African cultural traditions, so that polygamy was attributed to the Africans' uncontrollable lust, tribal dances were reduced to the level of orgy, and African religions lost the sacredness that had sustained generations of ancestral worshippers.[6]

The lust of the white man was only part of the story and rape was not the only sexual abuse inflicted on bondwomen. The "manipulation of procreative sexual relations" became an "integral part" of the sexual exploitation experienced by female slaves.[7] This form of debasement only increased after 1807 when Congress outlawed the overseas slave trade. Slavery would likely have been banned sooner if not for the fact that the United States government could not take action for twenty years after the adoption of the Constitution, according of Article 1 Section 9. As this article stipulated:

> The mitigation or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.[8]

Once the slave trade was abolished, slaveholders deemed it necessary to integrate forced breeding into the routines of female slaves in order to maintain the level of labor to which they had become accustomed.

The other myth, that of the Mammy, suggested that African women embodied the most saintly qualities of nurturing motherhood. This alternate myth, as different as it was from the Jezebel, was equally detrimental in that it reinforced the acceptability of the employment of African women in raising their masters' children.

White slaveholders used these two myths to excuse their abuse by placing the blame on bondwomen, and to explain why African American women were so involved in the private lives of the slaveholders. One main reason the African woman was so debased was that she came from another world that the southern slaveholders could not understand, which created a mysticism around her. She was

---

[6] Ibid., 29.
[7] Ibid., 68.
[8] U.S. Constitution, art. 1, sec. 9.

mysterious, sexual, and completely different from the white women in southern society. The hardships black women faced made them a strong antithesis of their white counterparts. They toiled in the fields every day, enduring intense physical labor. They lived with the constant threat of being sold or having their loved ones taken away from them. On the other hand, southern society expected white women to be meek and quiet. They did not do any work, and sharing their own opinions was frowned upon. White women held such an inferior place in society that it was only their authority over blacks that gave them any status at all. While this was not true in all households, it was true for the planter class. Poorer women could not afford such a luxury, and many from the yeomen and lower classes had to take on more of the household duties than did their wealthier counterparts. However, the fact that weakness, dubbed "daintiness," was the valued norm in the planter class demonstrated what was preferred in all women even if they did not have such a luxury.

Even the punishments and whippings of female slaves were sexually suggestive.

> The man who whipped the slave Henry Bibb's wife was often heard by Bibb to exclaim that 'he had rather paddle a female than eat when he was hungry.' The whipping of a thirteen-year-old Georgia slave girl also had sexual overtones The girl was put on all fours, sometimes her head down, and sometimes her head up' and beaten until froth ran from her mouth.[9]

What is quite surprising is the lack of sympathy expressed by male slaves for their female counterparts when it came to sexual exploitation. Take the case of Celia, a slave woman who was put to death for the murder of her master Robert Newsom. Newsom raped Celia for five years and had a child with her before Celia killed him. At the time, she was pregnant with the child of George, a fellow slave whom she loved. It was not until George told her that he would leave her if she did not stop sleeping with Newsom that she decided she had no choice but to murder her master.[10] After living their lives in servitude, it is curious that bondmen did not express more sympathy for the plight of their

---

[9] White, 33.
[10] Douglas O. Linder, "The Trial of Celia, A Slave (1855): An Account," *Famous Trials*, 2011, http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/celia/celiaaccount.html.

female counterparts who were enduring rape and other forms of sexual exploitation on a constant basis.

Statutes written in an attempt to curb sexual relations across the racial divide demonstrate just how pervasive the sexual debasement of female slaves became. As early as 1630, "laws regulating relations between whites and blacks appeared on the statute books, including such penalties as a whipping before an assembly of slaves for a white man who had sex with a black woman."[11] Miscegenation laws maintained the purity of whiteness, not just as a facet of racial identity, but also for the other concrete legal and economic privileges that came with being white in the colonies. While immoral from a twenty-first century standpoint, laws dealing with miscegenation were a New World phenomena based entirely on race and not on ethics. All other laws dealing with sexual taboos such as bigamy and incest had roots in what the Bible deemed as morally corrupt.[12]

Early laws punished only whites in the interracial couple for the primary purpose of ensuring that whites adhered to the "norms of endogamy."[13] Whites were the only ones punished because they were the party responsible for protecting the purity of the bloodlines. In other words, these laws existed to protect white supremacy. While the records are scarce, the existing cases in which a white man was punished for having sexual relations with a female slave demonstrate how whites enforced racial segregation from the very beginning. After the 1690's, stricter laws against miscegenation rendered interracial marriages illegal, and it was decreed that whites could be expelled from the colony as punishment for violating these laws.[14]

One of the better-known cases of documented white punishment was the 1630 Virginian case of Hugh Davis. While there is no documentation of Davis's race, one may infer that he was white since the assembly that found him guilty explicitly noted the race of the black woman with whom he was fornicating. Combined with the fact that

---

[11] American Anthropological Association, "Government: 1600-1775, Colonial Authority," Understanding Race, 2007,
http://www.understandingrace.org/history/gov/colonial_authority.html.
[12] Kevin Mumford, "After Hugh: Statutory Race Segregation in Colonial America, 1630-1725," *The American Journal of Legal History* 43, no. 3 (July 1999): 290.
[13] Reginald Oh, "Regulating White Desire," *Wisconsin Law Review* 2007, no. 2 (April 2007): 477.
[14] American Anthropological Association.

Davis was sentenced to be whipped in front of a group of slaves, which to a white colonist would have been an especially humiliating form of punishment, the silence regarding his race is all the proof that as is needed to deduce his whiteness. Legal historian Leon Higginbotham revisited Davis's case in his final book on the subject of race and colonial law, *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process.* Higginbotham believed that the term "defiling" which the court used demonstrated the complete disgust that white southern society had in regards to black and white sexual relations and that it "suggested a wide chasm between races commensurate to that between human and animal; therefore Davis's crime was not [only] fornication but bestiality."[15] Such strong wording, Higginbotham believed, was representative of the disgust white society had with interracial relations.

Another documented case involved Robert Sweatt, who was convicted of fornicating with a black woman in 1640. As with Davis, documents did not state Sweatt's race, yet his punishment indicates that he was white as well. The court sentenced Sweatt to penance at a local parish, which would not have been a punishment for an African man.[16] Nine years later in Norfolk, a William Watts was punished for a similar crime.[17]

These legal actions demonstrated the deep intolerance within southern society for interracial couplings. While at first it was white men who received the brunt of this intolerance, by the 1850's white society became increasingly antagonistic toward the mulatto class. The whiter mulattos became, the more the southerners disliked them. In a society that worked around the one-drop rule – the belief that any black ancestry made a person black – skin color was a primary determinant of class in the south.[18] As mulattos began to look more like the rest of white southern society, it became increasingly difficult for southerners to make racial distinctions, which blurred social categories and made many

---

[15] Leon Higginbotham, *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process* (New York: Oxford, 1996), 20.

[16] Mumford, 283.

[17] Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 195.

[18] Joel Williamson, *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States* (Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 73.

people uneasy. Whites became increasingly less tolerant of slaveholders who flaunted their indiscretions. As Joel Williamson explains,

> Whole families of planter men here and there surrendered sexually and fell over the race line. Whole clans of mulattoes, more slave than free, were created, to the almost inexpressible horror of their white neighbors. The response of the white South to the totally fallen was to ostracize them and isolate their plantations. Not a few communities were thus lost to miscegenation in the South in the 1850s.[19]

There were two groups of white men who had sexual relations with slave women. Those who were subtle and slept with only one slave or who were widowers who then took on a black mistress were tolerated by a southern society that usually looked the other way. However, some men were much more promiscuous and flaunted such behaviors. Legal historian Edward Phifer addresses this topic in an article in *The Journal of Southern History*. According to Phifer, if a bachelor entered into an intimate relationship with a female slave and raised a family by her, but never became openly promiscuous, the situation did not become a topic of polite conversation, yet "he was [not] censured for his conduct [nor did he] lose status in the community… But the married slaveholder who promiscuously or openly consorted with his slaves became a social outcast, and he was never forgiven nor his actions forgotten so long as his name was remembered."[20]

Not only was it socially dangerous but the white slaveholders who were most flagrant about these taboo practices were even subject to mob violence. In one documented case in the spring of 1859, Major Aurellen St. Julien led a "campaign of organized intimidation in and around Lafayette [Louisiana]" to punish the perceived immorality of interracial relationships between white men and mulatto women.[21] These bands of vigilantes openly attacked interracial couples in the streets, as in the whipping of Auguste Gudbeer and his free mulatto mistress.

While the exploitative sexual relations between masters and their female slaves were common, the majority of society disapproved and even reacted against such acts violently. Yet these unwanted sexual

---

[19] Ibid., 56.
[20] Edward W. Phifer, "Slavery in Microcosm: Burke County, North Carolina, "*The Journal of Southern History* 28, no. 2 (May 1962): 148.
[21] Williamson, 66.

advances were not the worst crimes perpetuated against bondwomen. As Williamson states, "a few [slaveholders] passed from simple abuse into horrifying extravagance."[22] One case in New Kent, Virginia in 1830 resulted in the murder of a slaveholder by his slaves Peggy and Patrick. The slave owner had kept Peggy chained to a block in his meat house for not consenting to have sex with him. He threatened to beat her to death if she did not consent, but she refused because her master was also her father, and she would not agree to incest.[23] Unfortunately, this behavior by white slaveholders was not uncommon in the Old South, and sexual exploitation, sadism, and even incest multiplied the horrors of slavery and dehumanized bondwomen even more.

Yet the sadism of some slaveholders paled in comparison to the atrocities inflicted upon female slaves by J. Marion Sims. Considered the father of modern surgical gynecology, Sims was an Alabaman surgeon who developed the operation still used today for *vesicovaginal* and *rectovaginal fistulas.* These were catastrophic complications of childbirth for 19th century women, in which a hole developed between the bladder and vagina that led to constant urinary incontinence.[24] Sims developed his surgical method through a series of experimental operations from 1845 to 1849 on fourteen female slaves he had purchased to use as guinea pigs.[25] During these experimental surgeries, slave women had to be held down and were denied the use of anesthesia, despite its use within the medical field since Crawford Williamson Long became the first doctor to use ether as an anesthetic in 1842.

Anarcha, one of Sims' slaves, had a combination of both *vesicovaginal* and *rectovaginal fistulas.* Sims forced her to undergo thirty operations before he deemed the surgery successful.[26] When defending his brutal forms of torture, Sims claimed that not using anesthesia was acceptable since African women had higher pain tolerances. He also claimed that he was doing these women a favor –

---

[22] Ibid., 55.

[23] From Executive Papers, Sept 10, 1830, cited in James Hugo Johnston, *Race Relations in Virginia and Miscegenation in the South, 1776-1860* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970), 307-308.

[24] L. L. Wall, "The Medical Ethics of Dr. J. Marion Sims: A Fresh Look at the Historical Record," *Journal of Medical Ethics* 32, no. 6 (June 2006): 346.

[25] Sara Spettel and Mark Donald White, "The Portrayal of J. Marion Sims' Controversial Surgical Legacy," *The Journal of Urology* 185 (June 2011): 2425.

[26] Wall, 348.

either he operated on them, or they had to live with their conditions for the rest of their lives. Unsurprisingly, even after Sims had refined and published his technique he could find no white patients willing to undergo the surgery without the use of anesthesia.

It was unethical to perform the surgeries on patients who were not asked for their consent. It was also inherently racist for Sims to not use anesthesia on his female slaves. Of course, when he moved to New York with his fully developed operation, he began using anesthesia on his white patients.[27] Even worse was the fact that Sims' use of non-consenting slaves for his experimental operations was unnecessary, as "substantial advances in medical care were made in the 19th century by southern physicians who experimented in an ethical manner using white women from whom they obtained 'informed consent.'"[28]

Historical writing has frequently disregarded the full extent of the suffering of African and African American slave women. In dealing with the Jezebel and Mammy stereotypes, which excused the indecent treatment shown to them, female slaves not only suffered and toiled in the fields but also faced deeper, more intimate degradations than did many of their male counterparts. Some bondwomen endured sadistic masters who tortured and experimented on them in the name of 'science.' Sexually exploited for the slave owner's pleasure and profit, female slaves had no escape and were sometimes forced to resort to extreme measures like murder. Yet slave women were not even able to find solace among their male counterparts, who judged and scorned them much like white society did for the sexual encounters into which these bondwomen were forced. These frequently nonconsensual encounters were so common that southern society passed laws to hinder master-slave relationships, but to no avail. As miscegenation continued and mulattos began having lighter skin, white southern society began to lash out and ostracize fellow plantation owners and their families for their blatant sexual indiscretions. Many whites in the Antebellum South began to turn to open confrontation against those who participated in interracial relationships, and these violent outbursts would only increase with time, well after the abolition of slavery.

---

[27] Ibid., 347.
[28] Ibid., 348.

Bibliography

American Anthropological Association. "Government: 1600-1775, Colonial Authority."
     Understanding Race. 2007.
     http://www.understandingrace.org/history/gov/colonial_authority.html.

Brown, Kathleen M. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and
     Power in Colonial Virginia.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Fitzhugh, George. *Cannibals All! Or, Slaves Without Masters.* Cambridge: Harvard
     University Press, [1859] 1960.

Higginbotham, A. Leon, *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the
     American Legal Process.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Jacobs, Harriet A. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl.* Edited by Lydia Maria Francis Child.
     New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, [1861] 1973.

Jennings, Thelma. 1990. "Us Colored Women Had to Go Though a Plenty": Sexual
     Exploitation of African-American Slave Women. *Journal of Women's History* 1,
     no. 3 (Winter): 45-74.

Johnston, James Hugo. *Race Relations in Virginia and Miscegenation in the South, 1776-
     1860.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970.

Linder, Douglas O. "The Trial of Celia, A Slave (1855): An Account." Famous Trials. 2011.
     http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/celia/celiaaccount.html.

Mumford, Kevin. "After Hugh: Statutory Race Segregation in Colonial America, 1630-
     1725." *The American Journal of Legal History* 43, no. 3 (July 1999): 280-305.

Oh, Reginald. "Regulating White Desire." *Wisconsin Law Review* 2007, no. 2 (April 2007):
     463-88.

Phifer, Edward W. "Slavery in Microcosm: Burke County, North Carolina." *The Journal of
     Southern History* 28, no. 2 (May 1962): 137-165.

Spettel, Sara, and Mark Donald White. "The Portrayal of J. Marion Sims' Controversial
     Surgical Legacy." *The Journal of Urology* 185 (June 2011): 2424-2427.

Wall, L. L. "The Medical Ethics of Dr. J. Marion Sims: A Fresh Look at the Historical
     Record." *Journal of Medical Ethics* 32, no. 6 (June 2006): 346-350.

White, Deborah Gray. *Ar'n't I A Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South.* London:
     W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.

Williamson, Joel. *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States.* Louisiana:
     Louisiana State University Press, 1995.

This image shows a former slave, known simply as "Aunt Jane," holding a white child for whom she was a caretaker. This photo is an example of the "Mammy" stereotype of slave women that was perpetuated throughout the South. Photograph by G. M. Elton, titled *Former Slave "Aunt Jane" with One of the J. D. Walker Children*, ca. late 1800s. Located at the State Library and Archives of Florida, or online at www.floridamemory.com/items/show/784.

GENDERED CAPTIVITY: THE PLIGHT OF MALE AND FEMALE SLAVES IN CONTRAST | Kylie Tomlin

Throughout the history of American slavery, bondwomen endured a level of subjection and abuse far different from that of men. Men were the main workforce in slavery, particularly in the fields of southern plantations. Slaveholders used male slaves for the production of tobacco in the upper South and rice in the lower South.[1] These men were worked extremely hard, some to the point of death. If they did not toil as hard or as efficiently as their masters demanded of them, they faced harsh punishments. Masters beat, whipped, and took food rations away from their slaves. At times, these punishments were so severe that slaves attempted to run away, though few were successful in their flight. In some cases, slaves were beaten or whipped so brutally that they died from their wounds. These men came into and left the world as slaves, though often not in the same place. Frequently, masters sold their slaves if they became too old or weak to maintain their workload. Slaveholders took these bondmen to slave auctions or sold them through private sales, where buyers priced and purchased them according to their apparent strength, skill, and physical stamina. Plantation owners bought women, on the other hand, for a few distinct reasons unique to their gender.

Though slavers primarily purchased men in the early years of the slave trade, they soon realized that by having women on their plantations, they could maintain or grow their slave population at a much lower cost. By about 1730, plantation owners bought African women based not only based on their ability to work, but also on their ability to bear children.[2] Potential buyers physically and invasively inspected women's bodies in public to determine their reproductive capabilities. Women quickly became a vital component to the slave industry and to the plantations on which they lived, though they were treated much differently than their male counterparts. They faced sexual exploitation and abuse and suffered discrimination based on both their race and gender. These biases against female slaves constituted a new dynamic within the slave economy. These bondwomen had to care for not only themselves and their masters, but also their masters' children and often children of their own. These immense pressures were unique to

---

[1] Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery: 1619-1877* (New York: Harper and Wang, 1993), 6.
[2] Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I a Woman?* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1985), 67.

the social position of the female slave. Although they endured similar conditions to male slaves, enslaved women carried distinctive burdens that neither white women nor black men shared.

As early as 1619, the European colonial powers were capturing African men and sending them to the colonies as slaves.[3] They forced these bondmen to work for the colonists without respite, redefining human beings into property. By the early eighteenth century, slavery had grown immensely. It was during these years that the prevalence of slavery in the South over the North became clear. In the South, slaveholders tended to have twenty-five or more slaves each, whereas in the North, they typically owned around three or four. In these Southern states, especially states with large slave populations like South Carolina, slave experiences varied greatly, depending on the plantation or farm on which they worked. There is of course no such thing as benevolent chattel slavery. Yet some slave owners put on a façade of "caring" for their slaves in comparison to the brutal masters who seemed to take pleasure in punishing their slaves. One such cruel master, as described by a slave named Henry Smith, was Edward Brisco. Smith describes Brisco as having no equal in cruelty. He never killed any of his slaves, but he believed that no matter how good the slaves were, "they must be whipped once a year to let them know they were negroes."[4] Masters like Brisco saw men and women in bondage as being no different from the equipment they used to tend their farms. Many slave masters even had a period of "breaking in" their slaves in which they would beat and whip them in order to break their spirits and make them completely subordinate.

Even children were not immune from the whips of their masters. In his book, *The Experience of a Slave in South Carolina,* John Andrew Jackson recounts his childhood interactions with his mistress:

> When I was about ten years old, I and her son were digging for hickory root to amuse ourselves with, when he, seeing that I was obtaining mine quicker than he, kicked me on the nose, upon which I wiped the blood upon him. He ran and informed his mother, who whipped me on my naked back, to console her son, till the blood ran down. After that, she always hated not only me but my family, and would even stint my mother's allowance; and since then, I had many whippings through her influence.[5]

---

[3] Kolchin, 3.

[4] Harry Smith, *Fifty Years of Slavery in the United States of America* (Grand Rapids: West Michigan Printing Co., 1891), 88.

[5] John Andrew Jackson, *The Experience of a Slave in South Carolina* (London:

Slave masters had no boundaries for their punishments. In their view, it did not matter that slaves like Jackson were merely children; they were nonetheless property.

Not all slave owners were like Brisco or Jackson's mistress. Some slaves avoided their master's beatings altogether, or, as in the following case of a slave from North Carolina, others had masters who appeared to care about the well-being of slaves when an overseer overstepped their boundaries. In a letter to her husband, Duncan, Rebecca Cameron recounts the beating of one their slaves, Jim, by their overseer Mr. Nichols. Rebecca details the confrontation between the two, describing how Mr. Nichols beat and severely injured Jim. In her account, she is clearly concerned for his life. Rebecca stated that she believed Jim would recover, and she prayed, "God grant he may for many reasons."[6] On the back of the same letter, Duncan's son Paul wrote a note to his father also expressing a desire for Jim to heal, voicing what seems to be genuine concern for him and an uneasiness about excessive beatings. Although he admits that Jim can be troublesome at times, he expresses that he has "ever felt a great regard to him."[7] It is clear that although this man is a slave and is technically the property of the Duncan family, they cared for him in a way that many masters did not. They even tended to him themselves and sent for the doctor to come immediately to help with Jim's wounds. They could have easily left him to die and done nothing to punish Mr. Nichols. Instead, they speak in their letters of possibly reprimanding Nichols for his harsh beatings. Nonetheless, it is a shallow measurement of humanity to consider the Duncans' sympathies to be true compassion, as they were still slave owners after all.

Regardless of the intensity and frequency of their punishments, slaves toiled ceaselessly at their appointed tasks. Masters used male slaves for their strength and their utility in manual labor. It was very rare for male slaves to do any sort of household work; that was considered a job for slave women. Instead, bondmen toiled in the fields like machines. In his memoirs, Moses Roper recounts his experience with his new slave master, who did not hesitate to put him to work. "As soon as he got home, he immediately put me on his cotton plantation to work, and put me under overseers, gave

---

Passmore & Alabaster, 1862), 7.

[6] "Rebecca Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 26 April 1835," in the Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

[7] "Paul Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 26 April 1835," in Cameron Family Papers.

me allowance of meat and bread with the other slaves, which was not half enough for me to live upon, and very laborious work."[8] If slaves were unable to complete a task within an allotted time, which was frequently the case, they were severely punished. Roper continues in his memoirs with an account of one such occasion. He remembers, "When I failed in my task, he commenced flogging me, and set me to work without any shirt in the cotton field, in a very hot sun, in the month of July."[9] Slaveholders had very high expectations for their slaves, many of which were far too high for any one slave to reach, and severe beatings were commonplace. After they were whipped, slaves were expected to return to the fields and continue their work. In response to this intense abuse, multitudes of male slaves attempted to flee from their masters.

Moses Roper was just one of many slaves who attempted to run away from his master. His first of many unsuccessful attempts to escape came after failing to complete a task for his master. He fled, fearing "that [he] should get a flogging."[10] Even after being captured, returned, and severely punished for trying to run away the first time, Roper did not stop. As he states in his book, "I made several attempts, was caught and got a severe flogging of one hundred lashes each time."[11] In response to his multiple attempts to flee, his master resorted to chaining him during the day to prohibit his mobility. At one point, his chains were removed so that he could be flogged, and once they were taken off, he again attempted to run. Roper's tragic story no doubt parallels that of many slaves who were desperate to escape the bonds of slavery, but ultimately failed and were returned for severe beatings. They did not want this life of servitude and wished to be free. These slaves were willing to run away as many times as they needed to in order to achieve their freedom.

Another slave who attempted to run away from his master was John Andrew Jackson. Jackson had a far different experience with running away than Roper, and his attempt was successful. Jackson speaks of hearing about Boston being free soil, and decides that is where he will flee. He left around Christmas in 1847, and found his way to a vessel leaving for Boston. On the vessel, a free black man agreed to stow him away, but not without a

---

[8] Moses Roper, *A Narrative of the Adventures and Escape of Moses Roper, from American Slavery* (Philadelphia: Merrihew & Gunn, 1838*): 14.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Roper, 15.
[11] Ibid.

fair amount of misgivings. He recalls the cook's suspicions: "But don't you betray me! Did not some white man send you here to ask me this?"[12] Jackson assured the cook that he was not setting him up, but when he returned the next day the cook was still unsure and told Jackson, "walk ashore, I will have nothing to do with you; I am sure some white person sent you here."[13] Jackson eventually convinced the cook that his intentions were sincere, and the cook allowed him to stow away. Upon reaching Boston, Jackson found both freedom and employment. While some slaves were successful like Jackson, many more were caught and sent back to be severely punished like Roper. Yet unlike male slaves, many bondwomen refused to run away because of their family ties to the plantation. They refused to leave behind their children and were to an extent cemented to their plantations and their masters. Before discussing this phenomenon, however, it is important to examine the unique experiences that informed enslaved and freed black women's identities.

As mentioned above, women were not bought in the slave trade initially, though this changed when plantation owners sought to reproduce their own slave populations. Once purchased, women were not only utilized for reproduction, but also in ways that paralleled their mail counterparts. When it came to working on plantations, women took on roles in the fields as well as in households. Deborah Gray White points out this fact in her essay, "Female Slaves: Sex Roles and Status in the Antebellum South." She states, "It appears that they did a variety of heavy and dirty labor, work which was also done by men."[14] She continues, "In 1853, Frederick Olmsted saw South Carolina slaves of both sexes carting manure on their heads to the cotton fields where they spread it with their hands between the ridges in which cotton was planted."[15] Female slaves suffered the toils of manual labor as bondmen did, with the added burden of rearing children, and few respites in between. Once pregnant or nursing, women could be excused from participating in heavy fieldwork. As White suggests, "It is likely, however, that women were more often called to do the heavy labor usually assigned to men after their childbearing years. Pregnant women, and sometimes women breastfeeding infants, were usually given less physically

---

[12] Jackson, 26.
[13] Ibid.
[14] White, "Female Slaves: Sex Roles and Status in the Antebellum Plantation South," in *Half Sisters of History*, ed. Catherine Clinton (Duke: Duke University Press, 1994): 59.
[15] Ibid.

demanding work."[16] James Oakes also brings light to this topic in his work, *Slavery and Freedom.* As Oakes contends, "Masters set the rules about how much work pregnant women could perform, when nursing mothers should return to the fields, how small children were to be cared for while the parents were at work, and the age at which slave children should begin labor."[17] As such, female slaves, including some who were pregnant, were often relegated to housework. In her work, White considers whether women being forced to do housework was yet another way for their masters to take control of their lives. "But bondswomen did do a lot of traditional 'female work' and one has to wonder whether this work, as well as the work done as a 'half-hand,' tallied on the side of female subordination."[18] While much of the work these women did bordered on subordination, there were certain tasks that were deemed true skills and earned them more prestige. Such tasks were cooking, midwifery, and "doctoring."[19] The many tasks that female slaves took on in the home led to a stereotype and myth that would follow black women well after the abolition of slavery.

The myth of the Mammy figure accompanied female slaves for the majority of their lives on plantations. "Mammy was the woman who could do anything, and do it better than anyone else. Because of her expertise in all domestic matters, she was the premier house servant and all others were her subordinates."[20] This idea, however, was not an accurate depiction of the household slave. In fact, in many households "it was the Southern mistress, not a female slave, who carried the keys of the household."[21] Some Southern women even chose to care for their own children rather than having a slave do the job. "Mrs. Isaac Hilliard, for instance, had several house slaves, but would not allow her son Henry to be cared for by anyone but herself."[22] While the idea of the Mammy was perpetuated to keep slave women locked within the stereotype that they were fully committed to their white families and seemingly cared more for them and their white children than their own families, it simply was not true. Yet the Mammy stereotype was just one of many myths that mystified the role of slave women on the

---

[16] Ibid., 60.
[17] James Oakes, *Slavery and Freedom: An Interpretation of the Old South* (New York: Knopf, 1990): 146.
[18] White, "Female Slaves," 60.
[19] Ibid., 61.
[20] White, *Ar'n't I a Woman?,* 47.
[21] Ibid.,, 51.
[22] Ibid., 52.

plantation and contributed to the identities of bondwomen themselves.

The stereotype known as the Jezebel also tormented black women in the South. Female slaves were stereotyped as overly exoticized women who could not control their desire and sexuality. The basis for these claims began in the early seventeenth century when Englishmen traveled to Africa to bring slaves to the colonies.[23] "Unaccustomed to the requirements of a tropical climate, Europeans mistook seminudity for lewdness. Similarly, they misinterpreted African cultural traditions, so that polygamy was attributed to the Africans' uncontrolled lust."[24] These misunderstandings led to incorrect conclusions about African women. Englishmen brought these myths back to the colonies and perpetuated them through the way they spoke about and treated female slaves. "Even in the Chesapeake, ideas about promiscuous black women held firm."[25] Female slaves were stereotyped by this myth, and though their sexual contact with slave masters was nearly always coerced, white southerners still characterized slave women as Jezebels who willingly and forcefully threw themselves upon married men.

Female slaves faced exponential amounts of sexual abuse during their time on plantations. This abuse came from masters, overseers, and the sons of their masters. Many white Southerners acted as though this abuse did not occur, but in recent years, more historians have acknowledged this abuse. Multitudes of female slaves, like Harriet Jacobs, faced the advances and harassment of their masters, while others endured sexual exploitation via physical assault. Many were forced to bear their masters' children. In her autobiography, *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl,* Jacobs speaks of her life on the plantation of the Flint family. Jacobs details her life as a female slave, including the interactions she had with her master, Dr. Flint. Once Jacobs reached her teenage years, she noticed that his attitude toward her changed. He began making advances toward her, much to the dismay of his wife. Jacobs recalls turning fifteen, "a sad epoch in the life of a slave girl. My master began to whisper foul words in my ear."[26] Despite her deep hatred of her master, she could do nothing to resist him. Jacobs thought about turning to her mistress for help, but the master's wife had "no other feelings towards her but those of jealousy and rage."[27] Jacobs endured these

---

[23] Ibid., 29.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid., 30.
[26] Harriet Jacobs, *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl* (New York: Dover, 2001): 26.
[27] Ibid.

advances for years, although she claims there was never any physical contact between the two. This was not an uncommon situation for female slaves, and once Jacobs had a daughter, she dreaded the day she would be old enough for Dr. Flint to begin pursuing her as well. Bethany Veney, a slave living in Virginia in the 1800s**,** also commented on the sad day when a daughter would become old enough for her master to take notice. Veney tried to convey to white women that they would never understand the feeling of having a daughter in bondage and knowing that "almost certain doom is to minister to the unbridled lust of the slave-owner."[28] While Jacobs may have been fortunate enough to never endure coerced sexual contact with her master, many other slaves were not.

Although much of this went undocumented, "it has been no secret, then or now, that in the plantation South, owners and slaves lived on terms of physical closeness and often engaged in sexual intimacy."[29] While few slaves willingly had relations with their masters, most slaves were forced by their masters to take part in these relations. Nell Irvin Painter points to this in her essay "Of *Lily*, Linda Brent, and Freud." She explains, "Nineteenth-century fugitive slave narratives, such as those of Frederick Douglass and Moses Roper, and the Fisk and WPA ex-slave narratives from the 1930s, are full of evidence that masters did not hesitate to sleep with their women slaves, despite the marital status of either."[30] Female slaves lived under the domination of their masters and felt they had no choice but to bend to their master's will. Many women feared severe punishment if they did not partake in relations with their masters. These relationships frequently led to slave women becoming pregnant with their masters' children. "A limited amount of evidence suggests that at least a few southern slaveholders in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries took deliberate steps to force slave women to bear children."[31] Whether or not the slave owner intended for her to become pregnant, a female slave carrying her master's child caused much tension within both white and black families. Jacqueline Jones

---

[28] Bethany Veney, *The Narrative of Bethany Veney: A Slave Woman* (Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis, 1889): 26.

[29] Nell Irvin Painter, "Of *Lily*, Linda Brent, and Freud: A Non-Exceptionalist Approach to Race, Class, and Gender in the Slave South," in *Half Sisters of History*, ed. Catherine Clinton (Duke: Duke University Press, 1994): 94.

[30] Ibid., 95-96.

[31] Jacqueline Jones, "Race, Sex, and Self-Evident Truths: The Status of Slave Women During the Era of the American Revolution," in *Half Sisters of History*, ed. Catherine Clinton (Duke: Duke University Press, 1994): 23.

examines this topic by stating,

> Whether or not a slave woman was expected to bear children for her master's use, she remained vulnerable to his sexual advances, and the constant threat of rape injected raw-edged tensions into black family life. Any offspring that resulted from rape or concubinage served to enhance the wealth of labor-hungry planters, who thus had positive inducements to wreak havoc on the integrity of slave husband-wife relations.[32]

Slave owners wanted a large slave population, especially if they did not have to pay for the slaves. By having their slaves procreate, masters were able to achieve this. Some female slaves did not take a husband or partner, so masters would take it into their own hands and force their slaves to procreate with them or with other slaves. "A North Carolinian reported in 1737 that after two or three years of marriage, childless wives were compelled 'to take a second, third, fourth, fifth, or more husbands or bedfellows.'"[33] Even if a slave did not want to bring children into the world, particularly into the horrors of slavery, they were frequently forced to do so.

There was much hope that the abolition of slavery would bring an end to these forced relations. Yet many African American women, even after emancipation, were sexually abused by their old masters as well as by other white men. Catherine Clinton recites a quote from ex-slave C.W. Hawkins detailing this issue: "The women were beat and made to go with them. They were big fine men and the master wanted the women to have children by them. And there were some white men, too, who joined the slave women to do what they wanted to do. Some of them didn't want to stop when slavery stopped."[34] Although slavery was constitutionally abolished, freed slaves were not free from the abuse of white men. They felt as though they were still entitled to control and power over these women and wanted to assert that domination. Clinton goes on to state, "Unfortunately for southern black women, emancipation escalated the degree of sexual violence to which they might be subjected."[35] Southerners were extremely angry that slavery was abolished and that they had lost their slaves, and in some cases, their livelihood. They depended upon these slaves to do their fieldwork for them at no cost of wages. Without slaves, they would have to find workers

---

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Catherine Clinton, "Bloody Terrain: Freedwomen, Sexuality, and Violence during Reconstruction" in *Half Sisters of History*, ed. Catherine Clinton (Duke: Duke University Press, 1994): 146-147.

[35] Ibid., 149.

whom they would have to pay and treat with a certain level of respect and dignity. The resultant anger was directed toward ex-slaves, who continued to endure abuses new and old. Black women took the brunt of this vitriol and resentment in the form of continued sexual assault. In bondage and freedom, black women endured horrors and experiences unique to their social position.

Another area in which slave men had different experiences than bondwomen was within family life. Family relationships meant something different to female slaves than to bondmen. Slave marriages were not recognized legally, and sometimes not even by a slave's master. As Deborah Gray White contends, "it has long been recognized that slave women did not derive traditional benefits from the marriage relationship, that there was no property to share and essential needs like food, clothing, and shelter were not provided by slave men."[36] Because of the confines of slavery, male and female slaves were not able to support one another as is done in a traditional marriage. Masters forced them both to work all day and gave them minimal supplies to survive. Children complicated this situation. Taking care of children while working all day was very difficult for slave mothers, but slave fathers were frequently unable to lend support. This introduced a mother-child dynamic on the plantation, known as matrifocality. Matrifocality is "a term used to convey the fact that women *in their role as mothers* are the focus of familial relationships. It does not mean that fathers are absent; indeed two-parent households can be matrifocal."[37] While fathers were still present, they were not seen as an integral part of the family. As such, many plantation owners did not hesitate to split up marriages by selling one of the spouses; they were far less likely, however, to split up the mother and children. Friday Jones witnessed this during his life on a plantation in 1834 and discussed it in his autobiography. He speaks of Colonel Jones, who "was a white Southern man who believed in parting slaves and sending them where he pleased."[38] Another slave, Lucy Delaney, recalls her parents being sold apart despite their marriage. Delaney writes, "Though in direct opposition to the will of Major Berry, my father's quondam master and friend, Judge Wash tore my father from his wife and children and sold him 'way down South!'"[39] Tearing husbands and wives apart did not concern

---

[36] White, "Female Slaves," 65.
[37] Ibid., 66.
[38] Friday Jones, *Days of Bondage* (Washington, D.C.: Commercial Pub Co., 1883): 7.
[39] Lucy Delaney, *From the Darkness Cometh the Light or Struggles for Freedom*

masters; however, they were more cautious when it came to a mother and her children.

Although they did not respect marriages, slave owners knew "the most important factor is the supremacy of the mother-child bond over all other relationships."[40] Women were often able to cope with a life of bondage without a husband; in fact, some women had "abroad marriages."[41] These were marriages between slaves on different plantations and afforded women more freedom, especially to raise their children. If a slave master were to try to interfere with a mother and her children, she would retaliate, sometimes in violent ways. In response to this, masters afforded some mothers special treatment such as "the tendency to sell mothers and small children as family units, and to accord special treatment to pregnant and nursing women."[42] This special treatment, where afforded to them, amounted to a reduction in tasks and punishments. Labor was frequently commuted from fieldwork to household tasks.

Masters also treated women with children more kindly because they knew that children would make female slaves less likely to run away. As Jacqueline Jones suggests,

> Family considerations played a major role in determining when, why, and how slave women ran away from their owners, just as duties to their kin could… discourage such behavior. Young and childless women at times took advantage of their lack of child-rearing responsibilities to strike out on their own and rejoin other family members.[43]

Children acted as anchors for slave women, tying to them to the plantation. Running away and leaving their children behind was rarely an option, but attempting to run away with a child was too difficult and dangerous. Some mothers, such as Harriet Jacobs, did make the difficult decision to leave their children behind and in the care of family members. They believed that by running away, they could gain their freedom and one day purchase their children from their masters. Others, however, felt it was much too hard to leave their children behind. Jacqueline Jones wrote of the women who considered this difficult decision: "But other black women, like the Virginia slave Mary, had to assume the added risk of absconding with children, who

---

(St. Louis: J.T. Smith), 14.

