But the tale of history forms a very strong bulwark against the stream of time, and to some extent checks its irresistible flow, and, of all things done to it, as many as history has taken over, it secures and binds together, and does not allow them to slip away into the abyss of oblivion.

- Anna Komnena
The Alexiad
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Introduction & Acknowledgements

It is once again our pleasure to present you with The Chico Historian. The annual journal of the California State University, Chico History Department, this, the twenty-sixth volume, contains the work of some of the Department’s best and brightest students. Like every year, the editors fretted whether they would receive enough submissions and, again like every year, an abundance of excellent offerings arrived in the journal’s inbox.


The Chico Historian this year is fortunate to have three papers that address various aspects of the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s. In “How Citizens’ Council Values Refused to Perish,” Parker Wilson dissects the influence of white citizens’ councils on white resistance to the civil rights movement. “Drugs and the Counterculture,” by Nora Smith, offers a history of the rise in the use of narcotics during the 1960s. In the last of this volume’s offerings on modern American history, Jeanette Adame’s “The Pill and 1960s American Society” describes the impact that form of birth control had on culture and the women’s liberation movement.
Outside of these more modern offerings, we are excited to share the work of Chris Paintner, whose “Kett’s Rebellion, 1549: A Rejection of Social, Religious, and Economic Changes in East Anglia,” provides a detailed analysis of the underlying causes of this Norfolk, England uprising. Finally, Rod Thomson looks at changes in another historiographical tradition in his “Muslim Chronicles of the First Crusade: A Transition in Islamic Historiography.”

The editors wish to express their thanks to several entities and individuals who made this year’s publication possible. First, Professor John Boyle, who yet again made a generous contribution, without which the publication of this journal would be far more challenging, if not impossible. *The Chico Historian* enjoys a long association with both the History Club and the CSUC chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, and we owe a debt of thanks to the support that the advisor of those two organizations, Professor Dallas DeForest, has provided. Our penultimate thanks go to the History Department faculty, all of whom have proven themselves dedicated mentors to Chico State’s budding historians. Finally, our sincerest thanks to everyone who participated in this year’s volume. It goes without saying that what you hold in your hands could not exist without the dedicated effort of those who submitted the fruits of their labors for publication.

*The Chico Historian Editorial Board*
Editors

**Jerrad Benedict** is a current graduate student of history at California State University, Chico. Jerrad’s primary interests lie in modern history, particularly in Latin America, Europe, Russia, and the United States. Upon graduating with his MA in history in Spring 2016, Jerrad intends to teach history at the lower-division and community college levels, with future aspirations of pursuing a Ph.D. in Latin American history. His paper was written for Dr. Robert Cottrell’s History 690 (Graduate Seminar in Historiography) in Fall 2015.

**Rodney Thomson** is a graduate student of history at California State University, Chico. Rod’s current research includes identity formation among early-Islamic sectarian groups and how contemporary socio-political events influenced that process. He is also completing a history of activists and activism at Chico State College during the period 1964-1976. Rod intends to 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. He wrote his paper in the Fall 2015 semester for Professor Robert Cottrell’s History 690 (Graduate Seminar in Historiography) course.

**Chris Paintner** is a graduate student working on his M.A in History. He is continuing his research into the causes and the impact of Kett's Rebellion for a thesis project, particularly the role of popular culture in the rebel's worldview. After finishing his M.A., Chris plans to pursue a career in public history as an archivist. Chris’ offering was written for History 423 under Dr. Jason Nice.

**Jeanette Adame** is a fourth year student at Chico State, graduating in spring, 2016. She is currently pursuing a BA in History, with a minor in Music. After graduation Jeanette plans to attend the Master’s program at CSU Chico with future aspirations of pursuing a Ph.D. in history.
After completing her education she plans to continue writing, and begin teaching at the collegiate level. Her primary area of interest is early United States history, with a focus on slavery and gender. In addition to educating students in history, Jeanette also intends to educate future generations about human trafficking and modern day slavery in the twenty-first century.

Nora Smith is currently a senior at California State University, Chico. She is a History major and a European Studies minor with a focus on modern Eastern European and Russian history. Nora wrote her paper for Dr. Cottrell’s class on America in the 1960s. After graduating in spring of 2016, she plans on returning to the San Francisco Bay Area. When not thinking critically about historical matters, Nora can be found baking cakes in her kitchen or watching Star Wars.

Contributors

Connor Hendricks is a graduating senior at California State University, Chico. He will be receiving BAs in History and Anthropology in Spring 2016. Following graduation, Connor will be commissioned as an officer in the United States Navy with future plans to pursue graduate education in archaeology following service. His special interests include the archaeology of the early American frontier and maritime history. His paper was written for Dr. Laird Easton’s History 290 (Historical Methodology) in Fall 2015.

Matthew Williams is an undergraduate at California State University, Chico. He will be graduating in the Spring of 2017 with a Bachelor of the Arts in History. Post-graduation he plans to pursue a career in teaching at the high school level and to continue his research in transportation development in the United States. In his time off, Matt enjoys writing, hiking, yoga, and tending to his 1966 Ford Mustang. He originally wrote this paper for Dr. Robert Tinkler’s History of the American South class in Fall of 2014.

Brett Hyde is an undergraduate at California State University, Chico and is pursuing a Bachelor of Arts in History. His academic interests lie in twentieth-century international relations. After receiving his degree at CSUC, Brett hopes to teach history at the high school level and pursue a Master of Arts in History to teach at a higher level in the future. His paper was written for Dr. Nice’s History 290 (Historians and Historical Methodology) in Fall 2015.

Parker Wilson is finishing up his MA in history here at CSU Chico. He loves to travel and read and he is currently engaged to the love of his life, Victoria. Parker hopes to one day soon teach at the community
college level where he can inspire people of all ages to take a closer look at the importance of history. He composed his contribution as part of History 600 (Graduate Research Seminar in History) for Dr. Robert Tinkler.

**Joshua Furtado** is studying both Mathematics and History. He enjoys combining his two passions by studying how mathematics has shaped history and how historical cultures have shaped mathematical advancements. He is pursuing a career in teaching, and hopes to pass on his passion for both his areas of interest. He wrote his paper for Dr. Kate Transchel in History 419.

**Brendan Flesher** is a 21 year old Junior from Paradise, CA. He is majoring in History and German and minoring in both European Studies and International Studies. He plans on graduating in Spring 2017, and after will pursue a Masters degree in History in either Germany or in the U.S. After completing his education, he wants to share his passion for history with students at the college level. He wrote his paper for History 290 (Historical Methods and Methodology) under Professor Easton.
Articles
An illustration by Yahya ibn Mahmud al-Wasiti from the thirteenth century, depicting mounted warriors equipped in a manner similar to those who encountered the First Crusade in the late-eleventh, early-twelfth centuries.
MUSLIM CHRONICLES OF THE FIRST CRUSADE: A TRANSITION IN ISLAMIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

Rodney Thomson

For most of the twentieth century, scholars engaged with early Muslim historiography theorized the existence of several schools of Islamic historical thought, the identities of which were geographically based. This contention was challenged and unseated in 1972 by the work of Albrecht Noth, who in his habilitationsschrift asserted that no clear distinctions existed on which to base a "theory of schools." Instead, he pointed to commonalities found throughout the early Islamic historical writings, regardless of their places of origin or the backgrounds of their authors. Noth identified several themes of principal importance to the Muslim traditionists: apostasy (ridda), conquest (futūḥ), inter-communal strife (fitna), leadership (sirat al-khulafā‘), and others. He also observed the common literary forms (documentary, epistolary, rhetorical), and topoi (content-related narrative motifs) utilized by early chroniclers such as al-Tabari, Ibn Ishaq, and al-Baladhuri. While a few fellow specialists have criticized Noth's book on points of scholarly minutiae, it continues to be regarded as a seminal work that advances the understanding of its subject in a meaningful and useful way.

The Muslim authors considered by Noth composed their works over a relatively long period – the eighth through the early-tenth centuries. They shared a body of source materials, and often recycled verbatim the reports of prior traditionists. But the way in which Muslims approached historical writing changed over time in response to shifting cultural priorities. Chase Robinson notes that the goal of the traditionists was the preservation of an idealized past that could

---

2 Noth and Conrad, 28-61. The term "traditionist" is used to describe the earliest Muslim historiographers. It derives from their role as collectors of traditions (ahadith – sing. hadith) concerning the Prophet Muhammad, the first four Caliphs, and the early community of believers. Later Muslim history writers – those dating from after c. 950 CE – are referred to herein as “chroniclers.” Besides primary themes, Noth also identifies several "secondary themes," none of which are relevant to the present discussion.
3 Ibid., 62-172. As with Noth's secondary themes, his literary forms and schemata have no bearing herein.
4 For example, Robert Hoyland notes that Noth's conclusions regarding the trustworthiness of the early sources, while plausible, are really nothing more than conjecture on the author's part (Robert Hoyland, "Review of Albrecht Noth: The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-Critical Study," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 60, no. 1 (1997): 130.)
"validate and guide the experience of the present," but once that past had been created, Muslim historiographers turned to other matters.\(^5\) Just five decades after the period addressed by Noth, some of his themes, forms, and motifs had been discarded in favor of new ones, while those that survived were modified to meet the needs of a community trying to come to grips with events unforeseen by their forefathers.

To the peoples of the Middle East, the First Crusade came as a complete surprise, and they were caught unprepared as a result. The relative unity of the Muslim community experienced in the early days of the Arab Conquests was a distant memory, and the crusaders found themselves facing a region torn by faction, a condition that contributed to the otherwise-unlikely success of their military venture. The lingering 'Abbasid caliphate, the fiercely competitive Seljuqs and Fatimids, the appearance of violent religious sectarianism, and a host of independent amirs, governors, and Arab robber-barons all contributed to the creation of a political environment with a "complexity verging almost upon anarchy.\(^6\)"

The situation was further complicated when the Saljuq Sultan, Qilij Arslan, effortlessly defeated the first groups of Europeans to cross the Bosporus into Anatolia in 1096.\(^7\) This bred overconfidence and a tendency for the Saljuqs – Islam's first line of defense against the crusaders – to ignore the invaders in favor of local political issues. This situation was magnified in the Levant, where Saljuq, Fatimid, and Arab leaders treated the Europeans as just another group of players in the game of local politics, even to the extent of allying with the crusaders against one another. The political environment remained largely unchanged until Imad al-Din Zengi began to unite the region, a process continued by his son Nur al-Din and completed by Saladin in the last decades of the twelfth century.

In their attempts to explain this series of events, Islamic chroniclers of the Crusades found that the methods of their predecessors no longer sufficed. In some cases, what the early traditionists deemed of primary importance no longer had relevancy to the evolving socio-political situation. The theme of apostasy is one such example. Some Arab tribes had understood their allegiance to

---


\(^7\) The so-called "People's Crusade" arrived before the main crusader military groups. Driven by a dangerous combination of religious zeal and material greed, this motley mob of some 20,000 was isolated and crushed by the Turks in two battles. As much as ninety percent of the Europeans were either killed or enslaved, the latter after professing Islam.
Islam to be part of their political arrangement with the Prophet Muhammad, and considered that bond severed upon his death. The Wars of Apostasy followed, in which the early community of believers invited the apostate tribes to return to Islam either voluntarily or “by the sword.” Apostasy developed as an important early historiographical theme for a variety of reasons, not least of which the need to justify the reintegration of politically-important tribes back into the community. But, by the end of the twelfth century, this need had vanished. Not only had the socio-political structure of the Islamic world changed, but even the question of membership in the religious community was no longer so clearly defined as it had been in the mid-seventh century. Since then, Islam had fractured into sub-traditions too numerous to count, and the epithet “apostate” had therefore lost much of its usefulness. As a result, Muslim chroniclers of the Crusades discarded apostasy as a theme in their writings.

Other themes retained some value, however, and were maintained, albeit with modification. In earliest Islamic historiography, inter-communal strife meant civil war. While the numerous regional conflicts that occurred before and during the period of the Crusades were not civil wars per se, they were violent confrontations between Muslims and therefore the concept of fitna remained useful. But the nature of the conflicts and their participants had changed, and this was reflected in the narrative motifs favored by the chroniclers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In relating early inter-communal conflicts, the traditionists recorded numerous instances of one individual slaying another, both remembered by name, often including details such as dialogue or wounds inflicted. Such stories all but disappear from the chronicles of the Crusading era in favor of a top-down perspective largely devoid of such detail. Ibn al-Qalanisi, a

---

8 The term “by the sword” evolved early into a legal definition of how a city or community had come under Muslim rule. The other option was to submit voluntarily. The distinction was important for a number of reasons, including how a community would be taxed.

9 The Banu Tamim is an example of this phenomena. A large and politically-powerful Arabian tribe, it proved a persistent problem to the early community of believers. Siding with the dissenters during the Wars of Apostasy, Tamimi would later form most of the leadership of Islam’s first major sectarian division, the Kharajites (Elie Adib Salem, Political Theory and Institutions of the Khawarij [Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956], 56-57). The conflict over how to treat such an influential-but-troublesome group is reflected in the various hadith collections, which contain traditions that denigrate the tribe’s behavior as Muslims or praise the Tamimi as holy warriors, sometimes in the same collection (e.g. Imam Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim, accessed October 25, 2015, www.sunnah.com/muslim, 44:270, and 44:282).

Muslim Chronicles of the First Crusade

witness to the First Crusade and several decades of Frankish presence in the Levant, provided terse reports of the regional conflicts between Muslims. For example, in his description of the events of the year 500/1106, he described a battle between the ruler of Mosul, Jikirmish, and the amir Jawali Saqawa in a single sentence. The immediate consequences of that battle – including Jikirmish’s execution – occupy only a sentence more. Who captured him, the means of his execution, or even its justification are left unsaid because, for the author, such details had no relevance to the ebb and flow of greater events. A century later, Ibn al-Athir reported on the same encounter, and he used a lot more ink to do so than his laconic predecessor – al-Athir’s account takes up most of a page. He recorded the battlefield deeds of two individuals, but only because they tried to defend Jikirmish against Jawuli’s men. As in Ibn al-Qalanisi’s account, the name or names of those who captured Jikirmish or were responsible for his death are not mentioned. This represents a considerable departure from the early historiographic tradition, and a marked shift in cultural priorities away from the deeds of politically-unimportant individuals to focus on those in power.

Of course, leaders were important to the traditionists, and examples of inspired leadership abound in their works. This is especially true when one of the first four caliphs is involved. These men, the rashidun (“rightly guided”) caliphs, were accorded a special status in the early historiographical tradition. The traditionists often portrayed them as flawless examples to the community of believers, even to the extent of possessing divine powers. For example, at the Battle of al-Nahrawan (39/659), the fourth caliph, ‘Ali Ibn abi-Talib, had prophetic visions regarding specific, named casualties that would be suffered by the enemy. When the second caliph, ‘Umar, cursed

11 Dates are provided first in the year of the Islamic calendar, then the Gregorian year, divided by a slash.
12 As with all names transliterated from Arabic, how they are translated into English is based on the preferences of the translator. For example, “Jikirmish” is also spelled “Jokermish,” and “Jawali Saqawa,” “Jawuli Saqao.” The present author has avoided using multiple transliterations where they exist, preferring a single variant to avoid confusion.
14 Ibn al-Athir, The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi’l-Ta-rikh; Part I: The Years 491-541/1097-1146; The Coming of the Franks and the Muslim Response, trans. by D. S. Richards (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 112-13. While not relevant to the present work, it is interesting to note that Ibn al-Athir’s account differs in another way from Ibn al-Qalanisi’s, in that Jikirmish is not executed but instead is found dead one morning while in captivity.
15 Al-Tabari, First Civil War, 134 and 139.
some Syrians for drinking wine, a drought ensued.\footnote{16}{Al-Tabari, \textit{The Conquest of Iraq, Southwestern Persia, and Egypt}, vol. 13 of \textit{The History of al-Tabari}, trans. and annotated by Gautier H. A. Juynboll (New York: State University of New York Press, 1989), 151-52.} And when he publically related a dream from a pulpit in Medina, his armies in Persia heard the message thanks to divine assistance and arranged their battle lines according to 'Umar's vision, leading to a “victory of victories” against the Sassanids.\footnote{17}{Al-Tabari, \textit{The Conquest of Iran}, vol. 14 of \textit{The History of Al-Tabari}, trans. and annotated by G. Rex Smith (New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 71-72.} In a similar vein, Noth notes the omniscience exhibited by some of the rashidun caliphs in knowing exactly what their field commanders were doing, even when the latter were 1,000 kilometers distant.\footnote{18}{Noth and Conrad, 78.} Such myths had parallels in the biographies of the Prophet, and that association provided legitimacy for the early caliphate.

Muslim chroniclers of the Crusades did not generally go to such lengths, even when they possessed a favorable bias toward a leader. Two of the reasons behind this revised method for looking at leadership were the decline in caliphal authority and the co-opting of that title by competing groups. By the time of the Crusades, the ‘Abbasid caliph had been reduced to a figurehead, and possessed no real power outside the walls of Baghdad. And, beyond the tenuous claims of the Umayyads and ‘Abbasids, the Fatimids in Egypt and the rulers of Cordoba also claimed to represent the only legitimate line of succession from Muhammad.\footnote{19}{The Arabic word “caliph” means “successor.”} Tarnished by so many pretenders, it is no wonder that enthusiasm for the caliphal title had diminished considerably among later historiographers. Whereas the legitimacy of the early caliphate was based on a close and often-mythological association with the Prophet, that of later Muslim leaders would be based on them as individuals whom the chroniclers judged in typically-brief eulogies. When the 'Abbasid Caliph al-Mustazhir died in 512/1118 after twenty-four years in power, he was praised for his handwriting and little else.\footnote{20}{Ibn al-Athir, \textit{Part 1}, 190-91.} Saladin, the greatest of the Muslim heroes to come out of the Crusades, was remembered more for his humane qualities than for his feats of arms. Ibn al-Athir goes to great lengths to describe that sultan as the epitome of patience, understanding, and kindness but only mentions his military achievements once, in passing.\footnote{21}{Ibn al-Athir, \textit{The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh; Part 2: The Years 541-589/1146-1193; The Age of Nur al-Din and Saladin}, trans. by D. S. Richards (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 408-409.} Even Ibn Shaddad, Saladin's companion and biographer,
limits his eulogizing to a discussion of the grief felt by the Muslim community upon the sultan's death.\textsuperscript{22} These down-to-earth evaluations of politically important leaders represent a significant departure from the earlier historiographic methods preferred by the traditionists.