[40] White, "Female Slaves," 67.
[41] White, *Ar'n't I a Woman?,* 76.
[42] White, "Female Slaves," 67.
[43] Jones, "Race, Sex, and Self-Evident Truths," 27.

enriched their newfound (if temporary) sense of freedom but at the same time slowed their flight and made them more obvious to white authorities."[44] Many mothers faced this difficult choice and some ultimately decided to run with their children. These attempts often ended in capture or loss of children.

Bondwomen faced a much more difficult and complex situation under the domination of chattel slavery than many have acknowledged. Not only did they have to worry about physical labor and being whipped by their masters as male slaves did, they also had to worry about sexual abuse, bearing children, and the harsh stereotypes that confronted them wherever they turned. Yet, as Jones asserts,

> This is not to suggest that black women suffered more than black men under the oppressive weight of the racial caste system, only that gender considerations played a significant role in shaping the task assignments parceled out to blacks by slaveholders and in shaping the way blacks structured relationships among themselves.[45]

Female slaves had to balance their life on the plantation with family life, including making difficult decisions in raising their children, often without a husband. Having spouses sold to different plantations took heavy tolls on bondwomen, and there was little in the way of respite from their labors, especially when compounded with physical and sexual assault. Slavery was an unimaginably difficult time for both men and women, but female slaves had to face issues that few could comprehend, and unfortunately, many of these issues did not simply disappear with the abolition of slavery. The institution of slavery created innumerable wounds on slaves' lives and these wounds left scars that never faded in American society.

---

[44] Ibid., 28.
[45] Ibid., 20.

Bibliography

Clinton, Catherine. "Bloody Terrain: Freedwomen, Sexuality, and Violence during Reconstruction" in *Half Sisters of History*, edited by Catherine Clinton. Duke: Duke University Press, 1994.

Delaney, Lucy. *From the Darkness Cometh the Light or Struggles for Freedom.* St. Louis: J.T. Smith.

Jackson, John Andrew. *The Experience of a Slave in South Carolina.* London: Passmore & Alabaster, 1862. http://www.docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/jackson/jackson.html

Jacobs, Harriet. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl.* New York: Dover, 2001.

Jones, Friday. *Days of Bondage. Autobiography of Friday Jones. Being a Brief Narrative of His Trials and Tribulations in Slavery.* Washington DC: Commercial Pub. Co., 1883. http://www.docsouth.unc.edu/neh/fjones/jones.html

Jones, Jacqueline. "Race, Sex, and Self-Evident Truths: The Status of Slave Women During the Era of the American Revolution," in *Half Sisters of History*, edited by Catherine Clinton. Duke: Duke University Press, 1994.

Kolchin, Peter. *American slavery, 1619-1877.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.

Oakes, James. *Slavery and Freedom: An Interpretation of the Old South.* New York: Knopf, 1990.

Painter, Nell Irvin "Of *Lily*, Linda Brent, and Freud: A Non-Exceptionalist Approach to Race, Class, and Gender in the Slave South," in *Half Sisters of History*, edited by Catherine Clinton. Duke: Duke University Press, 1994.

"Paul Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 26 April, 1835." In *The Cameron Family Papers*, *1757-1978*, compiled by Southern Historical Collection. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

"Rebecca Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 26 April, 1835." In *The Cameron Family Papers*, *1757-1978*, compiled by Southern Historical Collection. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Roper, Moses. *A Narrative of the Adventures and Escape of Moses Roper, from American Slavery.* Philadelphia: Merrihew & Gunn, 1838.

Smith, Harry. *Fifty Years of Slavery in the United States of America.* Grand Rapids: West Michigan Printing Co., 1891.

White, Deborah G. *Ar'n't I a woman?: Female Slaves in the Plantation South.* New York: Norton, 1985.

———. "Female Slaves: Sex Roles and Status in the Antebellum Plantation South," in *Half Sisters of History*, edited by Catherine Clinton Duke: Duke University Press, 1994.

Custer's Last Fight, ca. 1896 by Otto Becker, based on an 1884 painting by Cassily Adams. In this depiction of the Battle of the Little Bighorn, Custer (center figure) faces armed Native Americans at the battle's climax. Becker was hired by Anheuser-Busch Brewery Company to make prints of the painting as a Budweiser advertisement. Numerous institutions, including the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, hold duplicates of the lithograph.

CUSTER DIED FOR OUR ENTERTAINMENT:
THE BATTLE OF THE LITTLE BIGHORN IN FILM
| Sean T. Painter

|2nd Place Graduate Paper, 2014 Northern California Regional Conference of Phi Alpha Theta|

"Almost any mention of Custer's Last Stand today is a reference not to history but to myth."[1]

Compared to other battles fought in the history of the United States, the complete annihilation of Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer and his command at the Little Bighorn should be an inconsequential historical footnote. However, this is not the case. Despite its relative insignificance, myths have entangled the participants of the battle since news first reached the east coast from sources in the Montana and Dakota Territories. The dramatic news about "the greatest individual defeat … suffered by the U.S. Army" stunned a populace celebrating its centennial.[2] Several historians and authors have speculated that more has been written about Custer and the Little Bighorn than about any other subject in the United States' military history.[3] In large part, they remain popular because for over a century, artists, authors, filmmakers, and poets have immortalized or condemned Custer. The symbolic myth of this battle and its participants has undergone enormous changes since 1876. The commander of the Seventh Cavalry, originally celebrated as a tragic national hero, has become synonymous with all that is wrong with the United States' relations with Native Americans.

Studying Custer remains popular today. He is a magnet for controversy, and representative of a continuing struggle for Native Americans who seek proper recognition for their contributions to American history. Presently, negative portrayals make up the majority of scholarly and non-academic interpretations, with Custer representing white arrogance and aggression. Nevertheless, more than a half century of positive analysis

---

[1] Brian W. Dippie, *Custer's Last Stand: The Anatomy of An American Myth* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 1.

[2] Harrison Lane, "Custer's Massacre: How the News First Reached the Outer World," *The Montana Magazine of History* 3, no. 3 (Summer, 1953): 46.

[3] Several works expressed this statement. See Evan S. Connell, *Son of the Morning Star* (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984); James Donovan, A *Terrible Glory: Custer and the Little Bighorn, The Last great Battle of the American West* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2008); and Bruce A. Rosenberg, "Custer: The Legend of the Martyred Hero in America," *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 9, no. 2/3 (August – December, 1972).

preceded this modern trend. Film offers the best way to examine these differing representations. This paper examines several significant portrayals of the Battle of the Little Bighorn in film, focusing on *They Died with Their Boots On* (1941) and *Little Big Man* (1970). While filmed nearly thirty years apart, these two movies best represent the range of interpretations of Custer and the battle. They also reveal the continued inconsistencies that plague portrayals of Indians in film and television, and demonstrate Hollywood's reluctance to emancipate themselves from old habits of stereotyping Native Americans.

Background

   Upon graduating last in his class from West Point in 1861, Custer rose to prominence both militarily and publicly through his bravery in the Civil War. Known for aggressive tactics and meticulous planning, he served admirably for the Union, attaining the rank of Brevet Brigadier General prior to the Battle of Gettysburg. After the war, he briefly served as the Commander of the 2nd Cavalry in Texas and enforced Union law during reconstruction. While Custer had admirably led men during the Civil War, in Texas he found those under his command "insubordinate [and] mutinous."[4] Biographer Robert M. Utley assesses that "as an officer Custer had never experienced resistance to his will" and "responded with harsh discipline and cruel, even unlawful punishment … [to] men who did not revere him, and who in fact loathed him."[5] After an extended period of leave from February to October of 1866, he returned to the Army as a Lieutenant Colonel and joined the newly created 7th Calvary in Fort Riley, Kansas. There, partly based on his own self-promotion, he transformed himself from Civil War hero to the nation's most recognized Indian fighter. Boosting this reputation was his participation in the Battle of Washita in Oklahoma, where the 7th Cavalry, in a "most assuredly one-sided" victory, defeated the Cheyenne under the leadership of Black Kettle.[6] Historians debate whether to refer to the event as a "battle," or as a "massacre." Paul A. Hutton observes:

> Black Kettle's Cheyenne were not unarmed innocents living under the

---

[4] Robert M. Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin: George Armstrong Custer and the Western Military Frontier* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001), 37.
  [5] Ibid., 37-8.
  [6] Paul Andrew Hutton, ed., *The Custer Reader* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004), 96.

> impression that they were at peace. Several of [Black Kettle's] warriors
> had earlier raided the Kansas settlements and had recently fought the
> white soldiers … Nor were the soldiers under orders to kill everyone,
> for Custer personally intervened to stop the slaying of noncombatants,
> and fifty-three prisoners were taken by the troops. The battle, although
> a sad and tragic affair, does not deserve the harsh epithet of massacre.[7]

Historians Joseph B. Thoburn and Stan Hoig offer opposing views. Thoburn "considers the destruction … too one-sided to be called a battle," and suggests that if "a superior force of Indians attacked a white settlement containing no more people than in Black Kettle's camp, with like results, the incident would doubtless have been heralded as a 'massacre.'"[8] Hoig argues that classifying Washita as a massacre is appropriate because the U.S. Army killed the Cheyenne "indiscriminately, mercilessly, and in large numbers."[9]

Custer's annihilation of the Cheyenne at Washita in 1868 occurred the same year that the United States signed the Treaty of Fort Laramie, ending Red Cloud's War and conceding the Black Hills to the Sioux, which they considered sacred land.[10] By the terms of the treaty, modern day western South Dakota became the Great Sioux Reservation and closed to white settlement. Peace did not last long. In July 1874, the United States Army Black Hills Expedition left Fort Abraham Lincoln in North Dakota to explore the relatively uncharted hills. Led by Custer, and accompanied by engineers, miners, scientists, photographers, and press, the army looked for strategic sites for forts and signs of gold. In August 1874, the discovery of gold prompted an increase in illegal white immigration into the Black Hills, understandably causing conflict with the Sioux. The United States could not stop the illegal encroachment of white settlers, and instead attempted to negotiate the purchase of the land. In February 1876, the Sioux refused demands from the United States to sell the Black Hills and return to their reservations. In response, the Army launched a military campaign against them. It was during this conflict, the Great Sioux War, that the Battle of the

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Quoted in Richard G. Hardorff, ed., *Washita Memories: Eyewitness Views of Custer's Attack on Black Kettle's Village* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), 29.

[9] Quoted in Ibid., 30.

[10] Not to be confused with the Treaty of Fort Laramie (1851) between the United States and several Native American tribes that recognized the Cheyenne and Arapaho territories in present day Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado and Kansas. After an influx of white settlers into the Colorado Territory due to the 1858 Pikes Peak Gold Rush, the United States renegotiated the treaty and vastly reduced the territory allotted to the Cheyenne and Arapaho. Red Cloud's War lasted from 1866 to 1868, and resulted in the Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Northern Arapaho gaining legal control of the Powder River Country in Wyoming.

Little Bighorn took place.

In May 1876, three different Army columns left outposts in North Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana with the goal of subduing hostile Native Americans in Eastern Montana and Western Dakota who had not returned to the reservation.[11] The coordinated attack plan involved converging upon the native forces gathering near the Little Bighorn River around June 26 or 27. On June 22, Brigadier General Alfred Terry ordered the 7th Calvary to move forward and stalk the Indians to prevent their escape until the combined forces of all three columns could engage them.[12]

At first light on June 25, 7th Calvary scouts observing the Little Bighorn from present day Crow's Nest spotted what scout Mitch Bouyer referred to as "the largest encampment ever collected on the northwest plains."[13] When Custer arrived at the lookout to view the reported village, he had limited visibility; a haze had settled over the valley. Worse, he received reports that Indians were departing and Lakota scouts were riding toward the river. As Stephen Ambrose writes, "That was what Custer feared most – the enemy would get away."[14] What he could not know was the Lakota scouts were not riding away from the village, but attempting to draw the army prematurely into a disastrous charge.[15] As for the departing Sioux, they were heading back to agency reservations.[16] A decision to attack immediately rather than wait for Gibbon and Terry's columns became the best bad option afforded to the 7th Calvary Commander.

Custer understood that he was facing a superior force. The Army fixed their estimate at 800 warriors, basing this figure on the number that they believed to follow Chief Sitting Bull. This figure would have been

---

[11] Colonel John Gibbon's column of six companies from the 7th Infantry and four companies of the 2nd Cavalry departed from Fort Ellis in Montana. Brigadier General George Crook and ten companies of the 3rd Cavalry, five companies of the 2nd Cavalry, two companies of the 4th Infantry, and three companies of the 9th Infantry left from Fort Fetterman in the Wyoming Territory. Brigadier General Alfred Terry's column, including twelve companies of the 7th Cavalry under Custer, portions of the 17th Infantry and an artillery detachment of the 20th Infantry traveled from Fort Abraham Lincoln in present day North Dakota.

[12] Upon departing Terry's column, Custer refused both the use of Gatling guns and a company from the 2nd Calvary. Approximately 644 personal left with Custer. This included 31 officer, 566 enlisted men, 35 Indian Scouts, and about 12 civilians. See Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin*, 176-77.

[13] Steven E. Ambrose, *Crazy Horse and Custer: The Parallel Lives of Two American Warriors* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 430.

[14] Ibid., 431.

[15] Ibid., 436. Custer misinterpreted their movements as fleeing.

[16] Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin*, 182.

accurate about two weeks before the battle. However, thousands of Indians left reservations to join Sitting Bull near the Little Bighorn to hunt buffalo.[17] The Indians established a hunting village on the banks of the Little Bighorn on June 18. Robert Utley describes its increase in size:

> Over a span of six days Sitting Bull's village more than doubled, from 400 to 1,000 lodges, from 3,000 to 7,000 people, from 800 to 2,000 warriors … a village of unusual size … White apologists, seeking to explain the disaster this coalition of tribes wrought, would later endow it with an immensity it never approached. Still, it was big by all standards of the time, and it was more than twice as big as any of the army officers looking for it had anticipated.[18]

Outnumbered by a Sioux, Cheyenne, and Arapaho force estimated to be at least 2,000 warriors, the 7th Calvary had little hope for victory.[19]

At what is now called Reno Creek, Custer made the decision to divide his forces into four battalions.[20] Major Marcus Reno and Captain Frederick Benteen each received three companies, while Captain Thomas McDougall received command of the slower pack train.[21] The remaining five companies rode with their commander.[22] Custer directed Benteen "to march south … to make certain that the Indians didn't escape in that direction."[23] Reno received orders to "'move forward … as rapid … as he thought prudent, and charge the village."[24] Hidden by the bluffs, Custer moved north to what he thought would be the northern end of the village. He intended to launch a surprise attack and capture the native women and children unprotected and use them as hostages to force the warriors to surrender, a tactic used at the Battle of Washita eight years earlier.[25]

The action began with Reno's movement into the valley. Crossing the Little Bighorn River at Reno Creek at approximately 3:00 pm, Reno

---

[17] Nathaniel Philbrick, *The Last Stand: Custer, Sitting Bull, and the Battle of the Little Bighorn* (New York: Viking, 2010): 110-111. See also Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin*, 178.

[18] Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin*, 179.

[19] The number of Indians that faced the 7th Calvary remains hotly debated. Early histories grossly exaggerated the numbers, in part to give a valid excuse for the defeat. Presently, estimates from historians range from a low of 1,000 to a high approaching 3,000. For a detailed breakdown of the size of the village, see Gregory Michno, "How Big Was That Village?: Custer Loses in a Fair Fight," *Journal of the West* 35, no. 1 (1996): 59-69.

[20] Major Reno received command of Companies A, G, and M. Captain Frederick Benteen led Companies H, D, and K.

[21] Company B made up the Pack Train.

[22] Companies C, E, F, I, and L.

[23] Ambrose, 437

[24] Quoted in Ibid.

[25] Ibid. See also Connell, 278.

quickly came up on the village. However, as Stephen Ambrose writes, "in sight of the tipis, Reno stopped, dismounted his men, formed a skirmish line, and engaged in some long-range and fruitless firing at the Sioux."[26] At a later court of inquiry, Reno admitted that he thought he "was being drawn into some trap."[27] Nathaniel Philbrick criticizes Reno's judgment during this period, suggesting that he had been drinking and that "insidious workings of alcohol" amplified his suspicions that Custer's strategy would fail, causing him to halt his charge.[28] Whatever Reno's reason for halting the attack, tactically it contributed to defeat. Indian testimony suggests that Reno's charge had sent the village into a terrified state, with some native leaders believing that "Long Hair had planned cunningly."[29] In a later interview, Pretty White Buffalo Woman revealed that "if Reno's battalion had 'brought their horses and rode into camp … the power of the Lakota nation might have been broken.'"[30] When Sioux leaders realized that the Calvary's advance had stopped and was not an attempt at negotiating surrender, they attacked. Crazy Horse led the assault on Reno's left flank. Rightly sensing the imminent danger of collapse, the Major ordered a hasty retreat. His men first fled to some trees by the Little Bighorn. When that position became untenable, they fled in a panicked and disorderly retreat across the river to the bluffs, where they would make their own defensive stand on a hill later named for Reno.[31] Reno's retreat cost the lives of approximately three officers and thirty troopers, and his companies faced certain annihilation if not for a miracle: the fortuitous arrival of Captain Benteen's column.

Historians believe that around the time Reno made his charge upon the village, Custer had finally realized the size of the force he faced. Knowing that he needed every abled soldier and the reserve ammunition carried by Company B, he sent two messages to Captain McDougall and Captain Benteen. The first message, carried by Sergeant Daniel Kanipe, had orders for the pack train to come "straight across the high ground," and for

---

[26] Ambrose, 437.
[27] Philbrick, 174. See also Ambrose, 366.
[28] Philbrick, 174.
[29] "Long-hair" was one of the Sioux names for Custer. Ibid., 175.
[30] Ibid., 176
[31] The death of scout Bloody Knife probably exacerbated Reno's hasty retreat. Riding next to Reno, a lucky bullet hit him in the head "and splattered his brains all over Reno's face. According to Ambrose, Reno "lost his nerve." Philbrick writes that the death of his scout "seems to have badly flustered Reno." See Ambrose, 439 and Philbrick, 187.

Benteen to "come quick, big Indian camp."[32] Later, at 3:30 pm, and possibly after observing Reno's stalled advance, Custer sent a second message. The message carried by Italian bugler Giovanni Martini read "Benteen. Come on. Big Village. Be Quick. Bring Packs. W. W. Cooke. P.S. Bring Packs."[33] Two hours earlier, Custer had ordered Benteen's companies to search for another entrance into the valley, a duty the Captain referred to as "valley hunting ad infinitum."[34] After a fruitless search, Benteen decided to rejoin the force and made his way to the trail that his commander had traveled. Moving at a slow pace, and even stopping to water the horses, Benteen's companies eventually rendezvoused with the slower pack train. Subsequently, they encountered Sergeant Kanipe. Yet, because his message was mainly for Company B, he barely stopped upon seeing Benteen and continued on to the pack train, and thus failed to communicate the urgency of the situation.[35] A few miles later, the meandering Benteen encountered Martini, who gave him the exigent message. Shortly after setting out to meet Custer at his last known position, they unexpectedly encountered Companies A, G, and M, reeling from their heavy losses. Major Reno, breathing heavily, greeted Benteen: "'For God's sake, halt your command and help me. I've lost half my men."[36] Companies H, D, and K never made it to Custer. They stayed with Reno and helped fortify his position. This decision doomed Custer and his five companies, but saved Reno's men from being overrun by the Sioux. Joined shortly thereafter by Company B, the soldiers on the bluffs organized their defensive perimeter, bunkering down for what they expected to be a relentless harassing attack.[37]

Custer's actions and movements after he sent off Martini are open to conjecture. That last message, sent at approximately 3:30 pm, arrived to Benteen a half hour later. Around 4:25 pm, a "'heavy volley of rifle shots' erupted from the bluffs down river.[38] Despite this, Benteen chose to remain with Reno. Disobeying orders, Captain Thomas Weir led Company D from its defensive position on Reno Hill toward Custer's presumed position. At

---

[32] See Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin,* 186.

[33] Custer's Adjutant 1st Lt. William W. Cooke wrote the message that Martini carried. The orders were originally given verbally, but Cooke, not trusting the courier's English comprehension hastily rewrote the message. See Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin,* 186. See also Ambrose, 439.

[34] Philbrick, 201.

[35] Ibid., 203.

[36] Ibid., 205.

[37] Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin,* 192.

[38] Philbrick, 219.

approximately 5:25 pm, after advancing only a mile, Weir came to an overlook (now called Weir Point). In the distance, nearly four miles to the east, "the hills … were shrouded in a thick cloud of dust and smoke." They could see riders on horseback shooting into the ground.[39] Historical analysis suggests that Weir witnessed the final moments of Custer's five companies on Last Stand Hill.

Benteen, Reno, and the pack train did eventually leave their position to join Weir, but all seven companies retreated to Reno Hill when Sioux attacks harried their position at Weir Point. Driving back to the bluff, the Sioux besieged the remaining companies of the 7th Calvary until sunset, at about 9:30 pm, and then continued for most of the next day.[40] During this siege, survivor testimony reveals Captain Benteen demonstrated "exceptional courage … [and] was exercising the functions principally of commanding officer," despite Reno outranking him.[41] Further demonstrating his courage, Benteen also led two charges to repel encroaching natives that threatened to overrun the encampment.[42] The Indians withdrew from the battleground on June 26, when they detected Brigadier General Terry's force approaching. Upon arriving at the Little Bighorn, the General first encountered scouts sent down from Reno Hill. Neither knew of Custer's fate. A scout later brought the news, and upon investigating Last Stand Hill, the surviving members of the 7th Calvary discovered "'a scene of sickening ghastly horror,' … the bodies … stripped, scalped, and mutilated, all grotesquely bloated from the burning sun lay scattered about the battlefield where they had dropped."[43]

Custer's battle lasted less than two hours. Among the 210 men with him, there were no survivors but for a horse named Comanche.[44] Between Reno and Benteen's companies, another 53 soldiers died. Three civilians were killed during the battle: George's younger brother Boston Custer, Custer's nephew Henry Armstrong Reed, and Mark Kellogg, a reporter for the Associated Press. Twenty-four members of the 7th Cavalry

---

[39] Ibid., 224-5.
[40] Ibid., 232.
[41] Larry Sklenar, *To Hell with Honor: Custer and the Little Bighorn* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000): 316. See also Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin,* 192. Utley writes, "Reno displayed weak leadership. Benteen, fearlessly stalking the lines as Indian sharpshooters tried to drop him, inspired the troopers to valiant efforts."
[42] Sklenar, 317.
[43] Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin*, 192-3.
[44] Edgar I. Stewart, *Custer's Luck* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1955): 474. See also Philbrick, 281.

received the Medal of Honor for their actions during the fight, eighteen for soldiers who risked their lives to retrieve water for the wounded.[45] Seventh Cavalry survivors hastily buried the dead in shallow graves where they had fallen, marking them with stakes driven into the ground.[46] A year later, an expedition returned and exhumed all the officers for burial back home. Custer's final resting place would be a grave overlooking the Hudson River at the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.[47] The remains of the other soldiers were placed in a mass grave atop Last Stand Hill. In 1879, the area of the battle was designated the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery. In 1881, a marble obelisk erected at the top of Last Stand Hill formed the basis for a more permanent memorial. In 1890, white marble blocks replaced the wooden stakes marking where each individual soldier fell. Officials added Red Granite markers for Native Americans nearly a hundred years later. In 1946, seventy years after the battle, Congress reestablished the site as Custer Battlefield National Monument. In an attempt to acknowledge all participants of the battle, the name of the monument changed again to Little Bighorn National Monument in 1991.

The Battle of the Little Bighorn represented a high mark for Native American resistance against the United States. It was short lived. Nathaniel Philbrick describes the aftermath:

> The U.S. government stepped up its efforts against Sitting Bull and his people … The new Custer, Colonel Nelson Miles … began his ceaseless pursuit of the Lakota and the Cheyenne. All Indians … were forced to surrender their ponies and guns … With the collapse of the Buffalo herd came the collapse of the Lakota. In the months to come, after a series of small but bloody skirmishes, virtually every band of Lakota and Cheyenne … found that they had no choice but to surrender.[48]

The news of the 7th Calvary's defeat at the Little Bighorn reached eastern presses a few days after Fourth of July centennial celebrations had begun. Almost immediately, myth began to surround Custer's reputation. While there was some criticism of Custer from Republican newspapers and some of his superiors, the preponderance of press and commentary glowed with praise.[49] James O. Gump references the *New York Herald*'s praise,

---

[45] Sklenar, 319
[46] Ibid., 331.
[47] Ibid., 332.
[48] Ibid., 331-2.
[49] Many of Custer's tactical decisions received instant scrutiny. Additionally, the conduct and decisions of both Reno and Benteen have faced detailed examination. For a

which "went so far as to characterize Custer as a Homeric demigod."[50] Numerous editorials would continue to grow and serve as inspiration for artists, authors, filmmakers, and poets. Yet it is in film that Custer and the Little Bighorn reached their greatest scrutiny.

The construction of the Custer myth and his reputation has evolved considerably since 1876. Initially, in the nineteenth century, Custer was a hero. As Brian W. Dippie accurately summarizes, "heroism is a fickle thing, and heroes … have cycles of popularity."[51] Today, in the nadir of his popularity, rarely does Custer receive idolization, and most consider him an antihero or a fool. To understand how his positive reputation was first created in film (best represented by *They Died with Their Boots On*), it is important to have a cursory understanding of the early myth-making surrounding Custer.[52]

Early Portrayals: Poetry, Literature, and Art – The Filmmaker's Muse

Robert M. Utley assesses that early reporting resembled anything but accurate journalism. These early reports created most of the common fallacies associated with the Battle of the Little Bighorn upon which later artists would base their interpretations.[53] Poetry was an early outlet for the glorification of all things Custer, with approximately 150 poems lauding his deeds. Among the most prominent is Walt Whitman's "A Death-Sonnet for Custer." Gump describes Whitman's poem as "melodic and melodramatic" but "thoroughly inaccurate."[54] It contains references to Custer's "flowing locks" and "shining saber," both highly erroneous. Custer had cut his hair short before the battle, and none of the soldiers in the Seventh Calvary carried swords.[55]

The poets certainly created the literary inspiration for other artists, and following them were the "unskilled hacks" who created quick and highly

---

discussion of these, see Ambrose, 444-447 and Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin,* 194-212.

[50] James O. Gump, *The Dust Rose Like Smoke: The Subjugation of the Zulu and the Sioux* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 121.

[51] Dippie, 2.

[52] For a detailed examination of the Custer Myth and how it was represented in culture, see Dippie and Robert M. Utley, *Custer and the Great Controversy: The Origin and Development of a Legend* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998). Both works offer much insight into this topic and expand on subjects briefly outlined in this paper.

[53] Robert M. Utley, *Custer and the Great Controversy: The Origin and Development of a Legend* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 29.

[54] Gump, 124.

[55] Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin,* 174.

inaccurate visual images. The most famous of these works is the Cassily Adams – Otto Becker lithograph distributed by Anheuser-Busch to countless saloons across America in promotion of Budweiser beer. Titled *Custer's Last Fight,* the Adams-Becker lithograph further reinforced visuals of the battle that were fictitious. Most prominent was the image of Custer being the last to perish. Despite numerous testimonies from Native Americans that 'Yellow Hair' died earlier in the battle, this "fact" became entrenched in the minds of the public. In 1949, Paul Treadway, a reporter for the St. Louis *Globe Democrat,* best summarized the lasting importance of the work, writing that the lithograph is "responsible for the vivid mental picture most Americans have of the tragedy on the Little Bighorn."[56] The lithograph's influence magnified when Raoul Walsh framed the climactic scene for *They Died with Their Boots On* by using imagery straight out of the painting.

Before the arrival of film, the medium that allowed the biggest saturation of the Custer myth into the public was the voluminous production of literature. Countless authors made a living by writing a "repetitive … ritualistic retelling of the same basic story."[57] Unimaginably uncreative themes are present in these works that undoubtedly inspired future filmmakers. The most influential literary work, *A Complete Life of General George A. Custer*, authored by Frederick Whittaker, is a puff piece. Published shortly after Custer's death in 1876, it is responsible for much of the glorification of Custer and is more drama than literature.[58]

In film, Custer's image would remain untarnished well into the 1940s, but it was in the written arena where he first faced harsh criticism. Critical revisionist biographies like *Glory Hunter* (1933) began to portray Custer as an "immature seeker of fame … brutal … insubordinate, and … distrusted by most of his officers and men."[59] Arthur Penn's *Little Big Man* would echo this interpretation thirty years later. Works like *Glory Hunter* would be the lone dissenters in Custer profiles while the film industry continued glorifying him for nearly twenty more years.

The Last Stand became what historian Richard Slotkin describes as "a kind of linguistic resonance," in which anyone uttering the words "Custer," "Last Stand," or "Little Bighorn" can awaken memory and implied

---

[56] Quoted in Dippie, 55.

[57] Dippie, 62.

[58] Paul A. Hutton, "From Little Bighorn to Little Big Man: The Changing Image of a Western Hero in Popular Culture," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (January, 1976): 24.

[59] Ibid., 34.

understanding.[60] Like the poets, writers, and artists, filmmakers would also find "something exhilarating … in Custer's Last Stand" and help continue the tradition of creating a "moral victory" out of his defeat.[61] The early films that depict the battle become instantly recognizable with their theme conveying the general's honorable death.   A heroic Custer appears in countless films from 1909 to 1941. The first of these, *On the Little Big Horn* (1909), precedes a long series of heroic interpretations: *The Massacre* (1914), *The Flaming Frontier* (1926), *The Last Frontier* (1932), *Custer's Last Stand* (1936), *The Plainsman* (1937), and *The Santa Fe Trail* (1940). However, the still popular *They Died with Their Boots On* best represents the zenith of positive Custer films.

They Died with Their Boots On (1941)

They Died with Their Boots On is "unquestionably the most influential version of the Custer story ever filmed."[62]   Conceived when Custer was facing a backlash in other media, the original script had a harsher outlook on him. Unlike the filmed script, the original script did not ignore his less honorable contributions to history. It included a scene depicting Washita. It also replayed Custer's court martial in a more historic manner and avoided draping it in a veil of Custer's selflessness. By refusing "to paint Custer in pristine hues" and place the blame of the Little Bighorn on Custer's "greed for glory," the original *They Died with Their Boots On* would have signaled the end of Custer praising and the beginning of his bashing.[63]

However, Warner Brothers did not produce that film, and instead released a movie that they hoped would raise public morale and patriotism during an increasingly difficult time.[64] The more heroic tone also fit into an age where a population still reeling from the Great Depression would have been attracted to a hero who challenged big business.[65] To accomplish this, the director and screenwriter ignored Custer's controversial episodes and his

---

[60] Quoted in Paul Stekler, "Custer and Crazy Horse Ride Again … and Again, and Again: Filmmaking and History at Little Bighorn," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 42, no. 4 (Autumn, 1992): 66.

[61] Dippie, 19.

[62] Ibid., 106.

[63] Quoted in 106.

[64] Angela Aleiss, *Making the White Man's Indian: Native Americans and Hollywood Movies* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005), 71.

[65] Shirley A. Leckie, *Elizabeth Bacon Custer and the Making of a Myth* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 308.

defeat became the result of corporate greed instead of his own quixotic pursuit of glory.

In *They Died with their Boots On*, Errol Flynn portrays Custer as a sympathetic character and the Native Americans' savior. The real villains are the "Machiavellian" railroad tycoons who wish to acquire the valuable land that the Indians occupy. In an imaginative scene, Custer vows to Anthony Quinn's Crazy Horse that in exchange for peace between the United States and the Sioux, he will protect the Black Hills from white expansion. Custer's valiant pledge interferes with an entrepreneurial land-grabbing scheme engineered by the Railroad, which conspires to remove him from his command. In a scene shortly before the climactic battle, Custer realizes that in order to save the Sioux, he must sacrifice the Seventh Cavalry in combat.

With "Garryowen" countered by a menacing Indian theme, the 7th Calvary fights to their death. The film climax concludes with a solitary Custer, "with his troopers all dead around him, his pistols empty," waiting with saber drawn to engage the enemy.[66] He dies from a shot by Crazy Horse's rifle as a wave of mounted Sioux ride over his position. The film's final appearance of Custer as he awaits certain death leaves the audience with a visual reminiscent of the Adams-Becker painting, which is an image of unquestioned honor and courage.

Custer's final service to the Indians is presented in the film's closing scene, in which his dying declaration (in the form of a letter) urges that the Indians "be protected in their right to the existence in their own country."[67] The entire depiction of the battle presents him in a historically inaccurate light and relegates the Sioux's decision to go to war to an insignificant plot point. In Hollywood, the United States honors Custer's dying plea to protect the Indians. In reality, the history is far from the "truth" presented to the film's audience. Writer Ward Churchill levies harsh criticism for this "systematic historical falsification." He finds it repugnant that Hollywood portrays Custer, the man who broke the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty and led an illegal expedition into the Black Hills in 1874, as the Sioux's "staunchest defender," whose defeat transforms into a heroic

---

[66] Paul Andrew Hutton, "'Correct in Every Detail': General Custer in Hollywood," in *Legacy: New Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn,* ed. Charles E. Rankin (Helena: Montana Historical Society Press, 1996), 246.

[67] Aleiss, 75.

sacrifice rather than a military blunder.[68]

There are some positive aspects in *They Died with Their Boots On.* While not a praising portrayal of Native Americans, the film did attempt to move away from the stereotypical depiction of Indians as "cruel, bloodthirsty, inhuman savages."[69] Director Raoul Walsh wished to escape this representation and create Indian characters with a "human dimension."[70] Supporting Walsh, studio executive Melvin Levy hoped to portray the Indians not as prop pieces, "whose sole function in life is to be wiped out … but as a real people having desires, hopes, loves, and hates."[71] Further attempting to go beyond the hackneyed portrayal of Indians as villains, the film depicts them as victims. The "real" villains are the evil railroad tycoons. Quinn's portrayal of Crazy Horse gives the Sioux leader individuality and depth, adding to the message that Indians are real people too.

However, the characterization given to Crazy Horse in the film is self-serving for the producers. It serves the purpose of providing Flynn's Custer with a worthy adversary to defeat, making his eventual sacrifice honorable to the 1941 audience. Despite the individuality afforded to Crazy Horse, the film stubbornly refused to relinquish stereotypes prominent in Hollywood, including the fully dressed Indian topped with a ceremonial headdress. Ralph and Natasha Friar criticize the absurdity of the Indians in the Last Stand scene where a native trying to hide before attacking the cavalry is plainly visible because of a full-feathered war bonnet.[72]

Between They Died with Their Boots On and Little Big Man

After the end of World War II, and the romantic portrayal in *They Died with Their Boots On*, the image of Custer in film and television took a stark turn. Increasing antiwar sentiment in the United States led to transformation and reexamination for many of America's storybook heroes. Author Raymond W. Stedman states that Custer was the "frontier hero who really started taking it on the chin during the revisionist film era."[73] Custer

---

[68] Ward Churchill, *Fantasies of the Master Race: Literature, Cinema and the Colonization of American Indians* (San Francisco: City Light Books, 1998), 187.

[69] Ralph E. Friar and Natasha A. Friar, "White Man Speaks with Split Tongue, Forked Tongue, Tongue of Snake," in *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies,* eds. Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L. P. Silet (Ames: Iowa State University, 1980), 94.

[70] Aleiss, 72.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ralph E. Friar and Natasha A. Friar, *The Only Good Indian … The Hollywood Gospel* (New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1992), 194.

[73] Raymond William Stedman, *Shadows of the Indians: Stereotypes in American*

moved from the overtly heroic model to its complete opposite. From the zenith of *They Died with Their Boots On* to the nadir of *Little Big Man*, numerous examples of negative portrayals in film exist.

Paul Hutton assesses that "it was only natural for Hollywood to demythologize Custer, ever the symbol of the Indian wars and the cavalry, and use him as an evil counter to the new Indian heroes."[74] Hollywood quickly caught up with the historians, journalists, and novelists that had been criticizing the man since *Glory Road* (1933). Frequently in the late 1940s through the 1960s, Hollywood portrayed him in a reverse image of heroism. *Fort Apache* (1948), *Warpath* (1951), *Sitting Bull* (1954), *Tonka* (1958), and *The Great Sioux Massacre* (1965) all depicted Custer in increasing negativity. By the time Disney released *Tonka,* he was portrayed as a "harsh, blustering Indian-hater" capable of immense cruelty in his pursuit of immortality.[75]

Surprisingly, not all depictions of Custer in the intermediate period between *They Died with Their Boots On* and *Little Big Man* were negative. Two prominent examples demonstrate that to some, Custer will always remain a hero. In 1968, the Spanish import, *Custer of the West,* portrayed him in a similar manner to Raoul Walsh's film. The film received harsh criticism for being a clone of *They Died with Their Boots On.* The previous year, the American Broadcast Company (ABC), under the impression that an honorable Custer might draw a television audience, began airing *Custer*, a series focusing on his exploits from 1868 to 1875.

Native American reaction to the series was understandably severe. A.A. Hopkins-Duke, director the Tribal Indian Rights Association, declared, "General Custer was the Indian's worst enemy." Other organizers compared Custer to Adolph Eichmann.[76] Despite the massive protest, ABC aired the program. Trying to relieve fears that *Custer* would whitewash history, the network announced that they would treat Indians "sympathetically and realistically."[77] August Little Soldier, a Mandan-Arikara, commented on *Custer* and on the portrayal of Indians in film in an interview with Ralph Friar. Stating "the movies always show the Indians massacring whites …

Culture (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982), 223.
[74] Hutton, "General Custer in Hollywood," 251.
[75] Dippie, 112.
[76] Donald Kaufmann, "The Indian as Media Hand-Me-Down," in *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies,* eds. Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L. P. Silet (Ames: Iowa State University, 1980), 33.
[77] Friar and Friar, *The Only Good Indian,* 275.

that happened only once … they never show how whites massacred the Indians."[78] *Custer* did not find an audience, and lasted only one season. The next major attempt to portray the general would indeed depict what August Little Soldier felt was lacking, a portrayal of whites massacring the Indians.

Little Big Man (1970)

Author Jerome A. Greene recognizes the affect that both *They Died with Their Boots On* and *Little Big Man* had on the continued popularity of Custer and the Battle of Little Bighorn. In the 1940s, the general was still very popular, however, by the 1970s, his imaged changed partially because *Little Big Man* "depicted a "brutal side to the Indian wars" that most Americans had not conceptualized.[79] Due in part to radically changing viewpoints occurring in society, Custer transformed into a villain, in glaring contrast to prior portrayals.

Similar to *They Died with Their Boots On, Little Big Man*'s author had a particular political statement in mind for his interpretation. At the time, the United States was entrenched in the Vietnam War, and at home, the American Indian Movement (AIM) was in full swing. The social activism prevalent in the U.S. bled into cultural depictions. Angered by the United States' continued involvement in Vietnam, director Arthur Penn and writer Calder Willingham used Custer as a metaphor. Initially the film had trouble even getting financial backing. Many film studios refused to green light the film because it attacked white heroism during a war.[80] A perceived lack of patriotism, no matter how unpopular the war was, could have resulted in a loss of revenue. Undeterred, Penn did receive financing through Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), and he produced his negative image of Custer.

Custer's atrocities against the Indians reflected the United States' horrible military slaughter of the Vietnamese. Penn commented that Vietnam was a hopeless endeavor and Custer offered a perfect metaphor for an egotistic, steadfast refusal to exit a hopeless situation.[81] The disparity in tone of the two films is best expressed in what was included in *Little Big Man*: the Battle of Washita. While *They Died with Their Boots On* went to great lengths to glorify Custer and edit out his atrocities, Penn's film made

---

[78] Quoted in Ibid., 276
[79] Jerome A. Greene, *Stricken Field: The Little Bighorn since 1876* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008), 78 and 173.
[80] Aleiss, *Making the White Man's Indian*, 124.
[81] Hutton, "General Custer in Hollywood," 259.

Washita a centerpiece. Sequences depicting the battle weave "graphic violence … horror … and death" together as a parable to the shocking accounts surfacing of My Lai and Army Lt. William Calley Jr.: a twentieth-century repeat of Washita.[82]

Believing the Hollywood portrayal of Indians to be "pure, naked racism," director Arthur Penn was determined to give a Native American perspective.[83] Protagonist Jack Crabb (Dustin Hoffman) does lead Custer (Richard Mulligan) to his doom at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. Mulligan portrays Custer completely opposite of the stereotype. The audience of *Little Big Man* would have staunchly supported his demise. The culminating scene prior to the depiction of the Last Stand summarizes Custer's character and alludes to his imminent destiny. Custer, believing Crabb (a man that he rightly knows despises him) is trying to deceive him, begins what can only be described as an egotistical exercise in faulty logic. Assuming Crabb will tell him nothing but lies and function as a "perfect reverse barometer," he engages Crabb in a comically confusing (to the audience), game of "I know you know that I know that you know that I know." What Custer does not realize, or chooses to ignore, is that Crabb is also playing this game. Knowing that Custer will not believe a word he says, Crabb reveals the truth to him that "there are "thousands of Indians down there" waiting for him. Custer disregards these prudent warning and charges into the valley. Crabb and the audience share the smug satisfaction of watching him travel to his death. Tired of Custer's maliciousness and ego, the viewer enthusiastically cheers this outcome.

Portrayed as a personification of ignorance and evil, this Custer loses the audience's sympathy, reflecting the anti-imperialism movement prevalent upon the film's release. In the era of the Vietnam War, Americans began to realize that their heroes needed reexamining. Instead of the "intrinsic nobility" that Custer had in every film up to the late 1940s, he is now a vulgar "egotistical psychopath."[84] *Little Big Man* serves as the essential reexamination of Custer's image in film, and is an example of the general impression that most people today have of the Boy General.[85]

While Custer receives a harsher treatment in *Little Big Man,* the

---

[82] Peter C. Rollins, and John E. O'Connor, eds., *Hollywood's Indian: The Portrayal of the Native American in Film* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1998), 130.

[83] Aleiss, 124.

[84] Churchill, 188.

[85] Leckie, 309.

Native Americans, predominantly the Cheyenne, receive realistic portrayals as real humane human beings. This refreshing change received praise from many critics. In the May, 1971 issue of *Akweasne Notes*, *Little Big Man* received one tomahawk, denoting a "fair to good" response among the viewers in an informal poll on Indians' "Hollywood image."[86] Native author James Welch remembers watching the film "with awe," amazed that the Sioux and Cheyenne were portrayed as human beings that made love … had strong family and tribal ties … worked for a living and lived well within their environment."[87] Vine Deloria, Jr. stated the film gave "a good idea of the intangible sense of reality that pervades the Indian people," especially their outlook on life.[88] The film also employed Native Americans to portray extras and main cast members, eschewing the long standard practice of casting anybody but Indians in film as themselves. For his portrayal of Old Lodge Skins, Chief Dan George received an Oscar nomination.[89] Despite the significant role, Vine Deloria Jr. feels that Old Lodge Skins is a problematic character. Deloria wanted an angrier reaction. In *Little Big Man*, Old Lodge Skins experiences much hardship because of Custer and other whites and presents Hollywood's stereotypical Indian attitude towards hardship – believing that all things serve a purpose – diminishing the importance of the role.

Notwithstanding a considerable effort to include Native Americans in the film, *Little Big Man* remains flawed in the eyes of some critics for its continued use of an old ploy: using the comfortable clichéd plot device of a white man "out Indianing" the Indians. In trying to represent Crabb's Indian indoctrination, the film shows a series of scenes about Jack learning to shoot a bow and arrow, hunt buffalo, and follow trails. However, these skills are only "the outward manifestations of Indian life" and contribute to the stereotype of Native Americans in film.[90]

---

[86] Quoted in Friar and Friar, *The Only Good Indian*, 266.

[87] James Welch and Paul Stekler, *Killing Custer* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1994), 96.

[88] Vine Deloria, Jr, *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), 16.

[89] This was the first Oscar nomination for a Native American actor but not the first for a Native American role. Jeff Chandler's portrayal of Cochise, in *Broken Arrow* (1950) earned him a nomination. To date, no Native American actor has won an Academy Award, and the last to be nominated, Graham Greene, received his nomination for *Dances with Wolves* in 1990.

[90] John W. Turner, "*Little Big Man*: The Novel and the Film," in *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies,* eds. Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L. P. Silet (Ames: Iowa State University, 1980), 158.

Jack Crabb is a successor to a long line of whites who are better at being an Indian than the actual Indians. In Crabb's case, this serves as a plot tool to allow him to live in both the Native American world and his white world. This serves the purpose of making his character understandable to an audience that does not want to think too hard while watching the film. Certainly not the first time this characterization is used, and not the last, it has never been popular with Native Americans. Since the release of *Little Big Man,* Hollywood has attempted to portray a progressive attitude in its depictions of Native Americans; however, they have failed miserably. There have been many attempts to portray Indians in a more realistic manner. Two of the more interesting examples are *Dances With Wolves* (1990), and the CBS television series, *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman.* While Custer appears in only one of these, each demonstrates the difficulty in portraying Native American culture without relying on the presence of white characters.

Dances With Wolves

This theme found use in perhaps the best film depiction of Native Americans, Kevin Costner's Academy Award winning *Dances With Wolves* (1990). The release of the film ushered in a new age of westerns. Like *A Man Named Horse* (1970), *Dances with Wolves* made heavy use of the Sioux language. Costner's masterpiece endeavored to be culturally accurate. Screenwriter Michael Blake, whose novel served as the inspiration for the film, was sensitive to the portrayal of Native Americans. Blake received praise from *Lakota Times* editor Tim Giago, who proclaimed that *Dances With Wolves* "could be one of the finest films ever done on Native Americans."[91] Praise was incredibly high for the film. One native critic, Gemma Lockart, was impressed with the real portrayal of Indians in cinema. Similar to *Little Big Man,* the film depicts the Sioux "laughing, speaking, listening, and loving" and "portrayed as thinking and compassionate people."[92] Opinion of the film was positive. It was a film about the Lakota, however it was also about a journey of one white man through their land.

John Dunbar (Kevin Costner) is the central character. While the film depicts the Sioux with generosity and care, the centerpiece of the story is Dunbar. It is only through Dunbar that the film viewer gains insight into the Lakota culture portrayed in the film. The film is admirable in its use of

---

[91] Tim Giago, Mary Cook, and Gemma Lockhart, "They've Gotten It Right This Time," *Native Peoples* 4, no. 2, (1991), 7.

[92] Ibid., 11.

the native language, but fails ultimately because it repeats the stereotypes seen in previous movies. The film industry has been and will continue to remain an industry that requires profit. A film with no White-Indian interaction, a Native American *Quest for Fire,* solely containing Native American characters, is rare.[93] Stories that should prominently feature the Native American side of the story fall victim for Hollywood's need to put a white face in the film. Films about the Battle of the Little Bighorn remain a prime example. There has not been a serious depiction of this event from the narrative side of the Sioux, Cheyenne, or Araphao. Media that has attempted to address this issue undoubtedly fall back to the comfortable clutch of including whites. It would take a tremendously strong willed director with considerable influence to devote a film entirely to Native Americans. Costner tried his best in *Dances with Wolves*, but even with all its success, the film still cuts from the same century-old fabric that depicts Native Americans as supporting characters. These trends continued into the 1990s with the very popular drama, *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman.*

Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman

Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman is not a show about Indians and never intended to be. However, over the course of six seasons, Indians became an important plot device for the writers, and the show fell into what Ward Churchill refers to as a variation of the "Good Indian theme."[94] Like many other depictions, Indians are prop pieces and relegated to the background. The show unfortunately falls into the same clutch of having a white man out-Indian the Indians in the persona of the male protagonist, Sully (Joe Lando). A carbon likeness of Natty Bumppo and John Dunbar, he is longhaired and rugged, knows Indian culture, and is empathetic towards the pain that they feel throughout the show. While Native Americans are present in the series through a mostly ambiguous Cheyenne village and several heavily recurring Cheyenne protagonists, Sully's character allows the real Indians to "be pushed into the background."[95] The titular character, Dr. Quinn (Jane Seymour), also unexpectedly out-Indians the Indians. Frequently used in

---

[93] *Quest For Fire* (1981) follows a group of "cavemen" in their "quest of fire." The film has very little dialogue other than a combination of verbal grunts and body language. The plot focuses a group of "cavemen" and their interactions with competing groups of "caveman." The use of a non-English language and narrow focus of these characters creates a certain authenticity.
[94] Churchill, 182.
[95] Ibid., 186.

plots in the show are scenes in which the "Medicine Woman," teaches Indian healer Cloud Dancing (Larry Sellers), the main Native American character in the show, her western medical secrets.

Through Cloud Dancing's character, the audience sees the hardships that Native Americans had to endure because of unsympathetic policies perpetuated by the intolerant whites. It is in this vein that the series writers accurately interject Custer into the fictional world of the show as a frequent guest character when the plot requires a white villain to counter-balance the altruistic Dr. Quinn and Sully. A prominent example proceeds in the first season episode, *The Prisoner*, which opens with Custer leading an attack on the Cheyenne village where he yells out "Let's send some Indians to hell!"[96]

In the third season episode, *Washita,* Custer again visits the show.[97] This time the backdrop is the Battle of Washita.[98] The episode depicts the Cheyenne as noble warriors desperately trying to protect their land, and Custer as an arrogant soldier celebrity. Most of the town's people are star-struck by his persona, and excuse his slaughter of peaceful Indians. The lone objectors to any brainwashing are Dr. Quinn and Sully, who desperately try to avert history. Custer, immune to the charms of the fictional Dr. Quinn, states that the "United States does not wage war on the Indian, but if they refuse to abide by our treaties they must suffer the consequences." Echoing the words of his commanding officer, Custer cries out "the only good Indian is a dead Indian." Tragic history unfolds later in the episode. Custer massacres Black Kettle and the Cheyenne at Washita, and Sully, representative of the white conscience, apologizes to Cloud Dancing "for everything my people are doing to yours." In typical Hollywood Indian stoicism, Cloud Dancing forgives, stating "anger is good, but hate is not." Native writer Ward Churchill assesses that Sully's and Dr. Quinn's progressive attitude is a whitewashing that attempts to relieve white guilt, as every episode of the show is "salted with comparable gestures of absolution and forgiveness from victim to victimizer."[99] Custer's characterization in *Dr. Quinn*, while not as insane as the Custer of *Little Big Man*, does find

---

[96] *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman*, "The Prisoner," episode 12, (originally aired March 13, 1993). [Season 1 DVD Disc 3.]

[97] *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman*, "Washita," episode 70-71 (originally aired April 29, 1995), [Season 3 DVD Disc 7.]

[98] The Battle of Washita River, in *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman* occurred in 1869, while the historic event occurred in Fall, 1868.

[99] Churchill, 185.

inspiration from Richard Mulligan's portrayal, playing upon the archetypal white militarist depiction associated with the role. In the visual media, the general is an arrogant war-mongering cavalier that the audience can feel good about not liking, and to elicit guilt, the Indians find themselves again used as cinematic set pieces.

Conclusion

Steeped in romanticism, the lasting appeal of Custer and the Battle of the Little Bighorn continues to be felt in numerous ways. In the academic arena, Custer and the Little Bighorn have become outdated relics. However, this does not detract from the subject's popularity. More than Valley Forge, Gettysburg, and D-Day, Custer and the Little Bighorn remain romantic subjects for writers to explore, despite being comparably less significant to the overall fabric of American history. Try as modern historians might, these subjects will not go away. Because we love our tragic heroes, author Evan S. Connell writes, Custer "will be remembered as long as the nation lasts."[100]

Custer certainly did commit atrocities, but to prejudge him as a villain is to wrap history into too nice of a package in which everything is appropriately evil or good. To do this also diminishes the useful purpose he serves for history. That purpose is a continued examination of historical events under critical evaluation. Custer might not serve the same purpose that he did for children in the 1940s and 1950s who became captivated with Flynn's Custer or Quinn's Crazy Horse. Welch writes that he "can't think of a hero who has taught kids more about dying in mock battles" than Custer.[101] While the lesson that Welch learned has lost its value, Custer still does have valuable lessons to teach. The two dynamic portrayals of Custer, represented by the glowing, magnanimous, and selfless Errol Flynn, and the egomaniacal, insane Richard Mulligan, demonstrate that Custer is always at the center of the story. Presently he is vilified, and while there is merit to this vilification, it preoccupies too much of the story of the Little Bighorn. Historians should strive to depict Custer with more balance, giving fair analysis to both his faults and achievements. This might allow a more realistic portrayal void of distortion or extremes – a Custer presented with his numerous historical flaws, and not the glowing hero of *They Died with Their Boots On* or the maniacal psychopath from *Little Big Man*.

---

[100] Connell, 356.
[101] Welch and Stekler, *Killing Custer*, 96.

Bibliography

Aleiss, Angela. *Making the White Man's Indian: Native Americans and Hollywood Movies.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005.

Ambrose, Steven E. *Crazy Horse and Custer: The Parallel Lives of Two American Warriors*. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Churchill, Ward. *Fantasies of the Master Race: Literature, Cinema and the Colonization of American Indians*. San Francisco: City Light Books, 1998.

Connell, Evan S. *Son of the Morning Star.* San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.

Dippie, Brian W. *Custer's Last Stand: The Anatomy of An American Myth.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

Donovan, James Donovan. *A Terrible Glory: Custer and the Little Bighorn, The Last great Battle of the American West.* New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2008.

Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman, Central Broadcasting Systems, USA. [Aired from January 1, 1993 to May 16, 1998.]

Friar, Ralph E. *The Only Good Indian ...* The Hollywood Gospel. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1992.

Friar, Ralph E., and Natasha A. Friar. "White Man Speaks with Split Tongue, Forked Tongue, Tongue of Snake." In *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies,* edited by Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L. P. Silet, 97-97. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1980.

Giago, Tim, Mary Cook, and Gemma Lockhart. "They've Gotten It Right This Time." *Native Peoples* 4, no. 2 (1991).

Greene, Jerome A. *Stricken Field: The Little Bighorn since 1876*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008.

Gump, James O. *The Dust Rose Like Smoke: The Subjugation of the Zulu and the Sioux*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

Hardorff, Richard G. ed., *Washita Memories: Eyewitness Views of Custer's Attack on Black Kettle's Village*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.

Hutton, Paul Andrew, ed. *The Custer Reader.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.

———. "'Correct in Every Detail': General Custer in Hollywood." In *Legacy: New Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn,* edited by Charles E. Rankin, 231-270. Helena: Montana Historical Society Press, 1996.

———. "From Little Bighorn to Little Big Man: The Changing Image of a Western Hero in Popular Culture." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (January, 1976): 19-45.

Kaufmann, Donald. "The Indian as Media Hand-Me-Down." In *The Pretend Indians: Images*

of Native Americans in the Movies, edited by Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L. P. Silet, 22-35. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1980.

Kraft, Louis. "Custer, The Little Bighorn and History." *American History*, June 2006.

Lane, Harrison. "Custer's Massacre: How the News First Reached the Outer World." *The Montana Magazine of History* 3, no. 3 (Summer, 1953): 46-53.

Leckie, Shirley A. *Elizabeth Bacon Custer and the Making of a Myth.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.

Little Big Man, directed by Arthur Penn, Cinema Center Films, 1971. [DVD released by Paramount, April 29, 2003]

Michno, Gregory. "How Big Was That Village?: Custer Loses in a Fair Fight," *Journal of the West* 35, no. 1 (1996): 59-69.

Philbrick, Nathaniel. *The Last Stand: Custer, Sitting Bull, and The Battle of The Little Bighorn.* New York: Viking Press, 2010.

Rollins, Peter C., and John E. O'Connor, eds. *Hollywood's Indian: The Portrayal of the Native American in Film.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1998.

Rosenberg, Bruce A. "Custer: The Legend of the Martyred Hero in America." *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 9, no. 2/3 (August – December, 1972): 111-132.

Sklenar, Larry. *To Hell with Honor: Custer and the Little Bighorn.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.

Stedman, Raymond William. *Shadows of the Indians: Stereotypes in American Culture.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982.

Stekler, Paul. "Custer and Crazy Horse Ride Again … and Again, and Again: Filmmaking and History at Little Bighorn." *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 42, no. 4 (Autumn, 1992): 63-72.

Stewart, Edgar I. *Custer's Luck.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1955.

They Died with Their Boots On, directed by Raoul Walsh, Warner Brothers, 1941. [DVD released by Warner Home Video, April 19, 2005]

Turner, John W. "*Little Big Man:* The Novel and the Film." In *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies,* edited by Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L. P. Silet, 156-165. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1980.

Utley, Robert M. *Cavalier in Buckskin: George Armstrong Custer and the Western Military Frontier.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.

———. *Custer and the Great Controversy: The Origin and Development of a Legend.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Welch, James and Paul Stekler. *Killing Custer.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1994.

Image of the Instituto Indigenista Interamericano logo. This emblem, created by an *indigenista* organization established by the Mexican government in 1940 to "solve the Indian problem," depicts representations of Mexico's indigenous population. The logo can be found on the official Mexican government website of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples Development, located at http://www.cdi.gob.mx/difusion/19abril/logo_iii.jpg.

INDIGENISMO IN LATIN AMERICA: OVERLOOKING THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM | Brooke Silveria

During the twentieth century, especially from the 1920s to the 1970s, a political, cultural, and economic movement arose in Latin America as a response to the "problem" of what should be done with the indigenous groups dispersed throughout the region. This movement, called *indigenismo*, appeared on the agendas of various countries' governments with the largely incongruous goal of celebrating indigenous peoples and their cultures while also working to modernize them through assimilation and "improvement" strategies. Those who took up the task were dubbed indigenistas, and their efforts, while based on a central Pan-American schema, were comprised of an amalgam of different strategies, goals, and ideologies, and had varying degrees of success. In general, the indigenistas aimed to bring about the assimilation of indigenous groups into a more urban mestizo lifestyle, the preservation and study of their historic cultural practices, and the improvement of their living conditions, mostly in the hopes of modernizing each country's economy, creating a unified national identity, and thus enhancing their image among other nations. In various countries such as Ecuador, Peru, Mexico, Colombia, and Guatemala indigenistas managed to make improvements within individual indigenous groups in the development of health, education, cultural study, and other areas. Despite good intentions, however, the indigenistas' objectives were largely unattained due to a crucial shift in policy early on in the course of indigenismo that created a "scientific" and "apolitical" framework, which, when combined with other problematic factors, was ill-suited to bringing about a drastic transformation in the lives of the indigenous population.

Mexico's Pátzcuaro Congress of 1940 laid out the overarching mission of indigenismo for the whole of Latin America, formally establishing the Instituto Indigenista Interamericano (III) as an intergovernmental organization charged with solving the "Indian problem."[1] Moisés Sáenz, though previously subscribing to a more moderate approach to indigenismo involving gradual assimilation of

---

[1] Laura Giraudo, "Neither "Scientific" nor "Colonialist": The Ambiguous Course of Inter-American Indigenismo in the 1940s," *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 14.

native groups, became director of the III with radical solutions in mind in the form of politically combative measures and socioeconomic reform.[2] He believed that the III could and should be a tool with which to take action to support indigenous rights and welfare with policies that influenced each nation directly and were relevant to their individual circumstances. Upon Sáenz's death in 1941, however, Manuel Gamio assumed control of the III, and his own goals for the organization came to prevail among its members.[3] Drawing from the current fervor for anthropology and other social sciences, Gamio proposed a more scholarly purpose for indigenismo removed from politics and emphasizing scientific inquiry as well as the modernization of the indigenous peoples' own cultural practices rather than the social makeup of Latin America. This, he believed, would allow the III to maintain state support by avoiding outside interference in each nation's affairs and thus controversy.

Every country in attendance at the conference created its own institute to manage indigenous affairs, resulting in the foundation of the Instituto Nacional Indigenista (INI) of Mexico and its counterparts throughout Central and South America over a span of several years.[4] Though each institute shared this point of origin, many of their paths diverged when it came time to put indigenista policy into practice. Each nation's social structure and hierarchy, as well as its governmental interest and ability to invest in the proposed projects, influenced the implementation of their various programs. Preconceived and commonly held views about indigenous people were also of great influence, and like Gamio's beliefs, were themselves largely defined by a growing interest in the new fields of anthropology and ethnology, and a wave of nationalistic zeal. Furthermore, some important political figures subscribed to Sáenz's more revolutionary vision of indigenismo, while others embraced Gamio's anthropologically based model, and this dichotomy, when compounded by the previous factors, caused a multitude of trajectories to emerge.

---

[2] Laura Giraudo and Stephen E. Lewis, "Pan-American Indigenismo (1940-1970): New Approaches to an Ongoing Debate," *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 4.

[3] Giraudo, "Neither "Scientific" nor "Colonialist," 14.

[4] Marc Becker, "The Limits of Indigenismo in Ecuador," *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 49.

The perception of native groups by elites and the general population alike in each country played a large role in the direction of the indigenistas' undertakings. In Ecuador, for example, the consensus among the indigenistas was that it was "the responsibility of the dominant classes to save Indians from their laziness, alcoholism, criminal behavior, and antagonism to Western education and medicine" by bringing them into modernity and civility.[5] Though they held the native groups in low regard, indigenistas also believed the indigenous could be integral to Ecuador's economy if they just made a few lifestyle changes. These views led to a top-down, paternalistic and superficial approach to indigenismo, which included using education as a means of emphasizing white-mestizo norms as well as making symbolic gestures such as venerating historic native culture in museums rather than addressing their current realities.[6]

Similarly, efforts in Guatemala fixated around curbing the "backward" practices of the indigenous population. Because native Guatemalans constituted over half of the population throughout the early 1900s, many recognized that they had the potential to be economically, industrially, and politically influential, but their cultural practices were believed to be the cause of their continual subordination and ineptitude.[7] The political elites directed their contempt especially at the ritual and social consumption of alcohol, as they considered it one of the biggest roadblocks to national economic development.[8] For these reasons, indigenistas based their efforts in Guatemala on the integration of the indigenous into the dominant *ladino*, or non-indigenous, culture through state established institutions, as well as the suppression of behaviors that they considered uncivilized.[9]

In Colombia, indigenous groups were ushered into the national spotlight in the 1920s and 1930s when industrialization and expansion into previously ignored rural lands brought them to the forefront of the minds of

---

[5] Ibid., 52.

[6] Ibid., 53.

[7] Alejandro Dagoberto Marroquín, *Balance Del Indigenismo: Informe Sobre La Política Indigenista En América* (México: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, 1972), 119; and Leslie M. Dow, Jr., "Ethnic Policy and Indigenismo in Guatemala," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 5, no. 2 (April 1982): 142.

[8] Virginia Garrard-Burnett, "Indians Are Drunks and Drunks Are Indians: Alcohol and Indigenismo in Guatemala, 1890-1940," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 19, no. 3 (July 2000): 344.

[9] Dow, 142.

the political class.[10] Furthermore, around this time, Colombia's increasing economic dependence on the United States led to a collective desire to distance themselves and cultivate a unique national identity. Upon observing the examples of Mexico and Peru, each of which had a complex and powerful indigenous history and culture to draw from when constructing their own identities, Colombian elites felt inadequate and insecure about their supposed dearth of native culture and "a glorious pre-Columbian past."[11] In response to such anxiety, Colombian indigenistas set out to improve the image of the indigenous, mostly through art, literature, and archaeological and anthropological research, and to foster a cultural revival through the preservation of communal lands, or *resguardos*, which they determined to be essential to indigenous ethnic identity.[12]

Government interest and participation was also a factor in indigenista policy implementation. The Instituto Indigenista Ecuatoriano (IIE) was only a quasi-governmental organization that received little concern and funding from the state, and it often relied on its own resources.[13] This prevented the implementation of extensive programs. Peru did not experience a lack of governmental interest and funding, but, like Ecuador, it still had modest programs in the form of education and cultural study that did little more than to superficially address the "indigenous problem."[14] Mexico, for its part, was originally able and willing to fund elaborate indigenista programs in education, health, hygiene, and economic development, but these only functioned until decreasing budgets led to loss of morale, effectiveness, and state support.[15] In Guatemala, though it supported other programs, the state had little incentive to back indigenista efforts to combat alcoholism as they received large amounts of revenue from liquor taxes, resulting in an impediment to indigenista policy on the issue.[16] The rise of the Liberal Party in Colombia in the 1930s after a long conservative reign brought

---

[10] Brett Troyan, "Re-imagining the "Indian" and the State: Indigenismo in Colombia, 1926-1947," *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 33, no. 65 (2008): 91.

[11] Ibid., 94.

[12] Ibid., 99.

[13] Becker, 50.

[14] Osmar Gonzales, "The Instituto Indigenista Peruano: A New Place in the State for the Indigenous Debate," *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 41.

[15] Stephen E. Lewis, "Indigenista Dreams Meet Sober Realities: The Slow Demise of Federal Indian Policy in Chiapas, Mexico, 1951-1970," *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 64.

[16] Garrard-Burnett, 350.

about a renewed enthusiasm for solving past issues, including rural land reform.[17] The government was eager to improve its national image and increase solidarity with other Latin American countries and thus was supportive of indigenistas' efforts to strengthen indigenous culture through preservation of communal land.   Further, their newfound economic development and prosperity meant that Colombia was in a prime position to finance indigenista projects.[18]

   Whether the political elites of a nation fell into the camp of Gamio or Sáenz further determined the reach of the indigenous institutes' policies. For example, the director of the Instituto Indigenista Peruano (IIP), Luis Valcárcel, while formerly supporting a revolutionary overthrow by Andean indigenous groups of imperial oppression, completely changed his ideology in the 1940s to fall in line with Gamio's gradualist, detached, and scientifically based indigenista strategy.[19] As a result, this view dominated Peru's policies, causing indigenismo there to become more of a "school of thought" concerned with research and rationalism rather than taking action and effecting actual and widespread change.[20]   In contrast, Antonio García Nossa, a prominent figure in Colombian indigenismo, believed, as did Sáenz, that it was the duty of indigenistas to influence social and economic transformation through activism.[21] He himself used the indigenous identity linked to communal land ownership established by indigenistas to foment agrarian reform, and he actively assisted in organizing native Colombians, which set the tone and standard for future endeavors and may explain why indigenista policy in the country was more effective in contributing to a greater change in indigenous welfare.[22]

   The indigenista policies of Ecuador, Peru, Mexico, Guatemala, and Colombia had various levels of success in certain areas. In Ecuador, the IIE's moderate projects undertaken with a limited budget did not have much of a lasting effect on the indigenous groups in the region. The legacy of the indigenistas' scholarly pursuits, however, was a valid achievement.   Ecuador's policy of promoting indigenous peoples'

---

[17] Troyan, 90.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Gonzales, 39.
[20] Ibid., 41.
[21] Troyan, 97.
[22] Ibid.

historic cultural accomplishments through museums and ethnological reports meant ignoring their current situations, creating a duality where past individuals were revered and descendants were denigrated, and denying the ability of their culture to change over time. However, it did lead to a significant increase in knowledge about various native groups in the country, which is still evident today. Indigenistas of the IIE published many books as well as several academic journals containing scientific studies on the subject.[23]

The institute in Peru also greatly contributed to academic understanding regarding their own indigenous populations that has remained relevant to the present day, despite its lackluster performance when attempting to enact change in indigenous life. For example, the institute created and adopted alphabets for the native languages of Quechua and Aymara, conducted and published scientific studies, and established cultural museums. Further, the IIP was able to recognize and legitimize Peru's Incan past and to "[make] indigenous presence visible on a national level."[24]

In contrast, the methods employed by the INI of Mexico and its pilot institution, the Centro Coordinador Indigenista Tzeltal-Tzotzil (CCI) in Chiapas, were quite successful during the implementation period, in that they managed to attain indigenous participation in their programs, though they were less successful in the long term once their stability was compromised. For example, the INI's attempts to introduce formal education to Chiapas involved the use of "bilingual cultural promoters," who were indigenous men, and sometimes women, trained to teach reading and writing to their communities, as well as other topics like hygiene, agriculture, and Western medicine.[25] These promoters also persuaded community members to cooperate with the INI's various projects. The use of the promoters was a highly effective strategy and it led to an education program in the 1950s that was "firmly rooted."[26]

Furthermore, though the INI's medical centers were largely a failure due to mistrust and a clash with indigenous beliefs, the later preventative medicine campaign fared better, despite the questionable use of DDT to eliminate typhus. This was primarily due to the puppet

---

[23] Becker, 54.
[24] Gonzales, 39.
[25] Lewis, "Indigenista Dreams," 65-66.
[26] Ibid., 66.

shows the indigenistas created to promote the acceptance of vaccinations as well as other objectives.[27] The indigenistas also succeeded at various points in protecting the indigenous from those who wished to exploit them, including an illegal alcohol monopoly whose owners terrorized the native population.[28] These accomplishments were short-lived, however, as decreasing budgets led to an inability to pay workers and keep projects going, and indigenistas and natives alike lost faith in the program.

Guatemala achieved some measure of success in its endeavors as well. Like Mexico, Guatemala's indigenous institute managed to decrease some of the exploitation that was rampant in the *fincas,* or plantations, by banning *cantinas* that sold copious amounts of alcohol to indigenous workers and kept them in debt bondage.[29] In several communities, the institute established laws to protect the indigenous textile industry and to legitimize marriages performed through native rituals.[30] Guatemalan indigenistas also assisted in academic pursuits by conducting various studies of different aspects of indigenous culture and producing alphabets of native languages.[31] Such accomplishments were scarce, however, as employee salaries, office expenses, and "practical tasks" stretched the institute's already limited funds, leaving little to any actual indigenista projects.[32]

As for the case of Colombia, Brett Troyan argues that indigenistas laid the groundwork for the later success of the modern day indigenous movement in the country by forging for them an identity closely intertwined with the concept of communal landholding, so much so that the two were thought to be inseparable.[33] Many claimed that indigenous religion, language, and other customs had largely disappeared, and that an innate attachment to their ancestral land was the only remnant of indigenous culture.[34] Some considered this belief racist and harmful, as it disregarded the humanity of the indigenous and painted them as irrational and pathetic beings irrevocably dependent on unproductive tracts of land. Yet it simultaneously benefited them by

---

[27] Ibid., 68.
[28] Ibid., 69.
[29] Garrard-Burnett, 354.
[30] Marroquín, 133.
[31] Ibid., 132.
[32] Ibid., 134.
[33] Troyan, 101.
[34] Ibid., 100.

justifying the preservation of such lands in the eyes of those in power. The Columbian state possessed nationalistic motives and was concerned about the perceived lack of indigenous culture within its borders that it could use to bolster the "authenticity" it craved. Thus, the creation of an indigenous identity connected to the *resguardo* ensured that it would recognize the legitimacy of communal land laws in order to foster native culture.[35] This was a decided improvement over past attempts to deny the labeling of the indigenous as an ethnic group and to break up communal land in favor of individual titles.[36]

Yet Colombia's indigenista work, which eventually influenced political change and left 600,000 indigenous people, or two percent of the population, with control of twenty-five percent of national land and a means of bargaining with the state, was an exception to the rule. Despite minor achievements elsewhere in the advancement of individual well-being, indigenismo throughout Latin America ultimately failed to generate any major alteration of the lives of indigenous people as a whole.[37] Several factors explain this downfall of indigenista ambition. Firstly, most programs were highly paternalistic and "top-down," promoting policies without insight into the indigenous populations' current situations, and indigenous participation and leadership was notably missing from the institutes that featured their namesake. Even in Colombia, which eventually achieved some measure of indigenous voice due in part to indigenista policy, indigenistas often failed to recognize and appreciate the humanity of the indigenous populations they served. Further, many institutes experienced lack of funding and support that limited their aspirations. They also were often unclear as to their roles within state governments, especially whether they had any actual authority or merely served as advisers, which contributed to a certain measure of paralysis.[38]

What had the greatest impact on the fate of indigenismo, however, was the prevention of many countries from making real progress towards indigenous prosperity by Gamio's gradualist and scientific III, which supplanted the radical action required to address the structural composition of the societies themselves and mitigate how they

---

[35] Ibid., 100-101.
[36] Ibid., 88.
[37] Ibid., 84.
[38] Marroquín, 144-147.

marginalized indigenous groups and blocked their development. In each of the four countries besides Colombia, indigenous institutes were either unwilling or unable to undertake such actions.