Of all the early themes identified by Noth, chroniclers of the Crusades found conquest the most useful, and with little modification. By the time of the First Crusade, the Arab Conquests were over two centuries past, but accounts of armies, battles, and sieges continued to dominate the Muslim historiographical tradition regardless. The protagonists had changed, but that did nothing to diminish the enthusiasm of the chroniclers for recording anything and everything of a military nature. While reports of battles involving only Muslim armies maintained a facade of objectivity, those involving the Franks often resorted to topoi seen in the writings of the traditionists. Al-Tabari's report of al-Nahrawan claims that the forces of the fourth caliph, 'Ali, suffered less than ten casualties, while his enemy's losses were one-hundred percent – approximately 2,800 total.\textsuperscript{23} Battle reports from the Crusades contain similarly implausible results. In a combat near Ankara in 493/1100, a Frankish rescue party intending to liberate the Norman leader Bohemond from captivity was ambushed by the captors. According to Ibn al-Athir, "not a single one of the 300,000 Franks escaped, apart from 3,000 who fled by night and escaped wounded."\textsuperscript{24} Similarly, albeit on a smaller scale, Ibn al-Qalanisi reports on a battle outside Ascalon in 494/1101 between the Egyptian amir, Sa'd al-Dawla, and a force of Franks numbering 11,000. The Franks repulsed both wings of al-Dawla's cavalry, but the battle turned against the Europeans and they were driven from the field: "Thus the issue turned in favor of the Muslims and only a small number of them were killed," al-Dawla among them, who "gained the prize of martyrdom."\textsuperscript{25} The case of individuals like al-Dawla who gave their lives in the cause of Islam represents another topos carried over from the traditionists. This had particular value in battles against the crusaders, where the victim became a martyr and therefore an example for the faithful. Occasionally, a chronicler applied this topos to an entire group. In the immediate aftermath of the siege of Jerusalem, the victorious Franks massacred most of the city's non-Christian inhabitants. In relating this atrocity, Ibn al-Athir made martyrs of many of them: "a large number,"

\textsuperscript{22} Baha al-Din Ibn Shaddad, \textit{The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin, or al-Nawadir al-Sultaniyya wa'l-Mahasin al-Yusufiya}, trans. by D. S. Richards (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 244.
\textsuperscript{23} Al-Tabari, \textit{First Civil War}, 130-132.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibn al-Athir, \textit{Part I}, 32.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibn al-Qalanisi, 53-54.
of the 70,000 killed were "imams, ulama, righteous men and ascetics, Muslims who had left their native lands and come to live a holy life in this august spot."\textsuperscript{26}

The shift in cultural priorities affected the chroniclers of the Crusades in other ways. As Noth observed, the traditionists resorted to several stock literary forms in relating the early history of the community. Documents in the form of treaties with conquered peoples, letters to and from caliphs, and speeches ostensibly given by leaders all featured regularly in the writings of al-Tabari, Ibn Ishaq, and other traditionists. These were all but abandoned by later chroniclers, who rarely included “quotations” and avoided citing documents.\textsuperscript{27} They also discarded the isnad, the means of citation used to verify stories, to prove they were not fictions.\textsuperscript{28} This represented a major departure in technique from the traditionists, who meticulously recorded the line of transmission through which they received each hadith.\textsuperscript{29}

The abandonment or modification of the themes, literary forms, and topoi of the traditionists by those who chronicled the Crusades marks a major shift in cultural priorities. This also denotes the point when Islamic historiography became more literary in character, as opposed to the reporting-style of the traditionists.\textsuperscript{30} Whereas they sought to legitimize the community and its faith by developing a usable foundation myth, later chroniclers recorded history either for political reasons or simply for its own sake. This allowed them to discard unwieldy or questionable themes and methods – the isnad, apocryphal speeches and letters – in favor of those more appropriate to their desired ends.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibn al-Athir, \textit{Part 1}, 21. According to this chronicler, the massacre occurred in the al-Aqsa Mosque. Considering that the building that stands today is the same one that stood during the First Crusade, and that it can accommodate 5,000 worshippers, Ibn al-Athir's claim of 70,000 victims is undoubtedly an exaggeration – as are many of the numbers recorded by the chroniclers. "Ulema" is the plural form of 'alim, the Arabic word for a learned scholar, which for all practical purposes means a scholar of Islam.

\textsuperscript{27} Contemporary biographers tended to provide more in the way of dialogue by their subjects, e.g. Ibn Shaddad’s biography on Saladin, and Usamah ibn Munqidh’s auto-biographical memoir (\textit{An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in The Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usamah Ibn-Munqidh [Kitab al-I’tibar]}, trans. by Philip K. Hitti [New York: Columbia University Press, 2000]).

\textsuperscript{28} Robinson, \textit{Islamic Historiography}, 84.

\textsuperscript{29} An isnad is this chain of transmission. It is the most important element in determining the relative legitimacy (technically: “soundness”) of a tradition in Islam, and their evaluation is considered a science in its own right.
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Kett’s Rebellion, 1549

Robert Kett holding court at the Oak of Reformation, 1549 (Samuel Wale, 1784).
In the summer of 1549 the smoldering embers of discontent among the Norfolk and Suffolk commons erupted into flames of rebellion. While rebellions sprang up independently across both counties, led by individuals with a variety of interests, the participants eventually coalesced under the leadership of Robert Kett. These uprisings by the laboring and middling classes embodied a rejection of social, religious, and economic changes against the perceived mismanagement of the gentry. The rebels looked to return to an idealized, nostalgic vision of the past that emphasized a close relationship between the people and the crown. Poor economic conditions during the sixteenth century created an opportunity for the wealthy to rapidly accumulate large land holdings, an action that challenged popular conceptions of social order. The rebels expressed nominal Protestantism as a means of participating in political discourse, shaped by the Henrician Reformation's consolidation of church and state and magnified by the devout faith of Protector Somerset, Edward VI's uncle and architect of the young king's policy. While expressing support for Protestantism demonstrated the rebels' solidarity with the crown and the reform-minded Somerset, they maintained a deep connection to religious traditions that indicate a failure to quickly internalize Reformation values. Additionally, facing inflation due to the influx of silver from South America and stagnant wages, the rebels reacted violently to rapidly increasing property values that enabled the gentry to increase their holdings disproportionately faster than the commons. Unrest signified a reaction to the slow decline of traditional feudalism and a rejection of the religious, economic, and social changes brought about by the Henrician Reformation.

The response to the rebels expressed the "hysterical sublime," a quality that allowed the gentry and nobility to shift their own sense of superfluity onto the commons as a means of justifying their existence, while demeaning the masses as helpless, stupid, lazy, or bestial. Jim Holstun defines the hysterical sublime as the combination of "anxious displacement, fearful memory, and the traumatic recoil from class violence," that "has consequences for the killers as well as the killed," inducing "a normalised post-traumatic stress disorder" in the gentry.1 Excessive violence by the gentry and nobility in response to rebellion

---

resulted in the creation of a history that cast the victims of class violence as the aggressors, deserving the violent punishment eagerly meted out. This characterization of the rebels by the elite in contemporary accounts appears prominently in Alexander Neville's 1575 history of the rebellion, *Norfolk's Furies*.

Neville illustrated how the elite distanced themselves from the commons. His description of Kett as "a man of stout, rude, of an impudent boldnesse, and unbridled violence,"\(^2\) imbued the rebel leader with qualities that particularly terrified the gentry. The author's description of Kett depicted a man who refused to show humility and deference toward those above his station, thereby threatening social order. Neville, according to Diarmaid MacCulloch, "wrote to impress on his young audience the barbarity and anarchy of their social inferiors," casting Kett as "the barbarian anti-hero, a sort of latter-day Vercingetorix or Calgacus, complete with set-piece speeches in the classical manner."\(^3\) Neville, writing as an alleged witness to the events of 1549, composed his work in Latin, a choice that indicated the elite audience he targeted. *Norfolk's Furies* clearly displays the gentry's fear that the 1549 uprising intended to dismantle class boundaries. The author expressed a reasonable, if incorrect, assessment of the rebels' goals based on the anxiety and insecurity of wealthy individuals with no hereditary claim to the power they wielded. By interpreting Neville's work as a literal retelling of the events, some historians, such as Andy Wood, see "important insights into both the representation of the rebel voice and of a plebeian political language," but this viewpoint should be weighed against the class composition of the intended audience.\(^4\)

Unfortunately, the voices of the rebels cannot be found in *Norfolk's Furies*, but their actions indicate a desire to return to an idealized past with clear divisions between the crown, the commons, and the clergy, with well-defined roles and duties for each. The age of the rebels provides some insight into their nostalgia. Fifty-four percent fell between the ages of forty and fifty, and 11 percent exceeded fifty years old, implying a vision of the past through the lens of childhood nostalgia that fondly recalled the reigns of Henry VII and VIII.\(^5\) The rebels envisioned a future described by Holstun as "a smallholders'..."

utopia securely based in post-feudal but precapitalist agriculture: a radically traditionalist and innovative return to an England that had never really existed."\(^6\)

The classes that participated in the 1549 uprisings included yeoman farmers, artisans, and minor landholders, and composed what Wood describes as the "honest men," a class between the gentry and the landless laboring poor that included many of the rebels' leaders, including Kett. According to Wood, this group "tended to be identified - and to identify itself - as the 'honest men' or the 'honest inhabitants'."\(^7\) Identifying as Wood's "honest men," Kett and his fellow rebels often expressed support for Somerset and only sought to remove the gentry's disruptive presence from the traditional social order, not radically overturn it. The men believed they had a reciprocal relationship of support between themselves and Protector Somerset, suggesting, as Jane Whittle proposes, "why . . . most of the rebels' actions were moderate and selective, but at the same time why members of the camp at Mousehold, once congregated, were reluctant to accept a pardon and disperse."\(^8\) They hoped to reform government with the help of Protector Somerset, "staging," MacCulloch notes, "a giant protest against the ruling classes' mismanagement of affairs . . . they were out to right injustice, not to attack the state."\(^9\)

The widespread support for popular uprisings in East Anglia in 1549 illustrates the systemic failure of economic, political, and religious institutions to address the complaints of the commons. The parishes of North Elmham and Carleton Colville provided material support for residents participating in rebellion, while the local lord forced manorial jurors from Blickling and Hargham to publically reaffirm fealty after "raising war against the King at Mousehold in Norfolk."\(^10\) Kett's rebellion began with the destruction of enclosures near Wymondham on July 8, but simultaneous uprisings erupted throughout Suffolk and Norfolk: by 14 July rebels established camps at Norwich, Downham Market, Ipsich, and Bury St. Edmunds.\(^11\) The leaders of a concurrent uprising in Suffolk, John Levet, a butcher; John Brand, a chamberlain in Ipswich; and John Harbottle, an Ipswich merchant and landlord, accepted pardons in August and peacefully disbanded. They "came from the same world of prosperity," as MacCulloch explains, "just below the level of the gentry class as
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Robert and William Kett," and, while they held many similar complaints with Kett's rebels, they raised unique complaints representing local concerns. The rebels who refused to surrender in Suffolk and other local uprisings collected at Mousehold under Kett’s banner, bringing their particular local grievances with them.

Protector Somerset, in a correspondence dated 24 August and addressed to Phillip Hoby, the English ambassador to the court of Charles V, commented on the seemingly disorganized nature of the rebellion and the superficial Protestantism that the rebels professed to believe. Somerset complained that "the causes and pretences of these uproars and risings are divers and uncertain, and so full of variety in every camp, as they call them. . . . Some crieth, 'Pluck down enclosures and parks.' Some, for their commons. Other pretendeth religion. A number would rule another while, and direct things as gentlemen have done." The Mousehold articles, a list of demands presented by Kett and other rebel leaders, represented a variety of local interests adopted by the rebels at Mousehold. Neville suggested that Kett stood at the top of a military-like heirarchy, proclaiming him to be "a Captaine and in the doing of so great a worke, not a fellow, but a Leader, Authour, and principal and not to be present onely at all their consultations, but always president." However, examination of the articles suggests a diffusion of leadership among the rebels, rather than an authoritarian power structure centered around Kett, and a democratic process in the drafting of the list of complaints. This "agglomeration of grievances," as Whittle notes, "[explains] the survival of repetitive clauses within the petition which touch on the same issues in slightly different ways, such as the multiple articles relating to common land and grazing, and . . . indicate a petition born out of compromise to multiple interest groups." Some of these complaints, such as the demand to end bondage, emerged out of the decline of traditional feudalism, coinciding with the accumulation of capital into the hands of a few powerful individuals, creating dramatic changes in society.

Feudalism's decline ended widespread serfdom in England and bondsmen did not feature prominently in the rebellion. The transition away from serfdom makes comparisons with the German peasant rebellion of 1525 difficult, but some regions of England persisted in holding bondsmen into the sixteenth century. This provides some
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context for the otherwise curious demand in the Mousehold articles: "we pray that all bonde men may be made ffree for god made all ffre with his precious blode sheddyng." Both Whittle and MacCulloch concur that this demand represents a literal and locally-based complaint, rather than a symbolic sign of solidarity with German Protestant peasant rebellions. MacCulloch suggests that the complaint refers specifically to the interests of serfs held by the duke of Norfolk, bondsmen who joined with the rebels after they purchased their freedom and contributed to the drafting of the articles. Whittle suggests that, because "none of the rebels identified was a bondman of blood" but "at least six Norfolk manors where known rebels held land continued to enforce personal serfdom in 1549," the complaints represent a more general concern by the commons for the end of bondage. MacCulloch's interpretation appears the simplest and most likely explanation, supporting the proposal that diverse parties included specific interests into the articles. The belief that their demands, presented in the form of a petition, would find a receptive audience in the crown largely stems from Somerset's anti-enclosure commissions, creating a perception that Somerset's own political goals aligned with the commons.

The Protector did very little to discourage the belief in the power of enclosure commissions to redress the complaints of the commons, issuing public proclamations in the name of Edward VI that placed the blame solely onto the gentry and their "gredines of mynde" for the troubles plaguing the land. The anti-enclosure stance of Somerset, including his granting of new enclosure commissions, encouraged a belief that the government endorsed the destruction of enclosures. "For this reason," as Whittle explains, "the Norfolk rebels placed the destruction of enclosures first, both in their actions and their petition. . . . They were signaling their support to the government on this issue, as well as hoping to gain legitimacy for their actions and grievances." Royal proclamations, containing strong condemnations of the gentry's manipulations of the market, reciprocated this belief.

The Proclamation Against Enclosures claimed that "lande whiche heretofore was tilled and occupied with so many men, and did bryng furthe not onely diverse families in worke and labor, but also capons, hennes, chikons, pigges and other such furniture of the
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Merkettes, is now gotten by insatiable gredines of mynde, into one or twoo mennes handes." The rebels looked to act within the legal framework established by the king to attack the loss of the commons. Their actions suggest support for the crown and a belief in the legitimacy of their complaints against the gentry, who could not be trusted to head the commissions themselves. After seizing letters from the king authorizing certain "worshipfull Gentlemen" to head enclosure commissions, the rebels "caused their owne names to be written in, and pulling off the King's Seales, set them to forget Commissions of their owne, and setting them up in open places, abused the ignorant people that knew not this great deceite." This act signaled that the rebels felt they could not trust the local gentry to carry out the king's commands and that they desired to displace the gentry's position between the crown and the commons. Although he participated in forging official documents, Kett claimed to act in accordance with the crown and, according to Neville's own account, claimed to work in tandem with the King's wishes rather than rebelling against royal authority. One of Kett's writs, that Neville claimed to have reproduced accurately, charged "all men by the authoritie hereof, that as they wish well unto the King, and the afflicted Commonwealth, they be obedient to us his Delegates." The rebels worked within the existing legal framework, avowing their allegiance to the king but replacing the gentry with themselves as "governors," looking to remove the gentry from their world and reverse changes in class structure. In the same writ, Kett proclaimed, "we, the King's friends and deputies, do grant license to all men to provide and bring into the Camp at Mousehold all manner of cattle and provisions of vittels . . . so that no violence or injury be done to any honest or poorman: commanding all persons, as they tender the King's honor and roiall majestie." When the rebels confiscated property under the guise of protecting the commons and with the support of the king, they appropriated the legal discourse typically used by the gentry. The rebels' fixation on legality offers an ironic twist, considering the common's loss of traditional rights as capitalism displaced traditional feudalism.

In some instances, the rebels perceived enclosure as a positive, particularly in regard to the foldcourse system and saffron cultivation, a crop specific to Norfolk. Their demand that "where it is enacted from inclosyng, that it be not hurtfull to suche as have enclosed saffren
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grounds, for they be gretly chargeablye to them, and that frome hensforth noman shall enclosure eny more." The rebels sought to obtain exemptions for individuals that enclosed areas for saffron production, allowing them to maintain their enclosures in the face of the crown's enclosure commissions. MacCulloch proposes that "saffren grounds" refers to sovereign land, "grounds which were the exclusive freehold property of their owner and not liable to the exactions of the foldcourse system: the article could then be taken as stating that the enclosure of such grounds hurt no one and benefited their owner." MacCulloch reaches too far in this conclusion. Tawney offered the most reasonable explanation, because "people have spent capital on hedging and ditching their lands for the better cultivation of saffron," the rebels believed themselves entitled to "a special exception . . . made in favour of this particular kind of enclosure." The inclusion of the demand addressed a very specific, localized problem and suggests that the rebellion represented a variety of interests. Rebels from other regions in England worried deeply about enclosure, but many of the demands presented by Kett and his rebellious peers reflect the unique nature of agriculture in Norfolk, where tenants often enclosed their property to protect it from the lord's roaming livestock, a practice called the "foldcourse system." The demand that "no lord of no mannor shall comon uppon the Comons," appears confusing in the context of enclosure. MacCulloch explains that "the foldcourse system was liable precisely to reverse the attitude of manorial lord and tenant towards enclosing. . . The lord's instinct was to oppose enclosure to preserve his foldcourse." The emphasis on the foldcourse system, rather than enclosure, occurs because, as Wood explains, "large parts of Norfolk were already enclosed by 1549, and conflict had shifted instead to the lords' imposition of sheep flocks on to the enclosed fields of tenants."