In Ecuador, indigenistas were urban white and mestizo men who refused to seek input from indigenous communities themselves, whom they felt were "disrupting national unity and halting the country's economic development."[39] They hoped to integrate the indigenous through paternalistic policies, but they did not recognize them as a capable group deserving of justice, liberation, empowerment, and sovereignty. The indigenistas had a great deal of influence among governmental figures and most likely could have brought about drastic changes to the social system, but, following the "apolitical" indigenismo of the III, they were unwilling to "rock the boat" and pressure the state to address inequalities. Because of this, radical Marxist groups that welcomed indigenous men and women into positions of power, such as the Federación Ecuatoriana de Indios (FEI), rose up to demand native rights and proved to be much more successful than the IIE.[40]

Indigenistas in Peru under the tamed Valcárcel also avoided taking radical actions and instead opted for a more moderate policy of assimilation that did not endanger the current social system. However, rather than being at odds with leftist groups, the IIP somehow managed to subsume them, and Peru's common goal became gradual indigenous integration and "orderly development."[41] Indigenistas forgot previous calls for land reform and a more equal power distribution, and all that remained was the IIP's non-threatening legislation and scientific study, which generally ignored the true realities and problems with which the indigenous grappled. For example, the Cornell-Peru Project of the 1950s, located in the village of Vicos, concentrated its research of the local indigenous in a controlled "laboratory" type setting in order to determine indigenista policy and the best way to go about integration.[42] However, this strategy treated natives as specimens and experiments, and it was detached from and ignorant of the political context in which they

---

[39] Becker, 59.
[40] Ibid., 56.
[41] Gonzales, 41.
[42] Jason Pribilsky, "Development and the "Indian Problem" in the Cold War Andes: *Indigenismo*, Science, and Modernization in the Making of the Cornell-Peru Project at Vicos," *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 3 (June 2009): 421.

actually lived. For this reason, major positive changes to the indigenous population's situation did not result.

Despite the higher levels of success accomplished by Mexico in improving the well-being of some indigenous on an individual level, it too was unable to effect the kind of broad-based change necessary to truly advance the indigenous peoples' status, economic opportunity, and quality of life on a wider scale. For example, many of the INI's programs contributed to high levels of literacy, better health and hygiene, and other benefits for various indigenous communities. However, the indigenistas did not address the systemically based inequalities that negatively affected the indigenous population as a whole, and thus once the programs unraveled, there was not much lasting effect on their general situation. As another example, structural agrarian reform, which was arguably one of the biggest factors that could have transformed native life, was inaccessible to the indigenistas because they did not have the resources to avoid the "huge, slow, often corrupt bureaucracy" that controlled the process.[43] Further, as Fernando Benítez charged in a meeting of the INI in 1971, indigenistas did not address the unequal land distribution in Mexico and merely provided temporary fixes such as providing agricultural technologies. As a result, *latifundistas*, or large-scale landowners, and *caciques*, or powerful political bosses, were easily able to maintain control of economic and political authority.[44] This led to the extreme exploitation of the indigenous in the region and a worsening of their poverty and subordination. Though the indigenistas of Mexico did provide modest assistance to individuals, it was merely more of a topical remedy without the radical change that would have challenged the underlying problem of structural inequity at its source.

In Guatemala, where indigenistas focused mainly on the "indigenous alcohol problem" throughout the 1940s, any improvement came at the price of fierce discrimination and blame of the native population's problems on their own behaviors. Indigenistas hoped to end the proliferation of alcoholism, which was rampant among both indigenous people and *ladinos*, by pushing the state to more strictly enforce existing laws and intervene in other ways. However, these

---

[43] Lewis, "Indigenista Dreams," 72.
[44] Instituto Nacional Indigenista, *Ha Fracasado El Indigenismo? Reportaje De Una Controversia (13 De Septiembre De 1971)* (México: Secretaría De Educacíon Pública, 1971), 66.

efforts obviously targeted the lower class indigenous, as crackdowns on home-brewing and increased arrests and convictions for alcohol related offenses only occurred in areas with high native populations, rather than nationwide, and *ladino* arrest numbers did not significantly increase.[45] Because of this, the well-being of the indigenous population did not improve, and it in fact may have suffered due to the ideology put in place that drunkenness and other evidences of "cultural backwardness" such as illiteracy and poverty were the "causes of Indian subordination, not the results."[46] In this way, the state used indigenista policies and programs to avoid societal change, which would have threatened *ladino* power and security. They were able to rest on the notion that the low social status and prosperity of the indigenous was caused by their own "Indianness" rather than the inequalities fostered by the state itself.

Overall, the indigenistas and their institutes throughout Latin America each achieved some aspect of their original goals during their operations from 1920 to 1970. They made strides in health, reduction of exploitation, literacy, education, hygiene, and academic study of native cultures. Further, their efforts represented a positive step forward in indigenous relations, especially when considering that previous regimes wished to do away with native presence altogether. The objective they failed to accomplish, however, was also their most important. They were optimistic about improving the social and economic lives of the indigenous populations within their countries' borders, but their approach was not radical enough and did not confront the deep-rooted societal inequalities that strongly oppressed the indigenous people as a whole. Though Manuel Gamio hoped to allow for the success of the III and its regional offshoots by maintaining a moderate and "scientific" indigenismo, he failed or refused to recognize that the imbalances and injustices within the political and economic systems in Latin America prevented any real change to the social order from taking place. Any modifications made within this context were thus ephemeral at best. As the projects of indigenismo fractured and dissolved by the 1970s, indigenous groups had to forge their own way in a quest for social and economic equality and autonomy that had advanced little since the turn of the century.

---

[45] Garrard-Burnett, 354.
[46] Dow, 143.

Bibliography

Becker, M. "The Limits of Indigenismo in Ecuador." *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 45-62.

Dow, Leslie M., Jr. "Ethnic Policy and Indigenismo in Guatemala." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 5, no. 2 (April 1982): 140-55.

Garrard-Burnett, Virginia. "Indians Are Drunks and Drunks Are Indians: Alcohol and Indigenismo in Guatemala, 1890-1940." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 19, no. 3 (July 2000): 341-56.

Giraudo, Laura, and Stephen E. Lewis. "Pan-American Indigenismo (1940-1970): New Approaches to an Ongoing Debate." *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 3-11.

Giraudo, Laura. "Neither "Scientific" nor "Colonialist": The Ambiguous Course of Inter-American Indigenismo in the 1940s." *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 12-32.

Gonzales, Osmar. "The Instituto Indigenista Peruano: A New Place in the State for the Indigenous Debate." *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 33-44.

Instituto Nacional Indigenista. *Ha Fracasado El Indigenismo? Reportaje De Una Controversia (13 De Septiembre De 1971)*. México: Secretaría De Educacíon Pública, 1971.

Lewis, Stephen E. "Indigenista Dreams Meet Sober Realities: The Slow Demise of Federal Indian Policy in Chiapas, Mexico, 1951-1970." *Latin American Perspectives* 39, no. 5 (September 2012): 63-79.

Marroquín, Alejandro Dagoberto. *Balance Del Indigenismo: Informe Sobre La Política Indigenista En América*. México: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, 1972.

Pribilsky, Jason. "Development and the "Indian Problem" in the Cold War Andes: *Indigenismo*, Science, and Modernization in the Making of the Cornell-Peru Project at Vicos." *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 3 (June 2009): 405-26.

Troyan, Brett. "Re-imagining the "Indian" and the State: Indigenismo in Colombia, 1926-1947." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 33, no. 65 (2008): 81-106.

Dresden, Germany, ca. September 17, 1945-December 31, 1945, by Richard Peter (1895-1977). The photograph depicts the utter destruction of the city of Dresden from the vantage point of city hall after it was firebombed by the Allied forces during WWII. Deutsche Fotothek at Saxon State Library in Dresden, Germany holds the photo.

MORAL RATIONALIZATION VERSUS MILITARY EXPEDIENCY: THE DECISION TO TARGET DRESDEN | Kenneth Knirck

There is an overwhelming tendency in war time to adjust ends to means instead, that is, to redefine initially narrow goals in order to fit the available military forces and technologies. – Yehud Melzer (Israeli philosopher)[1]

Introduction

The destruction of populated cities in Japan and Germany by the Allies for its presumed effectiveness in hurting the morale of the enemy has been the topic of much philosophical examination about the morality and proportionality of such practices. Although German bombs and rockets killed many British civilians, and the American firebombing of Tokyo killed as many as 100,000 Japanese citizens, the most often cited example of indiscriminate bombing of civilians is the firebombing of Dresden by the British and American air forces on February 13 and 14, 1945. At the time, most British and America citizens were unaware of the circumstances that surrounded this bombardment. But the 1963 book *The Destruction of Dresden* by British historian David Irving, and the inclusion of this firebombing in Kurt Vonnegut's 1969 novel *Slaughterhouse Five*, focused a great deal of attention on this incident and on the morality of intentional or unintentional civilian "collateral damage" caused by aerial bombardment. This paper will examine the moral and philosophical questions surrounding the bombing of Dresden, as well as the military and political decision making process that led to this and other incidents of intentionally bombing civilians.

By 1944, the air war over Europe had increased both quantitatively and qualitatively. Rapidly growing numbers of allied bombers had taken to the skies over Germany. The addition of long-range bombers, like the B-17, and highly capable long-range fighter escorts, like the P-51 Mustang, to the American inventory gave American aircrews the capability to mount bombing missions deeper into German airspace and attack major industrial centers that produced weaponry and support materials for the German war effort. Effective fighter escorts and technological improvements such as the Norden bombsight made it possible for American bombers to accurately target

---

[1] Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 120; and Yehuda Melzer, *Concepts of Just War*. (Leyden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1975), 170-171.

specific factories or rail junctions during daylight missions. However, the Royal Air Force did not enjoy the relative accuracy of the American daylight bombing missions. Although the American bombers were much more capable of precision bombing than their RAF counterparts, their accuracy was often compromised during night raids or daylight raids in which cloud cover obscured the bombsights. Targeting inaccuracy forced American bomber crews, and to a much greater extent, British crews, to abandon precision targeting of specific factories in favor of "area bombing" that was intended to hit a specific target but would also include hitting the civilian areas around the target. As the ground war progressed, and the air war escalated, the use of area bombing not only became more acceptable to British and American war planners, the intentional bombing of German civilians became an important facet of the Allied war strategy.[2]

Moral Rationalization

Allied war planners, such as Commanding General of the U.S. Army Air Forces Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, Commander of the 3rd Bomb Division of the U.S. Army Air Corp Curtis LeMay, and the Royal Air Force's Chief Air Marshall Sir Arthur T. Harris, easily rationalized the use of area bombing. These men, along with many of their subordinates and superiors, including Winston Churchill, fervently believed that by destroying entire cities, and the inhabitants of those cities, the war would end sooner by crippling the ability and willingness of the enemy to continue fighting. The acceptability of collateral damage in the effort to shorten the war also gave the bomber crews themselves the moral justification to carry out bombing missions that they knew were killing civilians.[3] Also buttressing the military justification for Harris, LeMay, and Arnold, was their fervent belief that "morale bombing" would be successful in undermining the German war effort. This rationale for morale bombing was an adoption by Harris and the other Allied war planners of the "Doctrine of Double Effect." Saint Thomas Aquinas first introduced this principle of justifiable killing, which posits that the act of killing a human being is acceptable if the act has the positive side effect of preventing further or additional killing. Political scientist Michael Walzer applied this concept to modern warfare and concluded that the justification for killing civilians is not absolute, and one must

---

[2] Michael Bess, *Choices under Fire: Moral Dimensions of World War II*. (New York: A.A. Knopf, 2006), 91-95.
[3] Ibid., 95-96.

place it on a sliding scale to ensure that the appropriate proportionality is considered in the calculus.[4]

The shift from the technique of precision bombing to the use of area bombing by the British commanders was evident early in 1943. The Casablanca directive stated the targeting priorities that were to be used by British war planners in specific terms, while using enough ambiguity as to allow a great deal of flexibility in the plans for British air campaigns:

> Your primary objective will be the progressive destruction and dislocation of the German military, industrial and economic system, and the undermining of the morale of the German people to a point where their capacity for armed resistance is fatally weakened.[5]

Hamburg: The Prototype for Dresden

The RAF Bomber Command under Arthur Harris wasted little time in proceeding with the morale bombing of several major German cities. On July 27, 1943, they launched *Operation Gomorrah* on Hamburg. Seven hundred and eighty-seven British bombers dropped a mixture of high explosive and incendiary bombs on the city. This bombing quickly engulfed Hamburg quickly in flames, drawing in air from the surrounding countryside to produce a massive firestorm that superheated the air, which caused asphalt to liquefy and bricks to explode. The hurricane force winds that the inferno created lifted people off their feet and carried them into the night sky. It took nearly two days for the heat to subside enough to launch rescue efforts in the city. What many rescuers found in the city bomb shelters was an indistinguishable mass of human bodies that had been melted together by the intense heat. The raid killed 45,000 people and destroyed over 30,000 buildings. Upon hearing word that their military was administering this type of warfare, many Britons voiced objections to what they deemed unconscionable conduct. Yet Sir Arthur Harris defended the practice as the best means available to shorten the war.[6] Besides a segment of the British populous that was uncomfortable with the tactic of morale bombing, some dissent was evident in the U.S. command, though supporters of the practice quickly quashed the opposition. When Hap

---

[4] Walzer, 260.
[5] David Irving, *The Destruction of Dresden*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963), 36-37.
[6] Bess, 94-95

Arnold learned that Secretary of War Henry Stimson was growing averse to indiscriminate bombing, Arnold wrote him: "We must not get soft. War must be destructive and to a certain extent inhuman and ruthless."[7]

From a military standpoint, the effectiveness of the Hamburg raid was unquestionable. "Hamburgization" became a term of art that many at Bomber Command favored. They then used the plan as the model for similar raids to come, Berlin being the ultimate target. Harris' belief in the effectiveness of morale bombing may have been well founded. The Nazi Minister of Munitions, Albert Speer, told Hitler that "six more cities done in like Hamburg would mean the end of the war."[8] Yet try as they may, the allies were not able to reproduce the Hamburg firestorm in Berlin. Had Berlin been devastated to the extent that Hamburg had been, the back of the German war effort may have been broken sooner, and the war may have ended more quickly. The allies had not been able to produce six Hamburgs, as was feared by Speer; instead, they destroyed approximately 160 small and mid-sized cities and towns. Between the destruction of Hamburg and the eventual fall of Berlin, 340,000 Germans would die from aerial bombings.[9]

Yet General Arnold was conflicted over the ethical dilemma of the use of area bombing. He understood the importance of minimizing civilian casualties because of his concern for creating "victim populations" that would work against America in the post war years. Hap Arnold had a pragmatic approach to bombing. He favored selective, accurate bombing because he felt that it was the most efficient way of winning the war. In the spring of 1943, Arnold instructed his commanders to bomb as accurately as possible in order to avoid the necessity of sending additional crews into harm's way in a repeat mission on the same target.[10] General Arnold shared his moral and ethical concerns with his subordinates. In June of 1943, he sent a memo to all of his bomber commanders expressing his concern for the proper use of aerial bombardment:

> War, no matter how it may be glorified, is unspeakably horrible in
> every form. The bomber simply adds to the extent of the horror,

---

[7] Ronald Schaffer, *Wings of Judgment: American Bombing in World War II*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 103.

[8] Algis Valiunas, "Fire from the Sky." *Commentary*, (July-August, 2007): 55.

[9] Ibid., 52-57.

[10] Schaffer, 60-61.

especially if not used with discretion; but when used with the proper degree of understanding, it becomes, in effect, the most humane of all weapons.[11]

Those above General Arnold's pay grade also felt this moral and pragmatic dilemma. On September 9, 1944, President Roosevelt wrote to Secretary of War Henry Stimson suggesting the establishment of an agency to study the direct and indirect consequences of bombing German cities. Topics of study would include the movement of evacuees from bombed cities, the effect that these refugees had on the cities they moved to, and the medical care and food distribution among bombing refugee populations. Also examined were the resulting psychological effects on the refugees and their new communities. This would later be established as the *United States Strategic Bombing Survey*. The phrasing of this letter to Stimson made it clear that attacks designed to terrorize citizens were acceptable to the President. The information gleaned from the survey regarding the European theater of operation would be applied to bombing strategies in the Pacific theater.[12]

Dresden: Moral Apocalypse or Legitimate Military Target?

Many regard the case of the Dresden firebombing as an example of the unjustifiable killing of civilians. One of the primary arguments used to establish the destruction of Dresden as an immoral act, is the perception that the city lacked legitimate targets used by the German war industry. On this point, much of the information regarding the benign status of Dresden as a contributor to the war effort can be attributable to Nazi propaganda. Information sources that were uncovered following German reunification in 1990 have created a much clearer picture of the legitimacy of the city as a military target, as well as a more accurate accounting of the actual death toll. These modern sources indicate that Dresden had more than 120 companies that were directly contributing to the war effort, with an unknown number of smaller companies not registered by the Nazi government. It was, in fact, one of the more highly industrialized cities in Nazi Germany. During the war, Dresden was producing radios, ammunition casings, optical components for bomb and machine gun sights, torpedo tails, and aircraft instrumentation. Dresden was also a major rail depot. Its busy marshalling yards were actively moving trains loaded with military personnel and equipment to the

---

[11] H.H. Arnold to All Air Force Commanders in Combat Zones, June 10, 1943 (marked "as rewritten be Gen. Arnold"), bombing folder, box 41, Arnold Papers.
[12] Schaffer, 89.

Eastern front, as well as rail cars packed with Jewish detainees on their way to concentration camps in Poland.[13]

The fact that Dresden was a legitimate military target does not absolve the war planners, commanders, and bomber crews that were involved in this incident from moral scrutiny. The practice of "area bombing," "terror bombing," or "morale bombing," whichever nomenclature most accurately suits the act, had been established, scrutinized, and criticized, but ultimately accepted as a viable military tactic. The moral rationale for this practice, as stated previously, was the idea that demoralizing and terrorizing the German population would ultimately end the war sooner, rather than later.

Why Dresden?

The importance of Dresden to the German war effort is just one of the questions surrounding the decision to destroy it. The year 1945 was a time of not only great destruction, fear, and loss of life; it was the threshold of a major turning point in geopolitics. Though heavy fighting persisted, the defeat of Germany was a foregone conclusion in early February of 1945 when the Yalta Conference convened. Here U.S. President Roosevelt, Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin, and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill would negotiate, vie for, and dictate the distribution of power in the post-war world. These three men were determined to demonstrate their military and political prowess, to one another, and to the rest of the world, in order to put themselves and their respective countries in a greater position of power, or perceived power. This situation, many historians believe, is what prompted the combined British and American air forces to opt for the complete destruction of Dresden as a demonstration of power. Although British and American war planners could have eliminated Dresden's military industrial facilities, which were mainly outside of the town, with far less collateral damage, they were intent on sending a signal to the Soviets that the Anglo-American forces possessed superior technology, military might, and willingness to use these assets on a grand scale.[14]

Geopolitical competitiveness and the desire to inflict a

---

[13] Fredrick Taylor, *Dresden: Tuesday February 13, 1945*. (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 148-153.

[14] Irving, 86-90.

devastating blow to the Germans' willingness to continue the war came together in the plan to obliterate Dresden. The plan originally was to use the combined American and British air forces in a massive raid on a major German city, most likely Berlin, to undermine German morale to the point where they would surrender. Bomber Command and the commanders of the U.S. bomber units under Hap Arnold and Jimmy Doolittle hatched this plan, codenamed Thunderclap, in October of 1944. The consensus was that such a devastating morale blow, coupled with the sustained advance of the Soviet army on Germany's Eastern front, would force the German High Command to surrender by spring 1945.

Hap Arnold, along with American Admiral William Leahy, opposed the morale bombing of Berlin, and offered a more humane way of demoralizing the civilian population. Arnold suggested attacking military targets in many smaller cities, which had not yet experienced Allied bombing.   Command scheduled this operation, codenamed *Clarion*, for February of 1945 in conjunction with *Thunderclap*.[15] By this time, most of the German early-warning radar systems had been virtually destroyed, allowing the Allied bombers to venture deep into Germany with relatively little resistance from German fighters or ground-based defenses.[16] This left cities like Dresden, Chemnitz, and Leipzig prime targets, not only for their relative lack of defense, but also for the psychological toll that the destruction of these cities would have on the German population. These cities were also crowded with thousands of German evacuees displaced by the war, a point not lost on the Allied war planners. The destruction of these cities, and the resulting confusion and logistical nightmare caused by the dispersion of hundreds of thousands of refugees could prove to be the death knell of the Third Reich.[17]

The Destruction of Dresden

Dresden was the seventh-largest city in Germany, and strategically positioned at the crux of several major north-south and east-west roads and railways. Because of its Baroque architecture and its status as the "Florence of Germany," many thought Dresden to be immune to major Allied bombing. On October 7, 1944, and January 16,

---

[15] Alexander McKee, *Dresden 1945: The Devil's Tinderbox*. (New York: Dutton, 1984), 64.

[16] Ibid., 62.

[17] Irving, 88-89.

1945, the American 8th Air Force conducted small raids on the industrial areas and railroad marshalling yards of Dresden. These raids had little effect on German morale or the war effort, and the destruction fell far short of the type promoted by Air Marshall Harris.

With the Hamburg air raid and firestorm as the prototype, the combined forces of the RAF and the American 8th Air Force moved in on Dresden. On consecutive nights, February 13th and 14th, several waves of specialized aircraft hit the city. Bad weather over Europe on the night of the 13th prevented operations by the USAAF, leaving the RAF Bomber Command in charge of leading the missions. The first attack, late on Tuesday night, February 13, started with British Lancaster bombers, whose "pathfinder" mission was to locate the city and illuminate it with magnesium parachute flares. Following behind were twin-engine British Mosquito bombers, who dropped red indicator bombs using the sports stadium as their target. The stadium was located in the old town (*Altstadt*) section of Dresden and was surrounded by old, highly combustible buildings constructed of wood.

Next in was a group of 244 Lancaster bombers, which carried a combined bomb weight of 500 tons of high explosives, and 375 tons of incendiaries. This wave ignited a section of the city that was 1.25 miles long and 1.75 miles wide. Three hours later, 529 Lancaster bombers from the 1st, 3rd, 6th, and 8th Bomb Groups arrived over the city. Thousands of fires were burning, and the flames of the city could be seen sixty miles away. The Pathfinders of the 8th Bomb Group decided to expand the target zone by dropping their flares on both sides of the existing fires. In this wave, the RAF had dropped 1,800 tons of bombs. Just after noon on the 14th, B-17 bombers from the American 8th Air Force arrived. Nine of the division's twelve groups reached their intended target, while three groups mistakenly bombed Prague, which was 70 miles southeast of Dresden. Some B-17 crews were able to hit the railroad marshalling yards, but others were unable to see through the smoke, and ended up scattering their bombs around the city. This wave, which included 311 B-17s, dropped 771 tons of bombs, a total which included 294 tons of incendiaries. On the 15th, 210 B-17s, unable to reach their primary target, a synthetic oil plant, moved to their secondary target of Dresden, where they dropped a total bomb load of 461 tons.[18]

---

[18] Marshall De Bruhl, *Allied Airpower and the Destruction of Dresden*. (New

Conclusion

In the years following the firebombing of Dresden, the horrors that the people of that city witnessed and endured were chronicled by survivors, historians, novelists, and journalists. Casualty figures for those two days and nights were often stated to be nearly 250,000 dead, including Dresden residents and German refugees. This figure is most likely the result of exaggeration by Nazi government propagandists as well as Soviet Anti-American propagandists. In recent years, historians have learned that deaths resulting from the bombing and fire number between 25,000 and 40,000.[19] These diminished numbers, though rather small in comparison to the fatalities suffered on the Japanese mainland by Allied bombers, still represent a tragic fact of war; innocent civilians die. Even in the current era of precision-guided smart bombs, collateral damage still occurs. The question remains-to what extent are civilian losses acceptable, and how far do war planners and practitioners need to stretch their moral rationale in order to apply the calculus that is necessary to justify civilian losses as acceptable?

> It is not so much this or the other means of making war that is immoral or inhumane. What is immoral is war itself. Once full-scale war has broken out it can never be humanized or civilized, and if one side attempted to do so it would be most likely to be defeated. So long as we resort to war to settle differences between nations, so long will we have to endure the horrors, barbarities and excesses that war brings with it. That, to me, is the lesson of Dresden.
> – British Air Marshal Sir Robert Saundby[20]

York: Random House, 2006), 203-206.; Taylor, 296-365.; Tami Davis Biddle, "Sifting Dresden's Ashes." *Wilson Quarterly* 29, No. 2 (2005): 65.

[19] Paul Addison and Jeremy Crang (eds.), *Firestorm: The Bombing of Dresden, 1945*. (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006), 74.

[20] Irving, xv.

Bibliography

Addison, Paul and Jeremy Crang, eds. *Firestorm: The Bombing of Dresden, 1945*. (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006).

Arnold, H.H.: to All Air Force Commanders in Combat Zones, June 10, 1943 (marked "as rewritten be Gen. Arnold"), bombing folder, box 41, Arnold Papers.

Bess, Michael. *Choices under Fire: Moral Dimensions of World War II*. (New York: A.A. Knopf, 2006).

Biddle, Tami Davis. "Sifting Dresden's Ashes." *Wilson Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (2005): 60-80.

De Bruhl, Marshall. *Allied Airpower and the Destruction of Dresden*. (New York: Random House, 2006).

Irving, David. *The Destruction of Dresden*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963).

McKee, Alexander. *Dresden 1945: The Devil's Tinderbox*. (New York: Dutton, 1984).

Melzer, Yehuda. *Concepts of Just War*. (Leyden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1975).

Schaffer, Ronald. *Wings of Judgment: American Bombing in World War II*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

Taylor, Fredrick. *Dresden: Tuesday February 13, 1945*. (New York: HarperCollins, 2004).

Valiunas, Algis. "Fire from the Sky." *Commentary*, (July-August, 2007): 52-57.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

U.S. President Harry S. Truman and Chaim Weizmann, first president of the new State of Israel, greet each other on May 25, 1948. Truman holds a Torah scroll given to him by Weizmann as a gift for his role in recognizing and supporting Israel. This photograph is the property of the Bettmann/CORBIS archives, and can be found at TrumanLibrary.org.

U.S. DOMESTIC POLITICS AND THE ZIONIST-ISRAEL LOBBY: TRUMAN AND THE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL | Tyler O'Connell

The history of United States involvement in the Middle East has been fraught with considerable controversy. American diplomatic, economic, and military support or opposition to certain Middle Eastern nations has left the international community's impression of the United States substantially tarnished. Nowhere has this zealous intervention been more strongly lobbied, legislated, and executed than in the establishment and buttressing of the nation of Israel. The United States' support for this small aberrant nation, like most other U.S. intervention in the Middle East, is a relatively recent phenomenon. Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent untold billions of dollars in the Middle East, especially in Israel, ostensibly in the pursuit of combating the subversive effects of Communism.

Many U.S. policymakers and others have argued that this unconditional support stems from strategic grounds. Borrowing heavily from a Cold War analysis, they claim that U.S. support for Israel is strongly founded upon its status as the only "stable" Middle Eastern country, which provides Washington with leverage for other policies in the region. A second argument is based on moral principles: that after the tyranny Jews experienced at the hands of the Third Reich, American support for a Jewish State is the morally "right" thing. Both of these arguments, while perhaps logical in a post hoc analysis, miss the integral moments in President Truman's thought process in the years leading up to the recognition of the state of Israel on May 14, 1948.[1]

Modern historians have sought to answer this question. Some have claimed his motivation "stemmed more from his desire to settle the problem of the Displaced Jews of Europe as peacefully as possible, and the expectation that a democratic Jewish state would enhance the stability of the region."[2] This argument, while portraying a benevolent and liberal sensibility in Truman, falls flat when taking into account the second analysis.

A second argument attributes Truman's decision to domestic

---

[1] John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2007), 12.
[2] Quoted in Michael J. Cohen, "Truman And Palestine, 1945–1948: Revisionism, Politics And Diplomacy," *Modern Judaism* 2, no. 1 (February 1982): 3.

politics. In this vein, John Snetsinger writes about the year of 1948, a campaign year for Truman. He argues that the decision and subsequent support rested merely upon domestic electoral considerations for the Democratic Party. The author alleges that, hoping to win key swing states, Truman appealed to high percentages of American Jewish voters in these states through his acknowledgement of Israel. He concludes with the assertion, "All forms of government, including dictatorships, ultimately rely on the support of public opinion to sustain their activities abroad."[3]

Snetsinger's argument, while compelling, misses a vital component of the U.S.-Israel relationship. While 'domestic politics' to Snetsinger meant American Jewish voters, it could be argued his interpretation is exclusive to electoral concerns. This paper will display the powerful effect of not only American Jewish voters upon President Truman's decision-making process from 1946 to 1948, but also how the organized and highly effective "Zionist Lobby" developed its strategy and moved Truman's Palestine policy in a staunchly pro-Israel direction despite international considerations to the contrary.

The initial aim of Zionism was advocated first and most notably by Theodore Herzl, an Austrian nationalist. Largely in response to centuries of ardent anti-Semitism in Europe, Herzl proposed the creation of a viable Jewish State in the historical homeland of Palestine. Many Sephardi Jews, who had already been living peacefully with other native Palestinians, largely ignored this call; on the other hand, the Ashkenazi Jews, which for centuries had assimilated into European nations and cultures, embraced the notion. The clear Ashkenazi shift to a European mindset is shown by the confluence of the Western notion of nationalism with Judaism, creating its newfound prodigy in Zionism. By the turn of the 20th Century, tens of thousands of Zionist Jews had begun pouring into Palestine despite British and Arab objections.[4] As there was no Jewish state in Palestine, the sanction of this unrestricted immigration came not from a government. Jewish power was built upon outside resources. Financial assistance facilitated by the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish National Fund was funneled in by a combination grants, loans, and donations by an international Jewish

---

[3] John Snetsinger, *Truman, the Jewish Vote, and the Creation of Israel* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1974), xii.
[4] Charles D. Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 7th ed. (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2012), 118-121.

community to purchase land in Palestine.[5]

Upon President Truman's accession to the White House, he expressed a more moderate view, similar to President Roosevelt. Truman approved a letter drafted by the State Department in August 1946 explicating a Palestine policy very similar to that of the late President, who once asserted that "'there should be no decision altering the basic situation in Palestine without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews."[6] However, contradicting the State Department later that summer, Truman pledged his support in "let[ting] as many of the Jews into Palestine as it is possible to let into that country." [7]

Truman was clearly unaware of the implications of such an immigration policy. Years of British experience in Palestine told the tale of conflict brewing between Jews and Arabic Muslims over unrestricted immigration practices. Truman, however, was not familiar with these reports. The bulk of his communiqués stemmed from the State Department. These files constantly advised moderation over the Jewish-Arab issue. Yet Truman, in late 1946 and early 1947, began to move further away from this advice. He later asserted of the State Department, "There were some among them who were also inclined to be anti-Semitic." Further, the foreign department was "more concerned about the Arab reaction than the sufferings of the Jews."[8]

In the spring of 1946, President Truman sought out the British for insight. He commissioned the Grady Committee, an American delegation sent to Britain to seek out British opinion on the matter. While aiming for the immediate immigration of 100,000 or more Jews, the British pressured the Committee to propose a Palestinian federal government with separate Jewish and Arab provinces and no unified Jewish State in mind. Further, the British convinced the Committee to only allow the 100,000 Jews provisional sovereignty on the acceptance of the Arabs.[9]

Additionally, the U.S. Department of State constantly advised moderation over the Jewish-Arab issue. The State Department and Joint Chiefs of Staff were worried that supporting the Zionists with no heed of

---

[5] Ibid., 122.
[6] Michael Ottolenghi, "Harry Truman's Recognition Of Israel," *The Historical Journal* 47, no. 4 (December 2004): 969.
[7] Snetsinger, 16-18.
[8] Ibid., 17.
[9] Ibid., 29-30.

Arab reprisal might, "orient the peoples of the entire area away from the Western Powers…" The State Department had already been working on viable solutions to settle the problem, including a form of Trusteeship under U.N. direction. Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Director of Near Eastern Affairs Loy Henderson, the department had proposed that the "Jewish national home" be subordinate to Palestinian law. This law would require a "single Palestinian state" with a fully representative government and a Constitution guaranteeing equality of representation, regardless of race or religion, for purposes of land policy and immigration. Additionally, U.N. delegates from Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt agreed on this trusteeship program as well as limited Jewish immigration that would de-escalate over a three-year period.[10]

All this pragmatic admonition proved an outrage to many in Truman's advisory body. For instance, Abba Hillel Silver, a particularly influential Zionist representative to the White House, called the plan a "conscienceless act of treachery." Paul Fitzpatrick, chairperson of the Democratic State Committee of New York, informed Truman, "If this plan goes into effect it would be useless for the Democrats to nominate a state ticket for the election this fall [given Jewish voting constituency]." Finally, New York Times writer James Reston claimed, "the political implications of acceptance and rejection were canvassed" by Truman. The President now had all sides of the argument before him, save the Arabic perspective, and due to this "canvassing" he made his choice of advisors on the issue. Largely in response to this unrelenting domestic pressure and desire for democratic success in November of 1946 and 1948, these moderated approaches proved "wholly unacceptable" to Truman, and he publicly denounced any plan that would limit Jewish immigration to the Levant or deny them a "national home."[11]

Clearly influenced by electoral considerations, Truman also turned to an unprecedented advisory body in late 1946, the Zionist Lobby. Now this term, as it elicits a wide range of often-negative responses, deserves at least an attempt at definition. The historians Mearsheimer and Walt have identified it as "a convenient shorthand term for the loose coalition of individuals and organizations that actively work to shape U.S. foreign policy

---

[10] United States, Department of State, *A Plan for the Future Government of Palestine, June 4, 1947*, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1947: The Near East and Africa (University of Wisconsin Digital Collections), 1096-1102.

[11] Snetsinger, 30-31.

in a pro-Israel direction."[12] This definition, perhaps amorphous by itself, takes shape when applied to those individuals and groups who actively sought to manipulate Truman's Palestine Policy in these pivotal years. It is under these circumstances that the term is used here. The World Zionist Organization, the Jewish Agency, and Jewish National Fund, and the highly powerful and influential leaders that comprised them, built the lobby's center in the late 1940s. Furthermore, individuals not directly beholden to such Zionist organizations, but in the White House serving in administrative and policy making positions, also came to comprise the lobby in its formative period of 1946-1948.

From this point forward, the Zionists realized that with enough pressure, Truman was malleable. Zionist lobbyists employed a variety of tactics to this end, as no clearly explicated policy had appeared since the failed Grady report. On several occasions, Weizmann himself visited the White House, Zionists purchased newspaper advertisements in the States, resolutions passed by Zionist organizations were forwarded to the President, and even mass rallies seemed to testify to the enormous political support the pro-Israel movement possessed in the United States. In one instance on September 30, 1946, the Greater New York Zionist Actions Committee, an American Jewish lobbying group, released a public letter calling for Jewish immigration to Palestine and the recognition of the imminent Jewish state.[13]

All this pressure and uncertainty at home caused President Truman, by mid-1946, to turn to a White House aide who would come to effectuate the Zionist Lobby's aims more-so than anyone during this period. This "man in the White House" that the Zionists overtly courted was now President Truman's personal administrative assistant on Palestine, David K. Niles. The assistant worked behind the scenes to direct Truman's Palestine Policy. Many direct communiqués between the White House and Zionist leaders were replied to and signed by Niles himself without Truman's signature. It was not just Niles' position in the White House that secured his value, but his rapport and close working relationship with "the top echelon of Zionist leadership." For instance, Eliahu Epstein, the Jewish Agency representative in Washington, labeled Niles "our friend" in the White House, and Weizmann lauded the administrative assistant for, "bring[ing] about a proper understanding of the ideals of our cause in high places in

---

[12] Mearsheimer and Walt, 112.
[13] Snetsinger, 31.

Washington."[14]

Niles' position and allegiances secured in mid-1946, he began to greatly influence President Truman's Palestine Policy in a pro-Israel direction. Pressing the President for sanction of Zionist immigration practices, he discounted any danger in angering the Arabs in response, as, according to Niles, "a good part of the Moslem world follows Gandhi and this philosophy of non-resistance." This either displays a blatant ignorance about Islam in the Levant, or an insulting disingenuousness. Whichever the case, Niles continued to petition Truman in preparation for the off-year elections. The argument he cast in the White House convinced the President that in the upcoming November elections, if the Democrats did nothing, the Republicans would surely "overtly sho[w] their determination to make the Palestine issue one of the focal points of attack on Truman and the Democratic Administration."[15]

The Zionist Lobby pressure brought to bear by way of Niles in early October, and exacerbated by the upcoming Democratic elections, caused Truman to issue a new proclamation. At Niles' goading, the President declared a statement on Yom Kippur, the most sacred Jewish religious day of the year, calling for, "substantial immigration into Palestine… at once," further endorsing the future establishment of "a viable Jewish state" in Palestine.[16] One grateful Democrat noted that this had a "very desirable effect upon our chances in New York" at re-election. Objection did arise from the Arab Higher Committee, and even King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia charged Truman with breaking his promises to consult all parties involved before altering his Palestine Policy. As Truman's public letter outlined, his policy was now two-fold: large-scale immigration and the establishment of a Jewish national home. Arab hostility to his measures was of marginal importance to him at best. Truman clearly had moved without the consultation of any of the Arab world or State Department, instead valuing the advice of the Zionist lobby and his inner circle led by Niles.[17] Truman's personal papers reveal his parochial view toward Arab resentment: "In all of my political experience I don't ever recall the Arab vote swinging a close election."[18]

---

[14] Ibid., 36-37.
[15] Ibid., 35, 41.
[16] Ibid., 42.
[17] Ibid., 43.
[18] Mearsheimer and Walt, 142.

Amid all these controversies and the anger felt in Palestine in early 1947, the British moved on the U.N. Their goal was to more openly air the Palestine problem and bring an end to the deadlock. On April 2, 1947, Great Britain formally asked the United Nations to summon a special session of the General Assembly. This assembly proposed a commission, neutral and objective, and comprised of 11 nations, to investigate a solution to the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. This commission was the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP).

Meanwhile, in addition to White House access, the Lobby turned to the State Department in an attempt to shift its position on Palestine. Acheson and Henderson however gave no concession, stating flatly that no movement on the Palestine issue was forthcoming until the conclusion of the U.N. investigation, privately stating, "We have no long-term Palestine policy. We do have a short-term, open-ended policy which is set from time to time by White House directives."[19] Zionist leaders instead wanted a clear policy from the White House. In a Memorandum dated May 28, 1947, Zionist leaders, Moshe Shertok, Special Executive member of the Jewish Agency, Eliahu Epstein, the Agency's Washington Representative, and Eliezer Kaplan, Agency Treasurer, discussed their proposals and questions to Acheson and Henderson. These leaders advocated, absent the presence of any Arab leaders, the use of "confidential exploratory conversations" to sanction continued Jewish immigration and clear the way for the State of Israel's formation with both the State Department and the White House. When Acheson and Henderson flatly stated Truman's position as undetermined pending UNSCOP's investigation (of which Henderson was a part), the Agency leaders threatened to go over the State Department's authority and expressed their ability to look elsewhere, obviously referring to their man in the White House.

Mearsheimer and Walt have identified the clear connection between the success of Israel lobby groups and "its capacity to influence campaign contributions."[20] In the United States, this lobbying tactic — buying off those who will not align with you solely on ideological grounds — proves especially effective as "[m]oney [has always] been critical to U.S.

---

[19] Department of State, *Memorandum by Mr. Gordon P. Merriam, Member of the Policy Planning Staff, to Staff Members, July 15, 1948,* Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948: The Near East, South Asia, and Africa: Part II (University of Wisconsin Digital Collections), 1221-1222.
[20] Mearsheimer and Walt, 154.

elections."[21] This is no less true for President Truman's campaign in 1948. Truman did in fact lament this excessive lobbying, which he claimed made it "almost impossible to get a fair-minded approach to the subject."[22] However, it seems ignorant to discount the importance of executive and financial Jewish National Fund representatives visiting Truman during the year of his Presidential campaign, and to disregard their bid for state recognition without an offer in mind pending Truman's acceptance of such "confidential conversations."

Again, Niles proved invaluable to the Zionist cause. In a memorandum dated July 29, 1947, he suggested that Truman not only fully endorse immigration and the creation of a Jewish State, but that he remove Henderson from the delegation to the U.N. and investigatory panel as he, among others accused by Niles, was "unsympathetic to the Jewish viewpoint… [and] continues to misinterpret your policy." He further warned Truman that, ultimately, "your administration, not [the State Department], will be held responsible."[23] Clearly, to both Niles and the Zionist leadership, any form of "trusteeship" leading to a representative government or equal constitution, as the State Department and Henderson proposed, would prove fatal to the creation of a viable Israel. Israel was to be a Jewish State. What is more, they used their powerful lobbying and access to push Truman to marginalize the State Department's solutions and remind Truman of his upcoming election which depended upon American Jewish voters.

Truman held the pivotal conference on Palestine on May 12, 1948. In attendance were Niles, Truman's new campaign advisor Clark Clifford, and four other representatives of the Department of State. Clifford offered the bulk of arguments in support of the Jewish state, "argu[ing] entirely on grounds of domestic politics." Truman, already heavily pressed by Zionist lobbyists, turned to the advice of his campaign advisor Clifford for input on the issue. Clifford, relying on his expertise in domestic affairs, asserted that "the American people" opposed possible "acts of appeasement toward the Arabs," and further pointed to "unbearable pressure" upon Truman which must lead him "to recognize the Jewish state promptly." Undersecretary of State Robert Lovett replied to all of this pressure from Clifford that the

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Michael T. Benson, *Harry S. Truman and the Founding of Israel* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997), 95.

[23] Snetsinger, 55.

President's action might lose "the effects of many years of hard work in the Middle East with the Arabs." However, Truman received this advice too late in the debate.[24]

The effect of these important domestic relations upon Truman is clear. For what other reason would his campaign advisor even be present at a conference on an issue of international law? Lovett saw the motives really at work in Truman's mind and sought to diminish its impact by suggesting a "wait and see" approach. Further, he stated that an open recognition of the Jewish State would inevitably tarnish future American-Arab relations in the long term, words that would prove prophetic. Despite this admonition of the State Department, Truman, more concerned with his upcoming election and perhaps the contributions he could garner, summoned Clifford on May 14, 1948 and instructed him to make the arrangements for the recognition of Israel later that day. It was domestic political campaign advisor Clifford who telephoned the Jewish Agency's Washington Representative, Epstein, and informed him of Truman's intent to recognize the state of Israel.[25]

Despite the State Department's constant call for moderation and focus upon the international concerns of such a decision throughout this three-year period, Truman ultimately cast off such advice. The entirety of his focus displayed his parochialism and motivation based in domestic rather than foreign politics. Furthermore, only the ceaseless and highly effective pressure brought to bear upon Truman by the Zionist-Israel lobbyists was ultimately the cause of solidarity and recognition. This lobbying, also at the expense of Arab access, surpassed the influence and advice of the apparatus designed to guide Presidential foreign policy, the State Department. In essence, domestic political concerns, only as articulated, cajoled, and pressured by the highly influential and effective Zionist Lobby, caused President Truman to cast off international implications for domestic considerations.

---

[24] Department of State, *Memorandum of Conversations, by the Under Secretary of State (Lovett), May 17, 1948*, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948: The Near East, South Asia, and Africa: Part II (University of Wisconsin Digital Collections), 1005-07.

[25] Snetsinger, 110.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

United States. Department of State. *Memorandum by Mr. Gordon P. Merriam, Member of the Policy Planning Staff, to Staff Members, July 15, 1948*. Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948: The Near East, South Asia, and Africa: Part II. University of Wisconsin Digital Collections.

———. *Memorandum of Conversations, by the Under Secretary of State (Lovett), May 17, 1948*. Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948: The Near East, South Asia, and Africa: Part II. University of Wisconsin Digital Collections.

———. *A Plan for the Future Government of Palestine, June 4, 1947*. Foreign Relations of the United States, 1947: The Near East and Africa. University of Wisconsin Digital Collections.

United States. President's Secretary's Files. *Joint Chiefs of Staff to State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, June 21, 1946*. The Recognition of the State of Israel. Harry S. Truman Library and Museum. Truman Library.

———. *Press Release, Statement by the President, November 13, 1945*. The Recognition of the State of Israel. Harry S. Truman Library and Museum. Truman Library.

Secondary Sources

Benson, Michael T. *Harry S. Truman and the Founding of Israel*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.

Cohen, Michael J. "Truman and Palestine, 1945–1948: Revisionism, Politics, and Diplomacy." *Modern Judaism* 2, no. 1 (February 1982): 1-22.

Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2007.

Ottolenghi, Michael. "Harry Truman's Recognition of Israel." *The Historical Journal* 47, no. 4 (December 2004): 963-88.

Smith, Charles D. *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. 7th ed. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2012.

Snetsinger, John. *Truman, the Jewish Vote, and the Creation of Israel*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1974.

At a rally in Washington, D.C. in the early 1970s, disabled activists borrow popular protest slogans to extend the frame of the Civil Rights Movement to include rights and protections for people with disabilities. This photograph was taken by Tom Olin, the director of the Disability Rights Center. It can be viewed at the University of Hawai'i Center on Disability Studies website, at http://www.ist.hawaii.edu/training/rights/02_dis_rights.php.

"THE GREATEST DISCOVERY OF MY GENERATION": THE DISABILITY RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN 1960s AMERICA | Michelle L. Erstad

|2nd Place Undergraduate Paper, 2014 Northern California Regional Conference of Phi Alpha Theta|

To Steve Taylor, whose decades of research and advocacy made this project possible.

"The greatest discovery of my generation," wrote philosopher William James, "is that human beings can alter their lives by altering their attitudes of mind."[1] Although penned decades before the tumultuous 1960s, these words expertly summarize the considerable changes that started to take place in America at that time. The disability rights movement grew from generations of inhumane treatment that was finally illuminated by a series of exposés published in the 1960s. As advocates called for a dramatic restructuring of the system that served those with special needs, parallel movements emerged in which the disabled explored their own identities. The richness of the disability rights movement has had far-reaching implications. In the spirit of advocacy dominating the 1960s, the civil rights movement for people with disabilities emerged as a powerful opposition to inhumane treatment and social marginalization, and began the process of reshaping what is considered possible for those with even the most profound disabilities.

Background

One cannot grasp an understanding of the civil rights movement for people with disabilities in the 1960s and 1970s separate from the historical views on and corresponding treatment of those with intellectual and developmental disabilities (ID and DD, respectively).

The study of those with disabilities first took shape in the mid-19th century, when social scientists began to explore the wide array of social problems plaguing the nation due to industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. Several researchers in the 1850s used the new theory of evolution to attempt to understand their society, and concluded that poverty and crime were linked to those with "defective genes." People with disabilities were the most obvious carriers of such defects. These theories

---

[1] Burton Blatt and Fred Kaplan, *Christmas in Purgatory: A Photographic Essay on Mental Retardation* (Syracuse, NY: Human Policy Press, 1974), 95.

spawned a body of research that only supported these findings. In the early 1900s, Robert Dugdale and Henry Goddard conducted studies on two different families and their lineages, and concluded that feeblemindedness was not only heritable, but also directly responsible for such problems as alcoholism and poverty. Goddard's study was especially influential in the field of disability research, and his findings led him to conclude in 1915:

> For many generations we have recognized and pitied the idiot. Of late we have recognized a higher type of defective, the moron, and have discovered that he is a burden; that he is a menace to society and civilization; that he is responsible to a large degree for many, if not all, of our social problems.

Around the same time, another early leader in this field, Walter Fernald, concluded, "Feeble-minded women are almost invariably immoral, and if at large usually become carriers of venereal disease or give birth to children who are as defective as themselves." Theories like these played a central role in shaping the attitudes of the general population toward those with disabilities.[2]

Institutionalization was the earliest response to caring for those with disabilities in America. Efforts at rehabilitation and reintegration of those with disabilities punctuated the first half of the 19th century, and advocates like Dorothea Dix called for their humane treatment. However, the second half of the 19th century saw an increase in urbanization and industrialization, and a decrease in the belief that those with ID and DD could be educated, or their condition improved. Factory work required greater amounts of skill than those with disabilities could provide, and the generation of progressive leaders died. Institutionalization evolved into a means of isolating the disabled from society entirely. Its popularity as a model of care grew significantly, and institutional populations soared, outpacing the growth of even the rapidly expanding American general populace. In 1880, approximately 4.8 people per 100,000 were institutionalized, but by 1926, that number skyrocketed to 47.8 per 100,000. In that same timeframe, the number of state-run facilities grew from ten to 77, and the number of residents climbed from 2,429 to 55,466. This number

---

[2] Steven J. Taylor and Stanford J. Searl, "Disability in America: A History of Policies and Trends," in *Significant Disability: Issues Affecting People with Significant Disabilities from a Historical Policy, Leadership, and Systems Perspective,* ed. E. Davis Martin, (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher Ltd, 2001), 26-27; Wolf Wolfensberger, "The Origin and Nature of Our Institutional Models," in *Changing Patterns in Residential Services for the Mentally Retarded* (Washington D.C.: President's Committee on Mental Retardation, 1969), 21.

peaked in 1967 when nearly 195,000 people with mental retardation called state-run institutions home.[3]

Because of the desire to remove those with disabilities from society, and because of the pervasive belief that heritable defects caused so many social problems, institutionalization was accompanied by a new and even more frightful treatment. During what is known as America's *eugenics movement,* thousands of adults with disabilities were involuntarily sterilized, prevented from marrying, engaging in sexual relations, or otherwise restricted, with the idea of "cutting off the defective germ plasm in the American population." According to Henry Hamilton Laughlin, the nation's most prominent advocate of eugenics in the early 20th century, eugenics was the best way of removing the burden upon and danger posed to the general populace by those with disabilities. Sentiments like Laughlin's caught on and the popularity of the eugenics argument peaked in 1910; the movement tremendously affected public policy toward those with disabilities. Between 1905 and 1917, seventeen state legislatures passed sterilization laws, many of which made sterilization a condition of a person's release from an institutional setting. Additionally, some thirty-nine states outlawed marriage between two adults with mental retardation. However, the popularity of eugenics began to fade in the 1920s. New theories emerged that challenged eugenics as a treatment, and the stance of the United States Supreme Court brought the constitutionality of such laws into question. Still, eugenic practices continued through the 1950s, and while the estimates of the total number of victims vary, it is no less than 30,000.[4]

While the eugenics movement lost some of its influence, institutionalization for those with ID and DD continued to be a given. Interestingly, the 1920s and 30s saw a renewed interest in community-based supports for those with disabilities. This "swing" held and proved to be the seed of a new movement that grew with each decade. By the 1950s, groups of parents with special needs children began to form, and they expressed their desires for change.[5] As we will see, 1960s America was the perfect time and place for such a civil rights revolution to take place.

---

[3] Taylor and Searl, 20-34.

[4] Philip R. Reilly, "Involuntary Sterilization in the United States: A Surgical Solution," *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 62 (1987): 155-59, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2829217; Taylor and Searl, 30-35.

[5] Taylor and Searl, 35.

"The Times They Are a-Changin'": The Era of Exposés and New Philosophies in the 1960s

Nothing got the civil rights movement for people with disabilities jumpstarted like the wave of exposés that were published in the 1960s. *Christmas in Purgatory,* a photographic exposé published in 1966, is amongst the most influential. Penned by Burton Blatt with photographs by Fred Kaplan, *Christmas in Purgatory* documents the horrific conditions in the "back wards" of several unnamed state-run institutions for people with disabilities in the Northeastern United States. What they saw, and what Kaplan captured with a small, hidden camera affixed to his belt, Blatt accurately described as "a hell on Earth." Men, women, and children were hidden behind barred windows and heavy doors like dangerous prisoners. They wandered the halls of decaying buildings, many nude or only partially clothed, with no purpose, no stimulation. Instead of being taught how to use a toilet, the residents were gathered in large common areas where waste could be hosed off down a drain in the middle of the floor. People were locked away in solitary cells, often without even a pillow or blanket, for days on end in the name of "therapeutic isolation." Children were bound to benches and left to wallow in their own excrement, and infants were left in their cribs day and night with no adult interaction. The abuse and neglect was unimaginable. *Look* magazine published a version of the exposé a year later under the title, "The Tragedy and Hope of Retarded Children," and placed what Blatt called "our most indefensible practices" in the laps of the American public. The article stunned and outraged the public, and the October 1967 edition of *Look* generated the largest reader response in the magazine's history.[6]

Burton Blatt, a professor at Boston University, and later the founder of The Center on Human Policy at Syracuse University, was instrumental in reshaping attitudes toward and expectations of people with ID and DD. Blatt was profoundly affected by the Holocaust and shocked by humankind's ability to abuse one another, and his attempts to answer difficult questions about humanity shaped his outlook. During a visit to Germany in the 1960s, Blatt grappled with how so many good people could come from a nation responsible for such atrocities. He compared Germany

---

[6] Steven J. Taylor, *Encyclopedia of American Disability History*, 1st vol., s.v. "Christmas in Purgatory."; Blatt and Kaplan, 121; James W. Trent, *Inventing the Feeblemind: A History of Mental Retardation in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 255.

and America and wondered how our society could allow the horrors of institutionalization to happen.[7] His advocacy challenged practically everything in the field of care for those with disabilities.

He believed in being humane, and felt his membership in society held him accountable for the treatment of the most vulnerable. He wrote,

> I could no longer ignore the probability that, unless I struggled to understand inhuman treatment of humans, I would become either insensitive to such treatment (as I believe I had become) or I would not be able to tolerate my own relatively pleasurable life in the face of the Holocaust surrounding those of us unaffected.

Blatt thought everyone bore such responsibility. When he published *Christmas in Purgatory,* he saw institutionalization as viable, so long as the facilities were made smaller, provided with more resources, and accountability measures were in place. Within a few years, however, Blatt abandoned any hope institutionalization could be reformed and called for the removal of people from state-run facilities in favor of community-based supports. Blatt's reasons were two-fold – not only did he want to save innocent lives, he also wanted to change humanity. "To have a decent society," he asserted, "we must behave as decent individuals."[8]

Exposés accompanied new theories that emerged regarding those with ID and DD. For the first time, social scientists usurped psychologists and medical scientists in developing models of care, which now focused on the humanity of the person, rather than on a label that prescribed a course of "treatment." *Normalization,* as first introduced by Bengt Nirje, and then expanded upon by Wolf Wolfensberger in the 1970s, represented this paradigm shift – instead of needing "treatment," people with disabilities needed to be treated "normally." As Wolfensberger defined it, "Normalization implies, as much as possible, the use of culturally valued means in order to enable, establish, and/or maintain valued social roles for people." In other words, people with special needs can participate in society when others have not devalued them through inferior treatment.[9]

---

[7] Steven Taylor, email message, December 4, 2013.
[8] Blatt, "Preface to *Exodus from Pandemonium,*" in *In Search of the Promised Land: The Collected Papers of Burton Blatt*, eds. Steven J. Taylor and Steven D. Blatt (Washington D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation, 1999); Blatt, "The Family Papers: A Return to Purgatory," in *In Search of the Promised Land*.
[9] Taylor and Searl, 44; Wolf Wolfensberger and Steven Tullman, "A Brief Outline of the Principle of Normalization," *Rehabilitation Psychology* 27 (1982): 131.

Litigation

By the end of the 1960s, public concern over the maltreatment of those with disabilities had grown, and increasingly the courts weighed in on these pressing issues. A series of class action lawsuits targeting institutional conditions brought sweeping reforms, and three cases in particular set precedents for other cases to follow.[10]

One of the first cases to grab widespread public and professional attention was Alabama's *Wyatt v. Stickney* (1972). Judge Frank Johnson declared that state-run facilities for those with mental retardation violated the individuals' civil liberties, but that those living in an institution had a right to live in a place that met "Minimum Constitutional Standards" that could be offered in the "least restrictive circumstances." These standards were very strict, specific mandates that covered practically every aspect of care, including "habilitation programs," a point on which Judge Johnson was very clear. "The mentally retarded person," Judge Johnson stated, "has a right to proper medical care and physical therapy and to such education, training, rehabilitation, and guidance as will enable him to develop his ability and maximum potential."[11] His ruling set in motion sweeping changes to Alabama's system of care for those with mental illness and retardation.

Another case that received much attention was the 1973 *Willowbrook* case in New York State. Judge Orrin Judd ruled that the Willowbrook facility, the largest in the world at that time for those with mental retardation, had failed to protect its residents' right to *protection from harm.* Although Judd did not agree with Johnson that residents of such facilities had the constitutional right to habilitation, the ultimate agreement both parties of the *Willowbrook* case reached in 1975 mirrored many of the same provisions included in Judge Johnson's ruling. It even went so far as to call for deinstitutionalization, mandating that Willowbrook reduce its population to no more than 250 residents by 1981.[12] Both *Wyatt* and *Willowbrook* brought about tremendous reforms to the system of institutionalization.

The 1974 *Pennhurst* case, however, challenged institutionalization itself. Judge Raymond Broderick determined that Pennsylvania's Pennhurst State School and Hospital violated its residents' civil liberties and failed to

---

[10] Taylor and Searl, 48
[11] Ibid., 49; Wyatt v. Stickney, 344 F.Supp. 387 (1972).
[12] Taylor and Searl, 50-51.

meet any sort of minimum standard for care. Building upon the rulings of both the *Wyatt* and *Willowbrook* cases, Broderick considered mandates from the 1973 Rehabilitation Act as well as the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution in his ruling. Citing language from *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), he declared that Pennhurst is "a facility that clearly is separate and Not equal." He determined Pennhurst had an obligation to provide community-based living, and as a result of this case, the facility shut down. Much like exposés, litigation played an important role in uncovering the abuse of those with disabilities. However, it had much greater power to affect nationwide change in what Samuel Walker calls "a new strategy of social reform: to change public institutions through constitutional litigation."[13]

The *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) ruling also set the precedent for achieving greater educational rights for children with special needs. In both *PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (1971) and *Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia* (1972), the district judges ruled that students, regardless of disability, had the right to a free, public education in the most inclusive setting possible. The rulings in both of these cases became the basis upon which important legislation on behalf of those with disabilities was designed.[14]

Legislation

Legislation on behalf of those with ID and DD first took form in the 1960s, and John F. Kennedy was the first president to express support for such legislation.[15] However, the most significant legislation emerged in the mid-1970s.

The first of such significant laws is Public Law (PL) 94-142, or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which President Gerald R. Ford signed into law in 1975. IDEA guarantees all children with disabilities a free and "appropriate" public education with access to services to meet their specific needs. Additionally, IDEA requires assessments to ensure the effectiveness of the teaching strategies, it protects the rights of

---

[13] Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89, 104 S.Ct. 900, 79 L.Ed.2d 67, (1984), http://www.pilcop.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Pennhurst_SCOTUS21.pdf; Halderman v. Pennhurst State School and Hospital, 612 F.2D 84 (1979) https://www.casetext.com/case/halderman-v-pennhurst-state-school-hospital/; Samuel Walker, *The Rights Revolution: Rights and Community in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998), 115.

[14] Taylor and Searl, 46-47.

[15] Ibid., 53.

both the children and their parents, and it authorizes federal money to support states in complying with its provisions.[16]   Because of IDEA, thousands of children with special needs attended school for the first time.

Another huge milestone was the passage, also in 1975, of the Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (DD Act). An amendment to the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963, the DD Act provided some government funding to states to conduct research and provide services for those with disabilities. Its most significant feature is its Bill of Rights, whose language reflected a growing belief in the dignity and value of those with special needs. It states that those with ID and DD "have a right to appropriate treatment, services, and habilitation in the least restrictive setting that maximizes developmental potential."   Additionally, it prohibited public funds from being spent on programs and services that do not meet minimum standards for care.[17]   The law has been amended a number of times since, reflective of the evolutionary process that is serving those with disabilities.

Another important piece of legislation is California's Lanterman Act of 1969, which states that people with disabilities have the right to services that allow them to live as their non-disabled peers. It established a system of regional centers, which connected disabled Californians with those services, and provided resources and support to families as they transitioned their loved one from state-run institutions to the community. The Lanterman Act effectively began the process of deinstutionalization in California.[18]

Even though Blatt commended progressive legislation, and called IDEA a "great and wonderful federal law," the need for such legislation at all must give us pause. According to Steven Taylor, the co-Director of The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies at Syracuse University, and Blatt's successor,

---

[16] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, "Thirty-five Years of Progress in Educating Children with Disabilities Through IDEA," 2010, http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/idea35/history/index_pg10.html.

[17] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living, Administration on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, "History of the DD Act," 2013, http://www.acl.gov/Programs/AIDD/DD_History/index.aspx.

[18] Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center, "The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act," 2013, http://www.lanterman.org/lanterman_act; Department of Developmental Services, "Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act and Related Laws," 2013, http://www.dds.ca.gov/Statutes/docs/LantermanAct_2013.pdf.

> [Such legislation as IDEA] is not a sign that we've arrived. It's a sign of how much further we need to go – that the ideal society [is] where we don't have to have these laws protecting the rights of people with disabilities. And while I think these laws are critically important, we have to change our society and our culture.[19]

Parallel Movements

Advocacy, litigation, and legislation created fertile ground from which a number of "parallel" movements for those with disabilities sprang up in tumultuous 1960s America. One of the most prolific was the Independent Living Movement (ILM), which established its first center in Berkeley, California in 1972. Started by a student named Ed Roberts in the early 1960s, the ILM says that even those with the most severe disabilities can and have the right to live in the community with the proper supports.[20]

Roberts contracted polio at 14 years old and was almost instantly paralyzed from the neck down. He needed to be in an 800-pound iron lung for twenty-four hours a day to breathe. Despite the doctor's grim prognosis, Roberts attended his first three years of high school over the telephone. Concerned he would never realize his independence, Roberts' mother encouraged him to attend school in person his senior year. Because portable ventilators did not exist at this time, Roberts taught himself how to breathe outside the iron lung by "frog breathing," or swallowing air into his lungs.[21]

After he received his high school diploma, he set his sights on a political science degree from UC Berkeley. However, Roberts' dream met much opposition from the university's administration. After being told, "We tried cripples, and they don't work," he sued the school and won the right to be a student and live on campus – iron lung and all. As a student, Roberts participated in the Civil Rights Movement for African-Americans, and learned from the women's rights movement. He realized how much the tenets of these revolutions applied to him and other people with disabilities. Over the course of many years, Roberts worked with other students with disabilities to not only make UC Berkeley more accessible, but to change

---

[19] Taylor, "On the Shoulders of Giants, Reflections on Great Leaders of Our Time: Burton Blatt, Gunnar Dybwad and Wolf Wolfensberger," *Revolutionary Leaders Webinar Series,* 2012, https://connectpro95156488.adobeconnect.com/_a944643455/p4sb7kqusqe/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal.

[20] University of California, Berkeley, *The Disability Rights and Independent Living Movement: Introduction,* 2013, http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/collections/drilm/introduction.html.

[21] Ed Roberts, "Autobiography," from *Parallels in Time: The Independent Living Movement,"* http://mn.gov/mnddc/parallels/six/6b/1.html, n.d., 1-3.

attitudes. He expanded his advocacy beyond the confines of the campus and founded the Center for Independent Living in 1972, which still provides resources to "enhance the rights and abilities of people with disabilities to actively participate in their communities and to live self-determined lives." California governor Jerry Brown even appointed Roberts to be the Director of the Department of Rehabilitation, a position he held for nine years.[22]

Roberts passed away in 1995, but in his lifetime of advocacy, he was a leader and an example of what was possible for even those with the most severe disabilities. He knew everyone has something to offer, stating:

> There are very few people even with the most severe disabilities who can't take control of their own life. The problem is that people around us don't expect us to. We built a system, a political system, and a system of public policy based on old attitudes that actually allow us off the hook, to have no expectations, that believe that we will not work or participate in our... in our communities when in fact we've discovered that the reality is just the opposite.[23]

The revolution that was 1960s America allowed leaders like Roberts to challenge the traditional ways of thinking that had long dominated popular thought regarding those with disabilities.

Analysis

There was perhaps no better time and place for this civil rights movement to happen than 1960s America. Several factors worked to create an environment conducive to the tremendous change that took place in the area of disability rights. Firstly, the groundwork for civil rights had already been laid, partially by the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) ruling. It was not a stretch to imagine separate facilities for people with ID and DD as unconstitutional also. Secondly, radical young Americans challenged the nature of institutions of all kinds, and consequently the validity of institutionalization for those disabilities was put on trial. Americans also approached traditional views, definitions, and authority figures with great suspicion during this era. In much the same fashion that college students challenged the authority of their academic institutions and bucked against

---

[22] Roberts, "Autobiography," 4-6; Ed Roberts, "Speech: The Emergence of the Civil Rights Movement," 1980, http://www.oac.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb6m3nb1nw&brand=oac4; Center for Independent Living, "Mission," 2012, http://www.cilberkeley.org/mission/.

[23] Ed Roberts, interview by Harry Reasoner, *60 Minutes,* CBS, April 1988, http://mn.gov/mnddc/ed-roberts/sixtyMinutes.html.

the leadership's traditional decisions, families of and advocates for those with ID and DD questioned the "authority of professional decision making." Certainly, the 1960s and 70s were also years of nonconformity, when many Americans sought to define their own identity separate from any institution. Many sociologists who published new theories on the care of those with ID and DD saw the traditional treatments offered by doctors and psychologists as attempts to stifle the nonconformity of those with special needs. Additionally, some sectors of society not only welcomed nonconformity, they reveled in the unusual. After generations of isolation, those with disabilities were amongst society's most unusual. The Supreme Court's greater involvement in what many traditionally considered states' affairs and the federal government's greater funding of social programs also contributed to the success and longevity of this movement.[24] This confluence of events and circumstances ripened America into a hotbed of progressive advocacy that changed everything for those with special needs.

Legacy of Blatt and the Movement

The impact of Blatt and Roberts' advocacy, as well as the civil rights movement for those with ID and DD in the 1960s, is very difficult to overstate. Not only did the immediate circumstances for many of our nation's most marginalized population change, but also precedents were set that enabled future generations of those with special needs to gain even greater status in U.S. society. They have gained greater legal recognition and society expects their participation.

Several important legal precedents emerged from the legacy of the tumultuous 1960s. In 1990, the United States passed the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which prohibits discrimination against and "ensures equal opportunity for persons with disabilities in employment, state and local government services, public accommodations, commercial facilities, and transportation."[25] Every wheelchair ramp into a business, every accessible bathroom stall, and every bus that kneels to accommodate passengers with physical disabilities is a manifestation of a cultural shift from exclusive to inclusive.

---

[24] Taylor and Searl, 52; Steven J. Taylor, *Acts of Conscience: World War II, Mental Institutions, and Religious Objectors* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2009), 392-93; Taylor, "Christmas in Purgatory: A Retrospective Look," *Mental Retardation* 44 (2006): 147.

[25] United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, "Information and Technical Assistance on the Americans with Disabilities Act," 2010, http://www.ada.gov/2010_regs.htm.

In much the same fashion that the ADA grew from the legacies of the 1960s and the DD Act, the Supreme Court ruling in the 1999 *Olmstead* case built upon the ADA. The Court concluded that unjustified segregation of those with ID and DD violates Title II of the ADA, and that appropriate community-based services must be provided to those who want them. The most significant part of this ruling, however, is why the Supreme Court ruled the way it did. According to the ruling,

> Institutional placement of persons who can handle and benefit from community settings perpetuates unwarranted assumptions that persons so isolated are incapable of or unworthy of participating in community life… Confinement in an institution severely diminishes the everyday life activities of individuals, including family relations, social contacts, work options, economic independence, educational advancement, and cultural enrichment.[26]

The United States finally articulated what advocates like Blatt and Roberts had known for decades. *Olmstead* was a human rights victory and the impetus for many states to deinstutionalize those with disabilities in favor of community living.

The closure of state-run institutions is another legacy of this movement. Since 1967, the population residing in institutional settings has declined an average of four percent per year, and resulted in the closure of 140 facilities across forty states.[27] In California, the systematic closure of such facilities began after the passage of the Lanterman Act in 1969, with a renewed effort beginning in 1994 following the *Coffelt* lawsuit.[28] As a result, the population in developmental centers has steadily declined from its peak of 13,000 in 1968 to 1,385 as of October 30, 2013. To cite only a few examples, New York has a plan in place to close four state-run institutions

---

[26] Department of Justice, "About *Olmstead,*" 2013, http://www.ada.gov/olmstead/olmstead_about.htm.

[27] Amie Lulinski Norris, Mary Kay Rizzolo, and Tamar Heller, "An Analysis of Movement From State Operated Developmental Centers in Illinois," prepared for the *Illinois Department of Human Services Division of Developmental Disabilities,* 2010, 11: http://www.dhs.state.il.us/OneNetLibrary/27897/documents/DD%20Reports/AnalysisofMovementfromSODCinIL092010.pdf.

[28] The *Coffelt* lawsuit is a class-action suit brought against the California Department of Developmental Services in 1990 by William Coffelt whose son was nearly beaten to death during his residency in Sonoma Developmental Center. The lawsuit claimed that insufficient state funding prevented those with ID and DD from community living, and that residency in developmental centers heightened their risks for injury. The 1993 settlement ensured provisions for high-quality community-based supports. (Elizabeth Chilcoat, "Coffelt v. Dept. of Developmental Serv. Case Profile," for the Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse at the University of Michigan Law School, 2006, http://www.clearinghouse.net/detail.php?id=433.)

in the next four years; in New Jersey, 204 residents moved from institutional settings into community-based supports over the course of two years, with a 94% success rate; and in Louisiana, 428 residents moved to community supports between December 2003 and February 28, 2007.[29] It is tragic that in our modern society there are still people with special needs living in the forced isolation of institutional settings. However, if it were not for people like Blatt and Roberts, America may never have made it this far.

It is hard to believe that our grandparents can remember a time when the educational system excluded students with special needs. Nevertheless, because of the Disability Rights Movement, kids with disabilities are included in their neighborhood schools across the country. As of 2009, some 95% of American students with disabilities are educated in regular schools, and roughly three in five spend 80% or more of their school day in the regular classroom.[30] Mainstreaming is the new norm. It reflects the belief that all children can learn and that those with special needs contribute just as much to the classroom as their peers in general education.

The legacy of the late Burton Blatt defies simple summation, and it cannot be pigeonholed. In his few short decades of national advocacy, Blatt helped to change expectations for those with disabilities. Seymour Sarason of Yale University believes part of Blatt's legacy rests in the demise of institutionalization. As he argues,

> For all practical purposes, there is no controversy today about deinstitutionalization; we do not hear individuals and groups say that individuals with mental retardation should be removed from the communities and placed in institutions… no *individual* more than Burt played as crucial a role in changing public attitudes and policy.

---

[29] California Health and Human Services Agency Department of Developmental Services, "Final Report on the Plan for the Closure of Agnews Developmental Center," 2010, 5: http://www.dds.ca.gov/AgnewsClosure/docs/March2010_FinalReportAgnewsClosurePlan.pdf; State of California Department of Developmental Services, "Population of Developmental Centers and State-Operated Community Facilities," 2013: http://www.dds.ca.gov/DevCtrs/AllFacPop.cfm; NYSARC, "Politics as it Happens: State to Close Four Remaining Developmental Centers," 2013: http://blog.nysarc.org/2013/07/29/politics-as-it-happens-state-to-close-4-remaining-developmental-centers/; Task Force on the Closure of State Developmental Centers, "Final Report," 2012, 5: http://www.state.nj.us/humanservices/news/hottopics/Final_Task_Force_Report.pdf; Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities, "State of Louisiana: Plan for Transformation of Public Developmental Centers to Supports and Services Centers," 2007, 3: http://new.dhh.louisiana.gov/assets/docs/OCDD/publications/PlanforTransformationofPublicDev CentersSupportsandServicesCenters.pdf.
[30] National Center for Education Statistics, "Fast Facts: Students with Disabilities, inclusion of," 2009, http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=59.

Yet, even more than that, Blatt challenged silence when it meant suffering would continue, because "when privacy contributes to suffering, it loses its significance as a cherished privilege." He lived by a strict moral code that empowered him to share his knowledge with the world, so that evil could not persist unopposed. He challenged the idea that ID and DD were diseases and saw all treatments for such as abusive because they imply that those with special needs require a "cure." He believed in the dignity and abilities of everyone, regardless of diagnosis. "Don't tell me what retarded people cannot do," he declared, "tell me under what conditions they can learn and do more." Indeed, Burton Blatt's advocacy is not bound to "a certain historical era," but is critical "to understand the age-old problem of human abuse, of inhumanity, that continues to plague us today."[31]

Conclusions

Less than one hundred years ago, people with intellectual and developmental disabilities were locked away in human warehouses, deprived of even the most basic rights, and blamed for alcoholism, poverty, and other social problems. Society considered them abnormal, diseased, and defective, and the advocacy of only a few made forced sterilization of thousands popular. How far the United States has advanced in its care for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities is almost unreal. Today, millions of Americans with intellectual and developmental disabilities have the federally guaranteed right to receive an education that best meets their needs, to seek employment without discrimination, and to live in the community of their choosing and lead the lives they wish to have. Models for care are no longer about "curing" a person, but about recognizing their uniqueness and inherent value as a human being. These progressive and humanistic ideals were born and reared in the hotbed of 1960s America, when tradition and conformity were challenged by nearly all segments of society.

---

[31] Seymour B. Sarason, Foreword to *In Search of the Promised Land,* xviii; Blatt and Kaplan, 120; Blatt, "How to Destroy Lives by Telling Stories," in *In Search of the Promised Land*, 95; Taylor and Steven D. Blatt, Introduction to *In Search of the Promised Land.*

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Blatt, Burton. "The Family Papers: A Return to Purgatory." In *In Search of the Promised Land: The Collected Papers of Burton Blatt,* edited by Steven J. Taylor and Steven D. Blatt. Washington D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation, 1999.