Changing conceptions of property rights and the emergence of the wealthy, but non-noble, gentry challenged the long-standing traditions established under feudal regimes that guaranteed the peasantry certain privileges and rights. This included, according to Wood, "the right to pasture; the liberty to glean for shards of corn after the harvest had been taken in; the entitlement to dig for coal or search for firewood on common land," and "such customary rights were often
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the subject of fierce conflict in early modern England.\textsuperscript{31} As these rights came under attack during the turmoil and social upheaval caused by the disruption of traditional economic activity, the rebels increasingly looked to return to a fictive past featuring an ordered world with clearly defined boundaries.\textsuperscript{32} The commons also held a certain expectation that the crown would shield them from the harshest consequences of a market economy, including the storage of grain for emergency distribution. While the actual effectiveness of such policies may be debated, Tudor magistrates, according to Wood, "were expected to be seen to be acting against forestallers and corrupt market officials. The intention was to prevent 'mutinies' amongst the poor by demonstrating an ostentatious proactive concern for the supply of food."\textsuperscript{33} In addition to the crown, monasteries advanced money for small holders to purchase seed, providing a much-needed balance to the accumulation of wealth into the hands of early capitalists. Yeoman farmers increasingly found themselves at the mercy of those capitalists after Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries.\textsuperscript{34}

The encroachment of the gentry into the realm of traditional religion by purchasing communal parish property embodied the problems caused by economic change during the sixteenth century. Statistically, many of the individuals that participated in the rebellion owned small holdings, but could not compete with the wealth concentrated into the gentry's hands. As a result, the wealthy obtained large swaths of land at undervalued prices, while small-holders found themselves trapped by rising rents and devalued currency. Out of forty-six identifiable rebels at Mousehold, seven held between five and ten acres of land, fifteen held between ten and thirty acres, and six held between thirty and forty-five acres.\textsuperscript{35} The dissolution of the monasteries and the resulting sale of corporate property during the Henrecian Reformation drove up the price of land and agricultural produce, accelerating the inequality in wealth distribution as early capitalists purchased land formerly held by religious orders.\textsuperscript{36} In addition to threatening the traditional social order of the commons, the ascension of wealthy protocapitalists disrupted the traditional hierarchical
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relationship between the crown and the nobility, diminishing the
importance of feudal bonds.

On 19 July, in an open letter to the Suffolk rebels, Somerset
publically affirmed his willingness "to provide for your ease quiet and
comforte as much as ever prince hath bene for for his subjects the
multiude of things reformed in the shorte time of our reigne."37 A
proclamation issued by the crown during the summer of the rebellion
forbade any "action, sute, violence or compulsion" against rebels that
accepted a royal pardon, a generous offer.38 On 7 July, William Paget,
one of Somerset's few remaining allies among the gentry, warned the
Protector in a private correspondence that his "pardonnes have geven
evell men a boldenes to enterpryse . . . and cause them to thinke youe
dare not meddel with them, but are glad to please them, and to suffre
whatsoever they lyste."39 This frank criticism illustrates the alienating
nature of Somerset's policies on the gentry, but Paget also cautioned
that the crown's issuance of pardons to the Suffolk rebels in July only
emboldened other dissidents. He warned that "the King's subjects owt
of all discilpine, owt of obedience, caryng neither for Protectour nor
King, and much lesse for any other mean officer," due to Somerset's
"owne levytie, . . . [his] opinion to be good to the pore."40

Enclosure commissions offered an even more compelling
demonstration of Somerset's hostility towards the gentry and the close
relationship between the crown and the commons. "Effectively," Wood
notes, "this amounted to the exclusion of the noble and gentle power
brokers through whom Tudor monarchs had previously governed, and
the construction of a populist alliance between crown and commons."41
Somerset's demand that "all his lovyng subjectes, who knoweth any
such defaultes and offences, contrary to the wealth and proffite of this
realme . . . geve informacion of the offence, to the kynges Majesties
Commissioners" reinforced the crown's authority and fostered a sense of
reciprocity between the Protector and the commons.42 The rebels' initial
attacks against enclosures expressed this relationship and provided a
moral and legal justification for their cause due to its association with
the official stance of the crown. The enclosure commissions,
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established by proclamation in June 1548, offered government support for investigations into illegal enclosures that, as Wood explains, "reiterated the widely held view of enclosure as a moral evil and assumed that the commons and the government had a mutual interest in its suppression." Suggesting a willingness to take even more radical action, Somerset expressed enthusiasm for a radical redistribution of land, publically proclaiming in 1548 that "if the same [land] were disparsed into diverse mennes handes, then as thei be now in fewe, who mate hold them dere, and tary their avauntage of the Merket." Reform-minded, the Protector expended a great deal of political capital to advance his reforms, a decision that placed him at odds with the gentry's accumulation of wealth and isolated him from the nobility.

Sending an open letter to the dissidents at St. Albans on 11 July 1549, the Protector expressed his displeasure with the rebels methods, but not their complaints or their cause. He openly supported their attempts to seek the legal redress of their complaints against the gentry through the enclosure commissions. He admonished the rebels, reminding them to remember "your dewties to the kings majestie and be content to receave the dewe execution of his majesties lawes which his majesties by commission at this present proposeth to put in use." Somerset's genuine attempts at agrarian reform, embodied by his insistence on the legitimacy of enclosure commissions, sprang from his Protestant beliefs, and created a conflict between his faith and the rebels tepid embrace of religious reforms.

Unlike the Cornwall rebellion of 1549 that heavily emphasized a return to traditional religion, the East Anglia rebels expressed a nominal acceptance of Protestantism. The rebels' religious faith and Somerset's genuine belief in the validity of their complaints prevented him from publically condemning Kett's group. In a 5 July letter to the rebels at Essex, Somerset observed that "ye doe acknowledge the Gospell which ye saye ye greatlie hunger: So on thother parte if the same proceade not from the har te and that there is in yow only a recyttal of textes to make for your present purpose, the foundacion on then is unsure, and the fruite that yow shold growe by the trewe embracinge of gods worde." While acknowledging the rebels' demand for access to religious instruction, the Protector's
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comments implied a superficial acceptance of the Henrecian and Edwardine Reformation among the commons and a failure to fully internalize Protestantism. Reminding the rebels that "scripture teachethew that your naturall dewtie of obedience to your kinge Governors and Rulers bearinge authoritie," Somerset reasserted the social order on a scriptural basis. 49 Somerset's Reformation values, that emphasized knowledge of the Bible in English, necessitated an understanding of scripture to participate in the political discourse of Edwardine England.

Utilizing this language in a letter directed to Kett's rebels, the Protector described the behavior of the commons using the parable of the ant from the Book of Proverbs. Chastising the rebels, he reminded them that "the selye Ante or Pismere whome we treade dailye under our feete hath that considaracion to the winter foode as he leaveth not his time in Sommer to gather it for the winter."50 Using this language connected religion with politics, but it also implicitly challenged the religious convictions of the rebels by relying on their knowledge of scripture to contextualize the Protector's statement. Somerset's Protestantism influenced the language of government and the commons, and the people of East Anglia shared his religion to show deference to royal authority. As a result, the rebels incorporated Protestant elements into their demands as a means of expressing solidarity with the crown. "The Somerset regime," explains Ethan Shagan, "put a great deal of energy into linking the rhetoric of national improvement with the rhetoric of religious reformation. The commons of 1549 appear to have internalized this linkage and turned it back upon the government."51 While the rebels adopted superficial elements of Protestantism for political purposes, they remained closely connected to traditional religion. MacCulloch finds that "there is no evidence of religious enthusiasm or radicalism in the revolt," noting that "the rebels wanted parish priests 'to preche and sett forth the woord of God,' but they gave no further indication of what they considered true doctrine to be."52 After the rebels' defeat in August at Dusindale, near Mousehold, Sir Edmound Knight accused one of the local Norfolk gentry, Sir Richard Southwell, of being "one of the authors" of Kett's Rebellion. Southwell, a Catholic and supporter of Queen Mary, offers a link between traditional religion and Kett's rebels.53 At the local level, a
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very personal link between Robert Kett, his followers, and traditional religion emerges, centered around John Flowerdew.

Nearly a decade before the 1549 uprisings, during the height of the dissolution of the monasteries, the Kett family petitioned the King to prevent the stripping of a local Wymondham church building by Flowerdew, a local landowner. Flowerdew, according to Russell, ignored requests to preserve communal property that included "bells, lead, &c," and "carried off the lead, and nearly demolished the choir, to the no little aggravation and annoyance of the townspeople."  

Unsurprisingly, one of the first enclosures the Wymondham rioters tore down in July 1549 belonged to Flowerdew, indicating a lingering sense of outrage over the stripping of the local church and the encroachment by a member of the gentry into the community. During the first week of July, immediately prior to the outbreak of the riots that evolved into Kett's Rebellion, the community collected at Wymondham Abbey to witness the Windham Game, a traditional play celebrating the life of St. Thomas Beckett.

The community's persistence in maintaining this tradition, even after Henry VIII outlawed the celebration of Beckett's life during the Henrecian Reformation, demonstrates a strong connection to traditional religion that indicates resistance to the Reformation, imposed on the commons from above. The community's bond to Beckett persisted, despite what Holstun refers to as "Henry's Erastian campaign against the Beckett cult," and the locals continued to commemorate the translation of Beckett's body to Canterbury even after the abbey's conversion into a school.  

Neville claimed that the play celebrating Beckett served to conceal the actions of a handful of "wretched conspirators" plotting against England and "watching so fit an opportunitie of time and place." Neville's suspicion suggests that a division between Protestant Reformers (more prevalent among the gentry) and the commons (more sympathetic to traditional religion despite adopting a superficial Protestantism).

Paget, in a correspondence with Somerset, recognized the failure of the English Reformation to meet the spiritual needs of the people and the superficiality of the commons' support for Protestantism. He lamented that "the use of the old religion is forbydden by a lawe, and the use of the newe ys not yet prynted in the stomackes of the eleven of twelve partes in the realme, what countenance soever men make outwardly to please them in whom they
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see the power restethe."57 Interestingly, Kett's rebels at Mousehold, "to have a fayre shew and similitude of well doinge, . . . first procurd a Priyst to mynister thyer morninge and evening prayer in the Inglish tonge, then newly begun to bee frequentyd."58 Uncontextualized, this may seem like a confirmation of the rebels' complete internalization of Protestantism. However, when contextualized with their affinity for traditional religious institutions, it appears more likely that the presence of the priest delivering prayers in English represented solidarity with the crown, and not a signification of the rebels' faith. Embracing religious services in English and participating in political discourse, required a proper education. This explains the rebels demand "that evry propriatorie parson or vicar havyng a benefice of 10 pounds or more by yere shall . . . teche pore mens chyldren of ther paryshe the boke called the cathaksme and the prymer."59 Traditional religion integrated with popular culture over a long period of time and shaped the laity's worldview. Popular culture cornerstones incorporating elements of traditional religion, like the Kalender of Shepherds, continued to circulate during the sixteenth century. "Significantly," Wood notes, "it was widely recognised in ruling circles that, by the mid-sixteenth century, the Reformation had failed to implant itself within popular culture."60

The commons' affinity for traditional religion manifested in their behavior at the Oak of Reformation, the great tree where the rebels held court over the summer of 1549. When the crowd cut off a Protestant priest's sermon with calls for violence, only to be soothed by an impromptu performance of Te Deum, they displayed their reverence toward traditional hymns. Blending a hymn connected to traditional religion with the Reformation, Thomas Coniers, Vicar of St. Martin's called "two or three Musicions unton him who began to sing, Te Deum, in English, with solemne Musicke, . . . by the sweetnesse of which song, they being ravished . . . their cruell and raging minds . . . by little and little were appealed."61 In this description, Neville cast the rebels as brutish beasts, soothed by a divine calm, but the effect the song brought to the crowd at the Oak of Reformation illustrates the strong affinity for traditional religion that the commons held. The dissolution of the institutions that maintained that legacy created cultural changes that the commons perceived as a threat to their conceptions of proper social order by further empowering the gentry.
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The commons understood that the encroachment of the gentry into the religious community after the Henrecian Reformation posed a threat, although they had difficulty coherently expressing this suspicion. Wood proposes that "the sale of former monastic estates, the dissolution of chantries and the sale of their assets after 1547, were all felt to benefit a vague class of 'rich oppressors' while simultaneously depriving 'the commons' of cultural identity." The gentry's acquisition of land encroached into the parish identity, created and maintained by traditional religion for hundreds of years, incited anger in the commons and showed that the connection to England's pre-Reformation past remained strong.

Robert Burnam, the Norwich resident who infamously uttered the comment that "there are to many gentylmen in Englande by five hundred" in the aftermath of Kett's Rebellion and one of the rebels at Mousehold in 1549, continued to issue polemics against the gentry in the year after the rebellion. He complained about the "recent confiscation of parish goods, regretting that the money he had donated to the church had been seized by the gentlemen," a violation with parallels in the rebels' reaction to recently constructed dove cotes. On 12 July, the rebels moved from Drayton to Mousehold Heath, but they stopped along the way to destroy a dove cote, owned by a member of the gentry named Corbet and converted from a recently purchased chapel. Dove cotes presented a particular offense to the rebels due to the conversion of communal property into private property after the dissolution of the monasteries. Additionally, the gentry's acquisition of dove cotes, historically reserved by the nobility, disturbed traditional economic relationships that limited hunting rights. One of the Mousehold articles demanded "that noman under the dege of a knyght or esquyer kepe a dowe howse, except it hath byn of an ould anchyent costome." Clearly the rebels had no problem with dove cotes in general, but the expansion of dove cote ownership beyond "ould anchyent costome" represented an encroachment on the traditional economic structure by permitting the gentry to take on privileges typically limited to the nobility.

The Mousehold articles contained references to the rebels' concern that priests formed a link between the people and their ruler, and that a priest who could not perform his duties threatened the community's connection with the king. The demand "that prests or
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vicars that be not able to preche and sett forth the woorde of god to hys parisheners may be thereby putt from hys benyfice, and the parisheners there to chose an other or else the pateron or lord of the towne," demonstrates this concern. It also may suggest a subtle rejection of the Reformation by implying that priests who brought Protestant values into the community failed to meet its need for traditional religion, although the rebels also demanded control over the clergy in other areas.

Smaller yeoman farmers found themselves unable to compete with large holders, and sought to remove not just the gentry from the realm of economic competition, but the clergy as well after the lines between the two blurred following the Reformation. The rebels demanded that "prests frome hensforth shall purchas e no londs neyther ffree nor Bondy, and the lands that they have in possession may be letten to temporall men, as thy wer in the fyrst yere of the reign of Kyng henry the VII," an expression of their desire to return to an idealized past as a reaction to changes under Henry VIII. The rebels feared the expansion of the clergy and the gentry into the realms traditionally left to the commons, but their view on enclosure seems muted compared to the frequency of enclosure riots.

The commons' anxiety towards economic, religious, and social changes in 1549 pushed them toward the breaking point in East Anglia, embodied by the uprising of Kett and his rebellious "honest men." Although the gentry, under the banner of the Earl of Warwick, crushed the rebels at Dusindale after a series of minor rebel victories, they impacted Tudor England by influencing the construction of Poor Laws and forcing the nobility and the gentry to recognize their responsibilities to the commons. Somerset's fall shortly after that of the rebels directly related to his failures to diffuse the situation in East Anglia. While the rebels could never return to the past they idealized, their attempt to reverse the grinding gears of the early capitalist machine represents a rejection of the economic, social, and religious changes foisted ungraciously upon the commons from above. Above all, it reveals the dramatic impact of the Henrecian Reformation on England's commons, an event that accelerated the causes of the 1549 rebellion and shattered the illusion of a unified and ordered English society.
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67 Ibid., 48.
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THE SCRUTINY OF LUNACY: HOW PSYCHOPATHOLOGY ALTERED THE INSANITY VERDICT | Brett Hyde

The insanity defense in trials changed dramatically between the eighteenth and the twentieth centuries in England. In their infancy, pleas of insanity were rarely successful because the court system lacked a standard test and expert knowledge on the subject to prove a prisoner’s mental illness. However, as experts began studying insanity and new laws impacted trials, the verdict began to advance and helped improve public safety as well as establish a firm definition for what insanity meant and how to handle those who fall under its definition. Beginning in the mid-eighteenth century, insanity as a defense saw a greater success rate and understanding of mental illness grew exponentially due to advances in the study of the mind.

Although most historians agree that insanity became more prevalent in mid-eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England, the cause of the sudden increase is largely debated. Some historians, such as Edwin Fuller Torrey and Judy Miller, have explained the rise as an effect of the Industrial Revolution. According to these authors, “the rise of insanity in the nineteenth century closely paralleled the rise of the urban, industrialized society.”

However, further studies by other historians, including Arlie Loughnan, have drawn attention to the advancements in the study of the mind occurring near the mid-eighteenth century. Loughnan’s work indicates that these advancements were causing the growth of fields such as psychology and psychopathology and can be linked to the growth of insanity as a defense. As the study of mental illnesses expanded, more experts began appearing in court cases and testifying for prisoners’ mental incapacity. Because of this, it is likely that experts’ presence in trials led to more diagnoses of the mentally ill rather than insanity spreading as previous researchers have concluded.