———. "How to Destroy Lives by Telling Stories." In *In Search of the Promised Land: The Collected Papers of Burton Blatt,* edited by Steven J. Taylor and Steven D. Blatt. Washington D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation, 1999.

———. "Preface to Exodus from Pandemonium." In *In Search of the Promised Land: The Collected Papers of Burton Blatt,* edited by Steven J. Taylor and Steven D. Blatt. Washington D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation, 1999.

Blatt, Burton, and Fred Kaplan. *Christmas in Purgatory: A Photographic Essay on Mental Retardation.* Syracuse: Human Policy Press, 1974.

California Health and Human Services Agency Department of Developmental Services. "Final Report on the Plan for the Closure of Agnews Developmental Center." 2010. http://www.dds.ca.gov/AgnewsClosure/docs/March2010_FinalReportAgnewsClosurePlan.pdf

Department of Justice. "About *Olmstead."* 2013. http://www.ada.gov/olmstead/olmstead_about.htm.

Halderman v. Pennhurst State School and Hospital 612 F.2D 84 (3D Cir. 1979). https://www.casetext.com/case/halderman-v-pennhurst-state-school-hospital/.

Lulinski Norris, Amie, Mary Kay Rizzolo, and Tamar Heller. "An Analysis of Movement from State Operated Developmental Centers in Illinois." Prepared for the *Illinois Department of Human Services Division of Developmental Disabilities.* 2010. http://www.dhs.state.il.us/OneNetLibrary/27897/documents/DD%20Reports/AnalysisofMovementfromSODCinIL092010.pdf.

National Center for Education Statistics. "Fast Facts: Students with Disabilities, inclusion of." 2009. http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=59.

Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities. "State of Louisiana: Plan for Transformation of Public Developmental Centers to Supports and Services Centers." 2007. http://new.dhh.louisiana.gov/assets/docs/OCDD/publications/PlanforTransformationofPublicDevCentersSupportsandServicesCenters.pdf.

Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89, 104 S.Ct. 900, 79 L.Ed.2d 67 (1984). http://www.pilcop.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/04/Pennhurst_SCOTUS21.pdf.

Roberts, Ed. "Autobiography." From *Parallels in Time: The Independent Living Movement.* n.d. http://mn.gov/mnddc/parallels/six/6b/1.html.

———. "Ed Roberts, Activist." By Harry Reasoner. *60 Minutes,* (April 1988): http://mn.gov/mnddc/ed-roberts/sixtyMinutes.html.

———. "Speech: The Emergence of the Civil Rights Movement." 1980. http://www.oac.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb6m3nb1nw&brand=oac4.

State of California Department of Developmental Services. "Population of Developmental Centers and State-Operated Community Facilities." 2013. http://www.dds.ca.gov/DevCtrs/AllFacPop.cfm.

Task Force on the Closure of State Developmental Centers. "Final Report." 2012. http://www.state.nj.us/humanservices/news/hottopics/Final_Task_Force_Report.pdf.

United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division. "Information and Technical Assistance on the Americans with Disabilities Act." 2010. http://www.ada.gov/2010_regs.htm.

Wolfensberger, Wolf, and Stephen Tullman. "A Brief Outline of the Principle of Normalization." *Rehabilitation Psychology* 27 (1982): 131-45.

Secondary Sources

Center for Independent Living. "Mission." 2012. http://www.cilberkeley.org/mission/.

Chilcoat, Elizabeth. "Coffelt v. Dept. of Developmental Serv. Case Profile." For the *Civil Rights Litigation Clearing House* at the University of Michigan Law School. 2006. http://www.clearinghouse.net/detail.php?id=433.

Department of Developmental Services. "Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act and Related Laws." Published January 2013. http://www.dds.ca.gov/Statutes/docs/LantermanAct_2013.pdf.

Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center. "The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act." Last modified 2013. http://www.lanterman.org/lanterman_act.

NYSARC. "Politics as it Happens: States to Close Four Remaining Developmental Centers." 2013. http://blog.nysarc.org/2013/07/29/politics-as-it-happens-state-to-close-4-remaining-developmental-centers/.

Reilly, Philip R. "Involuntary Sterilization in the United States: A Surgical Solution." *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 62 (1987): 153-70. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2829217.

Sarason, Seymour B. Foreword to *In Search of the Promised Land: The Collected Papers of Burton Blatt*. Washington D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation, 1999.

Taylor, Steven J. "Christmas in Purgatory." In *Encyclopedia of American Disability History,* edited by Susan Burch. Facts on File, 2009.

———. "Christmas in Purgatory: A Retrospective Look." *Mental Retardation* 44 (2006): 145-49.

———. Conclusion to *Acts of Conscience: World War II, Mental Institutions, and Religious Objectors,* 381-95. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2009.

———. "On the Shoulders of Giants, Reflections on Great Leaders of Our Time: Burton Blatt, Gunnar Dybwad, and Wolf Wolfensberger." *Revolutionary Leaders Webinar Series.* 2012. https://connectpro95156488.adobeconnect.com/_a944643455/p4sb7kqusqe/?launcher=false &fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal.

Taylor, Steven J., and Stanford J. Searl. "Disability in America: A History of Policies and Trends." In *Significant Disability: Issues Affecting People with Significant Disabilities from a Historical Policy, Leadership, and Systems Perspective,* edited by E. Davis Martin. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher Ltd, 2001.

Taylor, Steven J., and Steven D. Blatt. Introduction to *In Search of the Promised Land: The Collected Papers of Burton Blatt,* xix-xxi. Washington D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation, 1999.

Trent, James W. *Inventing the Feeblemind: A History of Mental Retardation in the US.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

University of California, Berkeley. *The Disability Rights and Independent Living Movement: Introduction.* 2013. http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/collections/drilm/introduction.html.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. "Thirty-five Years of Progress in Educating Children with Disabilities Through IDEA." Last modified November 22, 2010. http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/idea35/history/index_pg10.html.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living, Administration on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. "History of the DD Act." Last modified September 19, 2013. http://www.acl.gov/Programs/AIDD/DD_History/index.aspx.

Walker, Samuel. *The Rights Revolution: Rights and Community in Modern America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Wolfensberger, Wolf. "The Origin And Nature Of Our Institutional Models." *Changing Patterns in Residential Services for the Mentally Retarded.* Washington D.C.: President's Committee on Mental Retardation, 1969. Online edition.

.

Anti-Proposition 8 protesters rally in front of the United States Supreme Court building in Washington D.C., waving an American flag synthesized with rainbow colors, on the day the Court heard oral arguments in the *Hollingsworth v. Perry* case. The photo was taken by Jonathan Ernst on March 26, 2013, and is the property of Reuters. It can be found at: http://blogs.kcrw.com/whichwayla/2013/03/prop-8-at-the-supreme-court.

THE GAY MARRIGE IGNOMINY: THE PASSAGE OF CALIFORNIA'S PROPOSITION 8 AND THE INFLUENCE OF MASS MEDIA | Daniel R. Thompson

"Proposition 8 fails to advance any rational basis in singling out gay men and lesbians for denial of a marriage licence [*sic*]. Indeed, the evidence shows Proposition 8 does nothing more than enshrine in the California constitution the notion that opposite-sex couples are superior to same-sex couples." – Judge Vaughn Walker[1]

Common wisdom among most Americans leads them to perceive California as among the most liberal states in our nation. However, in the November 2008 general election, when a majority of the voting population elected our nation's first African-American president into office, a majority of citizens in the State of California voted to strike down the State Supreme Court's ruling allowing the right of same-sex couples to legally marry.

While significant research has focused on the influence of the media, only a moderate amount of scholarship has focused specifically on the media effects of agenda setting, framing, and priming. An alarming absence of research exists on the influence of the media's use of wedge issues. Most importantly, the identification of same-sex marriage issue salience has never utilized any of these media apparatuses.

M.V. Lee Badgett is among the scholars who advocates for the application of the reciprocal relationship of marriage to homosexual couples as well. She stresses the urgency of affording the right to marry to same-sex pairs by stating that "[f]ar from building a wall around the two people marrying, marriage is an experience that connects the couple to other people in their social circles—whether the couple wants it or not."[2] Therefore, an imperative question arises: why did a majority of California voters decide to prohibit the right of marriage to homosexuals by passing Proposition 8 in 2008, recognizing how valuable that social connection is to individuals? This paper argues that a possible explanation for why Proposition 8 passed is the direct result of the influence of the media over public opinion on gay rights and same-sex marriage in particular.

This research proposal focuses on a critical discussion of the passage of California's Proposition 8 in 2008 and the influence that the mass media had on the public opinion of the issue salience of same-sex marriage.

---

[1] *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 2013. *133* S.Ct. 2652.
[2] Badgett, M.V. Lee, *When Gay People Get Married* (New York: NYU Press, 2010), 4.

The proceeding literature review emphasizes a complete history of Proposition 8 juxtaposed to the rise of new media. Next, a methods and data section identifies all variables examined in the research design. Lastly, the interpretation of results and conclusion sections ensues.

Literature Review

This thorough literature review examines the effects of the media on the passage of California's Proposition 8 in November of 2008. A comprehensive history of gay marriage initiatives in the state begins and an explication of the rise of new media then follows, looking specifically at the growing use of interpretive journalism that relies on media tools like agenda setting, priming, framing, and wedge issues to manipulate public opinion.

A Complete History of Proposition 8 and Gay Marriage in California

The official title "California Proposition 8 – Eliminates Right of Same-Sex Couples to Marry" is the 2008 statewide ballot initiative that amended the California State Constitution. The amendment states that "only a marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California," which effectively banned same-sex marriage throughout the state.[3] Proposition 8 and the extensive legal challenges that occurred after its passage by voters on November 5, 2008 are only the most recent of a sequence of efforts by numerous groups to define marriage in the state of California.

The very first attempt to define marriage occurred in 1977 when the state legislature approved Assembly Bill 607, which described marriage as a "personal relation arising out of a civil contract between and man and a woman."[4] The significance of this early bill is that it was the first occasion where the section of the California Civil Code pertaining to marriage law included the specific reference to gender exclusively.

The next change to the state's definition of marriage took place with the passage of the ordinary statute known as Proposition 22 in 2000, which altered the California Family Code to unequivocally define marriage

---

[3] California Secretary of State, "Official Voter Information Guide." 2008a, http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/past/2008/general/text-proposed-laws/text-of-proposed-laws.pdf#prop8 (accessed April 20, 2014), 128.

[4] State of California. "Schwarzenegger Answer Brief on Merits." 2009, http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/highprofile/documents/01Schwarzenneger_Answer_Brief_on_the_Merits.pdf (accessed April 18, 2014).

as being between one man and one woman.[5] However, joint efforts by San Francisco and other state municipalities to conduct official same-sex marriages eventually helped shift public opinion and led to subsequent court challenges of the law.[6] In May of 2008, the California State Supreme Court overturned Proposition 22, thereby allowing approximately 18,000 same-sex couples to legally wed in the state.[7]

As a response to the Court's overturning of Proposition 22, opponents of gay marriage helped organize the California Marriage Protection Act, known more commonly as Proposition 8, in order to prevent same-sex couples from continuing to legal marry each other. The statewide initiative was qualified and officially placed on the general election ballot of November 2008 where it passed by a 52.3 percent majority by voters.[8] "More than $82 million was spent trying to educate and influence voters about Proposition 8. Opponents to the same-sex marriage ban spent more than $44 million, representing 53 percent of the total."[9]

Analysis of the official voter information guide reveals the arguments offered by the opposing sides regarding Proposition 8 and the issue of same-sex marriage. The advocates of Proposition 8, and opponents of gay marriage, argued that heterosexual marriage was "an essential institution of society" and that failing to define marriage between one man and one woman would "result in public schools teaching our kids that gay marriage is okay."[10] They also contended that "gays ... do not have the right to redefine marriage for everyone else."[11]   However, opponents of Proposition 8, and advocates of gay marriage, posited that "the freedom to marry is fundamental to our society," that the California Constitution "should guarantee the same freedom and rights to everyone."[12]   Their primary criticism of Proposition 8 was that such an initiative "mandates one set of rules for gay and lesbian couples and another set for everyone else"

---

[5] Sayre, Ben, et al., "Agenda Setting in a Digital Age: Tracking Attention to California Proposition 8 in Social Media, Online News and Conventional News," **Policy & Internet** 2, no. 2 (Jan. 2010): 11.

[6] Sayre, 11.

[7] Dolan, Maura, "California High Court Upholds Prop. 8," *Los Angeles Times*, 27 May, 2009.

[8] California Secretary of State. "State Ballot Measures." 2008b, http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/sov/2008_general/57_65_ballot_measures (accessed April 19, 2014).

[9] Sayre, 11.

[10] California Secretary of State, 2008a, 128.

[11] Ibid., 129.

[12] Ibid., 130.

and that "equality under the law is a fundamental constitutional guarantee."[13]

The significance of Proposition 8 is that, at more $82 million, it was the most funded campaign of the 2008 general election except for the presidency, despite the fact that it was one of many state ballot measures in only one state.[14] After the November 2008 election and passage of Proposition 8, a number of lawsuits with the California Supreme Court supervened challenging the law's prohibition on same-sex marriages. One such case that received standing and passed the *certiorari* voting stage by the Court was that of *Strauss v. Horton*, in which the Court upheld the validity of Proposition 8's exclusion of gay marriage. "Of the six initial filings, three were consolidated under *Strauss v. Horton* and three were stayed pending its resolution."[15] Nevertheless, the California Supreme Court permitted the approximately 18,000 same-sex marriages that had legally occurred since the decision in *In re Marriage Cases* to remain valid, in accordance with the grandfather clause principle.

Upon the Court's ruling in the *Strauss* case, a subsequent suit filed with a United States Federal District Court in San Francisco proceeded, resulting in the case of *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*. In August of 2010 the District Court Judge in this case, Vaughn R. Walker, overturned the validity of Proposition 8 upheld in the previous California Supreme Court case.[16] Judge Walker held that the ban on gay marriage violated both the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution and issued an injunctive relief against the enforcement of Proposition 8. However, the Court stayed the previous ruling allowing the prohibition of same-sex marriage to remain in effect pending an appeal, subsequently stayed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals as well.

The issue of the legality of gay marriage in the State of California continued into January of 2011 when the Appellate Court held that Imperial County lacked the standing to intercede in the suit. Then in February 2011, the California Supreme Court addressed the issue of whether or not non-governmental advocates of Proposition 8 had adequate standing to appeal. Finally, the Court heard oral arguments on September 6, and issued and advisory opinion stating that such advocates did in fact have standing on

---

[13] Ibid., 128.

[14] Sayre.

[15] Choper, Jesse H, "Should Proposition 8 Be Held to be Retroactive?" California Journal of Politics and Policy 1, no. 1 (Mar. 2010).

[16] *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 2010. 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010).

November 17, 2011.[17]

Less than three months later, on February 7, 2012, a three-judge panel on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the previous decision in *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, which declared Proposition 8 to be an unconstitutional violation of the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. Finally, on December 7, 2012 the U.S. Supreme Court granted writ of certiorari and held oral arguments on the case on March 26, 2013.[18] The Court issued a five-to-four decision on June 26, 2013 that the petitioners did not have standing to appeal in federal court, which left the district court's ruling overturning Proposition 8 as the final ruling of the case.

The Rise of New Media

When examining contemporary scholarship on the influence of mass media over public opinion on various social issues, especially in the case of same-sex marriage, it is obvious that the doctrine of minimal effects of the media that was prevalent in 1950's political science research no longer applies. The media has grown exponentially in its influence over public opinion in recent decades, during the period referred to as the rise of new media.[19] The progressive pronouncement of the issue salience of gay rights, likewise, resulted from the influence of mass media. More importantly, the perception created by strategic news coverage has become more influential than reality, based on the amplified use of interpretive journalism.[20] In examining the respective articles written by Marc J. Hetherington, Shanto Iyengar and Donald R. Kinder (and with Jennifer McGrady), and finally, John Zaller, it is apparent that the effects of media tools like agenda setting, priming, and framing are some of the most effective ways to influence public opinion. Moreover, in building upon the most recent scholarship of Iyengar and McGrady, it is evident that the media effectively use wedge issues to persuade public perceptions on issues like gay marriage.

In *News that Matters*, Shanto Iyengar and Donald R. Kinder

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 2013. *133* S.Ct. 2652.

[19] Hetherington, Marc J. "The Media's Role in Forming Voters' National Economic Evaluations in 1992." *American Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 2 (May 1996): 372-395; Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. "News That Matters." In *American Government: Readings and Cases,* edited by Karen O'Connor. New York: Longman, 2001; See also Zaller, John. "The Myth of Massive Media Impact Revisited: New Support for a Discredited Idea." In *Political Persuasion in American Politics,* edited by Diana C. Mutz, Paul M. Sniderman, and Richard Brody. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

[20] Hetherington, 372-375.

postulate that "television news has become a regular participant in the American political process," by utilizing the media tools of agenda setting and priming in order to influence public opinion.[21]   Iyengar further designates agenda setting as the giving of differential attention to certain issues, thereby setting the agenda of public discourse.[22] "That is to say, by covering some issues and ignoring others, the media influence which issues people view as important and which they view as unimportant."[23] Priming can be conceptualized as a natural extension of agenda setting and refers to how the media affect the criteria by which political officials are evaluated by the public."[24]

Framing is another, arguably undemocratic, tool exploited by the media to influence issue salience and was originally developed by Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. Framing refers to the altering of the opinions about particular issues by emphasizing (or de-emphasizing) certain facets about those respective issues.[25] Moreover, the media employs two types of news frames. The first is episodic framing, where "news reports present unconnected events centering on individuals rather than on broader societal concerns, thereby encouraging viewers to assign blame to individuals rather than elected officials."[26] The second form, thematic framing, "causes viewers to blame decision makers and institutions for societal problems."[27] Iyengar and McGrady also conspicuously differentiate between two distinct types of framing effects: equivalency framing effects, involving dissimilar, but comparable words; and emphasis framing effects, involving the highlighting of different subsections of considerations of a single issue.[28]

Expanding upon some of these mass media methods, Zaller postulated that such influence consists more in telling people what to think about than in telling them what to think, which explains how the mass media can successfully influence public opinion in a freethinking society.[29] As the contemporary 24-hour cable news cycle demonstrates, those news channels

---

[21] Iyengar and Kinder, 318.
[22] Iyengar and McGrady, 210-213.
[23] Ibid., 210.
[24] Ibid., 210-211.
[25] Ibid., 219-220.
[26] Hetherington, 375.
[27] Ibid., 375.
[28] Iyengar and McGrady, 219-223.
[29] Zaller, 17-18

that set their agenda by priming the most consistent and framing the most persuasive messages will have the greatest influence on the perceptions of their viewers.

In *Media Politics: A Citizen's Guide*, Iyengar and McGrady add to the list of tools employed by the media to shape public opinion by discussing the use of wedge issues, or highly partisan subjects like abortion or gay marriage, which have the effect of dividing or putting a wedge through the electorate. The authors specifically state, "Wedge issues are designed to pit groups against each other, to appeal to voters' sense of group identity."[30] By successfully employing techniques like agenda-setting, priming, framing, and the use of wedge issues, today's media may arguably be considered a quasi-fourth branch of government with more influence over public opinion than the first three branches combined.

This paper hypothesizes that there exists a positive correlation between Californians voting "yes" on Proposition 8 and being influenced by the tools of mass media. In other words, voters in California effectively persuaded by the media's use of agenda setting, priming, framing, and wedge issues were more inclined to support Proposition 8, which banned same-sex marriage in the state. This hypothesis presupposes that a preponderance of the media's tools utilized around the time of the November 2008 general election were focused on persuading viewers that same-sex marriage should be prohibited.

Methods and Data

The assumption that much of the media set the agenda of gay marriage prohibition is difficult to substantiate without extensive time-series data on all major television, radio, internet, and printed news surrounding the November 2008 election. However, such exhaustive data is not currently available to this author and existing time-series data are too extensive to thoroughly deconstruct in the short period available to compile this research proposal. Therefore, one of the shortcomings to this research design, which assumes such data will indicate a positive correlation between voting "yes" on Proposition 8 and the influence of mass media apparatuses, is that the operationalization of the hypothesis only transpires as a hypothetical situation. In other words, the limitations of the research design mean that the supposed relationship can only operate in a hypothetical world that

---

[30] Iyengar and McGrady, 145.

assumes that mass media overwhelmingly tried to persuade viewers that same-sex marriage should be illegal in California. While such conditions can certainly only be conceived as conjectural, they would be necessary for an efficaciously supported supposition.

The specific instrumentation of the proposed hypothesis is based on the notion that issue salience over gay rights, and same-sex marriage in particular, will be affected by how mass media set the agenda of public opinion by utilizing priming, framing, and the use of wedge issues that deliberately divide the voting populace. The precise hypothesis proposed here pertains to the presumption of the relationship between voting "yes" on Proposition 8 and the tools of the media permitting one to do so. Therefore, the independent variable is the 52.3 percent majority of Californians who voted "yes" on Proposition 8, while the dependent variable comprises of the abovementioned tools of manipulation used by mass media to persuade public opinion. The mechanism that connects these variables is that they are both complimentary to the growth of media politics (and, specifically, towards the rise of interpretive journalism). While there is certainly a plethora of other possible influences on the aforementioned dependent variable, such as issue salience of gay marriage, strength of political efficacy, interest in politics, or access to media outlets, this paper confines the analysis to only voting "yes" on California's Proposition 8 in November 2008.

One example of how to utilize the data to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables is based on the design established by Sayre et al. in the article "Agenda Setting in a Digital Age: Tracking Attention to California Proposition 8 in Social Media, Online News, and Conventional News." As the title suggests, Sayre and his coauthors closely tracked the volume of content that referred to Proposition 8 in three different types of media outlets: videos posted on YouTube, online search results from Google News, and the top eight daily California newspapers – all inspected over a 14-month period. While the research design of Sayre et al. may establish a model by which an interpretation of results could ensue, utilizing other models to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables may work as well.

One such method of testing the supposition of the relationship between the two variables is to closely scrutinize printed, broadcasted, or online news sources over the proceeding and succeeding months surrounding the November 2008 election that reference Proposition 8, same-sex marriage, or gay rights in general. This research project could apply the

same search string used by Sayre et al. to gather the data for all of their necessary analyses in combination with more general search terms like "gay rights" and "same-sex marriage." That is, the terms "prop 8" and "proposition 8" that were exclusively used by Sayre and his coauthors may be too limiting and fail to capture the influence of mass media to prohibit gay marriage vis-à-vis persuasive tools that manipulate public opinion. Therefore, they should be accompanied by more inclusive search parameters like "gay marriage."

Finally, the data for the proposed research project should indubitably examine a comparative analysis of the media effects of agenda setting, priming, framing, and use of wedge issues of more conservative media outlets, i.e. Fox News, juxtaposed to the more liberal-leaning media, such as the New York Times or MSNBC. This type of analysis would only be successful if a survey were conducted which asked respondents whether or not they voted "yes" for Proposition 8 in 2008 and the degree to which their voting decision was influenced by the media (see Appendix A for a proposal of such a survey). Such a cross-sectional analysis would allow academics to control for highly partisan news media, which would provide broader context to the possible sphere of influence the mass media has over affecting public opinion on the salience of same-sex marriage. Of course, standard frequency distributions of each variable and a basic cross-tabulation between the two variables may provide useful insights into the specific causation of certain media effects on the influence of public opinion over Proposition 8 and the right of homosexual couples to legally marry as well.

Results

The first empirical test should run separate frequency distributions on the dependent and independent variables once they become quantifiable and completely entered into a dataset (preferably utilizing either IBM's SPSS or the University of California, Berkeley's SDA online analysis). Such a test will reveal any statistically noticeable differences in the frequencies of respondents indicating whether they would vote "yes" on Proposition 8 and the degree to which the mass media influenced their voting decisions. Although a potential limitation to such a design is that some respondents may be conscientious of the influence of media effects on their voting behavior, others may be unaware of such influence on their decision to vote "yes" on Proposition 8.

The next empirical test should be a basic cross-tabulation between

the two variables with the dependent variable representing the rows and the independent variable demonstrating the columns, once the conduction of the aforementioned survey from the data section occurs. This type of analysis will allow academics to make comparisons across different values of the independent variable in order to determine the extent to which the effects of media tools of manipulation persuasively influenced most of the electorate to vote "yes" on Proposition 8, based on the effects of media tools of manipulation.

Moreover, if one were to conduct three-way cross-tabulations as well, then it would be possible to control for other possible influences on the dependent variable. This would help either support or disconfirm the hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between Californians voting "yes" on Proposition 8 and media's use of agenda setting, priming, framing, and wedge issues impelling their votes. If controlling for other possible influences of media effects (i.e. the salience of gay marriage, strength of political efficacy, interest in politics, or access to media outlets) demonstrates that voting "yes" on Proposition 8 still has the greatest statistical significance, then the hypothesis would be validated. However, other more prevalent influences of the effects of media tools revealed by a three-way cross-tabulation mitigate the supposition. Running Pearson Chi-square tests for statistical significance could confirm other influences besides the issue salience of gay rights and voting "yes" on Proposition 8.

Finally, a comparative analysis of the more ideologically driven, highly partisan media outlets, such as Fox News and MSNBC, may reveal how Conservative-leaning news in particular contributed to the sphere of influence on majority public opinion becoming unfavorable towards gay marriage rights in the State of California.

Conclusion

Overall, it is evident that the extensive history of same-sex marriage, and Proposition 8 in particular, are both convoluted and controversial. The 2008 statewide ballot initiative that amended the California State Constitution stated that "only a marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California," which effectively prohibited same-sex marriage throughout the state. A thorough examination of the relevant literature on this topic reveals that Proposition 8 and the extensive legal challenges that occurred after its passage by voters in November 2008 are only the most recent of a series of efforts my multiple groups to

specifically define marriage in the state of California. However, the legal battle over the constitutionality of Proposition 8's ban on gay marriage has finally been resolved by the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Hollingsworth v. Perry*.

It is also apparent that the rise of new media has included an increased use of interpretive journalism that focuses on specific media tools, like agenda setting, priming, framing, and wedge issues, in order to influence public opinion on the salience of certain issues – in the case at hand, same-sex marriage rights in the State of California. The doctrine of minimal effects of the media that was prevalent in 1950's political science research also no longer appears applicable in the age of interpretive journalism, as the media has grown exponentially in its influence over public opinion in recent decades, often denoted by the rise of new media. Furthermore, mass media's influence on the issue salience of gay rights has become progressively more prominent.

Empirical tests on the data cannot be carried out until extensive survey research has been conducted on the dependent and independent variables. One could hypothetically conclude that, if said research found a noticeable causation between voting "yes" on Proposition 8 and the influence of mass media on the issue of same-sex marriage, then the stated hypothesis would be strengthened. While supportive evidence for the hypothesis would be the theoretical implication of the proposed study, the policy implications are much more broad and over-arching. Finally, evidentiary support of the hypothesis has the policy implication demonstrative of highly influential and persuasive conservative media outlets having a greater effect on the public's opinion of gay marriage in California, compared to their more liberal-leaning counterparts, such as the New York Times or MSNBC. Unquestionably, the influence of mass media, especially its ideologically conservative wing, on the maintenance, advocacy, or subversion of civil rights for marginalized demographics is a topic that warrants further investigation.

Appendix A—Proposed Survey to Quantify the Variables

Question 1: If you voted in the November 2008 general election on California Proposition 8, did you vote "yes" or "no"?

Question 2: Were you influenced a lot, a moderate amount, or not at all by the media when you voted on Proposition 8?

Bibliography

Badgett, M.V. Lee. *When Gay People Get Married*. New York: NYU Press, 2010.

California Secretary of State. "Official Voter Information Guide." 2008a, http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/past/2008/general/text-proposed-laws/text-of-proposed-laws.pdf#prop8 (accessed April 19, 2014).

California Secretary of State. "State Ballot Measures." 2008b, http://www.sos.ca.Gov/ elections/sov/2008_general/57_65_ballot_measures (accessed April 19, 2014).

Choper, Jesse H. "Should Proposition 8 Be Held to be Retroactive?" *California Journal of Politics and Policy* 1, no. 1(Mar. 2010).

Dolan, Maura. "California High Court Upholds Prop. 8." *Los Angeles Times*, 27 May, 2009.

Grodin, Joseph R. 2009. "On Amending and Revising the Constitution: The Issues behind the Challenge to Proposition 8." *California Journal of Politics and Policy* 1, no. 1 (Mar. 2010).

Hetherington, Marc J. "The Media's Role in Forming Voters' National Economic Evaluations in 1992." *American Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 2 (May 1996): 372-395.

Hollingsworth v. Perry, 2013. *133* S.Ct. 2652.

In re Marriage Cases. 2008. 43 Cal.4th 757 [183 P.3d 384].

Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. "News That Matters." In *American Government: Readings and Cases,* edited by Karen O'Connor. New York: Longman, 2001.

Iyengar, Shanto, and Jennifer A. McGrady. *Media Politics: A Citizen's Guide.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2007.

Joslin, Courtney G. "Further Thoughts on Proposition 8 and Retroactivity: A Response to Choper." *California Journal of Politics and Policy* 1, no. 1 (Mar. 2010).

Perry v. Schwarzenegger (*Perry v. Brown* on appeal). 2010. 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010).

Sayre, Ben, Leticia Bode, Chirag Shah, Dhavan Shah, and Dave Wilcox. "Agenda Setting in a Digital Age: Tracking Attention to California Proposition 8 in Social Media, Online News and Conventional News." *Policy & Internet* 2, no. 2 (Jan. 2010): 7-32.

State of California. "Schwarzenegger Answer Brief on Merits." 2009, http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/highprofile/documents/01Schwarzenn eger_Answer_Brief_on_the_Merits.pdf (accessed April 18, 2014).

Strauss v. Horton. 2009. 46 Cal.4th 364 [207 P.3d 48].

Zaller, John. "The Myth of Massive Media Impact Revisited: New Support for a Discredited Idea." In *Political Persuasion in American Politics,* edited by Diana C. Mutz, Paul M. Sniderman, and Richard Brody. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

This image, used as the cover artwork for the twenty-fifth anniversary edition of Edward Said's *Orientalism*, is an 1870 painting by Jean-Léon Gérôme called "The Snake Charmer." The exoticized depictions of various Middle Eastern and Asian cultures perfectly embody Western European attitudes toward the "Orient." "The Snake Charmer" is currently part of Sterling and Francine Clark's collection at the Art Institute in Williamstown, Massachusetts.

SUBALTERN STUDIES: PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORIENT AND RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE COLONIZER AND THE COLONIZED | Matt Salisbury

Contemporary scholars and historians have hotly debated the field of history known as subaltern studies. Especially gaining prominence with the unraveling of colonial rule around the world, subaltern studies focus on the relationship between the colonized people and the colonizer. In modern scholarship, part of the reason for the debate on subaltern studies comes from this question: Who should be writing these histories? Some authors suggest colonized peoples need their histories written by scholars who are a part of the population in question. By doing this, subaltern history would have a less etic, or outsider, perspective. Though an etic history certainly adds to modern understandings of colonized peoples, it is not enough to fully understand the dynamic between them and the colonizer.

The roots of the 'subaltern' idea go back to the Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci. As Gramsci explains, "The 'subaltern' refers to those of inferior rank, whether of class, caste, age, gender or in any other way."[1] Subaltern studies focus on these groups of people. Ultimately, constructing a history of subjugated peoples without bias or skewed perspective is a challenge, and attempts to be unbiased are not immune to faults. This work will explore and seek to clarify scholarly viewpoints and debates about who is entitled to write these histories, to what extent the colonizers fail to understand those they colonized, and how modern interpretations of past events differ depending on etic and emic (insider) perspectives. Anna Green and Kathleen Troup, editors of *The Houses of History*, present the general arguments surrounding subaltern studies, as well as theories on postcolonial thought. Keith Windschuttle, in *The Killing of History*, chronicles the debate between two historians who argue that Hawaiian natives deified Captain Cook upon his first arrival there. Lastly, Edward Said, in his groundbreaking work *Orientalism*, provides a look into the past, when notions of imperialism first came into question, and key works of European intellectuals presented justifications for foreign rule. Regardless of the argument, subaltern studies are a nearly impossible field to condense. Due to varying definitions of what it means to be 'subaltern,'

---

[1] Anna Green and Kathleen Troup, eds., *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 283.

the colonizer may never fully understand the colonized.

In the historiographical compilation *Houses of History*, the primary questions of 'subaltern' studies involve written histories. Green and Troup reference the works of authors like Said and Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa to present the issue: "Should the historical experiences of indigenous peoples and the 'subaltern' be reconstructed only by indigenous scholars?"[2] If the historian is not an indigene, their perspective risks distortion, potentially belittling the plight of the indigenous population at hand. Green and Troup state that a substantial reason for the writing of postcolonial histories emanated from colonial histories whose "previous historical accounts… narrated European expansion as largely unproblematic."[3] A major issue with these histories, readily seen in the "postcolonial" field of study, is the implication that the colonizing power has ended and colonization is exhausted.

In lands that have attained independence, Green and Troup argue, the "imperial power does not have to be present to continue to exert considerable influence over its old dominions."[4] In many ways, the presence of the colonizer still looms over now sovereign countries like Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and India. Though Britain left India in the 1940s, its culture still permeates several levels of Indian life and infrastructure. Physical symbols and intellectual concepts continue to exude British culture in a country that attained its independence nearly seventy years ago.[5] The term 'postcolonial' is a contradictory one, especially when used to refer to independent countries like this. If a literal translation of "postcolonial" means the lack of a physical presence of the colonizer, then this accurately reflects India and other countries like it. Green and Troup, however, contend that in every other discernable sense, the term postcolonial is inappropriate for these countries; their colonizer's culture still affects a significant portion of their society.

Arguments made by Green and Troup derive from Said's *Orientalism,* as well as histories written by Hawaiian author Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa. Said claims that European scholars are not knowledgeable about "the Orient," and that they create an "essentialist representation of

---

[2] Ibid., 282.
[3] Ibid., 278.
[4] Ibid., 279.
[5] Ibid.

non-Europeans."[6] By 'essentialist,' Said refers to a series of characteristics ascribed to Orientals. These characteristics tend to be polar in nature, depicting the Oriental as having one of two dispositions. In showing the Oriental as either "politically unchanging or despotic" or "socially sensual and cruel," European thinkers seriously limit the personality of indigenous populations outside of European lands.[7] This raises a concern of whether it is possible to avoid dichotomizing when addressing thoughts of the Orient in comparison to Europe.

Said argues that the presence of imperialism in the Orient facilitates ignorant "knowledge" of the Orient itself. What Europeans know, Said suggests, is knowledge intended to enable colonial conquest. What happens, essentially, is the discourse of Orientalism becomes "based on very little fact."[8] Said's argument is weakened, however, when the assertion is made that this faulty knowledge enabled the earlier colonial conquest. Said's critics ask how "the 'Orient' is just a representation, if he also wants to claim that 'Orientalism' provided the necessary knowledge for actual colonial conquest."[9] Green and Troup identify the inherent contradiction, and therefore are unconvinced of its validity.

The arrival of Captain Cook in the Hawaiian Islands is another topic of debate within subaltern studies. In attempting to understand Cook's first encounter with the native islanders, historians argue the possible implications of Cook's presence there. Keith Windschuttle is a prominent Australian historian whose book *The Killing of History* critiques subaltern history. Several of his chapters are devoted to the ways in which historians write about and analyze other colonized cultures throughout the world. In his chapter titled "The Return of Tribalism," Windschuttle tracks Marshall Sahlins, an American anthropologist who suggests that different cultures produce different rationalities.[10] Sahlins debates Gananath Obeyesekere, a Sri Lankan, over the legacy of Captain James Cook, his arrival in the Hawaiian Islands, and his apotheosis at the hands of natives. Sahlins contends that, aside from his reverence as a god, Cook's arrival did not play any disruptive role in Hawaiian life. Obeyesekere suggests the opposite,

---

[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., 281.
[8] Ibid., 279.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Keith Windschuttle, *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists are Killing Our Past* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 1996), 254.

arguing Cook's arrival ushered in devastating change in Hawaiian culture, which took mere weeks to manifest.[11]

Windschuttle explains that these highly different explanations exist because of a dearth of Hawaiian sources on the encounter. Due to the lack of material coming from Hawaiians who were there, historical interpretation and assumptions must come from what evidence there is: that of Englishmen. Says Windschuttle:

> The principal evidence about native beliefs in 1779 comes from the diaries and journals kept by officers and sailors…[who] had only a smattering of the local language…[and] gleaned what they could of native religious beliefs from observation of their ceremonies.[12]

Sahlins' argument, however, comes from the Hawaiian belief that their god Lono, the benefactor of peace, games, and agricultural fertility, had arrived in Hawai'i in a location near to that where Cook laid anchor. After the natives treated him to activities and luxuries befitting a god, Cook sailed away, only to return just over a week later. When he returned, the natives were in the middle of celebrations in the name of the warlike god, Ku. Cook, although just there, was now likened to Ku, and treated with open hostility.[13] Sahlins argues that Cook was killed because of a Ku celebration that happened years earlier, where an embodiment of Ku was killed in order to usurp his power; Cook's return at this time made him appear to be this embodiment.

Windschuttle then outlines the arguments presented by Sahlins and Obeyesekere, occasionally offering his own interpretations. As stated earlier, a major issue is the different ways in which one can interpret the same evidence. One thing that readers must keep in mind is how deities exist within Hawaiian religion in contrast to the Western world. Sahlins reminds the reader that, like other Polynesians, the Hawaiians did not distinguish between the natural and the supernatural as Western religion does.[14] Hawaiians staunchly believe in physical manifestations of their gods in the perceivable world. If this is true, then the belief that Cook was a representation of Lono is valid. This difference in accounts ultimately hearkens back to the main sources used for their research. Sahlins, Windschuttle describes, uses as his source a chronicle written by one of his

---

[11] Ibid., 258.
[12] Ibid. Acquisition of this language came from contact with the peoples of Tahiti.
[13] Ibid., 259.
[14] Ibid., 260.

former students. Obeyesekere is using an alternative set of Polynesian and Hawaiian religions provided in the 1940s by various scholars, all of whom reject the idea that Hawaiians regarded their chiefs as gods in this period.[15] The disparities in these sources results in a disconnect in opinion, in which neither scholar bases their argument upon the tenets of the actual religion.

Windschuttle continues his analysis of both Sahlins' and Obeyesekere's arguments. He points out inconsistencies in Sahlins' assertions, ultimately agreeing with Obeyesekere.[16] Windschuttle acknowledges Obeyesekere's point that the mere foreignness of Cook disqualified him from being regarded as a Polynesian god. Sahlins argues, however, with his former pupil as his source, that this foreignness is just what Hawaiians were expecting. The gods, Sahlins claims, come from a place that is "invisible and [the gods] originate in places beyond the horizon."[17] What the reader must keep in mind is the nature of Sahlins' source, about which Windschuttle does not go into detail. It calls into question exactly how reliable this argument really is. Where did Sahlins acquire this information? According to Sahlins, the gods also speak in languages that men are incapable of comprehending. Windschuttle refuses this argument, mainly because Sahlins' source is unverifiable. What he does consider, instead, are some key points against Sahlins. Cook appeared to know nothing of what was supposed to be his own religion. If the Hawaiians believed him to be a reflection of Lono, how is it possible that he knew none of the tenets and beliefs of the Hawaiian religion?

Windschuttle even uses a piece of Sahlins' own evidence against him: "At the first rituals, as Sahlins himself acknowledges, Cook had to be shown at every stage what to do."[18] Sahlins' arguments become increasingly tenuous as he seeks to disprove Obeyesekere. In his reference to other Pacific cultures and their first encounters with Europeans, Sahlins suggests that other cultures had similar experiences: "It is common to find natives in Australia, Melanesia, and Micronesia who, like the Polynesians, saw their first contact with Europeans as meetings with gods."[19] Windschuttle points out the apocryphal nature of this claim in that Sahlins fails to provide a

---

[15] Ibid., 261.
[16] Ibid., 260. "Readers will hardly need reminding that, since I committed myself to Obeyesekere's side in Chapter Three, I am not a disinterested observer."
[17] Ibid., 262.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid., 263.

source. It makes sense that there is no source for this, Windschuttle says, as no documentation exists to suggest that Australian Aborigines have ever assumed Europeans to be gods at all.

These points are but a small portion of several made in this analysis of Cook's arrival. The underlying lesson here is that our understanding of these sorts of interactions between the colonizer and the colonized are dependent upon source material from the native peoples. Windschuttle reminds the reader that the only sources available to scholars are Hawaiian oral traditions and the journal entries of English sailors who did not understand the Hawaiian language. As Sahlins adopts a structuralist approach and Obeyesekere uses interpretations of Hawaiians created in the 1940s and 1980s, it is incredibly likely that perceptions and translations of initial contacts will be skewed. Understandings of these first meetings can be quickly lost in the milieu of scholarly distortion, rendering the truth to be attainable potentially only through exhaustive research.

In 1974, Edward Said published one of contemporary history's most prominent works on civilizations around the world. Titled *Orientalism*, his work considers that European standards of dominance and Eurocentrism led to a misrepresentation of the Orient. To begin *Orientalism*, Said provides an example to encapsulate his thesis. The book presents Gustave Flaubert, from whom Said derives much of his philosophy, with his Egyptian consort. Through his prominence as a high intellectual with wealth and influence, Flaubert acts as a spokesperson for his consort. Flaubert was able to "possess Kuchuk Hanem physically" and "to speak for her and tell his readers in what way she was 'typically Oriental.'"[20] Said states that this example of Flaubert is representative of the experiences shared between the Orient and the Occident: "Flaubert's situation…is not an isolated instance. It fairly stands for the pattern of relative strength between East and West."[21] Said believes that Orientalism is a collection of fabrications.

Said was raised and educated in two British colonies, Palestine and Egypt, which he states motivated him to write *Orientalism*.[22] Because of his education, he considers himself an "Oriental subject," which acts as an impetus for him to study "the traces upon me [Said], of the culture whose domination has been so powerful a factor in the life of all Orientals."[23]

---

[20] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978), 6.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid., 25.
[23] Ibid.

Additionally, Said explicitly states that the whole Orient, whatever its unities, is not his concern. He chooses to focus only on the Islamic Orient, particularly that of the Arabs, which he regards as the cultural center of Orientalism. The Anglo-French-American experience "for almost a thousand years stood for the Orient."[24] Said states that he chose to narrow his work to this experience largely because "Britain and France dominated the Eastern Mediterranean from about the end of the seventeenth century on."[25] Unfortunately, this narrow scope means that Said does not reflect on the importance of the contributions of other European powers. Orientalism is the repressive study of the world outside Europe, by Europeans. Orientalism is racist, backwards, and Eurocentric.

Part of what gives Orientalism its influence is what Gramsci called 'hegemony.' Said states that Orientalism acquires its durability and strength as a result of European cultural hegemony at work.[26] Simply put, Orientalism asserts the idea of European identity as superior to all non-European peoples and cultures.[27] Accompanying the emergence of the Renaissance as a transcontinental intellectual force, the European mindset saw an elevation of intelligence, reason, and purpose.

Said later recounts the words of Arthur James Balfour, who offered his musings at the House of Commons. Balfour, who had served many prominent political figures and established himself as a man of practical experience, spoke of the pressing need to colonize Egypt. When challenged by a man in the audience, Balfour suggested that Britain had more intimate knowledge of Egypt than any other country in the world. As Said claims, "knowledge to Balfour means surveying a civilization from its origins to its prime to its decline."[28] To have this sort of knowledge is critical and, as Said suggests, is to "have authority over it. And authority here means for 'us' to deny autonomy to 'it'… since we know it and it exists, in a sense, *as* we know it."[29] Balfour suggested that British intentions for Egypt surpassed Egyptian intentions for their homeland. An Egyptian would surely not agree with this notion of entitled occupation, and Said argues that such a person would be viewed as "'the agitator [who] wishes to raise difficulties."[30]

---

[24] Ibid., 17.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., 7.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid., 32.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid., 33.

Balfour presents Egypt as a country that exists, and in the act of simply existing, is vulnerable to occupation by Britain, as well as prone to having its culture supplanted by that of its new governing body. Britain here appears as a power that has the ability to make Egypt great again. Egypt had its time of prominence, wherein it accomplished great things, but now it relies upon Britain to not only facilitate these great things, but also to provide what is best for the Egyptian people. Following Balfour's logic, since Britain knows every aspect of Egypt, Britain therefore knows what is in the best interest of the land.[31]

Evelyn Baring, also known as Lord Cromer, seconds Balfour's proposal for occupation. Cromer is more direct than is Balfour, especially when he makes the assertion that the security of England's empire is contingent on the maintenance of "militarism and commercial egotism at home and 'free institutions' in the colony."[32] Cromer is suggesting that the colonized people would have the illusion of self-determination, but underlying it is "imperial might" that transforms the people into a subservient class. Cromer purports that "the real future of Egypt lies… in an enlarged cosmopolitanism."[33] The solution for Egyptians appears to be a total submission to the European ways, which will result beneficially for all parties involved. Said states, "Orientals or Arabs are thereafter shown to be gullible, 'devoid of energy and initiative.'"[34] Both Balfour and Cromer depict Orientals as the exact opposite of Europeans, setting the stage for intervention so that European virtues can rectify the state in which Orientals find themselves.

Balfour and Cromer regard the Oriental in an ironic way. In the Europe-Orient power dynamic, Europe is always in a position of strength. Balfour and Cromer use euphemistic language to underscore the inherent dominance in this relationship. This namely occurs when Balfour acknowledges the "greatness" of Oriental civilizations.[35] British imperialists stress the fact that regardless of how established the Oriental way of life was at the time, it had nothing to do with the efforts of the Oriental. The Orient existed because of the world Europe created, and only as a product of European thought did it receive acknowledgement. Said states that this view

---

[31] Ibid., 35.
[32] Ibid., 36.
[33] Ibid., 37.
[34] Ibid., 38.
[35] Ibid., 40.

of an inferior, though ancient, civilization engrained European presence in the Orient.

Orientalism raises a number of intellectual issues, with one at the forefront. So far, what has transpired has been an attempt by Europeans to define the Orient. In doing so, a standard of difference is now established. Said states that scholarship has divided the world "into large general divisions, entities that coexist in a state of tension produced by what is believed to be radical difference."[36] On each side of this division is a characteristic intrinsic to each member. On one side, there is Europe, the strong; on the other side is the Orient, the weak. This intellectual issue regards the division of human reality. Said tells us that the question is whether human reality can be divided and still avoid any hostility that arises as a result.[37] He references a discussion led by Henry Kissinger, who would state it differently: "Cultures which escaped the early impact of Newtonian thinking have retained the essentially pre-Newtonian view that the real world is almost completely *internal* to the observer."[38] Said follows Kissinger's logic to conclude that since developed countries (in Europe) underwent Newtonian thinking, and since developing countries (the Orient) have yet to do so, Europe is at an advantage over the Orient. Is it possible to so radically demarcate two influential portions of the world and retain any respect for the other? By intellectually ostracizing the Orient, any knowledge that comes from either there or Europe will be seen as solely their knowledge.

Edward Said argues that European perceptions of the Orient as an "Other" further engrained its status as perpetually and radically different. Oriental countries that were not privy to Newtonian modes of thought embodied a cultural 'difference,' which was synonymous with 'intellectually disadvantaged.' This discourse justified European imperial efforts. In a way, European powers presented themselves as benevolent entities that could use their intellectualism and intimate knowledge of the country at hand to lend a favor in the form of colonization. Said's criticism of Balfour states: "Balfour produces no evidence that Egyptians… appreciate or even understand the good that is being done them by colonial occupation."[39]

Said's work, however groundbreaking, is not without its critics.

---

[36] Ibid., 45.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid., 33.

His polemic against European-created Orientalism involved the direct affront to many prominent and influential thinkers. Robert Irwin, in his book *Dangerous Knowledge*, claims that Said has forgotten much of the history of Orientalism. "Much that is certainly central to the history of Orientalism has been quietly excluded by him, while all sorts of extraneous material have been called upon to support an indictment of the integrity and worth of certain scholars."[40] Irwin states that attacking Said is not his goal; rather, it is to address the sources that Said seems to have conveniently ignored. *Orientalism* contains such ambiguity, Irwin claims, that it is difficult to discern "honest mistakes from willful misrepresentations."[41]

Irwin's handling of Said's monograph begins with the scope presented in *Orientalism*. Said states in his introduction that he intended to write about "the Anglo-French-American experience of the Arabs and Islam, which for almost a thousand years stood for the Orient,"[42] which Irwin agrees with. Irwin approves of this limitation namely because he, like Said, is interested in "the history of Western studies of Islam, Arabic, and Arab history and culture."[43] This is nearly the only instance in which Irwin agrees with Said. In a section of *Dangerous Knowledge* written as a response to *Orientalism*, Irwin tells the reader that upon first receiving hostile reviews of his book, Said "made no attempt to correct any of the factual errors" and "added a smug 'Afterword' in which he refused to concede any points and roundly abused critics of the book."[44]

Irwin continues his litany of issues with Said's work later in this chapter, where he points out general inconsistencies. Said's motivations for writing *Orientalism* were somewhat stoked by then-current events. "It is obvious that bitterness about what had been happening to the Palestinians since the 1940s fuelled the writing of this book."[45] Irwin, whom *Orientalism* criticizes alongside Bernard Lewis, another prominent Orientalist, is keen on deriding the work as a slipshod effort. *Orientalism*, he claims, is "a book written in a hurry," with major factual errors: "Said has Muslim armies conquering Turkey before they conquered North Africa. That really does

---

[40] Robert Irwin, *Dangerous Knowledge: Orientalism and its Discontents* (New York: Overlook, 2006), 4.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Said, 17.
[43] Irwin, 6.
[44] Ibid., 281.
[45] Ibid., 282.

suggest a breathtaking ignorance of Middle Eastern history."[46] Irwin himself addresses those who have supported *Orientalism* as a landmark work. Their argument, he suggests, states that "though *Orientalism* is full of mistakes, the book is still of enormous value." Yet Irwin asserts that, on the contrary, "the value of a debate that is based on a fantasy version of past history and scholarship is not obvious."[47]

Another concern of Irwin's is quite simple, but it calls Said's thesis into question. Irwin addresses the chronology following Orientalism as a study and discipline. "Said cannot make up his mind about when Orientalism began," he claims.[48] Said claims in his introduction that writers from classical antiquity, like Aeschylus, to the late eighteenth century, like Victor Hugo, Dante, and Karl Marx, all participate in supporting Orientalism.[49] Irwin, however, has a problem with this large range of sources: "If Aeschylus, Dante, and Postel are to be indicted for Orientalism, it follows that the necessary linkage between Orientalism and imperialism that Said posits elsewhere cannot be true."[50]

In his introduction, Said tells the reader where he has chosen to focus his work. He claims that the "sheer quality, consistency, and mass" of Orientalist texts from Britain, France, and America outdoes what he says is "the doubtless crucial work done in Germany, Italy, Russia, and elsewhere."[51] Limiting the scope of Subaltern Studies texts is not something Irwin is concerned with, for the subject matter (Islam) is his field of study. Irwin's issues, however, lay in Said's assertions that Germans played a minor role in Oriental studies. He then provides a list of German scholars, "Hammer-Purgstall, Fleischer, Wellhausen, Nöldeke, and Becker. It is impossible to find British forerunners for these figures."[52] Irwin believes that were it not for these critically important German intellectuals, British scholars would have had almost nothing to work with. After listing prominent writers such as Nicholson, Wright, Lyall, and Cowan, all of whom benefited from German works, Irwin says, "these works are not marginal, but central to Arabic studies in Britain. Is it really possible that British scholars were mistaken in their belief that they needed to follow

---

[46] Ibid., 282-3.
[47] Ibid., 284.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Said, 3.
[50] Irwin, 285.
[51] Said, 17.
[52] Irwin, 287.

German scholars of Arabic and Islam?"[53] How does Said ignore these works, instead only crediting British and French thinkers?

Irwin devotes a small portion of *Dangerous Knowledge* to Said's thoughts on the subaltern. When asking a question of the subaltern's ability to speak for themselves, Irwin suggests that Said's answer would be negative. "Said also argued that Orientalism denied Orientals the possibility of representing themselves."[54] It is ironic that Said should argue that Orientals, under Orientalist thought, do not have the ability to speak for themselves, only to fail to include any works from Middle Eastern thinkers. In the conclusion of *Orientalism*, Said references influential sources of anti-Orientalist thought, but admits, "I have not attempted to do more than mention them or allude to them quickly… my project has been to describe a particular system of ideas, not by any means to displace the system with a new one."[55] Said, Irwin argues, intentionally ignores and chastises Arab thinkers, whose sole crimes were to have spoken unfavorably about certain aspects of Arab life. There are plenty of opportunities to show that Arabs can indeed speak for themselves, but Said denies them the ability to do this. "According to Said, Fouad Ajami is 'a disgrace…because what he says is so trivial and so ignorant.' Ajami's crime was to have written in a downbeat way… about the betrayal of Arab hopes and ambitions in the second half of the twentieth century."[56] Irwin follows this with several more examples of Arabic writers who were merely expressing their voice, and yet are belittled by Said with no provocation. As Irwin argues, Said would say that Orientals have no ability to speak for themselves, yet when someone does give their voice, Said is the one who shuts them down.

Robert Irwin is only one of *Orientalism*'s many critics. In her book *German Orientalism*, Suzanne Marchand addresses Said doubtfully, although considerably more politely than Irwin. Marchand's issues with Said originate at his narrow focus of Orientalist thought. As Said chose to address only British, French, and American sources, Marchand states that he "famously, and self-consciously, left Germans out of the analysis, despite the well-known fact that they were the pacesetting European scholars in virtually every field of Oriental studies between about 1830 and 1930."[57]

---

[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid., 292.
[55] Said, 325.
[56] Irwin, 292-3.
[57] Suzanne Marchand, *German Orientalism in The Age of Empire* (New York:

Similarly to Irwin, Marchand lists several prominent German scholars who contributed to the field. She states that in deciding to exclude these sources, Said "was engaging in a deliberate sort of deck-stacking," and that doing so proved his thesis "that 'Orientalism' was a product of empire."[58] Marchand acknowledges, however, that although Said's work is misleading, it is one of the foundational works that "structures virtually all discussions about the relationship between the European mind and the cultures of the East."[59] Marchand's interest is geared toward the works that Said intentionally ignored, as she was not trying to write a book "framed by a Saidian, or an anti-Saidian, theoretical structure." However, aside from thanking him for writing *Orientalism*, she warns that Said and his work would not receive much attention from her.[60]

Irwin and Marchand's responses to *Orientalism* represent a small portion of scholarly reactions to Said's work. C. F. Beckingham, in his review of *Orientalism* published in the University of London's bulletin, brings up several points that Said did not consider when writing. According to Beckingham, Said was "rightly contemptuous of the facile generalizations about Muslims, Arabs, and Semites."[61] What Said fails to consider, however, is the sheer amount of generalizations and stereotypes made against peoples all over Europe, not just Orientals. "They are made about the French, the Latin races, the Americans, the Scots," but what is more, "Said himself is guilty of generalizations quite as absurd as those he condemns."[62] Beckingham posits that Said, addressing the iniquities of Orientalists' treatment of Muslims, Arabs, and Semites, has irrationally generalized against Orientalists themselves.[63] Beckingham departs from Said's arguments when he addresses the innovative language used in *Orientalism*: "Not only do we encounter words like 'virtuosic', 'scriptively', 'mentalistic', and 'diminishment', but there are many phrases and sentences which are unintelligible or absurd."[64] Beckingham scarcely credits Said

---

Cambridge, 2009), xviii.

[58] Ibid., xix.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., xxv.

[61] C.F. Beckingham, "Orientalism by Edward Said," review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* (42) 1979: 562-4.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Beckingham points out examples of these generalizations in Said's text, like "Orientalists are neither interested in nor capable of discussing individuals." Ibid.

[64] Ibid., 563.

with having presented a lucid thought, attacking his content, his argument, and even scrutinizing his language.

Mahmoud Manzalaoui of the University of British Columbia at Vancouver lends more credence to Said's work than other critics have. Like Suzanne Marchand, he admits that *Orientalism* has "frequently illuminating observations," but they, along with Said's thesis, are stifled by "untruths and neophiliac fatuities."[65] According to Manzalaoui, Said's faults begin with his generalizations, a critique he shares with Beckingham. "He omits much and over-emphasizes much, so giving a distorted picture." Complementary to this omission is an absence of important information. Manzalaoui states that he neglects the accomplishments of earlier thinkers. Beginning with the Enlightenment, he omits "the seventeenth-century pioneering of the great Dutch scholars."[66] There are significant groups of influential Orientalists that Said's focus has ignored. Robert Irwin's analysis of *Orientalism* compounds on this observation. He addresses the absence of German studies: "If German scholarship was important, then Said's argument that imperialism was dependent on the discourse of Orientalism collapses."[67] Manzalaoui's observation and Irwin's point suggest that Said's selectivity helps him construct his thesis.

Peter Gran of Temple University reviews *Orientalism* in his article in the Journal of the American Oriental Society. His review is lengthier than are those of Beckingham and Manzalaoui, but also entails a quick synopsis of *Orientalism*'s concepts and arguments. Gran recognizes Said's main assumptions, where "France and England were the primary centers in which the image of the Orient was 're-structured and refined.'"[68] Gran takes a neutral approach, merely outlining Said's sources instead of taking a side on the effectiveness of the book.

Not all reception to *Orientalism* is negative, however. Talal Asad from the University of Hull sees Said's work as groundbreaking and influential. "Its outstanding contribution lies in its attempt to analyze the authoritative structure of orientalist discourse."[69] Said's aim in writing

---

[65] Mahmoud Manzalaoui, "Orientalism by Edward Said," Review of *Orientalism,* by Edward Said, *The Modern Language Review* 75 (1980): 837-9.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Irwin, 287.

[68] Peter Gran, "Orientalism by Edward Said." Review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 100 (1980): 328-31.

[69] Talal Asad, "Orientalism by Edward Said." Review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said. *The English Historical Review*, 95 (1980): 648-9.

Orientalism, Asad states, is to challenge the discourse of Orientalism that is able to "reproduce itself unchallenged."[70] Asad suggests that Said left some aspects of *Orientalism* unfinished, or that could have been more deeply addressed. The information available to French and English thinkers is "barely developed," where Said could have acknowledged the "particular conditions within which this authoritative discourse was historically produced."[71] Asad is one voice of support for Said's *Orientalism*, despite the initial hostility it garnered upon publication. Although he offers some criticisms to the work, Asad says that "none of this detracts from the remarkable originality of this very important book."[72]

The consensus among scholars is that *Orientalism*, however controversial, is an insightful work that sparked debate in Subaltern Studies. Though some critics, like Robert Irwin, suggest that Said wrote it because of some heartfelt angst, others are less critical. Suzanne Marchand, though she regards Said's work minimally in her *German Orientalism*, addresses some of *Orientalism*'s flaws, namely its restricted focus on Britain and France. Marchand argued that these countries were not the forerunners of research on the Orient as Said claims. Instead, Britain and France expounded off the work already done by prominent German thinkers. Manzalaoui and Beckingham argue that Said generalizes Orientalists too harshly, and even ignores those who made significant contributions to the field. Asad came up with more praise for Said's work than most, and despite alluding to its occasional flaw, he claims that *Orientalism* set the tone for future works on Orientalism.

Due to interactions between the colonizer and the colonized, the paucity of sources from native peoples, and skewed perspectives and representations of foreign lands, "subaltern" is a difficult term to define. Green and Troup make a similar argument as Windschuttle in that "many of the subordinate classes and indigenous peoples have left few written records, and their voice must be reconstituted through the official reports of the colonizer."[73] This concept is what makes the debate behind Captain Cook's deification so uncertain. Edward Said argues in *Orientalism* that the colonizer denies the 'Other' the ability to speak for him or herself, largely due to the hegemonic discourse created by the European mind. Critics of

---

[70] Ibid., 649.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Green and Troup, 283.

Said argue that he himself does not even give the Oriental, or the "subaltern," the ability to speak for himself. As Irwin states, "Said also argued that Orientalism denied Orientals the possibility of representing themselves… but it is worth nothing that he was no less hostile to Arab scholarship."[74] This is visible in Said's refusal to amend any assertions made in *Orientalism*, especially when critical reviews first emerged onto the scholarly scene. Even Said, a decrier of Orientalism and its denial of the Oriental speaking for himself, refuses to acknowledge the viewpoints and criticisms of his reviewers.[75] These inconsistencies and biases contribute to the difficulties in defining a true 'subaltern.' If Orientalism both constructs a sense of essential superiority among Europeans, and denies the ability to speak to the 'Other,' there is the unfortunate possibility that no amount of Subaltern Studies or 'postcolonial history' will ever create a sense of understanding between the colonizer and the colonized.

---

[74] Irwin, 292.
[75] Ibid., 281.

Bibliography

Asad, Talal. "Orientalism by Edward Said." Review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said. *The English Historical Review*, 95 (1980): 648-9.

Beckingham, C.F. "Edward Said: *Orientalism*." Review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* (42) 1979: 562-4.

Gran, Peter. "Orientalism by Edward Said." Review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 100 (1980): 328-31.

Green, Anna and Troup, Kathleen, eds. *The Houses of History*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Irwin, Robert. *Dangerous Knowledge: Orientalism and its Discontents*. New York: The Overlook Press, 2006.

Manzalaoui, Mahmoud. "Orientalism by Edward Said." Review of *Orientalism*, by Edward Said. *The Modern Language Review* 75 (1980): 837-9.

Marchand, Suzanne. *German Orientalism in The Age of Empire*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.

Windschuttle, Keith. *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Killing Our Past*. San Francisco: Encounter Books, 1996.

Solidarity, June 30, 1917. The Hand That Will Rule the World—One Big Union.

This illustration by Ralph Chaplin, titled "The Hand that Will Rule the World," appeared in the June 30, 1917 issue of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) publication *Solidarity*. The image represents the attempt by many radical left-wing organizations to overcome intra-class divisions in the pursuit of proletarian solidarity. Chaplin's illustration is displayed in the "Solidarity Forever: A Look at Wobbly Culture" exhibit at LaborArts.org.

PERIODIZING POSTMODERNISM: THE RETURN OF HISTORY IN LATE CAPITALISM | Joshua Bergeron

"The question [of history is] whether one should expect that … the states … by their accidental collision, make all kinds of formations that are destroyed again by a new impact until eventually and accidentally there occurs a formation that can maintain itself in its form …; or whether one should rather assume that nature follows a regular sequence to lead our species from the lowest level of animality gradually to the highest level of humanity by man's own, though involuntary, effort and that thus nature is unfolding … according to rule; or whether one prefers to assume that all these effects and countereffects will in the long run result in nothing, or at least nothing sensible, and that things will remain as they always have been …"
– Immanuel Kant, "Idea for a Universal History with Cosmopolitan Intent"[1]

"Thus there has been history, but there is no longer any."
– Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*[2]

The Enlightenment project has endured innumerable criticisms, revisions, and challenges since the 18th century. Perhaps none of these criticisms have been as absolute or popularized as the repudiation of its core tenets by the patrons of postmodernism in the last half century. Foremost among those challenged or refuted doctrines have been the notions of reason, science, progress, objectivity, and grand narratives. The rejection of these tenets of modernity has heralded an assault on historical studies, and posed a direct challenge to Marxist historiography. The concept of totalizing, universal histories as endorsed by Kant in the second of his three premises of history above, and embraced by Hegel and Marx after him, was abandoned by many academics on the Left with the advent of post-structuralism and other theories of the 'postmodern' era. Instead, many intellectuals began to advocate something more akin to Kant's third conceptualization of history in the epigraph, that of a multiplicity of events without inherent and coherent correlation, a rejection of "sensible" (i.e. rational and intelligible) meanings and interpretations, and a skepticism about suggestions of progress and other universal value judgments. Thereafter, for some there was not one narrative but many histories, for others there was only the history text or the *épistème* of historical discourse, and indeed, for a few, there was no longer a history proper at all. Where, then, does historical materialism stand? The Marxian singular narrative of class struggle, determined by the economic base of society and

---

[1] Immanuel Kant, "Idea for a Universal History with Cosmopolitan Intent," in *German Essays on History*, ed. Rolf Sältzer (New York: Continuum, 1991), 10.

[2] Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy* (New York: International Publishers, 1992), 131.

observable in the social relations between subjects and their material conditions, is directly undermined by the principles of postmodernism. Yet despite the loss of many of the brightest radicals to the lures of 'post-Marxism' at the height of this historical challenge, Marxists have begun to formulate their own response to the postmodern agenda, and foremost among their declarations is a return to a grand narrative of history.

Any discussion of this 'return' must begin with the foundations of historical materialism before it can address the challenge posed by the flight from metanarratives in postmodernist theories. In this way, the following analysis will be presented in a periodized fashion, in that it will trace an historical progression from one set of philosophical trends to another according to a number of cultural and material developments. As this analysis will show, for many poststructuralists the discipline of history itself has lost legitimacy. Consequently, the mere act of historicizing the development of the postmodern condition may appear to be an attempt to dismiss postmodern theories out of hand without engaging with them on their own terms. However, the notion that postmodernism can fit within the theoretical framework of historical materialism is itself a challenge to the structural soundness of the postmodern condition. As many contemporary Marxists contend, rather than relegating Marxism to the trash heap of modernism, postmodernity has merely made historical materialism all the more necessary and relevant.

The classic expression of Marx's materialist conception of stage-theory history appears in short in the preface to his *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

> At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or – what is but a legal expression for the same thing – with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation of the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.[3]

In other words, the ruling class is driven by the inherent logic of the system (particularly under capitalism) to exploit the laboring classes and develop the productive forces of society. At a certain point, the forces of

---

[3] Marx, "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 1978), 4-5.

production have advanced to the extent that the old social relations, between capitalist and laborer in the workplace for example, have become redundant and productive means can no longer progress as they used to. Class struggle overcomes these fetters and introduces new social relations that better correspond to the productive needs of the economic base. Likewise, the superstructure of society, which includes politics, identity, culture, and institutions like the State, transforms in correspondence to these new material conditions. In this way, human society transitions from one historical epoch to the next. Thus, nearly from the time of its formation, the school of Marxist historical analysis has attempted to anchor social and cultural histories in corresponding material conditions.

Many have accused this formulation of being reductionist or economically deterministic. Some suggest that it disregards all social categories except for class or eliminates agency in favor of economic forces. S.H. Rigby asserts that all respectable Marxist historical works, like those of E.P. Thompson, were successful only by abandoning that reductionism in favor of a pluralistic approach to causality, and that in the process they ceased to be Marxian altogether.[4] This in itself is a convenient reduction of historical materialism to a simplistic formula that cannot account for historical contingency. In fact, the concern of determinism was addressed to an extent as far back as the late writings of Friedrich Engels. In a letter to Joseph Bloch, Engels asserted,

> [History] is made in such a way that the final result always arises from conflicts between many individual wills, of which each again has been made what it is by a host of particular conditions of life. Thus there are innumerable intersecting forces, an infinite series of parallelograms of forces which give rise to one resultant – the historical event.

However, he continues, "There is an interaction of all these elements in which, amid all the endless host of accidents… the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary."[5] Therefore, the economic factor is still central, though its appearance as the only force influencing historical events was due to later theoretical revisions by adversaries and compatriots alike. To a certain extent, this simply amounts to a disagreement over the

---

[4] See S. H. Rigby, "Marxist Historiography," in *Companion to Historiography*, ed. Michael Bentley (London: Routledge, 1997).

[5] Friedrich Engels, "Letters on Historical Materialism," in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 760-761.

definition of 'determinant.' Marx and Engels did not intend for this language to imply a blueprint according to which all actions are economically ordained. In the Marxian lexicon, the economic base 'determines' the boundaries of potential superstructural developments, though within those boundaries the superstructure has a degree of autonomy from the base. Thus, to a degree the superstructure can have its own unique history. In fact, Engels suggests that he and Marx only focused so resolutely on the economic principle because their adversaries, the bourgeois economists, had denied its prevalence so resolutely.

In the end, however, Engels refers back to Marx, who in one famous passage that combined individual agency with material constraints, suggested that "Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly found, given, and transmitted from the past."[6] There is a degree, then, to which an acceptance of a plurality of forces in causality, notwithstanding the ultimate primacy of the economic base, is not merely a hedging of bets but rather a more dialectical understanding of the historical event than an abstract reduction to cause and effect. Yet, as will be discussed later, accusations of reductionism are not so easily shaken.

Marx and Engels also attribute to the capitalist mode of production a number of specific laws of development. Among these are a particular penchant for technological advancement and globalization, the commodification of nearly anything that has an exchange value, and a fetishism of the commodity-form that obfuscates social relations between people so that they appear to be relations among objects. Interlinking these notions is an oft-overlooked law of capitalism offered by Marx that is particularly pertinent here. He contends in his *Grundrisse,* "[W]hile capital must on one side strive to tear down every spatial barrier to intercourse, i.e. to exchange, and conquer the whole earth for its market, it strives on the other side to annihilate this space with time, i.e. to reduce to a minimum the time spent in motion from one place to another."[7] This acceleration of capital circulation to overcome spatial barriers is of critical import to the work of Marxist geographer David Harvey. According to

---

[6] Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 595.

[7] Marx, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, trans. Martin Nicolaus (London: Penguin, 1993), 539.

Harvey, there emerges "an inexorable trend for the world of capital to produce what I call 'time-space compression' – a world in which capital moves faster and faster and where distances of interaction are compressed."[8] In the present stage of "late capitalism," further elaborated below, market globalization has rendered the circulation of capital nearly instantaneous. Harvey and critics like Fredric Jameson contend that postmodernism is a cultural condition of this late capitalism, in which the global frontiers of capital circulation have been transcended and cultural identity is now a commodity for consumption and accumulation rather than a locus of subversion.

Capitalism, then, is an ever-expanding inescapable totality. In fact, as capital globalized in the 20th century, theories of this universalizing force became more prominent, as did a mounting fear and criticism of totalities in general. In one of the foundational texts of Western Marxism, *History and Class Consciousness*, Georg Lukács provides what becomes a continuing *problématique* of the totality of capitalism:

> The proletariat and *only* the proletariat can discern in the correct understanding of the *nature of society* a power-factor of the first, and perhaps decisive importance… As the bourgeoisie has the intellectual, organizational and every other advantage, the superiority of the proletariat must lie exclusively in its ability to see society from the center, as a coherent whole.[9]

Although the proletariat is merely one social class within a totalizing system, due to its unique potential as the emancipator of all humanity it can attain something of a universal consciousness which ceases to be subjective and thus becomes objective. Herein lies an issue that later becomes a principle target of postmodernism: Lukács' assertion that only the proletariat can ascertain the truth of capitalism suggests that he too has grasped the truth in order to make such a value judgment. As Terry Eagleton argues, from this standpoint "one is caught in the impossible paradox of judging the truth from outside the truth," in which case the claim undercuts itself.[10] This would demand an out-of-body experience in order to ascertain objective truth.

---

[8] David Harvey, *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 158.

[9] György Lukács, "History and Class Consciousness," in *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukács and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism*, ed. Roger S. Gottlieb (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 71-72.

[10] Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 2007), 97.

This critique set shortly aside, however, let us assume that the proletariat could potentially attain totalizing objective knowledge. What if the working class was unable to self-realize, or, in Marxist terminology, attain class-consciousness? This is another problem posed by totalizing theories of Marxism, which became more widely accepted among the Left especially through the post-war period and into the 1960s, as the works of the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory grew in prominence.[11] In his *Prison Notebooks* from the 1930s, Antonio Gramsci proposed a theory of cultural hegemony that expanded on the Marxian definition of the dominant ideology of the ruling class and elaborated its effects on subordinate social classes.[12] This concept became a central tenet of Western Marxism. According to many Marxist theorists that followed Gramsci's formulations, this dominant ideology of contemporary capitalist society "creates an acceptance of capitalism in the working class… powerful enough to overcome the contradictions within the structure of capitalist society."[13] In fact, according to Herbert Marcuse, contemporary capitalism brought a proliferation of commodities and an equalizing of lifestyles that amounted to "a good way of life – much better than before – and as a good way of life, it militates against qualitative change." He called this pattern "one-dimensional thought and behavior."[14] Other theorists proposed similar notions of impenetrable hegemonic structures, such as Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's "Culture Industry" and Louis Althusser's "Ideological State Apparatuses." In such formulations, capital's devices of ideological legitimation lull the proletariat into submission and apathy. Thus, capitalism circumvents the inherent contradictions that should have eventually destabilized the social structure. Slavoj Žižek describes this process as "permanent self-revolutionizing and self-expansion – capitalism thrives because it avoids its fetters by escaping

---

[11] As Roger S. Gottlieb summarizes, "In work ranging from socially oriented psychoanalysis to economic theory, members of this 'Frankfurt School' established new paradigms of leftist theory opposed both to Stalinist totalitarianism and the 'one-dimensionality' of modern bourgeois culture and political life." Roger S. Gottlieb, *An Anthology of Western Marxism*, 171. The Frankfurt School theorists, including Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Jürgen Habermas, profoundly influenced both Western Marxism and postmodernism.

[12] See Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (New York: International Publishers, 2012).

[13] Göran Therborn, "New Questions of Subjectivity," in *Mapping Ideology*, ed. Slavoj Žižek (London: Verso, 2012), 167, 171.