While it lacked the success that it would see in the early-nineteenth century, insanity was a common plea in the eighteenth century and was especially prevalent mid-century. Having been the verdict of only 0.12 percent of Old Bailey Proceedings up to 1759, (roughly 2 percent for murder cases) using insanity as a justification for
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crime proved ineffective.\textsuperscript{4} In the 1754 trial of Robert Finch, witnesses who had known the accused for nine years and observed his insanity over that course of time claimed to have seen signs of lunacy in Finch and have often referred to him as “mad Finch” or “crazy Finch.”\textsuperscript{5} From the evidence provided, Finch should have been given the verdict of \textit{non compos mentis} rather than being sentenced to death, but the lack of knowledge concerning insanity led to the misunderstanding of Finch’s capability to assess right from wrong. In a 1751 trial, gate house keeper Mr. Salt observed Philip Gibson, accused of violent theft, for two weeks while he was kept in the prison and labeled him a mentally “weak” man based on his observations. Despite Salt’s testimony, the evidence did not meet the judge’s standard of lunacy and he sentenced Gibson to death, but with “recommended mercy.”\textsuperscript{6} In such cases, prisoners were “sometimes simply discharged without punishment, or sent to the care of their master, relatives, or other figure of authority.”\textsuperscript{7} At this time, professionals with substantial knowledge of insanity did not yet appear in court, leaving the defendant’s plea to be decided entirely on the basis of testimonies from witnesses.\textsuperscript{8} This had a significant impact on the low success rate of insanity as a defense during the eighteenth century because it was difficult for the average citizen to provide the evidence required to convince the judge that the prisoner was incapable of moral judgment at the time of the crime. On the other hand, if the court did label the prisoner \textit{non compos mentis}, the prisoner was no longer guilty of whatever crime they were accused of and was free to be released to the public, which concerned the community, as they feared that the prisoner could still be a danger to society.\textsuperscript{9} The fact that the verdict set prisoners free led to several trials

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{4} Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 6.0, 17 April 2011), Tabulating verdict subcategory against offence category, before 1759. Counting by offence.; Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 6.0, 17 April 2011), Tabulating verdict subcategory against offence category where offence category is killing, between 1700 and 1760. Counting by offence.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.2, 19 February 2016), July 1754, trial of Robert Finch Robert Finch (t17540717-43).
\item \textsuperscript{6} Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.2, 19 February 2016), May 1751, trial of Philip Gibson (t17510523-25).
\item \textsuperscript{7} Clive Emsley, Tim Hitchcock and Robert Shoemaker, "Crime and Justice - Punishments at the Old Bailey", Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 19 February 2016).
\item \textsuperscript{8} Joel Peter Eigen, “Lesion of the Will: Medical Resolve and Criminal Responsibility in Victorian Insanity Trials,” \textit{Law & Society Review} 33, no. 2 (January 1, 1999): 426.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Peter Lovelass, \textit{The Law's Disposal of a Person's Estate Who Dies Without Will Or Testament: To Which Is Added the Disposal of a Person's Estate by Will and
in which prisoners pled insanity in hope of being found not guilty, while they showed clear signs of being in proper state of mind. As troublesome as this sounds, serious offenders, such as those involving violent crime, rarely met the standards of the court’s “will and right and wrong test,” in which prisoners had to prove that they were absent of will and were therefore incapable of purposely causing harm.

After 1760, the plea of insanity began to appear more often and saw more success than in the previous decade. By no coincidence, the 1760s also marked a period of major change in England as the Industrial Revolution began and reforms in the court systems took place. Some researchers have speculated that the Industrial Revolution had a great impact on the sudden spread of mental illness, driven by the poor living conditions and stress as well as a rise in toxins, diseases, and alcohol abuse that damaged the brain.

Douglas A. Galbi, research fellow at the Center for Population and Development Studies at Harvard University, recorded the life of young girls forced into child labor during the Industrial Revolution. In his document, Galbi stated that conditions of work were horrendous. On weekdays she began work in the factory at 5:30 a.m. and finished at 8 p.m. Included in this period were a thirty-five minute break for breakfast and a fifty-five minute break for dinner. On Saturday she worked about another nine hours. The factory in which she worked was relatively small, and the evidence suggests that it had poor quality machinery. . . Ellen stood in front of this machine, like a prisoner looking through cell bars, and tied up any of the threads that broke. She had trouble with this task and complained to her mother that she 'couldn't keep her ends up'.

These harsh work hours and conditions often led to negative psychological effects as well. For example, Galbi reported “a
horrendous account of beatings . . . caused the deaths of two girls and caused another girl to go insane.” As insanity began to increase around this time, more attention was drawn towards studying mental health and specialists began appearing in court. By the late eighteenth century, these experts of psychology had an important role in determining whether or not a defendant was guilty or spared on account of insanity.14 One of the earliest cases in which a professional’s testimony was present was in the trial of John Glover in 1789. In Glover’s trial, a physician, who had been attending to the prisoner for two years, described precise symptoms of insanity displayed by Glover. This discovery was crucial to the change in the defense, as the physician demonstrated clear knowledge of mental health which was not present in testimonies by the average public.15

While the mid-eighteenth century marked a time of growth in the understanding of insanity, the biggest change to the defense occurred in the nineteenth century. Based upon a series of Old Bailey Proceedings for the period, it is clear that the insanity defense was most successful after 1800.16 Near the end of the eighteenth century, the verdict of non compos mentis seemed to require less evidence which led to a demand for a standard for the verdict.17 Many researchers point to the case of James Hadfield, taking place in 1800 London, when attempting to explain this sudden growth.18 In this case, Hadfield attempted to assassinate King George III but was apprehended and tried for treason. In an attempt for freedom, Hadfield pled insanity without providing evidence to support his claim and was sentenced to death. However, Hadfield’s verdict was overturned when two surgeons and a physician challenged the decision by pointing out Hadfield’s head trauma a few years before the incident. While Hadfield was now not guilty on account of insanity, the court agreed that it was not safe to turn him over to the public and, therefore, he should be kept in an asylum. This case led to the establishment of new laws and regulations, specifically the Criminal Lunatics Act, passed in 1800, which had to be

16 Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 6.0, 17 April 2011), Tabulating decade where verdict category is non compos mentis. Counting by verdict.
followed when deeming a prisoner *non compos mentis*.

Under this act, criminals found not guilty on account of insanity were subject to automatic confinement as they were unfit to return to society. In most trials following the Hadfield case, the judge’s verdict, along with confirming the prisoner’s insanity, specifically states that the prisoner is to remain in custody until “His/Her Majesty” permits their release (in some cases they were explicitly sentenced to an asylum). This, partnered with the idea that physicians, who were experts on insanity, meant that the court could not be tricked by a prisoner simulating insanity, and led to a better judging of whether a prisoner should be released to the public or kept in custody.

Due to the advancement of study on mental health, the term insanity gained a more clinical and legal meaning than it had before, leading to professionals often referring to the condition as “psychosis.” Defined as the inability to judge right from wrong in 1843 by the M’Naghten Rules, the nineteenth century marked the beginning of a surge of successful insanity pleas due to the introduction of a standardized test.

This is shown in the trial of Edward Inde Thurgood, a surgeon and apothecary who had tended to Thurgood for several years. He argued that the prisoner had never shown signs of being able to judge right from wrong and should remain in custody, in adherence with M’Naghten Rules.

Throughout the nineteenth century, insanity accounted for approximately 8.5 percent of all known verdicts for violent crimes. The radical increase from the early eighteenth century’s success rate can best be explained by the emergence of experts studying insanity and their presence in trials. According to Loughnan, in relation to evidence and proof of mental incapacity, unequivocally, the most significant development in the intervening period has been the appearance in the 19th century of an expert body of knowledge about ‘madness’. Of course, this development has extended well beyond the bounds of the criminal law, but it had a significant impact on legal
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procedures from the first decades of the 19th century. Each of the individuals who claimed to have this knowledge — a group which, at least initially, included alienists, mad doctors, prison surgeons and asylum superintendents, and each with varying claims to authority — shared a depiction of ‘madness’ as a genuine object of expertise, from which it was possible to offer intelligible explanations about cause and effect. Reflecting its place in a wider if loose alliance of elite knowledges about health and the relationship between mind and body, the burgeoning expertise or specialist knowledge about ‘madness’ encompassed bureaucratic, administrative, scientific and medical knowledges, as well as an emergent psychiatric knowledge.26

As Loughnan describes, the growth of professionals who claimed to have expert knowledge of insanity helped the success of prisoners’ defenses as a better explanation of their mental incapacity helped the court understand that truly insane people were incapable of knowing right from wrong as they are often characterized by absurd and frenzied behavior, often compared to that of a beast.27 By 1820, three out of four cases had medical experts present and by 1840 the number increased to nine out of ten.28 Some researchers, such as Joel Peter Eigen, question the validity of early “experts” knowledge, as they felt the medical men did not have a sufficient study of the defendants’ health.29 For example, in the case of Thomas Rhodes, apothecary John Haslam testified that he met with the prisoner once and spoke with him for a mere two hours and, from the information he received, concluded that Rhodes was incurable of his insanity and demanded that the Hoxton mad-house keep the prisoner in their custody.30 In earlier centuries, a testimony containing such a lack of evidence would not have convinced the judge, but the evidence provided by a medical examiner held an absurd level of significance, giving the expert the most power in nineteenth-century trials. By comparing the amount of power these experts had to the increase in their presence in trials, it can be concluded that the rise of

26 Loughnan, “In a Kind of Mad Way,” 35.
28 Joel Peter Eigen, Witnessing Insanity: Madness and Mad-Doctors in the English Court (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 120.
29 Ibid.
insanity from the early eighteenth century was not due to more victims of mental illness, as speculated by researchers of the Industrial Revolution. Rather, the advancements in the study of the mind led to an immense amount of prisoners being diagnosed with mental illness now that a credible source was present in the court.

Now with an advanced understanding of insanity, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw an increase in laws concerning prisoners diagnosed with mental illness. When Anthony Ashley Cooper entered parliament in 1826, he was intent on reforming the treatment of lunatics, leading to the establishment of the Lunacy Act of 1845. Before this act, only nine asylums existed but, under the Lunacy Act of 1845, city asylums were mandatory and had specific regulations that included standards for physicians. After this act, cities had constructed twenty-four public asylums by 1850 and ninety-eight by 1930. Additionally, mentally ill patients were no longer allowed to appeal for their freedom and could only be freed if a commissioner deemed them cured of insanity and no longer a safety hazard to the public. In 1930, the Mental Treatment Act epitomized the progress of mental health in twentieth-century Britain. Under this act, British law officially declared mental illness equal to physical illness and demanded that patients of mental illness received equal treatment. Twentieth-century society believed asylums were not satisfactorily dedicated to the prevention and treatment of psychosis. Asylums soon became mental hospitals committed to curing lunatics, referred to as “persons of unsound mind,” of their illness and patients could be admitted voluntarily and care takers monitored patients even after leaving the hospital. These reformations reflected a society capable of properly diagnosing and treating prisoners incapable of differentiating morals due to the important changes in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, insanity as a defense in trials underwent several changes. As decades passed, a greater understanding of mental health began to arise, causing regulations to ensure both the safety of prisoners and the public. These regulations laid the foundation for a court system that properly analyzed the mentally ill and understood how to both prevent and treat the disorder. The Old Bailey proceedings display a clear timeline for the development from the verdict being used too conservatively to a standardized system for proving a prisoner’s insanity as well as the punishments that followed.
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THE CAROLINA RAILROADS: AN EXPLORATION OF THE HISTORY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TWO ICONIC RAILROADS | Matthew Steven Williams

The introduction of railroads into the American South was one of the greatest technological advances the region has ever seen. This paper will explore the technological wonder of the railroad by examining the construction and expansion of two railroads, the South Carolina Railroad and the North Carolina Railroad and their social and economic impact on their respective areas in the South. Specifically, it will analyze the economic impact of these railroads on yeomen— independent, non-slaveowning farmers—and planters—large-scale slave owners—in areas surrounding these railroads and how they fared with the new technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (including West Virginia)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>11,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The South Carolina Railroad

Going into the 1800s, Charleston, South Carolina was one of the most important economic hubs of the southeastern United States. However, by the 1820s, Charleston’s economy was beginning to recede. Between 1815 and 1825, imports decreased by 51.7%.
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Between 1816 and 1826, exports dropped from $11,000,000 to $7,475,747. Cotton exported from Charleston harbor offered slight salvation. Between 1820 and 1830, there was a 42.6% increase in the number of cotton bales produced. Among all southern states, however, cotton production more than doubled, meaning Charleston was not actually experiencing an increase in cotton export. A report from the Charleston Chamber of Commerce in 1828 exemplifies the grim situation:

Charleston has for several years past retrograded with rapidity unprecedented. Her landed estate has within eight years depreciated in value one half. Industry and business talent driven by necessity have sought employment elsewhere. Many of her houses are tenantless and grass grows uninterrupted in some of her chief business streets. This may be a melancholy picture, but it is nevertheless true.

The city leaders of Charleston felt that the solution to the recession was better transportation. Due to its lack of navigable rivers, the only real option available was the newly invented railroad. On December 4, 1827, Alexander Black introduced “a bill to incorporate a company to establish a railway or railways between the city of Charleston and the towns of Hamburg, Columbia and Camden.” Thus, on December 19, 1827, the South Carolina General Assembly chartered the South Carolina Canal and Railroad Company. In an attempt to gain public approval for the railroad, the Charleston City Council voted to have a model of the railroad constructed and displayed. During the model’s construction, in February 1828, surveyors were dispatched to find the best possible route from Charleston to Hamburg. They presented their
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findings to the people of Charleston on March 15, 1828.\textsuperscript{10} The route
they surveyed ended up being about 140 miles in length, with an
estimated cost-per-mile of $3,600 and an estimated total cost of
$504,000. Other necessary rail infrastructure, such as railcars, bridges,
and maintenance facilities added an additional $96,000, which brought
the grand total to $600,000.\textsuperscript{11} The city of Charleston was expecting a
nineteen percent return on that investment, which would help
rejuvenate the city’s economy. The \textit{City Gazette} expressed the hope that

...thus shall the departed prosperity of our City be recalled,
and the visions of increasing splendour and importance, which
once cheered our night and animated our hearts, but which
have so long faded away before a chilling gloom and a lifeless
inactivity, beam again with refreshing brightness, and with
even more inciting allurements.\textsuperscript{12}

On March 17, 1828, the South Carolina Canal and Railroad
Company began selling stock. Within a few days, they had received a
capital of $350,000, enough to commence construction.\textsuperscript{13} Meanwhile,
on March 18, 1828, the model was finally opened to the public.\textsuperscript{14} The
\textit{Charleston Courier} reported,

A model of a Rail-Road 200 feet in length is now exhibited in
Wentworth Street, opposite the residence of John Hume, Esq.
It is on an inclination of 22 feet to the mile. A car bearing 36
bales of cotton...has been placed upon it which is propelled
with ease by only two hands the whole length each way. It is
open to the inspection of the citizens, and has been an object
of curiosity to many, who, from the exhibition seem satisfied
of the practicability of executing the proposed Rail-Road from
this model. Those who sincerely doubted before, have had
their doubts entirely removed on this interesting subject.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} Elias Horry, \textit{An Address Respecting the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad}
(Charleston: Archives of the South Carolina Historical Society, October 2, 1833), 7.
\textsuperscript{11} Charleston \textit{City Gazette}, March 14, 1828, stated in Grinde, “Building the
South Carolina Railroad”, 86.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, March 18, 1828, quoted in Grinde, “Building the South Carolina
Railroad”, 86.
\textsuperscript{13} Grinde, “Building the South Carolina Railroad”, 86.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{The Charleston Courier}, February 15, 1828, stated in Grinde, “Building the
South Carolina Railroad”, 85.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{The Charleston Courier}, March 18, 1828, quoted in Grinde, “Building the
South Carolina Railroad”, 85.
The public exhibition was a resounding success, and construction began on the first four miles on January 9, 1830, starting from Line Street in Charleston. Messrs. Gifford, Holcomb & Co constructed the railroad. By the end of 1830, only six miles of the route had been completed. On December 25, 1830, The Best Friend of Charleston pulled the first scheduled passenger train in the United States along the completed six-mile section of the route. It continued to operate the six-mile section for nearly six months, until, on June 17, 1831, it became the first locomotive to experience a boiler explosion in the United States.

However significant that may have been, the South Carolina Railroad was far from finished. The South Carolina Canal and Railway Company again needed to sell stock to acquire enough capital to continue construction in 1831. With that capital, they ordered 1,040 tons of iron from Liverpool, and hired civil engineers to come up with plans for the railroad. Sixty-five miles of the railroad from Charleston to the Edisto River had been contracted by May of 1831. The Board of Directors gave the contractors one year to complete their work on the section. Planters along the Edisto River tended to oppose the railroad, primarily because they were already using the river as a means of transportation, but also because they thought the trains would be disruptive to their peaceful way of life. The largest landowner in the Edisto area, Colonel Barney Brown, did not allow the railroad to be built through his property. He said,

...engines would run over and kill his little negro slaves; also that the noise of the trains, such as the blowing of whistles and ringing of bells would seriously disturb the quiet and repose of the citizens and under no circumstances would such a nuisance be tolerated by a respectable community.

Many other planters in the region also refused to sell their land to the railroad, and the route would have to be altered so it did not go through their property. Most of the planters in the other regions, however, were more than happy to sell their land as a right-of-way for the railroad.
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Some planters even granted the land for free and instructed their slaves to clear the 200-foot-wide path for the railroad.\(^\text{21}\)

By May of 1833, the remainder of the railroad up to the bridge going into Augusta was undergoing construction.\(^\text{22}\) Then finally, on October 3, 1833, the entire route had been completed and opened to passenger service. The *Charleston Courier* made the announcement:

> The railroad will be opened for passengers on Thursday next, the third of October, on which day his Excellency, the Governor of the State, and suite with a committee, etc., [*sic*] will be conveyed by locomotive power to Aiken, 120 miles from Charleston and other passengers, by hand cars to Hamburg by the railroad.\(^\text{23}\)

Leaving Charleston at 5:45 A.M., the governor’s party reached Aiken at 5:00 P.M.\(^\text{24}\) They travelled nearly 120 miles at an average speed of ten miles-per-hour. The main line of the South Carolina Railroad was complete. It was also well over-budget. The original cost estimate of $600,000 ended up being $951,148.36. That is the equivalent of $6,993.74 per mile, more than double the original cost-per-mile figure of $3,600.\(^\text{25}\)

The South Carolina Railroad is one of the most historically significant railroads in the United States. It was the first railroad in the United States designed with steam locomotion in mind. It was also the home of the first locomotive to be built entirely in the United States, the *Best Friend of Charleston*, mentioned earlier. The South Carolina Railroad was an important stepping-stone in the overall history of railroading in the southern states.

**Social and Economic Impact of the South Carolina Railroad**

The South Carolina Railroad was in part created as a result of the economic recession occurring in Charleston in the 1820s. Not only did the railroad solve the root cause of the recession—lack of efficient,
The Carolina Railroads

reliable transportation—but it also resulted in the employment of hundreds of people along the route to provide wood, labor for construction, and other services for the railroad. It also allowed yeomen to sell their crops at market for profit.\(^{26}\) The stockholders of the South Carolina Railroad said on the matter:

Rail-Roads have introduced a new element of civilization, which is making wonderful revolutions in all the pursuits of peace, and the affairs of war, and even in intellectual improvements, affecting physically and morally, as well as all the relations of business and property, as the extension of human knowledge, and the diffusion of social sympathies and connexions [sic].\(^{27}\)

The ridership on the South Carolina Railroad (and branch lines) jumped dramatically between 1834 and 1848; from 26,649 to 75,149, respectively. This increase led to corresponding growth in gross revenue as well. In 1834, the railroad generated $166,559 in revenue from all sources. By 1848, that number soared to $800,073.\(^{28}\) Between 1820 and 1850, total exports of cotton from Charleston went from 146,959 to 347,098 bales.\(^{29}\) Within the same timespan, the total exports of rice rose from 64,153 to 137,931 bushels.\(^{30}\) Within fourteen years, the South Carolina Railroad had well exceeded its initial return of nineteen percent, and brought Charleston back as a major shipping and economic hub for the area. It also brought countless opportunities for many people to gain employment, which even further stimulated Charleston’s economy, and those of other cities along the route.