[14] Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), 12.

into the future."[15]

A paralyzing incongruity arises when all alternative forms of social organization have been devised within the ideological boundaries of the system they proclaim to renounce. In such circumstances, Marcuse argued, "all contradiction *seems* irrational and all counteraction impossible."[16] In other words, all subversive action that is intelligible to those within the totalizing structure has already been subsumed, and its subversive elements negated, by the logic of capital. As radicals pursued the logical ends of these theories, there came to some a paralyzing sense of Marxism's defeat. What the Left once upheld as a philosophy of liberation now seemed a sentence of political paralysis. The inner motor of historical materialism and its progressive stage theory of history appeared to stop moving. Many proposed that Marxism itself was no longer capable of theorizing and critiquing society. Others asserted that society had in fact transitioned to a new epoch in the post-war era, one that no longer conformed to the laws or logic of modernity.

Marcuse himself, without renouncing Marxism as a whole, would argue that this culture of "one-dimensional thought and behavior" was indeed a "new society."[17] Others on both the Left and the Right made similar announcements. Among them is American sociologist Daniel Bell, who proclaimed the transition to a "post-industrial society" and promised an "end to ideology" when the grand narratives of the modern era would be exhausted (astutely foreshadowing today's similar notion of the "end of history").[18] The West was undergoing a marked change in appearances, with the expansion of a service economy, the increased accessibility of lifestyle consumerism, and the growth of post-war affluence. Many on the Left appear to have interpreted these signposts of postmodern society as a transition to a 'post-capitalist' historical epoch that was neither strictly capitalist nor socialist. This transcendence of modernity required a corresponding break from its obsolete criticisms. Indeed, several 'post-

---

[15] Slavoj Žižek, *The Year of Dreaming Dangerously* (London: Verso, 2012), 8.

[16] Marcuse, 9. Italics mine. Here Marcuse is referring to a paralysis that, despite the omnipresence of industrial society, is more psychological than physical. Like most of his Marxist peers, Marcuse still advocated for a possible liberation of the masses from such a system, though what is important here is his influence on the concept of inescapable totalities from which postmodernists would later draw.

[17] Ibid., 19.

[18] Ellen M. Wood, "What Is the "Postmodern" Agenda?," in *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, ed. Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997), 2.

Marxists' argued that the primacy of class struggle as the motor of history and as the locus of subversive activity in general was outdated. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, for example, asserted that,

> The rejection of privileged points of rupture and the confluence of struggles into a unified political space, and the acceptance on the contrary, of the plurality and indeterminacy of the social, seem to us the two fundamental bases from which a new political imaginary can be constructed, radically libertarian and infinitely more ambitious in its objectives than the classic left.[19]

Laclau and Mouffe proclaimed the "impossibility of society" as a valid object of discourse, placing them within the same discursive field as right-wing luminaries like Margaret Thatcher.[20] Nonetheless, one can observe here a new response to the old Marxist *problématique* of class reductionist economism. If the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie was once the "point of rupture" in modern capitalist society, it is now, in the postmodern era, an either insufficient or impossible plane of resistance.

Yet the rejection of traditional Marxism was not merely the result of the paralysis of action felt within totalizing structures, or simply of its perceived inability to explain or solve the problems of a "new society." It can also be traced to the notion, growing more popular between the 1960s and 1980s, that totalizing discourses of modernity like Marxism or the Enlightenment led inevitably to totalitarianism in their own right. In Adorno and Horkheimer's text *The Dialectic of Enlightenment,* they warn that modernity's totalizing forces of rationalization and progress, instead of emancipation, brought fascism.[21] They argue, in fact, "Enlightenment is totalitarian."[22] By 1968, however, many socialists were convinced of modernity's equal likelihood to produce totalitarianism on the Left as well, with the continued dominance of Stalinism in the Eastern bloc and the refusal of the Communist Party of France to support the ultimately failed Parisian uprising in May. Almost *en masse* throughout this period,

---

[19] Quoted in Michèle Barrett, "Ideology, Politics, Hegemony: From Gramsci to Laclau and Mouffe," in *Mapping Ideology*, 252.

[20] Eagleton, *Ideology*, 174.

[21] See Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, "Dialectic of Enlightenment," in *An Anthology of Western Marxism.* Foucault would later express agreement with this, suggesting that "it was on the basis of the flamboyant rationality of social Darwinism that racism was formulated, becoming one of the most enduring and powerful ingredients of Nazism." Michel Foucault, *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Vintage Books, 2010), 249.

[22] Kenan Malik, "The Mirror of Race: Postmodernism and the Celebration of Difference," in *In Defense of History*, 125.

Marxists and others on the Left, like Althusser and Foucault, began to abandon the Communist Party, embracing new philosophical theories like post-structuralism. Many harkened back to the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche, whose warnings about the "use and abuse of history" seemed prescient in the light of self-rationalizing totalitarianisms. For example, Nietzsche wrote, "Monumental history lives by false analogy; it entices the brave to rashness, and the enthusiastic to fanaticism by its tempting comparisons."[23] Though Nietzsche was not outright rejecting the use of monumental history, his apprehension is later echoed in the warnings of Foucault and Jacques Derrida that historical analogy is dangerous and invites fascism. Thereafter, many who had been on the "classic left" began to focus on language and discourse as the locus of power, representing a foundational shift from Marxism to postmodernism.

Further, according to Peter Dews, Nietzsche's work revealed "the deceptiveness of all partial perspectives on reality, while also blocking the possibility of a historical totality of perspectives that would reveal what cannot be known through any one alone." Central to his work, Dews continues, was Nietzsche's view that "all meaning, coherence, and teleological movement is projected on to a world which, in itself, is blank, purposeless, indifferent, chaotic."[24] Nietzsche's writings were further developed by the likes of Foucault and Derrida, who emphasized the existence of a plurality of differences, rather than an historical totality of identities-in-common, and for whom thereafter "knowledge" became "knowledges." Further, this theory of a blank and indifferent world lent itself to a rejection by Foucault and others of another Enlightenment value, that of humanism. Anti-humanism represented, among other things, a rejection of essences, particularly in discussions of human identity, and thus a skepticism toward such notions as class-consciousness or class-based identities in general.

This amounts to a rejection of totalizing discourses *in toto*, whether they were progressive narratives of the Enlightenment like Kantianism, or of Marxism. The work of Jean-Francois Lyotard is particularly significant here, as he took it upon himself to address this detotalizing reflex in 1979: "The grand narrative has lost its credibility,

---

[23] Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Use and Abuse of History," in *German Essays on History*, 183.

[24] Peter Dews, "Adorno, Post-Structuralism & Critique of Identity," in *Mapping Ideology*, 50.

regardless of what mode of unification it uses, regardless of whether it is a speculative narrative or a narrative of emancipation." He therefore states outright, "I define *postmodern* as incredulity toward metanarratives," which thereafter became a core tenet of postmodernist theory.[25]

Post-structuralists and others under the philosophical umbrella of postmodernism embraced this rejection of metanarratives, preferring instead fragmented histories, schizophrenic identities, and localized struggles. These they saw, like Laclau and Mouffe above, as "radically libertarian." A number of philosophical works were produced at this time, coming from the perspectives of post-structuralism and advocating deconstruction, difference (or Derrida's différance), unreason, pluralism, and a re-thinking of revolutionary action within the postmodern era. Foucault asked if it is even possible for "a criterion of intelligibility [to] be discovered amid the various accidents, chances, and the possibly irrational elements that are insinuated in the history of science."[26] Derrida announced that linear narratives came to represent "the suppression of multidimensional symbolic thought."[27] Jean Baudrillard proclaimed that the speed of interactions in the postmodern age represented "the triumph of effect over cause, the triumph of instantaneity over time as depth, the triumph of the surface and pure objectality over the profundity of desire."[28] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari proposed that radicals embrace a schizophrenic fragmentation of identity, and that the true revolutionary path is in fact in the direction of the market, and through it. They urged "not to withdraw from the process, but to go further, to 'accelerate the process' as Nietzsche put it: in this matter, the truth is that we haven't seen anything yet."[29] This was all, in one way or another, an open critique of Marxism, which as Dews reminds, was "seen as attempting to coerce the plurality of social and political movements into a single unswerving dialectic of history."[30]

This of course posed a direct challenge to the discipline of history

---

[25] Jean-François Lyotard, *Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis: U of Minn. Press, 1984), 37, xxiv.

[26] Michel Foucault, *Remarks on Marx: Conversations with Duccio Trombadori*, trans. R. James Goldstein and James Cascaito (New York: Semiotext(e), 1991), 61.

[27] Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 102.

[28] Jean Baudrillard, *America*, trans. Chris Turner (London: Verso, 1999), 6.

[29] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (New York, NY: Penguin, 2009), 239-240.

[30] Dews, 50.

as informed by modernist values, encapsulated for many in the famous creed of 19th century empirical historian and disciplinary founding father Leopold von Ranke, who insisted that the historian's duty was to attempt to explain "how things actually happened."[31] For post-structuralists, the idea that any one person could grasp the narrative of even a singular historical event was an absurd notion. Rather than seeking intelligible narratives in his studies, Foucault, the "ardent detotalizer" who preferred "a syncopated approach which never pretends to capture the whole of a historical moment," instead wrote histories of discontinuity.[32] This insistence on historical discontinuity thus decentered subjects and subjectivities, rendering them relative to one another rather than to a singular focal point of reference (like class structure).

Derrida, drawing on the structural linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure, also spoke of relativity, though of a different sort than that of Foucault, in which the language of any discourse was inherently self-referential. In his foundational text of deconstructive criticism published in 1967, *Of Grammatology*, Derrida asserts, "there is no 'outside' to the text."[33] By extension, he rejected the "false 'logocentric' confidence in language as the mirror of nature."[34] In other words, Derrida suggested that one cannot proclaim an historical text as reflective of an 'outside' or 'objective' reality because there is simply no escaping the context that forms whenever a reader engages with a text. A work of history could therefore scarcely present "how things actually happened" as it would merely be representative of the writer and reader's interaction with the text as mediated by language. This emphasis on the role of language is emblematic of "the Linguistic Turn," a term popularized by a book of the same name edited and released in 1967 by Richard Rorty, whose philosophy of neopragmatism is another facet of postmodernist theory.[35] Yet deconstructive criticism and the focus on the role of linguistic structures in ordering our notions of reality represented more than merely

---

[31] Leopold Von Ranke, "Preface to the Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations," in *German Essays on History*, 89.

[32] Mark Poster, *Foucault, Marxism, History: Mode of Production vs Mode of Information* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984), 88, 74.

[33] Christopher Norris, *What's Wrong with Postmodernism: Critical Theory and the Ends of Philosophy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 38

[34] Christopher Butler, *Postmodernism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 17.

[35] See Richard Rorty, *The Linguistic Turn: Essays in Philosophical Method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). The 'Linguistic Turn' is also often called the 'Literary Turn.'

a retreat from the world at large into the self-referential text. In fact, deconstruction came to serve a liberating role, in that it exposed how even privileged discourses always implied, and thus contained, the absent 'Other.' This new method of analysis served to reinforce or revitalize intellectual currents like Subaltern Studies and Feminism, which in turn deconstructed historical texts to deduce, define, or reassert the identities of marginalized subjects.

A number of 'new social movements,' each with their own histories, thus arose concomitant with this embrace of the 'Other' and the repudiation of the old grand narrative of class struggle. This amounts to what many call the "retreat from class." As Patrick Joyce suggests, "Instead of being a master category of historical explanation, [class] has become one term among many, sharing rough equality" with other identities like gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, etcetera.[36] What resulted was a micro-politics of local struggles disengaged, in the last analysis, from the totality of capitalism. These included the ecology movement, feminism, post-colonialism, anti-racism, and other movements which more orthodox Marxisms had been rather dismissive of or treated as of secondary concern, but which were increasingly embraced by the Left into the 1970s and through to the present. For example, as Robert Berkhofer argues, "The denial of a single meta-narrative Great or partial story to organize history eliminates the omniscient viewpoint, probably the third person voice, and maybe the ethnocentrism so evident so long in history productions."[37] This postulates the thesis that metanarratives like Marxism are inherently racist and imperialist by virtue of its attempt to universalize and globalize the historical vantage point of Karl Marx's own Western Europe and inflict it upon the rest of the world. Post-colonialism, as proposed by Edward Said and Gayatri Spivak, argued that the decolonized Global South seeks to acquire its own set of identities separate from the homogenizing gaze of Western imperialism. Homi Bhabha asserted that post-colonial perspectives "intervene in those ideological discourses of modernity that attempt to give a hegemonic 'normality' to the uneven development and the differential, often disadvantaged, histories of nations, races,

---

[36] Bryan D. Palmer, "Old Positions/New Necessities: History, Class, and Marxist Metanarrative," in *In Defense of History*, 69.

[37] Robert Berkhofer, "The Challenge of Poetics to (Normal) Historical Practice," in *The Postmodern History Reader*, ed. Keith Jenkins (London: Routledge, 1997), 154.

communities, peoples."[38] Here, freedom from totalizing discourses of history is perceived as liberating in itself.

Ideas about the oppressive nature of the act of privileging discourses and the inherent self-reflexivity of the text were carried further in the work of postmodern historian Hayden White. In fact, White suggests, "There is an inexpungible relativity in every representation of historical phenomena."[39] This relativity is such that history no longer holds a privileged position apart from fiction. As Anna Green and Kathleen Troup put it, "Historians must now consider the assertion that our representation of the past has no greater claim to truth than that of novelists and poets, and that our narratives are literary artefacts, produced according to the rules of genre and style."[40] This seemingly represented the logic of postmodernism taken to its fullest extreme. If no value judgments of fact or fiction could be privileged over any other to bestow legitimacy on a particular narrative, then a social Darwinist justification for white supremacy could be considered just as 'correct' as any Subaltern study, thereby undercutting the superior authenticity that previous postmodernists had given to micro-histories over the imperialist grand narratives. Green and Troup criticize this position. They suggest that if "all histories are equally representative of reality and therefore equally fictitious... total relativism can result in a nihilism where everything is equally meaningless."[41] It would seem that, despite rejecting outright the Enlightenment project's obsession with objectivity, White's extreme relativity merely flips a familiar phrase of von Ranke on its head to suggest that every epoch is equally immediate to wretchedness or tyranny.[42]

Yet the work of Hayden White had a few specific criticisms that were perhaps less nihilistic and more important for Marxism to answer to if it were to make a response to the postmodern challenge. In "The Fictions of Factual Representation," White argued the following:

> [T]here is no value-neutral mode of emplotment, explanation, or even description of any field of events, whether imaginary or real, and...

---

[38] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 2006), 245-246.

[39] Hayden White, "Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth," in *The Postmodern History Reader*, 392.

[40] Anna Green and Kathleen Troup, *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 206.

[41] Ibid., 300.

[42] Ranke's original words were "every epoch is immediate to God." See Leopold Von Ranke, "On the Epochs of Modern History," in *German Essays on History*, 84.

> the very use of language itself implies or entails a specific posture
> before the world which is ethical, ideological, or more generally
> political: not only all interpretation, but also all language is politically
> contaminated.[43]

In other words, despite claims of objective observation of material reality, the Marxist metanarrative still contains its own political or ideological agenda. After all, it utilizes the same language as the system it denounces. Even if 'real' emancipation results only from a 'true' consciousness of exploitation, how could Marxism claim to be the arbiter of truth when objectivity in language is impossible? Still, Marxism never claimed to offer a one to one relationship between observation and a comprehension of material reality. Knowledge of one's material conditions is always refracted through the antagonisms of social relations and the subsequent ordering of structures of power according to who controls the means of production. Thus, as Marx and Engels originally put it, "The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas… the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it."[44] Ideology obfuscates class-consciousness, in which case objectivity is a lost cause.

Herein lies the first critical response by Marxists to postmodernists. White's assertion that language is not a neutral vehicle and is inherently political or otherwise obscured by inescapable interestedness is not necessarily a point of contention here. Recently, for example, Marxist critic of postmodernism Bryan Palmer insisted that Marxist social historians indeed had a role to play, albeit small, in proletarian politics.[45] Value-neutrality in this case would be considered politically useless, even reactionary. Further, one could contend that the use of the binary of objectivity and subjectivity as a critique of narratives represents, as Terry Eagleton suggests, the liberal equation of objectivity with disinterestedness. In arguing that objectivity is impossible because disinterestedness is impossible, many postmodernists are inconsistently seeking to undermine one value inherited from the Enlightenment-era by assuming that another is valid.[46] Still, however, this represents a return to the question of how one ascertains the 'truth' from within a totalizing discourse or structure. One may revisit the writings of Lukács for a

---

[43] White, "The Fictions of Factual Representation," in *The Houses of History,* 223.

[44] Marx and Engels, "The German Ideology," in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 172.

[45] Palmer, "Critical Theory, Historical Materialism, and the Ostensible End of Marxism: The Poverty of Theory Revisited," in *The Postmodern History Reader*, 112.

[46] Eagleton, *Ideology*, 166.

potential answer to this dilemma. He emphasizes the role of the dialectical method in comprehending a totality from within itself rather than without:

> [T]he essence of the dialectical method lies in the fact that in every aspect correctly grasped by the dialectic the whole totality is comprehended and that the whole method can be unraveled from every single aspect… It must be seen instead as containing the possibility of unraveling the whole abundance of the totality from within itself.[47]

This contention is presented in other words below.

For many postmodernists, critiquing a totalizing discourse is hopeless because the definition of a totality inherently presupposes omniscience or transcendental observation (i.e. viewing the totality from outside of its boundaries). Put this way, ascertaining truth is impossible, for there is no transcendence of circumstance, only relativity to other singular subjectivities. Formulating an objective critique of one's culture would involve "leaping out of our own skins."[48] As expressed in postwar totalizing theories, any alternative to capitalism that is proposed and is intelligible to our structures of language has already been defined and allowed by the systemic logic of capital, thereby representing no real change at all. In the end, the only real escape from such a system is death, or conversely, a partial submission in lifestyle consumerism and localized identity subversions. For Marxists, this is political quiescence and defeatism. They propose that the concept of a totality works under a different rubric. Marxists do not propose it is possible to transcend circumstance, ideology, or material conditions either, though as suggested by Marx above, there is a possibility for agency, or movement within circumstance. In this way, some postmodern theories are more deterministic than Marxism. Transcendental observation or omniscience is unnecessary, whether possible or not, for a totality does not require that one define its borders from without. Rather, the 'outside' of any totalizing system is to be found 'inside' of it, due to its inherent contradictions that can be observed via dialectical logic, just as the absent 'Other' can be found, through deconstruction, implied within the text. The totality of capitalism is thus internally comprehensible when viewed through what

---

[47] Lukács, 106-107.
[48] Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 203.

David Harvey calls the "cracks in the mirror" of capital.[49] Put simply, the façade of capital's omnipotence becomes transparent in times of crisis. So long as economic crises occur, the mode of production can be negated.

This of course assumes the continued existence of universal antagonisms, such as class struggle, which postmodernism denies. If Marxists are correct that all history thus far has been that of class struggle, then any theoretical "retreat from class" would suggest that class society, or history proper, has ended. One is reminded of Daniel Bell's predictions and of Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History and the Last Man*. Baudrillard stated, for example, "We are leaving history to move into the realm of simulation."[50] Yet as Palmer suggests, the age of postmodernity was made "not outside of history, but inside its relations of power and challenge, struggle and subordination."[51] If the age of modernity were an epoch of totalizing narratives, the act of "leaving history" behind in the transition to postmodernity would require a veritable "leaping out of one's skin" by the totalizing narrative of history itself. That these discontinuities are inexplicable does not seem to deter postmodernists. This prompted Ellen Wood to ask, "How do you criticize a body of ideas that *a priori* rules out the very practice of "rational" argument?"[52] In fact, as Marxist critic and postmodernist Fredric Jameson argues, this discourse is so paralyzing of criticism and action that it is now far easier to imagine the end of the natural world than the breakdown of capitalism.[53]

Another Marxist criticism levied at postmodernism involves the aforementioned "retreat from class" and embrace of identity politics by poststructuralists and many post-colonial theorists. This again brings into question the validity of a universal identity-in-common, such as class, upon which one can focus a narrative. Against the claims of intellectuals like Berkhofer and Bhabha that the Marxist grand narrative of history is

---

[49] Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity: Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992), 356.

[50] Baudrillard, "The Illusion of the End," in *The Postmodern History Reader*, 44.

[51] Palmer, "Critical Theory, Historical Materialism, and the Ostensible End of Marxism: The Poverty of Theory Revisited," 107. This notion of stages of history bearing within them the remnants of the old structures of power and contradiction is echoed at various points in Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.*

[52] Ellen M. Wood, "What Is the "Postmodern" Agenda?," in *In Defense of History*, 14.

[53] Fredric Jameson, *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998* (London: Verso, 2009), 50. Jameson, like Eagleton and many other forward-thinking Marxists, is something of a postmodernist himself. These radical academics couple their calls for a return to history and class with well-deserved criticisms of Old and New Left Marxisms alike.

imperialist, racist, and oppressive of marginalized ethnic minorities and other subalterns, many Marxist critics contend that such a view too readily dismisses the measureable benefits that global emancipatory movements can bring. By refusing global comparisons, post-colonial theorists impede the acknowledgment of comparative deficits in civil rights and liberties in favor of more 'authentic' cultural traditions. As Meera Nanda contends in her defense of modern science, "A discursive egalitarianism that refrains from critiquing objectively false beliefs because they happen to be held by the more traditional 'masses' actually impedes the struggle for real and substantive equality."[54] Such a view also erases the common experiences of those subjected to globalized capitalism outside of the West. According to Marxists, this dismissal of common identity dangerously undermines the potential for emancipatory action in favor of localized subversions that pose no real challenge to globalization.

Recently, Vivek Chibber addressed this issue in a criticism of the post-colonial discipline of Subaltern Studies. This field, he suggested, is "based on a flawed premise – that for capital to universalize, it must subjugate/subordinate the independence of… every element of the social whole that does not conform to capital's logic."[55] According to this premise, nonconformity and identity politics should be nexuses of revolutionary action. Yet he suggests instead that the universalization of capital does not necessarily determine every aspect of identity or enforce homogeneity. In fact, it can promote or reinforce difference to legitimize its exploitative presence as long as this fragmentation of identity does not does not undermine the accumulation of capital. The totality of capitalism as told by the grand narrative of Marxism is thus no longer that homogenizing, identity-erasing force that poststructuralists had once derided. As Eagleton suggests, quite the opposite is true. "It is clear," he

---

[54] Meera Nanda, "Against Social De(con)struction of Science: Cautionary Tales from the Third World," in *In Defense of History*, 84-85. In a different defense of science as such, civil rights radical Stokely Carmichael once argued that the narrative of Marxism could not inherently be Eurocentric, as it was in fact an objective science that was discovered and not invented. As Carmichael contended, Marx was "no different to Newton. We call the laws of gravity Newton's Laws. But Newton did not invent the laws of gravity. He merely observed and recorded." Stokely Carmichael, "From Black Power to Pan-Africanism" (speech, Whittier College, Whittier, CA, March 22, 1971). Postmodernism's rejection of science and objectivity notwithstanding, Nanda and Carmichael represent examples of marginalized actors using Marxism as an emancipatory tool from imperialism and racism rather than rejecting it as a Eurocentric imposition of outsider value judgments.

[55] Vivek Chibber, *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital* (London: Verso, 2013), 243.

says, "that without pragmatism and plurality the system could not survive at all. Difference, 'hybridity,' heterogeneity, restless mobility are native to the capitalist mode of production, and [are] thus by no means inherently radical phenomena."[56] Consequently, an embrace of these phenomena, as urged and promoted by postmodernists, is more akin to a reactionary political act, and one that reinforces the cultural logic of late capitalism at the expense of true radical politics. The Left can only pursue these radical politics through the common experiences uniting heterogeneous identities, rather than through the aspects that differentiate them. As Žižek argues in conversation with post-structuralists Laclau and Judith Butler, "in the series of struggles (economic, political, feminist, ecological, ethnic, etc.) there is always one which, while it is part of the chain, secretly overdetermines its very horizon."[57] This unifying narrative is class subjugation. To dispense with this narrative while claiming to be a radical, Marxists contend, is emblematic of a position of privilege and comfort with the status quo. As Meera Nanda quotes Ian Hacking, "To be able to be critical of the unities is a luxury and let us never forget it."[58]

Continuing this criticism of late capitalism's commodification of cultural difference, socialist-feminist Carol Stabile sums up the rejection of postmodern identity politics in this way:

> Instead of seeing the fragmentation of identities as a cause for celebration, we should try to understand how identity has been transformed into a commodity for those with the capital to consume it, and how the capitalist system has worked (and will continue to work) against the organization of socialist politics.[59]

Here she speaks to the final, and perhaps most important, Marxist response to the postmodernist challenge. Stabile is proposing the fitting of postmodernity within a historical materialist framework rather than rejecting it out of hand as a culturally divorced descent into dejected nihilism, as some other critics have done.[60] Here, with his influential slogan of "Always

---

[56] Eagleton, "Where Do Postmodernists Come From?," in *In Defense of History*, 21.

[57] Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek, *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left* (London: Verso, 2011), 320.

[58] Nanda, 74.

[59] Carol A. Stabile, "Postmodernism, Feminism, and Marx: Notes from the Abyss," in *In Defense of History*, 148.

[60] See Alex Callinicos, *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989). Here postmodernism is dismissed as a symptom of defeat, an expression of disappointment among the revolutionary generation of 1968 who were then deradicalized as they were incorporated into the professional middle class.

historicize!" reminding Marxists to periodize events into a materialist conception of history, Fredric Jameson has proven to be one of the most important defenders of the Marxist metanarrative against the postmodern agenda.[61]   Jameson makes the argument that "the waning of our sense of history, and more particularly our resistance to globalizing or totalizing concepts… are a function of precisely that universalization of capitalism." Rather than liberating themselves from the reductionist narratives of the Enlightenment, postmodernists are consenting to the totalizing narrative of modern capitalism.

The renowned Marxist historian and New Left intellectual E.P. Thompson tackled the "waning of history" and "retreat from class" phenomena long before many postmodern theorists broke with modernity. In his *Making of the English Working Class*, Thompson asserts,

> If we stop history at a given point, then there are no classes but simply a multitude of individuals with a multitude of experiences. But if we watch these men over an adequate period of social change, we observe patterns in their relationships, their ideas, and their institutions.[62]

Thompson purposefully reminds the reader of Friedrich Engles' letters on historical materialism. The disappearance of class and metanarrative are inextricably linked. A microcosmic focus on a decentered present fulfills the poststructuralist goal of neither privileging nor erasing any one particular subjectivity, though it also lacks the historical depth required to comprehend long-term patterns. Class is dialectical in that it is only visible in motion. When one follows Baudrillard in "leaving history behind," one also abandons the ability to see class and other historical patterns. All remaining identities then appear equally important and political.

Jameson goes further, suggesting that notions concerning the 'end of history' are "not really about Time at all, but rather about Space."[63] This parallels the constant expansion and 'time-space compression' of capital suggested by David Harvey, who likewise argues that postmodernism is "a historical-geographic condition."[64] In other words, the announcements of the end of history, ideology, and class society are merely the result of

---

[61] Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1988), 9.

[62] E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), 11.

[63] Jameson, *The Cultural Turn*, 43, 90.

[64] Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, 336.

the closing of yet another spatio-temporal frontier in the global marketplace. The proliferation of these ideas suggests that many believed it to be the final frontier. As Jameson relates, this cultural logic bespeaks "the entrance of capitalism into a new third stage and its consequent penetration of as yet uncommodified parts of the world which make it difficult to imagine any further enlargement of the system."[65] Jameson thus periodizes this era of postmodernity, which he suggests is not a 'post-industrial' society that left class stratification behind, but rather "late capitalism," a third stage in the evolution of capital as formulated by the economist Ernest Mandel. In the keeping with the Marxist tradition, it follows Marx's stage of market capitalism and Lenin's stage of imperialism.[66]

In this stage of late capitalism, the cultural logic of which is postmodernism, capital is so totalizing that it is no wonder "it is becoming invisible."[67] The sensation of living in an inescapable system, such a totalized social structure that it becomes invisible and impossible to criticize, is the anxiety and paralysis that characterized many of the postwar Marxists who were so influential on postmodernism. The market penetration of the "uncommodified parts of the world" Jameson spoke of led to the deradicalization of cultural difference. This argument is a criticism of the idea that within the paralyzing totality of capital, the only remaining radical politics are microaggressions against homogeneity. Jameson's criticism colludes with that of Chibber and Stabile above. In it, culture itself has become commodified under globalization. The celebration of difference, fragmented identities, and localized micronarratives by post-structuralists now plays directly into the logic of late capitalism. Through periodizing the development of these ideas, one can see them as "a response to the 'success' of capitalism."[68] Subsequently, they came to dominate the political and philosophical atmosphere of much of the Left even through the periodic recessions of the 1970s and 1980s, and they were given a new life and sense of legitimacy after the defeat of Soviet Communism. Global economic crises, which once served as a rallying cry for the working class movement, have either been ignored or divorced from their global

---

[65] Jameson, *The Cultural Turn*, 90.
[66] Jameson, *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 35.
[67] Wood, 15.
[68] Eagleton, "Where do Postmodernists Come From?," in *In Defense of History*, 25.

implications at crucial moments of potential radicalism.

To a certain extent, then, postmodernism is merely "a shamefaced apologia for the Western way of life," as Eagleton suggests.[69] Yet there can be no doubt that poststructuralists, post-Marxists, and post-colonial theorists brought a range of constructive challenges to traditional Marxist philosophy, including a reproach for marginalizing the historical narratives of women, ethnic minorities, colonized peoples, and other subalterns. Addressing these egregious deficiencies is not only consistent with socialist historians' project of rescuing the toiling masses from "the enormous condescension of posterity," it also improves the accuracy of materialist analysis.[70] For example, where Thompson characterized his work as a biography of the "working class from its adolescence until its early manhood," feminist historians like Anna Clark recently sought to "infuse gender… into the analysis of class."[71] In this way, Clark refuted Thompson's masculinization of labor while restoring the historical agency of working class women.

Marxist social historians cannot afford to dismiss these previously overlooked struggles out of hand as divorced from the narrative of class struggle, especially within an economic system that develops so unevenly across the globe and fosters heterogeneous identities. However, despite some claims to the contrary, there is no such 'post-industrial' society writ large, as industrial capitalism continues spread to underdeveloped nations, and the "proletarianization" of previously middling professions in the West reduces the standard of living for larger and larger populations in the developed world.[72] Only by understanding the development of this cultural logic can Marxists maintain their relevance against the challenge of postmodernism. Historical materialism seems more relevant now than ever, precisely when the Left has abandoned it. As Foucault once said,

> It is impossible at the present time to write history without using a whole range of concepts directly or indirectly linked to Marx's thought and situating oneself within a horizon of thought which has been defined and described by Marx. One might even wonder what difference there could ultimately be between being a historian and being a Marxist.[73]

---

[69] Eagleton, *Ideology*, 172.

[70] Thompson, 12.

[71] Ibid., 11; and Anna Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997), 2.

[72] Eagleton, *Why Marx Was Right* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 174.

[73] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 53.

If there is any truth to this statement, then in order to rehabilitate the role of the historian from the trash heap of modernity where postmodern theorists cast it aside, one must situate the flight from narratives within the old grand narrative itself. Historians must view the end of history as a return in its own right. Historicizing the decline of the discipline by using a materialist method of analysis is the surest route to recovery within academia.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor, and Max Horkheimer. "Dialectic of Enlightenment." In *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukács and Gramsci to Socialist-feminism*, edited by Roger S. Gottlieb, 179-93. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Barrett, Michèle. "Ideology, Politics, Hegemony: From Gramsci to Laclau and Mouffe." In *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, 235-64. London: Verso, 2012.

Baudrillard, Jean. *America*. Translated by Chris Turner. London: Verso, 1999.

———. "The Illusion of the End." In *The Postmodern History Reader*, edited by Keith Jenkins, 39-46. London: Routledge, 1997.

Berkhofer, Robert. "The Challenge of Poetics to (Normal) Historical Practice." In *The Postmodern History Reader*, ed. by Keith Jenkins, 139-57. London: Routledge, 1997.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Butler, Christopher. *Postmodernism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Butler, Judith, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek. *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso, 2011.

Callinicos, Alex. *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Carmichael, Stokely. "From Black Power to Pan-Africanism." Speech, Whittier College, Whittier, CA, March 22, 1971.

Chibber, Vivek. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*. London: Verso, 2013.

Clark, Anna. The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2009.

Derrida, Jacques. *Positions*. Trans. by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Dews, Peter. "Adorno, Post-Structuralism, and the Critique of Identity." In *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, 46-65. London: Verso, 2012.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 2007.

———. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

———. "Where Do Postmodernists Come From?" In *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, edited by Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster, 17-25. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.

———. *Why Marx Was Right*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Engels, Friedrich. "Letters on Historical Materialism." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 760-68. Second ed. New York: Norton, 1978.

Foucault, Michel. *Remarks on Marx: Conversations with Duccio Trombadori*. Translated by R. James Goldstein and James Cascaito. New York: Semiotext(e), 1991.

———. *The Foucault Reader*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Vintage Books, 2010.

———. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Gottlieb, Roger S., ed. *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukács and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers, 2012.

Green, Anna, and Kathleen Troup. *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992.

———. *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Cultural Turn: Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998*. London: Verso, 2009.

———. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.

———. *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.

Kant, Immanuel. "Idea for a Universal History with Cosmopolitan Intent." In *German Essays on History*, edited by Rolf Sältzer, 3-15. New York: Continuum, 1991.

Lukács, György. "History and Class Consciousness." In *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukács and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism*, edited by Roger S. Gottlieb, 54-111. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Malik, Kenan. "The Mirror of Race: Postmodernism and the Celebration of Difference." In *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, edited by Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster, 112-33. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. "The German Ideology." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 146-200. Second ed. New York: Norton, 1978.

Marx, Karl. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 594-617. Second ed. New York: Norton, 1978.

———. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. Translated by Martin Nicolaus. London: Penguin Books, 1993.

———. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. New York: International Publishers, 1992.

———. "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 3-6. Second ed. New York: Norton, 1978.

Nanda, Meera. "Against Social De(con)struction of Science: Cautionary Tales from the Third World." In *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, edited by Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster, 74-96. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "The Use and Abuse of History." In *German Essays on History*, edited by Rolf Sältzer, 174-94. New York: Continuum, 1991.

Norris, Christopher. *What's Wrong with Postmodernism: Critical Theory and the Ends of Philosophy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Palmer, Bryan D. "Critical Theory, Historical Materialism, and the Ostensible End of Marxism: The Poverty of Theory Revisited." In *The Postmodern History Reader*, edited by Keith Jenkins, 103-14. London: Routledge, 1997.

———. "Old Positions/New Necessities: History, Class, and Marxist Metanarrative." In *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, edited by Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster, 65-73. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.

Poster, Mark. *Foucault, Marxism, and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1984.

Ranke, Leopold von. "On the Epochs of Modern History." In *German Essays on History*, edited by Rolf Sältzer, 82-87. New York: Continuum, 1991.

———. "Preface to the First Edition of Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations." In *German Essays on History*, edited by Rolf Sältzer, 88-90. New York: Continuum, 1991.

Rigby, S. H. "Marxist Historiography." In *Companion to Historiography*, edited by Michael Bentley, 868-906. London: Routledge, 1997.

Rorty, Richard. *The Linguistic Turn: Essays in Philosophical Method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Stabile, Carol A. "Postmodernism, Feminism, and Marx: Notes from the Abyss." In *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, edited by Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster, 134-48. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.

Therborn, Göran. "The New Questions of Subjectivity." In *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, 167-78. London: Verso, 2012.

Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

White, Hayden. "The Fictions of Factual Representation." In *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory*, edited by Anna Green and Kathleen Troup, 214-29. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

———. "Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth." In *The Postmodern History Reader*, edited by Keith Jenkins, 392-96. London: Routledge, 1997.

Wood, Ellen M. "What Is the "Postmodern" Agenda?" In *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*, edited by Ellen M. Wood and John B. Foster, 1-16. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Year of Dreaming Dangerously*. London: Verso, 2012.

Appendix

2014 Phi Alpha Theta Initiates

It is with great pride and enthusiasm that the Editorial Board of *The Chico Historian* welcomes into the fold this year's new members of the Alpha Delta Omicron Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta:

Thomas L. Evens

Emma Folta

Thomas Giles

Spencer Gomez

Katelyn Hays

Richard Allen Kennedy, Jr.

Kynsie Lovell

Marissa Moore

Andrew Paddock

Alison Saechao

Daniel R. Thompson

Rodney Thomson

Iris Velasco

Chris Wagoner

Parker Wilson