The North Carolina Railroad

Prior to the introduction of the railroad in North Carolina, interstate and even intrastate trade was practically impossible because of its unforgiving terrain. The northeastern counties in North Carolina, isolated from the rest of the state by Albemarle Sound, a river estuary,

\(^{26}\) Marrs, *Railroads in the Old South*, 173.
\(^{27}\) *Proceedings Of The Stockholders Of The South-Carolina Rail-Road Company, And The South-Western Rail-Road Bank, At Their Annual Meeting, In The Hall Of The Bank, on the 10\(^{th}\), 11\(^{th}\), and 12\(^{th}\) February, 1846* (Charleston: Miller and Browne, 1846): 20-21, quoted in Marrs, *Railroads in the Old South*, 173.
\(^{28}\) *DeBow’s Review*, "Progress of the South and West," September 1850, 310.
\(^{29}\) Ibid, 312.
\(^{30}\) Ibid, 313.
traded primarily with Virginia.\textsuperscript{31} North Carolina was in fact nicknamed the “Rip Van Winkle state” as it failed to join the rest of the United States in the new wave of technological advancement that took place prior to the Civil War.\textsuperscript{32} Paul Cameron, the wealthiest man in North Carolina, saw many neglected farms and properties and stated that North Carolinians deserved a better commerce-oriented economy.\textsuperscript{33} Conservative leaders remained opposed to economic development until the rise of the Whig party in the 1840s led to a gradual change of perception of economic development, and thus, the North Carolina Railroad was created a decade later.\textsuperscript{34}

Construction on the North Carolina Railroad began in January 1852 with more than 1,000 workers building the 223-mile track from Charlotte to Goldsboro. On April 1, 1855; the railroad reached Hillsborough, North Carolina.\textsuperscript{35} The Hillsborough Recorder explained the exuberance of Hillsborough citizens:

No more will [our citizens] have to spend two days tugging through mud and over hills to visit our Capital; no more will our farmers have to endure the toil and exposure of wagoning, and expend all their profits in getting their produce to a market. The Iron Horse is now at their service, and time and space are almost annihilated. A brighter day, we trust, is dawning upon us.\textsuperscript{36}

The North Carolina Railroad opened the eastern portion of its route from Goldsboro to Durham on January 1, 1855. On December 14 of that year, the first train rolled into Greensborough.\textsuperscript{37} In that year, revenue from freight totaled $28,702.29; passenger travel, $28,161.11; and mail, $5,121.20. Expenditures totaled $21,678.07, giving a net revenue of $40,306.53.\textsuperscript{38}

In January 1856, the North Carolina Railroad’s entire route was completed.\textsuperscript{39} With this line completed, trains could now travel

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid, 275.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Hillsborough Recorder, January 31, 1855, stated in Escott, “Yeoman Independence,” 277.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Escott, “Yeoman Independence”, 284.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 286.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Hillsborough Recorder, April 4, 1855, quoted in Escott, “Yeoman Independence,” 286.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Escott, “Yeoman Independence,” 286.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} “North Carolina Railroad” \textit{The North Carolina Standard}, August 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1855.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Escott, “Yeoman Independence,” 286.
\end{itemize}
from Charlotte to Goldsboro in around 16 hours. Freight transportation also became much cheaper and more reliable than other means. This revolutionized commerce in North Carolina. This change was particularly evident in the yeomen. Prior to the railroads, the yeomen were primarily focused on subsistence farming—the practice of farming to sustain oneself. After the introduction of the railroad, this began to change. Many yeomen saw this as an opportunity and began to send crops to market for profit. This led to the gradual implementation of a “market economy” in North Carolina.

The Yeomen Reaction to the Market Economy
The reaction of yeomen to the market economy was not uniform and is the subject of historiographical debate. Historian Michael Merrill argues that Connecticut Valley yeomen were largely against the market economy, stating, “Household exchange was not commodity exchange because people made exchanges directly based on need, not price. Cooperating constantly in their work, individuals did not use money to mediate the exchange of farm products.” Steven Hahn, a historian doing research on yeomen in Georgia agrees with Merrill. He found that there tended to be regular mutual indebtedness among yeomen. He concluded that “The cultural web of social life [in the Georgia upcountry] encouraged anti-commercial sentiments and an attachment to small communities of producers.” Historicist Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, using a tax valuation list from 1771, determined that yeomen were never really self-sufficient on a household level, but rather they lived in communities in which one would help another. As the size of the community increased, being collectively self-sufficient became easier and more practical. Lacy Ford, on the other hand, studied South Carolina’s lower Piedmont region, where many large-scale planters and many slaves lived, and compared it to the upper Piedmont region, which was home to many yeomen running smaller farms. He found that although the yeomen in the upper Piedmont did not have railroads prior to the 1850s, many were still actively

---

participating in the market, selling their cotton as cash crops. He also found that when the railroads were introduced in the 1850s, most of those same yeomen responded by increasing production, in some cases even doubling their production. Of course, this resulted in twenty-five percent of the yeomen losing their cherished self-sufficiency. They did, however, retain the spirit of independence.44

There is a separate debate on whether or not yeomen were “profit-seekers.” Historian Christopher Clark argues that yeoman farmers in the Connecticut River Valley still valued their social and economic independence, but were pushed into the market economy in an attempt to better provide for their families, rather than purely for profit-seeking.45 Historian William N. Parker argues that yeomen saw these new advances in transportation in an opportunistic way, and they naturally would want to maximize profits. Parker states that yeomen had a “fixed star,” or goal of wealth, and that the colonial south presented many opportunities to become wealthy.46 Conversely, historian James A. Henretta argues that yeomen were not profit-seekers, stating “These men and women were enmeshed also in a web of social relationships and cultural expectations that inhibited the free play of market forces....The maximizing of profit was less important [to them]...than the meeting of household needs and the maintaining of established relationships within the community.”47

Analysis

After looking at the South Carolina Railroad and the North Carolina Railroad, two railroads in a similar region—the Carolinas—it can be determined that the railroads had both a significant social impact, as well as a profound economic impact.

Socially, these two railroads changed the lives of the people surrounding the routes. Yeomen, who were previously self-sufficient and independent were now beginning to break that tradition. Many yeomen were self-sufficient and independent simply because there was no easy way to get involved in the market because they lacked an

46 Jerome Blum, Our Forgotten Past: Seven Centuries on the Land (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 1982), 184-196
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efficient means of transporting crops to the market. For many, the railroad became the solution to this problem. Being cheaper and more reliable than transporting via canal or wagon, yeomen could afford for the first time to send their crops to market, and began producing cash crops. Some produced cash crops in addition to practicing subsistence farming, prioritizing their food source, and selling whatever is extra. This practice is often referred to as the “safety-first” principle. Some stopped being self-sufficient altogether and produced only cash crops, and with the money earned, they would purchase what they need. This latter example is somewhat rare in comparison to those practicing the “safety-first” model of subsistence farming. There were, of course, still yeomen who whole-heartedly opposed the idea of commercialization, and vied for the traditional yeoman methodology of subsistence farming, self-sufficiency, and independence. It is hard to say what the majority of the yeomen in the entirety of the South preferred. Each region had its own creed on the matter, and even so, many yeomen, sticking to their independent ideals, did not follow what others were doing. It is safe to say however, that the majority of yeomen in the Carolinas embraced the railroad, finding a middle ground so they could stay true to their roots, yet still reap the benefits of the new technology.

As for the planters, the majority of them saw the railroad as a great opportunity to cut the cost of shipping their crops to market. Because many plantations were not located along rivers or canals, prior to the railroads, their product would have to have been transported by horse and wagon, much slower, much less efficient, and less reliable. The railroad also expanded the markets available to the planters by allowing them to ship their crops farther, so they were no longer tied to their local market.

Another social impact of the railroads is that people could be transported farther, faster, more safely, more comfortably than by horse and carriage, and also were not restricted to waterways as would have been the case traveling by ship or boat. In North Carolina, the versatility of the railroad is exemplified. The state is divided by Albemarle Sound, a large river estuary that impedes trade and travel within the state and between states. Prior to the introduction of the railroads, the northeastern portion of North Carolina would usually trade with Virginia, while the southern portion traded amongst itself and with other states. The railroads made it possible to easily and safely traverse Albemarle Sound, opening up trade where previously it had been very limited. The railroads made travelling easy for the average person. When travelling long-distances overland by horse, one has to be concerned for the horse. The horse will get tired eventually and will need to rest. It will get hungry, and will need to eat. Not to mention that horses can fall ill,
suffer injuries, and have other problems. With a steam locomotive, one does not have to stop, except periodically to pick up wood for fuel, water for the boiler, and, of course passengers and/or freight at the depots. But that takes relatively little time by comparison.

Economically, the railroads excelled. Take the city of Charleston, for example: in 1820, prior to the introduction of the South Carolina Railroad, it was on the verge of an economic recession, as exports out of the Port of Charleston were gradually declining. The year prior to the completion of the South Carolina Railroad, the period of October 1, 1832 to September 30, 1833, saw a rice export of 117,999 bushels. The following year during the same period, after the railroad had been completed, Charleston saw an export of 137,703 bushels.\(^48\) That is an increase of 19,704 bushels in the span of a year. Cotton tells a similar tale. From October 1, 1832 to September 30, 1833, Charleston exported 176,091 bales of cotton. A year later, between those same dates, Charleston exported 238,883 bales of cotton; an increase of 62,792 bales of cotton!\(^49\) This significant of an increase surely could not have been coincidental.

In addition to increasing trade, the railroads also created many jobs, which impacted the economy in itself. Running a railroad requires a large number of employees, especially during the early years of railroading. There are engineers, firemen, brakemen, signalmen, locomotive maintenance workers, freight depot workers, passenger ticket salesmen, construction crews, in addition to a plethora of other positions. The railroad created a huge demand for a large workforce, and in the South, where prior there were no large-scale employers, it put people to work. When people work, they are paid, and when they are paid, they spend that money, putting it back into the economy, and ultimately making the economy healthier.

**Conclusion**

In summation, the railroads made a *huge* positive impact on the South, socially and economically. Prior to the railroads, transportation was slow, inefficient, and dangerous. The railroad made traveling safer, faster and more economical than the horse and it was more versatile than boats or ships. As the cost of transportation decreased and the speed of transportation increased, economies boomed as they never had before. It was the dawn of a new era, the era of the great American railroads.

\(^{48}\) *DeBow’s Review*, September 1850, 313.

\(^{49}\) Ibid, 312.
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The *History Workshop Journal* appeared first in 1976 to promote “history from below.”
HISTORICAL PURPOSE: THE PAST AS PRESENT
| Jerrad Benedict

From Leopold von Ranke’s insistence that history “seeks only to show what actually happened,” to Jacques Derrida’s assertion that “nothing exists outside the text,” transformations in western historical thought, framework, methodology, and areas of inquiry over the past two centuries have been nothing short of remarkable.\(^1\) Indeed, even a cursory glance at the theoretical shifts during the twentieth century—from Lord Acton’s declaration that a historian is “at his best when he does not appear,” to Hayden White’s contention that historical narratives are nothing more than “verbal fictions”—highlight the monumental changes in the field of history.\(^2\) These historiographical transitions, an explosion of fundamental change to the discipline, are owed to one question: What is the purpose of history? Although Rankean methodology helped professionalize the subject, the question of purpose—subject to both the collective and individual experiences of the historian—has remained at the bedrock of historiographical variation. In this light, the explosion of divergent schools of historical thought during the twentieth century is understandable as the increase in practitioners of the discipline collided with the shared human tragedy of two World Wars.

For western historians, the Great War challenged the very foundation of nineteenth-century conceptions of the discipline. Whiggish history, identified with a belief in human progress, and so eloquently displayed in Lord Acton’s inaugural lecture, lost its monopoly on historical interpretation. If the Great War fostered the questioning of positivist history and grand narrative interpretations, then World War II shattered them. Historians between and after the wars questioned traditional narratives, established methodologies, long-held conceptions of objectivity, stale inquiries, and the purpose of the discipline within society. Out of this climate of change emerged a new wave of modern scholars employing ‘history from below.’ Evolving from the broader social and economic history of the nineteenth-century, scholars of ‘history from below’ attempted to answer Bertolt Brecht’s

---

1936 call for an alternative perspective to what he termed “top person’s history.”³ Although ‘history from below’ has adopted many forms and foci in the seventy years since World War II, its first practitioners, primarily concerned with the purpose of the discipline, established a nearly unrivaled form of historical activism. In providing a brief summary of ‘history from below’ in the latter half of the twentieth century, this essay will highlight the activism of scholars whose determination to tell the story of the marginalized forever changed the field of history. In focusing on the manifestation of ‘history from below’ in Great Britain and the United States, the emergence of post-colonial and subaltern studies—too often the contemporary model and framework employed in history of the marginalized—can be viewed through an alternate lens: one with a blurred purpose.

It is fitting that the term ‘history from below’ entered the historians’ vernacular in 1966 after Edward Thompson published the article, “History from Below,” in The Times Literary Supplement.⁴ By the mid-sixties, Edward Palmer, or E.P., Thompson was the embodiment of British activist history. Born into a left-leaning, socially conscious family, Eric Hobsbawm later recalled that Thompson, “like so many other British intellectuals in the 1930s, found himself in the Communist party.”⁵ After serving in the 17th/21st lancers in North Africa, Thompson returned to Cambridge where he studied history and literature. Influenced by the writings of Christopher Hill, Christopher Cauldwell, and Karl Marx, and inspired by adult students enrolled in his night classes at the University of Leeds, politics became central to Thompson’s work as a historian.⁶ Together with his wife Dorothy, Christopher Hill, Eric Hobsbawm, Rodney Hilton, John Saville, Raphael Samuel, and others, Thompson helped found the Communist Party Historians’ Group (CPHG), a collective of distinguished young British Marxist historians.

The contribution to history and historiography of the Marxist tradition within the work of British labor historians is significant. Although much of the scholarship produced by the CPHG has received criticism for its intrinsic economic determinism and overwhelming focus on overt political activity, most would agree that ‘history from below,’ as a subject and methodology, was at the center of the

⁴ Ibid.
⁶ Marnie Hughes-Warrington, Fifty Key Thinkers on History (London: Routledge, 2000), 312.
collective’s purpose. Despite the overdrawn material focus Marxist historical perspectives engender and the limit in time periods available for such analyses, there is truth in Marxist philosopher Alex Callinicos’s contention that “all those writing history from below do so in the shadow of Marx’s conceptualization of history.” Armed with a professional purpose to inspire activism by recounting revolutionary traditions, and following Marx’s adage that “Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please,” the CPHG began publishing what became the vanguard of the tsunami of social history: the academic journal, Past & Present.

Expanding on what was obvious in the journal’s title, the editors of Past & Present in the inaugural issue stated that “history cannot logically separate the study of the past from the present and the future.” Reflecting the activist-history at the core of its Marxist editors, the introduction declared that controversial views would be encouraged, for there “is concern about the state of historical research and discussion at present.” Excluding the paraphrase of Marx that “men are active and conscious makers of history, not merely its passive victims and indices,” and declaring that only “contributions on historical questions which seem to us to be important” would be chosen for publication, the introduction to Past & Present obscured its ideological purpose. While wide professional acceptance of the fledgling periodical may have contributed to the decision to obscure overt discussions of intent, Eric Hobsbawm later recalled that “our work as historians was embedded in our work as Marxists,” and that “to criticize Marxism was to criticize the Party, and the other way around.” Although the British Marxist historians shared a commitment to revolutionary politics and ‘bottom up’ history, the changing of the guard in the Soviet Union and the brutal suppression of

7 Burke, 28.
8 From Alex Callinicos, The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), quoted in Ibid. Since the height of British Marxist history in the 1950s and 1960s, scholars employing ‘history from below’ have reached beyond labor history’s eighteenth-century starting point producing in common parlance micro history. For two significant examples see Carlo Ginzburg, The Cheese and the Worms, and Emmanuel Le Roy, Montaillou.
10 Budd, 279.
11 Ibid., 277.
12 Ibid., 277, 279.
the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 shattered the British Communist Party, and by extension, the CPHG.

Nikita Khrushchev’s “secret speech” to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which acknowledged the atrocities of the purges under Joseph Stalin, sent shockwaves throughout the Communist International. Forced to reconcile Marxist ideology and Communist reality, members of the CPHG left the party immediately with the notable exception of Hobsbawm. Leaving the party “with a more public éclat than most,” E.P. Thompson, and fellow CPHG member John Saville, utilized their position as editors of the small dissident bulletin, The Reasoner, to attack Soviet distortion of Marxism. Maintaining a political ideology he termed “socialist humanist,” Thompson, along with Saville and others, turned the small circulation bulletin into The New Reasoner, a democratic socialist journal dedicated to publishing works critical of Marxist histories that ignored humanity and overemphasized theory. In 1960, The New Reasoner combined with Universities and Left Review to form the New Left Review, which continues to provide a platform for dissident leftist critiques of bourgeois capitalism. Although Thompson’s public falling out with the New Left Review and subsequent theoretical debates with Perry Anderson somewhat derailed his historical writing, he left the discipline with what many scholars argue is the greatest work of history penned by a member of the CPHG, The Making of the English Working Class.

Not without its critics, The Making was nevertheless an exemplary piece of ‘history from below’ that provided a needed corrective to Marxist orthodoxy and underlined Thompson’s contention that people are not “prisoners or victims of their assignment to a particular class.” Arguing that “the working class did not rise like the

---

14 Some have viewed Hobsbawm’s choice to remain in the party as detrimental to his career, yet after the CPHG dissolved, Hobsbawm wrote his more famous works. His Age of series, which chronicles the rise of modern capitalism and democracy, maintains its canonical prestige for scholars of modern European history. See, “Eric Hobsbawm Obituary: Historian in the Marxist tradition with a global reach,” The Guardian October 1, 2012 http://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/oct/01/eric-hobsbawm (accessed December 5, 2015).
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sun at an appointed time,” and that class identity “must always be embodied in real people and in real context,” Thompson’s style, methodology, and analysis marked a significant accomplishment in British labor, and Marxist history. More important, Thompson’s innovative use of source material and focus on identity formation worked as a guidepost for historians interested in writing history from below, and some fifty years later, *The Making* maintains its historiographical significance. While Thompson’s outspoken ideological shift and the breaking of the CPHG ended the golden era of British Marxist history, its influence on history from below with an activist purpose remained substantial. In the vacuum left by the CPHG, Raphael Samuel and the *History Workshop* rose to reimagine and redefine history from below.

Other than fostering socialist thought, the primary goal of the British Marxist historians and by extension, the CPHG, was to reshape historical discourse. Founded in 1966 by Raphael Samuel, the *History Workshop* provided like-minded historians with a new collective to bring the “boundaries of history closer to those of people’s lives.” Like E.P. Thompson, Samuel was a former member of the CPHG and a vocal advocate of “people’s history,” or history from below. Always maintaining “opposition to the whole tradition of historical neutrality and ‘value free’ social science,” the workshop asserted that “truth is partisan,” and thus, maintained the political edge of its CPHG predecessors. Indeed, early on former CPHG members played a prominent role with Christopher Hill and John Thirsk chairing the first meetings, and Thompson and Hobsbawm among the workshop’s inaugural speakers. Yet overtime, Samuel’s vision of “democratic history” shaped *History Workshop Journal*, the publishing arm of *History Workshop* founded in 1976, into a “people’s history” publication that remains unique among the recent glut of history journals. Opposed to “the examination system, and the humiliations it imposed on adult students,” the workshop fostered a collaborative relationship between academics and local working-class adults. Thus, the *History Workshop Journal* published works from both amateur and professional historians, reprinted entire archives to provide non-student historians with primary source materials, and urged its subscribers to conduct and publish oral histories. This “democratic history,” which

---
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gave voice and agency to the people, naturally attracted the historically marginalized and although the project has generally maintained its leftist perspective, it has expanded past its Marxist beginnings to include discussions of gender, race, and ethnicity.

*History Workshop Journal’s* shift towards gender history—in 1982 the periodical changed its subtitle from “a journal of socialist historians” to “a journal of socialist and feminist historians”—was an organic transition of history-as-activism in the 1970s and 1980s. As feminist movements in Great Britain and the United States gained steam in the late 1960s, women historians, always integral members of the CPHG, *History Workshop*, and American social history circles, utilized models of history from below to redress marginalization in memory. In the beginning, feminist historians, many working in the British Marxist tradition, argued against mutually exclusive views of class-consciousness and the subaltern status of women. Sharing a “radical discontent with the use of categories that remain wholly external to the object they purport to account for,” Marxist and feminist historians made a “plainly political decision” in their scholarship to “challenge centuries of silence.”

Along with an activist purpose, early feminist historians coopted the empowering forms of people’s history originated by *History Workshop*. In Great Britain, Women’s Liberation Workshops began to appear within three years of *History Workshop’s* founding and maintained a “definite radical and subversive edge.” So too did feminist historians across the pond, where ties to local groups and organizations influenced oral history interviews. “Unapologetic advocates for women’s liberation,” feminist historians conducting oral history, recalls Sherna Burger Gluck, “empowered both us and our narrators” and “contributed to a very critical re-visioning of women’s history.” While both British and American feminist historians subscribed to history-as-activism, the unique experiences of women from differing socio-economic and socio-political backgrounds fragmented both the liberation movement and the writing of women’s history.

---
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In the 1980s, as post-modernist theory and the “linguistic turn” invaded the academy and the activism of the previous decade waned, feminist historians with a background in Marxist historical interpretations stepped in to shape gender discourse. For example, both Joan Wallach Scott and Catherine Hall began their professional careers as Marxist historians, only to later make significant contributions to modern western historiography and gender history. Prior to her famous essay “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” Scott studied labor history, co-authored an article with Eric Hobsbawm on nineteenth-century shoemakers, and was widely influenced by E.P. Thompson, who provided her “with a model for writing socially relevant history.”

Likewise, Catherine Hall’s work, most notably White, Male, and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History and Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850, connects Marxist politico-economic class analyses with the social constructions of gender. Instrumental in maintaining discourse between class and gender, Hall is the current lead editor of History Workshop Journal.

As a focus of historical inquiry, ‘history from below’ offers near limitless possibilities. In recent decades, history from below has expanded to incorporate the postcolonial and non-western world. Primarily influenced by the writings of Edward Said, post-colonial and subaltern scholars extend the precepts of history from below to marginalized groups outside the dominant, Eurocentric, power structure.

Michel Foucault’s discourse analysis theories have proven to be just as influential in composing new questions and frameworks in the subfields of gender, sexuality, and identity formation. Although this recent trend in scholarship has made significant contributions to the discipline and helps to justify the praxis of history from below, it remains generally an academic endeavor and thus, separated from the principles of social activism. For the British Marxist and early feminist historians, history from below reconciled the uncertainty of purpose. History was an extension of political activity: a means to confront social, cultural, and economic hegemony. Academic legitimacy, although important to reshaping the grand narrative, paled in comparison to the utopian goal where “the distinction between us and

29 Hughes-Warrington, 277-78.

30 In recent years scholars have called into question the apolitical, and sometimes ahistorical, nature of Postcolonial and Subaltern Studies. See, Vinay Bahl “What Went Wrong with ‘History from Below,’” Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 38, no. 2 (2003): 135-146; and Arif Dirlik, Vinay Bahl, and Peter Gran, eds., History after the Three Worlds: Post-Eurocentric Historiographies (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).
them is at last obliterated.”31 With the general questioning of the importance of education in the humanities in recent decades, historians would do well to follow the examples set by the activist historians of the mid-twentieth century. For if history is to remain relevant, it must retain its relationship between the academy and the public, the social and the political, and the past and present.

31 Peter Burke, “People’s history,” in Samuel, People’s History and Socialist Theory, p. 8.
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Luck as a Factor in the Battle of France, 1940

Frankreich, Rommel mit Offizieren. 1940 (source: German Federal Archives, http://www.bild.bundesarchiv.de/1458182208/).
Luck as a Factor in the Battle of France, 1940

Connor Hendricks

The defeat of France in May 1940 is widely considered to be one of the greatest military disasters in history. France boasted one of the largest, best equipped, and best trained fighting forces in the world at the time. Yet they would be utterly annihilated in a mere six weeks by a country whose rearmament began just seven years before in 1933. How to explain such a catastrophic defeat of this scale is a question which many historians and military strategists have explored since the moment it transpired. Luck is an inescapable factor in every battle that despite all planning, will create certain conditions which are beyond a commander’s control. A string of poor decision making by the French leadership, inability to adapt, the failed state of the British-French alliance, and a total intelligence fiasco were all factors beyond Germany's control. The state of the Allied effort to combat Germany was not the product of enemy manipulation. In the fog of war, it was luck that French leadership failed, just as it was luck that Allied intelligence was a broken system. Luck was undoubtedly a crucial factor in Germany's victory over France, but it was the superior command, strategy, and doctrine which allowed Germany to capitalize on the opportunities which luck provides.

Incompetence of French high command is one of the most important factors that led to a swift and decisive German victory in France. When faced with the inexorable fact that their battle plan had failed, French high command was unwilling or unable to adapt their strategy and tactics. Even after the weaknesses of the blitzkrieg were exposed, French command was incapable of seizing any advantage they allowed.

One of the most common explanations posited is that French generals were intent on fighting the war as though it were still World War I. The entire French strategy was based upon predestined battlefields with extensive fortifications and overwhelming artillery. When a breach in their static line occurred, reinforcements would be rushed to plug the gap and hold the same line at any cost.¹ This strategy had saved France before in World War I and French command believed they had it perfected, which may have been true 20 years before. However, they failed to perceive that warfare had fundamentally changed. The mechanization of warfare between the two wars had

rendered much of the logic behind static warfare obsolete. Now troops could cross "no man's land" quickly and in relative safety from small arms fire. The quickness with which an army could close any distance between two opposing forces made coordinating artillery from miles behind the front lines much more difficult. The invasion clearly demonstrated that fortifications and defended positions could easily be circumvented. Furthermore, when lines were broken, they could be pushed back as far as 30 kilometers in a single day. Air power could also now be reliably used to devastating effect on ground forces. With this new dynamic of warfare, a defensive war appears predestined to fail.

The French military did not neglect to integrate the new technology entirely. Tanks were implemented on the battalion level and attached to infantry divisions to serve as support. But, even though the French army had a numerical advantage in tanks overall, locally German forces would have the edge on any particular battlefield. The new doctrine of independent armored units implemented by the Germans created tank divisions independent from the infantry. Thus even if French tanks did outnumber German tanks in a particular engagement, their organization prevented a cohesive strategy to take advantage of the situation. Furthermore, French strategists did not develop the tactic that tanks should be countered with tanks. Instead they relied upon infantry being able to keep the enemy at bay while artillery delivered the killing blow.

This idea in and of itself does not necessarily reflect the incompetence of command, but the implementation of this strategy on the tactical level was, more often than not, executed ineptly. In fact, the tactic was not without its merits on the battlefield when applied with a certain degree of improvisation, can be an effective counter to the blitzkrieg.

The French high command recognized Gembloux Gap as a natural target for the blitzkrieg. The Gembloux Gap is a thirty kilometer wide plain of flat Belgian countryside. In the buildup to the anticipated invasion of France, the Belgian military was supposed to

---
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prepare extensive fortifications in this pass, however when the French First Army arrived on May 10, the area was largely devoid of any constructed defenses. The French prepared a hasty defense by laying minefields and preparing anti-tank gun emplacements. While making a stand in a position with little to no fortifications represented a complete deviation from French military doctrine, it allowed them much more flexibility and in a way that freed them from their fortifications.

During the two days of engagement at Gembloux, the French completely halted the German panzer forces. This battle served to highlight some of the problems with blitzkrieg methodology. For one it demonstrated that artillery was not rendered obsolete. The French predicted where the panzer attack would come from and forced an engagement on their terms. The Germans based their strategy up to this point on avoiding head on engagements where the enemy was behind fortifications. The lack of a heavily fortified pre-war defense lulled the Germans into a false sense of security; but they actually fought on a battlefield chosen by the French and not the other way around. This allowed the French to use their artillery in the manner intended, battering an enemy held in place by infantry. Furthermore, blitzkrieg forced a relatively large number of tanks to group up and attack a very small front as a sort of spear thrust. This meant that a precise artillery barrage could have devastating effect.

The tactical freedom provided by the improvisational defense opened up more possibilities to directly counterattack. After artillery bogged down the panzers, French tanks counterattacked. This proved to be devastating to the retreating Germans who lost between 35-50 percent of their armored vehicles. In spite of this this French success was ultimately undermined by defeats to the south which forced them to abandon the Gembloux Gap.

Gembloux provides a rare example of French command recognizing the situation and adapting to meet it. However, this was the exception and not the rule. The rigid nature of the French doctrine and over-cautiousness prevented French command from seizing any advantage, which they were quite clearly presented with.

The most apparent problem with blitzkrieg comes with its success. In their victory German panzers advanced almost 200 miles in four days. They had dangerously overextended themselves from their infantry support which had no hope of keeping pace. Furthermore it

9 Gunsberg, 110-113.
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left a massive gap between them and their supply line without which the panzers would be left useless and immobile. Most jarring is that French intelligence was fully aware of this situation as they reported, "From 18 to 22 May... the Panzer divisions had, to a large extent, lost touch with their infantry columns.... The extreme danger which these Panzers were running, of being attacked on their unsupported flanks, had been pointed out by the divisional commanders." The failure to act on this vital information sealed the French defeat. The forces posted along the east of France were already reforming themselves along the Somme at this point giving the French at the very least the ability to continue operations in some capacity. But French high command would only act if it knew every minute detail about the enemy. Heinz Guderian understood French doctrine very well and exploited it to great effect: "According to French military principles, General Frere had to wait for accurate information about our positions. What we had to do then was to keep him guessing, and the best way of ensuring that was to continue to advance." Under any other circumstances this would have exacerbated the problem facing German forces. However, by truly knowing and understanding how his enemy thought, Guderian turned this disadvantage into his salvation. It is this same understanding which the French sorely lacked on many different levels.

Before the battle, French commanders actually had a respectable understanding of German mechanized warfare. They had monitored its development and maneuvers during the rearming period of the 1930s. They even had the benefit of seeing the Wehrmacht's capabilities in action during the invasion of Poland. Yet they still failed to comprehend the true nature of the blitzkrieg. General Maurice Gamelin, and the majority of French high command for that matter, believed that the flat terrain in Poland was a major contributing factor to the German victory. Thus they would seek to replicate that success by attacking over similar terrain, in this case through the Low Countries. French high command did not think the Ardennes were impenetrable to tanks by any means. They acknowledged that with some effort, an attack could come through them. However, they firmly believed that an attack through fairly heavy woods contradicted German strategy.
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This fundamental misunderstanding of the German strategy that led to perhaps the most commonly stated failure of command of the campaign; the decision to commit all the French strategic reserve into Belgium and not at a centralized location in France. When the main German attack emerged from the Ardennes, the only force not committed to holding the line was isolated to the North completely separated from France. General Gamelin was so confident that he understood the German goals and how they would execute them, that he risked everything in one single move. A move of this boldness contradicts much about the overall French strategy, which relied heavily upon cautious and calculated moves. The feigned attack through the Netherlands and northern Belgium seemed to confirm everything Gamelin believed about the German plan and he rushed forward to meet it on May 10. By May 14 when the main attack had fully revealed itself through the Ardennes, it was already too late. This situation highlights another problem inherent with the French strategy: its style of command.

As already stated, French commanders intended to fight this war as though it were World War I. They relied heavily on static lines of defense. In most cases high-level commanders were stationed at headquarters miles behind the front line. The only reliable lines of communication between them and their troops were telephone lines and to a lesser extent radio communication. French commanders were given very specific instructions on how to act; everything they did originated from pre-constructed orders according to the strategic plan. However if something unexpected occurred that was not part of the plan or included as a contingency, a response proved extraordinarily difficult to coordinate between commanders. Perhaps even more critically, this created a certain latency between the commander receiving information about an unfolding event and the issuing of orders in response. As a result of this unwieldy arrangement, individual French commanders were not able to take advantage of tactical developments such as when a panzer unit overextended itself, or to counterattack a unit pinned down by artillery. Conversely, the Wehrmacht utilized the opposite style of command. In particular panzer commanders were encouraged to lead from the front. This made their tactics extremely dynamic and allowed them adapt to changing situations. In fact, a key component of the blitzkrieg was finding the weakness in the enemy for exploitation. General Erwin Rommel’s actions during the initial crossing of the
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Meuse are a notable example. He intuitively took it upon himself to aid engineers working to create a crossing on the river by assisting in recovering abandoned assault crafts and creating diversions from French artillery by feinting attacks on French positions.\textsuperscript{22} It is this freedom of operation encouraged and to a certain extent required of German leadership that marks a crucial contrast between the commanders of each army.

Another crucial component in the fall of France was the failed alliance between France and the United Kingdom, a failure on several different levels. The cooperation between the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) and the French First Army was marred by a number of problems, which ranged from differences in overall strategies to mundane issues of communication between officers.

The question of how these two partners would conduct the defense of France was, at the time of the invasion, a forgone conclusion. Fundamental differences in tactics and overall strategy did not become apparent until after the fighting on the western front had begun. On May 16 at a meeting between Winston Churchill and General Maurice Gamelin, Churchill remarked that more aircraft were needed to provide cover to British ground forces from German tanks\textsuperscript{23}. To this Gamelin responded, "Tanks...were stopped by artillery; fighters were used to clear the skies"\textsuperscript{24}. The civilian prime minister was not dictating British military doctrine, but reiterating to the western theater commander a basic principle of British combined arms warfare. For such a crucial and divisive aspect of doctrine to be addressed for the first time, six days after the invasion had begun and by a civilian official represents a failure to coordinate at the highest level.

The communications breakdown between the two allies was a constant problem. General Edward Spears, who acted as the chief liaison between the UK and France, was unable to get an office in the Ministere de la Guerre.\textsuperscript{25} He later wrote, "The best I could do was get Margerie or Reynaud himself to tell me what Weygard had passed on to them."\textsuperscript{26} Again, the two supposed allies failed to communicate at the highest possible level. The fact that the chief cable between the two governments coordinating a joint war was fulfilled via second hand connections is a clear sign that actual coordination was never given the attention and effort it warranted.

---
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There is a strong sense that the Anglo-French alliance was never taken as seriously as it deserved. Simple aspects of an alliance were seemingly not even considered; channels of communication between even the top authorities were never firmly established, and there was never any serious discussion of large scale integration on doctrine to reconcile fundamental differences in strategy. The fact that the alliance broke down with the evacuation of the BEF 16 days after the invasion began, is hardly a matter of surprise.

The conduct of intelligence operations was perhaps one of the most significant failures of the British and French in the months leading up to the May offensive. Intelligence professionals demonstrated ineptitude in several areas of conducting an intelligence war. This led to Allied war planners basing strategy off of unreliable sources and incomplete situational awareness.

The gross overestimation of German forces was one of the most obvious failures. Initially in January 1940, French and British intelligence reported that the active number of German divisions totaled fifty-six with fifty more becoming battle ready within a matter of months. When this was reported to French high command, the estimate grew to 135 active divisions and a likelihood that this number would rise to 170. In April 1940, General Gamelin reported that Germany likely had 190 divisions active.27 In reality, the first estimates were very close to accurate. When the German offensive began, they did so with 112 divisions. Estimates of the actual amount of equipment at Germany’s disposal proved to be the more erroneous mistake. British intelligence analysts estimated that Germany produced 700 aircraft a month while the French estimated 1,000. From these numbers they drew the conclusion that the Luftwaffe possessed 14,000 fighters and bombers. The actual number was closer to 5,400. British intelligence again produced a wildly inaccurate estimate of German tanks. French intelligence made the conservative estimate that Germany possessed at least 7,000 tanks, but could have as many as 10,000. This was perhaps the most important miscalculation, as German tanks actually numbered only 2,400.28 Many of the estimates were projections based on pre-war knowledge of industrial output.

Some of these estimates were based on outdated suppositions. French observers found German armor divisions the most reliable to track in terms of quantity. British and French planners made the mistake of assuming that additional armored units existed in conjunction with infantry divisions as support units.29 This represents a
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misunderstanding of the enemy's strategy and a belief that certain fundamentals exist in warfare that could not be challenged. There are also other, more cynical explanations. General Gamelin told a colleague regarding German numbers that "This bulletin is what one might call a 'smoke-screen' in case things turn out badly." This suggests that the Allied high commands sought out excuses to explain any failure that might occur.

In many situations, overestimating the enemy may play to one's advantage, however the passivity of Allied forces was a major factor in the fall of France. By giving the German military more respect than it deserved, Allied command allowed Germany space and time to consolidate and prepare. This played directly into the hands of German strategy and tactics that revolved around the ability to control the tempo, location, and timing of battle.

The most serious failure of Allied intelligence was the complete inability to perceive the indications and warnings of the attack. Right up until zero hour, French and British high command believed the main offensive was coming through the Netherlands and northern Belgium. However, this was less due to obstinacy than to a total intelligence fiasco.

British and French intelligence enjoyed a plethora of information about the potential invasion of France coming in from informants from a variety of sources, a handful of whom were considered very reliable. Intelligence officers passed along every single informant report as standard practice. Most did not indicate any pattern in timing and location of the pending German offensive. The reports ranged from claims of an impending German offensive through the Netherlands and Belgium and even on the Maginot Line. Notably, none of these reports mention an offensive through the Ardennes. Hitler was known to have kept all changes made to Plan Yellow limited to top officials on a "need-to-know" basis, making it very unlikely that a low level official (i.e. a potential informant), would have any knowledge of this. While there is no indication that Allied command took these informant reports seriously, it is not inconceivable that these reports justified what high command already believed.

The lack of reliable reports from inside sources does not necessarily constitute a total intelligence failure but the failure to perceive the clear, tangible indications does. Aerial reconnaissance conducted by the French reported several clear signs German troops
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were massing on the German-Luxembourg border. Furthermore, a summary of reports revealed at least four German divisions stationed along the Netherlands and about fifty located around south-eastern Belgium and Luxembourg.\textsuperscript{34} Other reports by British operatives pointed to the presence of munition depots and buried telephone lines being placed near the border of southeastern Luxembourg. There were further signs of an offensive through Luxembourg in the form of German reconnaissance activity. French and British observers spotted over fifty German reconnaissance flights spotted along the southwestern border of France and Belgium in the Ardennes during April 1940. Fewer than twenty were spotted north of the Ardennes where the offensive was believed by Allied command to take place. Allied intelligence officers even extracted the targets of the flights through interrogation of captured German pilots.\textsuperscript{35} Another clear sign that not all was as it seemed was the resumption of reconnaissance flights. In November 1939, Hermann Goring halted all single aircraft reconnaissance flights due to losses to Allied fighters. This practice was resumed sometime during April 1940.\textsuperscript{36}

As previously addressed, the passing along of any report without analysis was a major issue, which plagued Allied intelligence efforts. Marc Bloch, an officer in the French Army during the invasion, said of the French intelligence corps, “Every officer in charge of an Intelligence section lived in a state of constant terror that when the blow fell events might blow sky high all the conclusions he had told...were absolutely certain.”\textsuperscript{37} Under this climate intelligence officers would pass along every single bit of information and at many times report contradictory information in the hope that one of them would prove correct in hindsight.\textsuperscript{38} This evidence suggests that the French intelligence corps included many officers unsuited for their positions.

This information should have left little room for interpretation. There was a clear buildup of German forces and activity concentrated along Luxembourg, which begs the question as to how this was disregarded. However, this activity did not go unnoticed by all Allied intelligence. Belgian General Raoul Van Overstraeten reported to General Gamelin that he believed the offensive would take place "more or less from Bastogne to Mezieres".\textsuperscript{39} The possibility of an Ardennes
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offensive was not unthinkable. Yet French strategists developed no contingency plan adopted or even discussed the possibility of an Ardennes offensive. This does not represent a failure to collect information regarding the enemy, but one in analyzing the information. It is often stated that people make their own luck. This was the case in May 1940. Many factors beyond German control made their victory possible. Germany could not have possibly predicted the incompetence of French high command and their complete inability to adapt to any situation, just as they could not have known about the total intelligence breakdown in the months leading up to the invasion. They were not aware of the mechanisms that made certain actions possible, but within their strategy existed the ability to seize the initiative when it presented itself. Speculating about what may have occurred under different circumstances is a pointless endeavor; whether the invasion would have been defeated if only they did this or that. Despite all the “luck” involved, events unfolded due to a myriad of factors many of which existed long before planning started. Both forces, German and French, had the ability to seize the opportunities afforded by luck, what matters is that only one was able to do so.
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The trial of Bernhard Schlink’s character, Hanna, was inspired by the real life Frankfurt Auschwitz trials of 1963-1965 (source: http://www.ffmhist.de/ffm33-45/portal01/mitte.php?transfer=t_fbi_mk_auschwitz_prozess05&PHPSESSID=).
DER VORLESER: A NACHGEBORENEN NOVEL
| Brendan Flesher

In 1995, German lawyer and judge Bernhard Schlink wrote the controversial, yet popular novel The Reader (Der Vorleser). In Germany, it is a required reading for countless pupils and is ranked the 14th most-popular book in the country, in front of such greats as Goethe’s Faust.\(^1\) Even in America, the novel has had extraordinary success, being featured in Oprah’s Book Club and made into a Hollywood film. It is criticized book, being called a varying range of things: cultural pornography, Holokitsch, a Holocaust novel, and a romance novel. Although many critics have based their denunciations on the premise that it is a Holocaust novel, Schlink did not write it as such. It is a novel about the Bernhard Schlink’s post-war generation of Germans and their post-Holocaust grief. Therefore, The Reader does not deserve much of its criticism. To understand why it is undeserving of its criticism, the novel will be discussed, then compared with the Frankfurt Holocaust Trials of the 1960s. Lastly, the novel's criticism and defense, both foreign and German in origin, will be examined.

First, one must acknowledge the novel itself. Beginning in 1950s post-war Germany, the tale followed teenager Michael Berg. Michael belonged to the first generation of Germans born in the shadow of the war, who are commonly referred to as die Nachborenen. Following a near-death experience with hepatitis, Michael becomes entranced with a streetcar conductor by the name of Hanna Schmitz, who is in her mid-thirties. Hanna belonged to the generation that fought for Nazi Germany in the war. Disregarding the age difference, they engaged in a sexually intense and abusive relationship in which Hanna was the abuser. The relationship ended after a few months when Hanna decided to leave her apartment and job without notifying Michael. This certainly dismayed Michael, but it is not even close to the grief that he felt seven years later at university.

While attending a war crimes trial which was exceptionally similar to the Frankfurt trials, the older Michael is floored when he discovered that his ex-lover Hanna is one of the defendants. Previously unbeknownst to him, she was an Auschwitz guard accused of committing atrocities. This indeed deeply shocked and appalled Michael. He felt an enormous amount of guilt for once loving this heinous woman.

---

During the trial, Hanna is charged with, amongst other things, having participated in the burning of hundreds of innocent Jewish women in a church. She allegedly wrote a report on the incident, rendering her most guilty and responsible. Hanna confirmed that the report was written by her, thus incriminating herself. As a matter of fact, she never wrote the report. The reason why she didn’t, Michael soon realized is because she is secretly and to her own embarrassment, illiterate. She chose to falsely admit guilt rather than reveal her illiteracy. It is important to note that this weakness of hers also contributed to her joining the SS. She had previously been employed at a Siemens factory and was offered a promotion by the company. Unfortunately for her, the promotion involved both reading and writing. Because of this, she declined the offer, choosing instead to volunteer for the SS. Michael never disclosed the fact that she is illiterate. If he did, it could have saved her from being implicated and sentenced to life in prison, as opposed to only a few years. He refused to help, knowing that her fate is in his hands. He does not want to have anything to do with her.

Hannah thereby resided in jail for the rest of her life, while Michael continued on with his own life. For years, he is completely isolated from Hanna. But even with her locked away, Michael is drawn back. After the trial, he struggled to come to terms with his previous involvement with her, even though he had no knowledge of her dark past at the time of the relationship. He still felt guilty. Michael also feels sympathy for Hanna because she is suffering from her illiteracy and serving a life-sentence due to that illiteracy. This sympathy also served as a source of guilt for him. Nonetheless, he tried to keep his distance from her, but found it nearly impossible. After years of silence, Michael decided to write Hanna. He did not try to rekindle their relationship. Rather, Michael helped Hanna overcome her illiteracy by sending audio cassettes of well-known books. He even goes as far as securing a job and apartment for her when she is released from jail, for her life sentence is eventually reduced. Instead of being released, though, Hanna chooses to end her life.

The Reader contained symbolism throughout. The most important symbols are Michael and Hanna. Michael represented his whole generation of Germans, the sons and daughters of those that fought in the war. Bernhard Schlink, the novel’s author, is in fact also a member of this generation. Like Michael, the Nachgeborenen, the
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children of those who created the Holocaust, felt an insurmountable amount of guilt. They felt guilty by association. Just as Michael was Hanna’s lover, the first generation was a “lover” of the war generation and the perpetrators. Schlink’s representation of Hanna as the German perpetrators of the Holocaust has a deeper, more controversial aspect. Since Hanna was illiterate, it is implied that the German people were also “illiterate”. This provided the basis for much of the novel’s criticism.

Since the novel is a work of fiction, it is best to compare it with a historic event such as the monumental Frankfurt Auschwitz Trials, which were very similar to Hanna’s trial. Brought to the forefront of the world from 1963 to 1965, the trials dealt primarily with the guards of the Auschwitz concentration camp, most of whom played lesser roles at the camp. The issue of statute of limitations was at the center of the trial. Many of the prosecutable crimes committed by the guards became nullified in the year 1960, so it was no longer possible to charge many of the guards who killed thousands. Instead, only guards who killed in a specific manner could be charged with murder. In the end, 17 out of 20 defendants were sentenced to prison.

Throughout, the media reported the great atrocities committed by the Auschwitz guards. In doing so, the trials brought back the ugly memories from the war, resurrecting the shame felt by the German people. Especially affected by the trials was the generation that Michael would have belonged to. To Schlink, “the context of guilt was still very present.” And as famous 68er and fellow Nachgeborenen Daniel Cohn-Bendit similarly states, "Auschwitz was a film that tormented our thoughts.” The trial acted as a great factual prelude to the book. Certainly the symbolism of Hanna and Michael mirrored the shame and outrage that the Nachgeborenen felt towards Hanna’s generation as a result of the revelations to the Frankfurt trials.

4 Woetzel, „Reflections on the Auschwitz Trial,“ 498.
The more controversial aspects of Hanna’s illiteracy had basis in the Frankfurt Trials. The heroically-depicted Hessian District Attorney Fritz Bauer stated that the trials failed. He believed that they reinforced post-war Germany’s "wishful fantasy that there were only a few people with responsibility... and the rest were merely terrorized, violated hangers-on, compelled to do things completely contrary to their true nature." In this fantasy, the people who were responsible are the monsters. In particular, the German media augmented this fantasy. They focused on key atrocities and defendants, portraying them as monsters. One famous example would be defendant Wilhelm Boger, an infamous SS officer at Auschwitz. Trial testimony revealed that Boger had created a gruesome device from which he could torture prisoners at the camp. The device, known as “Boger’s Swing”, drew copious amounts of attention from the German media and people alike. To them, Boger was purely a “monster” or a “demon.” This helped prove Bauer’s beliefs, since it allowed the German people to separate themselves from the monsters of the Third Reich. By separating themselves, they felt no personal responsibility for Germany’s past actions, which is very similar to how Hanna’s illiteracy is perceived by critics to be an excuse for the German people.

Looking at the novel’s criticism, it is apparent that the strongest criticism is based on Hanna and her illiteracy. The most damning criticism came from Jeremy Adler of the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, who stated that *Der Vorleser* is mere “cultural pornography.” He went on to say that the novel excuses Hanna’s horrible actions, simplifies the Holocaust, and causes one to sympathize with her. His opinion of the novel is indeed very strong; saying the novel is “disgusting” and “contemptible.” Adler even believed that Schlink has the same opinion as Michael; that Hanna and Germany are victims who were led to commit atrocities by the monsters. Willi Winkler later
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reaffirmed Alder’s opinion in the aforementioned newspaper, labeling the novel despicable *Holokitsch*, which would be a holocaust novel in bad taste.\(^{14}\) Strong criticism can also be found in a 1995 episode of *Das Literarische Quartett*, Germany’s most-popular show on literature. The show’s main host, Marcel Reich-Ranicki, found the book to be quite dubious in regards to Schlink’s handling of the Holocaust. He believed that Hanna as an Auschwitz guard serves as the novel’s main theme.\(^{15}\) This opinion is most crucial, considering Reich-Ranicki is a Jewish Holocaust survivor who was known as Germany’s “Pope of Literature.”\(^{16}\) Co-hosts, and fellow critics Josef Haslinger and Singrid Löffer agreed with him. To them, the novel’s symbolism for illiteracy “leaves a bitter aftertaste” and allows the reader to sympathize with Hanna.\(^{17}\)

Outside of Germany, the foreign media shared the same qualms. The Americans and British were most critical.\(^{18}\) American Ernestine Schlant reaffirmed *Das Literarische Quartett’s* and Jeremy Adler’s beliefs, saying that, “illiteracy cannot serve as an explanation for cooperating in and committing criminal acts.”\(^{19}\) Gunhild Küble of the Swiss *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* agreed with the stark criticism made by Jeremy Adler.\(^{20}\) British author Lawrence Norfolk and American authors Frederic Raphael and William C. Donahue have also voiced similar disdainful opinions. Donahue stated “*Der Vorleser* is more concerned to establish Hanna as victim than as perpetrator,” to which historian Omer Bartov agreed.\(^{21}\) In even stronger wording, Raphael wrote “This German law professor is a deliberate counterfeit as an author” whose book does not even deserve to have a place in literature.\(^{22}\)

These critics brought forth a great point. It is inexcusable to say that the German people committed atrocious acts because they were ignorant and because they were also victims. Many critics, as well as Bernhard Schlink, agreed that such a thing would be inexcusable.\(^{23}\)

\(^{14}\) Krumme, “Uber Bernhard Schlinks Roman ‘Der Vorleser’.”
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Only the critics believed that the novel was trying to create a connection through the symbolism of illiteracy. Perhaps illiteracy would not have been the best choice in the novel. Another social or mental deficiency would have possibly been more fitting and less controversial, although it can be argued that the use of illiteracy was necessary for the novel to achieve such success.

In response to his critics, Schlink asserted that he did not write a Holocaust novel, as many critics claimed. He said that it was is a novel that was meant to illustrate the first post-war generation and its association with the war generation, thereby not trying to illustrate the Holocaust itself. He continued defending the novel, explaining that he does not believe that, "Hanna Schmitz, only because she is illiterate, was not guilty." To him, the illiteracy mainly served to create sympathy for Hanna, as Jan Schulz-Ojala of Der Tagesspiegel positively puts it, a “cleverly chosen psychological sideshow.” He admitted this, even though creating sympathy for Hanna is a reason why the novel is criticized. This sympathy serves as a lesson, for it teaches the reader that perpetrators are not always pure monsters. To pretend so would make the world naively just. If he were to portray Hanna as a pure monster, Schlink would be performing the same disservice as the German media during Frankfurt Trials. He would only contribute to the belief that separated the German people from the monstrous perpetrators, thus removing much of the same responsibility. Schlink’s true purpose of creating sympathy is quite relevant. It helped illuminate the feelings felt by the first post-war generation. The same generation which felt the aforementioned guilt following the war. They didn’t view their family, professors, and neighbors as monsters, even if they were perpetrators. They naturally held sympathy and affection for them due to their close relationships. So, just as die Nachgeborenen felt sympathy and affection for their elders, the readers and Michael feel the same for Hanna.

Then again, Donahue and Bartov believed that by creating sympathy for Hanna, Schlink is portraying Hanna as a victim. Whereas Adler said Schlink believes that Hanna and Germany are victims. His reasoning is that Michael directly reflects the author’s beliefs and therefore believes that Hanna is a victim. Professor Bill Niven disagrees with Donahue, Bartov, and especially Adler. On a fundamental level, he called their criticism “emotionally highly charged.
and even moralistic." The literary world typically disregards criticism containing these traits. Because they use these traits, critics like Adler used the words “contemptable” and “disgusting.” Continuing, Niven believed that Adler discarded the rules of literary critics by automatically assuming that Schlink’s beliefs were in sync with Michael’s without any evidence. He goes on to defend Schlink’s remarks; that it would be naïve to have to portray Hanna as purely a monster, for that is not how it is in reality. The novel is not simply a straight-forward Holocaust story. As Niven explains that, “Instead of positing in Der Vorleser a kind of uncomplicated redemption through Vergangenheitsbewältigung (struggling to come to terms with the past), Schlink highlighted the psychological difficulties involved in coming to terms objectively with Nazism. One reason for this difficulty as far as the second generation is concerned is its emotional dependency on the war generation, a dependency sharply illustrated by the manner in which Michael's life is intertwined with Hanna's.” Niven shared the same sentiment as Schlink; that The Reader is a novel about the Nachgeborenen.

The critics who believed that the novel is a Holocaust novel are the ones who tend to have the most qualms with the novel. To them, the book attempted to explain the Holocaust. Through the symbolism of Hanna’s illiteracy, one arrived at the conclusion that this illiteracy served as an excuse for the Holocaust. Since the German people were “illiterate,” they were blindly led by their leaders into committing the crimes that they did, thus explaining the Holocaust. Because it is, to them, a Holocaust novel, Hanna’s portrayal is controversial. She is shown as a character whom one can feel sympathy for. To the critics, this is preposterous, for it is unacceptable to portray a perpetrator in such a light.

The critics missed the point entirely, though, since the novel is not about the Holocaust. For one, the sympathy served a great purpose. It showed the readers the reality of the situation. All perpetrators were not monsters. Such a thought would be too convenient and naïve and would play into what occurred at the Frankfurt Trials. And since the novel is indeed about the post-war German people, the sympathy served to show the readers what the Nachgeborenen felt, since they had an unavoidable interdependency and close relationship with the perpetrators.

Also, since the novel is about the first generation after the war, it tried to explain what was felt by them in terms of grief. The novel does so through the symbolism of Hanna, who represented the
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perpetrators during the war, and through Michael, who represented the first post-war generation. Throughout the story, Michael felt a great deal of grief due to his relationship with Hanna, just as the Nachgeborenen did with the perpetrators. This is exemplified well by the Frankfurt Holocaust trials in the 1960s. In conclusion, after examining presented argument, it is apparent that the novel is undeserving of much of its criticism.

Seven years after criticizing Der Vorleser on Das Literarische Quartett, Marcel Reich-Ranicki proclaimed in Der Spiegel that in face of criticism, Bernhard Schlink should not be daunted. The critics who dismissed him will vanish from history before he does. If he and authors such as Günter Grass did not outlast the critics, it would be a disaster for German literature. In spite of criticizing The Reader, Reich-Raniki conclusively asserted to Schlink that he must “write what you think is right!”

29 Marcel Reich-Ranicki, "Marcel Reich-Ranicki in Der Sendung 'Solo' über Den Spiegel-Bericht 'Autoren - Verharmlosen Schriftsteller Wie Günter Grass Und Bernhard Schlink Die Historische Schuld Der Deutschen?';," Der Spiegel, April 22, 2002.
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UNCEASING RESISTANCE: HOW CITIZENS’ COUNCIL VALUES REFUSED TO PERISH

| Parker Wilson

Judge Thomas Brady stood outside enjoying the light breeze coming off the Gulf of Mexico on a Thursday afternoon in late October of 1954. Only five months before, the United States Supreme Court declared unanimously in the case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, that racial segregation in primary and secondary public schools was unconstitutional. Brady strongly disagreed with the ruling and he intended to make his view heard far and wide. He walked into the Gulfport, Mississippi, meeting hall where he was scheduled to give what had become his famous “Black Monday” speech named after the day the Supreme Court handed down the Brown decision. During the previous months Brady had expanded and refined his speech and had even published it as a book of the same title. This was not a random crowd Brady began to address; it was the local chapter of the White Citizens’ Council. Brady’s racist message had been heard across the South and many white people had responded. They used his book as their bible and created an association wielding political power.

The Council became the most influential force behind massive resistance to desegregation and black equality. But as the years wore on, the Council’s ideas began to be viewed as stale and repugnant in the eyes of many United States citizens. Civil rights supporters hailed the Council’s eventual downfall and restructuring as a victory. However, the replacement organization dubbed “The Council of Conservative Citizens” was only a sham, a place to put the people who would not adapt with the times. The ideas in the speech that Thomas Brady gave one late October afternoon would continue to be trumpeted by political leaders like George Wallace, who stoked the flames of racial prejudice at the national level. Republican Richard Nixon would later take up the mantle by sympathizing with a series of social issues that appealed to the Council mindset, with many inside the Republican Party continuing on the same path in the following decades. The ugly face of “respectable” racism did not die with the Council. People simply carried these ideas with them into mainstream politics, especially inside the Republican Party.

Brady’s speeches and subsequent book deeply influenced Mississippi’s own Robert B. “Tut” Patterson, a World War II veteran
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and former college football star, who worked as a plantation manager. Patterson became the perfect man in the eyes of segregationists to implement an organization that would be transparent in its actions, with a successful, friendly face associated to it, an organization in no way resembling the Ku Klux Klan’s image or tactics.\(^3\) Patterson gathered respected members of his community together, including the town mayor and city attorney, in a meeting on July 11, 1954, to form the Indianola White Citizens’ Council.\(^4\)

Although between seventy-five and one hundred people attended that initial Council meeting, nobody expected the Councils to spread so rapidly across the South. Reactionary activists of the new Council made sure it did. These activists traveled far and wide to spread their message. In towns without a Council, Council members searched out various community service clubs that might lend a sympathetic ear. Recruiting from organizations such as the Rotary or Exchange club allowed the Council to find the type of people it desired. These club’s members were often seen as respectable, responsible, and conservative, exactly the type of image the Council hoped to present.\(^5\)

Council members also wanted to portray their association as a successful representation of business, industrial, agricultural, and religious leaders. To enact the program Patterson and his men began an intense letter campaign.

Within the first year the Council began to recruit former and current politicians to their cause. Former state legislator Fred Jones of Mississippi produced mimeographed letters for mass distribution in support of the Council’s cause. Addressed to “friends,” the letters carried with them a very dramatic message meant to urge the white reader to take action against integration and the federal government. Fear was a common tactic for the Council letters. For instance, one version sent out for mass circulation, warned about the evils of “negro political domination.”\(^6\) The importance of these letters is clear as they allowed the Council’s argument to be presented in a friendly professional manner, so that people could read and discuss them in the comfort of their own home. The letters also worked to separate the Councils from the Klan. They allowed for some more extreme views to be normalized in the eyes of southern citizens. The letters helped to spread the word and grow a national base of support outside the South.
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A base of support sowed by the Council and reaped years later by the Republican Party.

Pamphlets became another important means to spreading the Council’s message. In the first year of the organization’s existence, Patterson created four professionally made pamphlets with the support of a major southern printing company. In the following year he launched five more influential segregationist pamphlets throughout the south. All of the arguments chosen for publication by Patterson came from respected members of society. Articles and speeches by a Supreme Court justice, a state attorney general, a state senator, and a state representative appeared in the pamphlets. Members urged others to pass on the message and spread the word. In Patterson’s second annual report to the Council he gloated that throughout the United States, the Council successfully delivered over two million letters, articles, and pamphlets to white citizens throughout the United States. Within two years, the number would jump to five million.

The massive success of the pamphlets motivated others inside the organization to create a newspaper roughly four pages in length, creatively titled *The Citizens Council*. It successfully took off with a distribution rate of anywhere between 40,000 to 125,000 during the high points of the organization. In an even more ambitious attempt to capture the public’s hearts and minds, the Citizens’ Council launched a weekly television broadcast titled *The Citizens Council Forum* that ran at first for fifteen minutes in six different southern states. The televised event was rebroadcasted over the radio throughout the entire South. By 1961, three hundred and eighty-three stations carried the *Forum’s* message with over 1300 episodes and over 6,400 radio broadcasts, a simply astonishing figure for such a new show. The broadcasts fostered an intimate relationship between politicians and the Council, a relationship that would assure that the struggle against integration would continue long after the downfall of the Council.

In its first two years, *The Citizens Council Forum* interviewed more than sixty congressmen. By 1962, the Council’s *Forum* had interviewed about twenty five percent of the United States Congress. It is hard to believe a small “grass-roots” organization, such as the Council, could produce such a feat, especially with its lack of sufficient funds, which relied heavily on donations and membership dues. Money became a non-issue when southern congressional representatives decided to continually host the *Forum* in government recording facilities designed to help members of Congress in reaching out to their
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constituents. The Council benefitted greatly from these weekly programs, so much so that southern congressmen from Mississippi allocated almost 200,000 dollars over the next five years through the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, paying for the cost of the shows production entirely. The connection between the Citizens’ Council and southern politicians continued to grow.

The views of segregationists and white supremacists, distributed everywhere through Council pamphlets, letters, and newspapers, lay strewn across kitchen tables, posted to work boards, and found in the hands of impressionable young minds. For many southerners racist notions became ingrained in their psyche at an early age, but the concerted effort of the Citizens’ Council to defend and promote these ideas allowed them to flourish. By the end of its first year, 1954, the Council boasted a membership of 60,000 people and in the following years the numbers grew rapidly. This armory of propaganda allowed people to justify their beliefs on a deeper level, paving the way for continued resistance from the white southerners in various forms in the decades to come.

By the summer of 1955, it became apparent that the rapid membership growth and an increase in nationwide activity required a national organization to coordinate various Council and other segregationist groups into an effective force. The first attempt to create such an organization was led by state representatives from twelve southern states. “Dixiecrat” Senators James Eastland of Mississippi and J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina were some of the main supporters of this move; both served on the Council’s board of advisers. Before the year was out the organization collapsed and a new one was created in its place. The first attempt at unifying the Councils failed largely because of southerners’ mistrust for any form of centralized governing authority. Democratic Senator Willie Rainach assuaged these fears by having William Simmons write editorials in the Citizens’ Councils’ newspaper that proclaimed that the CCA would only be the “information center and co-ordinating [sic] agency…It does not have and may not assume power or control of any kind over…local groups or members.” With the fear of centralized control neutralized, Rainach was elected president of the nationwide organization, the Citizens’ Councils of America, with Council founder Robert Patterson as his Secretary in October of 1956. Showing their strength and
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influence on a national level was important, but with the traditional southern mindset, individual state influence came first.

In the same year the people of Arkansas elected the president of their states chapter of the Citizens’ Council, Jim Johnson, a Democrat, to the Arkansas Supreme Court. This effectively demonstrated the power that Council members held outside the Deep South. At the same time, Johnson led a ballot initiative that allowed Arkansas legislators to veto any federal law it deemed unfit. The initiative won with fifty-six percent of the vote, showing state wide support for Council driven ideas as well as state opposition to desegregation. Johnson would later play a major role in attempting to unite conservatives by supporting Republican nominee Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential election. By the early 1980s Johnson finally made the switch himself to the Republican Party.\(^\text{13}\)

The cozy connection between Citizens’ Councils and the new Republican Party began, unofficially, in 1961. Louisiana Democrat Joe Waggonner, narrowly defeated his Republican opponent for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. While both ran on a strong segregationist platform, Waggonner’s position as president of the Fourth District Citizens’ Council of Louisiana proved the deciding factor. Yet once in Washington, Waggonner often sided with House Republicans on issues concerning segregation. Although this does not officially link the two organizations, it is an important moment that shows the signs of greater co-operation between two increasingly like-minded groups.\(^\text{14}\) This was a welcome cross-over for the Council that wanted to spread their message and their base of support regardless of region or political party in the hopes of reversing Brown v. The Board of Education.

If the Council wanted to see a successful reversal of “Black Monday,” then it needed to look outside the South in search of white supporters across the country. To be successful in this endeavor, it became clear that the organization would need to soften its racial rhetoric and appeal to broader conservative values. The Councils, united under the banner of the CCA and the leadership of Rainach and Simmons, spread the CCA’s presence in various degrees across thirty states.\(^\text{15}\) The state with the greatest Council membership outside of the South was California. Golden State support was due in large part to the success of CCA’s “Operation Information,” which used the Councils’ well-built media arsenal to bombard western states. Council spokesmen
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delivered speeches on radio, television, and at various college campuses throughout the region. Californian Councils, although strong in numbers and support, did not exist unchallenged. Civil rights activists in the hundreds often picketed and disrupted Council meetings, successfully stalling or terminating the creation of even more Councils, something unheard of in the South at this time.\(^\text{16}\)

California is where the Council and the Republican Party first officially colluded and collaborated, effectively breaking the traditionally strict attachment of the Council’s members to the Democratic Party. The shift in Council discourse from vocal advocacy of segregation to the protection of state and individual rights, helped make its growing partnership with the Republicans a success. The first major direct link was with William Shearer, a Republican political consultant who served as the administrative assistant to influential Republican assemblymen. When the CCA reached California Shearer worked as regional secretary-treasurer as well as a member of its executive committee.\(^\text{17}\) With Shearer’s help, the Republican Party united with the Citizens’ Councils of California in 1964 over Proposition 14. The ballot initiative was created to amend California’s constitution to void the Rumford Fair Housing Act, which made it illegal to refuse to house somebody on the basis of “ethnicity, religion, sex, marital status, physical handicap, or familial status.”\(^\text{18}\) Council members went door to door to inform citizens of the proposition, using the same slick fliers and pamphlets, only changing the argument from segregation, to one of personal liberty. All but one county in California passed Proposition 14 with just over sixty-five percent of California voters supporting the measure. By this time the Citizens’ Council of the United States was no longer a grassroots organization. It had been transformed into a well-oiled machine used in spreading “conservative values” across the nation.

The year 1964 continued to be an important time for the growing relationship between Council members and the Republican Party. With the passage of the Civil Rights Act in June by Democratic President Lyndon B. Johnson, southern whites overwhelmingly shifted their support to Republican presidential nominee Barry Goldwater. Although Goldwater failed to carry any state outside of the Deep South and his home state of Arizona, men such as California Republican Richard Nixon saw the shift as an opportunity to unite American
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conservatives with southerners who held segregationist views to form a powerful Republican voting bloc.19

With the passage of the Civil Rights Act it became abundantly clear to most Council members that segregation by law would now be relegated to the confines of memories past. However, the Republican Party still offered people a hand in resistance to other liberal programs such as busing and housing rights. This winning combination had in a way already been demonstrated to Nixon with the victorious union of Council members and Republicans that led to the passage of Prop. 14. Soon after, Councils in every part of the country began to shift their support to Republican candidates in state elections. Although Council support did not always translate into victory, as many traditionally conservative Democrats were able to maintain their seat, the Council’s full-fledged support of the GOP began in earnest.

The first two Councils on record to support Republican candidates outside of California also occurred in 1964. The first call of support came from the South Louisiana Citizens’ Council, who in late February announced their endorsement for Republican Charlton Lyons Sr. in the gubernatorial race. The announcement was plastered on the front-page news, the shift in Council discourse from vocal advocacy of segregation to protection of state and individual rights, helped.20 Although Lyons lost the bid he pulled 37.5 percent of the vote, a strong showing for a Republican in the South and a sign of a growing trend. Two Republicans did get elected to the legislature on the Lyons ticket, Morley Hudson, and Taylor O’Hearn. Their victories over entrenched veteran Democrats illustrate the Council’s growing political influence and the rise of the new Republican Party.

Later that year the Citizens’ Council of Louisiana made news again when it backed the Republican nominee for Congress David Treen. David had run in 1962 without Council support and lost to incumbent Democrat Hale Boggs. With Council support, Treen was able to muster over 60,000 votes, doubling the 30,000 he garnered in the previous election but it still was not enough.21 In 1968, Treen ran for Congress one more time against Boggs, by this time the Councils’ impact on politics was negligible as most members switched their support directly to the Republican Party. Although Treen lost the benefits of a Council endorsement he received a visit from Ronald

Reagan who spoke in support of the man. However the presence of Reagan was not enough to bring him victory, Treen lost, just two points away from victory.  

Finally in 1979 the people of Louisiana elected Treen to congress. David Treen’s political career is a perfect example of the political evolution in the South. The Civil Rights act pressured the members of the Citizens’ Council to begin supporting Republican candidates and platforms. Many southern citizens saw Council members as die-hard supporters of the South in its fight for states’ rights. Because of this many people followed their lead and switched parties. Yet it would take the maneuvering of both Nixon and Reagan to finally bring the segregationist minded people completely into the Republican fold.

By 1965 things started to turn against the Citizens’ Council, for the first three months of the year the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission withheld the finances allocated to fund the Councils’ television program Citizens’ Council Forum. After this the M.S.S.C. moved forward and completely cut the funding of the program, citing the Councils’ lack of proper accounting for their decision. The more probable reason behind the funding cuts stem from the Councils’ failure to effectively stop desegregation. Even Tom Brady, the author of “Black Monday” agreed that the Supreme Court was “still the ultimate in judicial determination” and that the southern states should “operate under law and law alone,” indirectly signaling the end of his fight, as well as others, against federal desegregation efforts. Ineffective at stopping desegregation, the main purpose for the Councils’ existence, they began to rapidly lose membership and influence. In adopting a toned-down racial rhetoric, the Republican Party continued to unintentionally sap men, money, and resources from the Council, which it used to rebrand and repackage the Councils’ message without directly mentioning race.

By the late 1960s the Dixiecrat wing of the Democratic Party in the South had all but vanished. However, even as late as 1966 the Councils’ could report the opening of new chapters inside the United States. The last known recorded Council formation came from Denver, Colorado, in the fall of 66. When the run up for the Presidential election of 1968 took place however, it looked as if the only viable candidate for people who shared the Council’s values would be the third party choice and pro-segregationist George Wallace. Wallace
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managed to receive 250,000 dollars in campaign donations from the quickly weakening but not defeated CCA.25

Fearing yet another defeat, Nixon quickly contacted former Citizens’ Council board member Senator Strom Thurmond, now a Republican, to cultivate a relationship that would repair his image in the South and rob Council support away from Wallace. Nixon’s first contact with the Citizens’ Council occurred in 1960 as Vice President, when the Council called his conservative credentials into question. The South Carolina chapter of the Citizens’ Council inquired about Nixon’s membership in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Nixon’s aids at campaign headquarters gave an immediate public response in the paper stating that he was indeed not a member and that a local chapter of the NAACP in California, did in fact bestow honorary membership to Nixon, but he was quick to state that he was not an active member nor did he participate in any role for the organization.26 His immediate public response in defending his conservative credentials is quite revealing in showing the influence the Council wielded. Nixon realized this and understood that having one of their favorite politicians on his side in future elections would be an incredible boost to his campaign. Nixon lauded Thurmond’s courage and integrity in the public eye, quickly gaining Thurmond’s unyielding support.27 Thurmond’s aid, Henry Dent, transferred over to work with Nixon on creating a southern strategy during his presidential campaign to take away southern votes from Wallace. Dent, however, never became an official member of Nixon’s team for fear of creating too close of a connection between former hardline segregationists and Nixon.28

Although the Council was in decline, its views were very much alive. Richard Nixon paraded around the South with Thurmond by his side pledging to important southern citizens that he would do the bare minimum when it came to enforcing the Civil Rights Act. Nixon’s hard work in melding Council and segregationist ideas with that of mainstream conservatism paid dividends. Texas voters chose the Democratic nominee while the Deep South, where the Council remained strongest, remained loyal to Wallace. However, the rest of the South chose to rally behind Nixon. When tallied, the combined votes for Nixon and Wallace accounted for more than eighty percent of the

white vote. The Democratic candidate was swept aside by white America.

After the 1968 election the change from open support of “segregation to one of encoded conservatism” could easily be attributed to Nixon and “top-down electoral strategies and presidential electioneering.”29 In Massive Resistance, historian George Lewis argues that, upon a closer evaluation “of patterns of segregationists prejudice at the community and state levels, however, suggests that those top-down political successes were greatly facilitated by… and reliant upon changes that began to occur within the South at the grassroots level.”30 The Citizens’ Council is the prime example of that kind of grassroots change. After 1968 the Citizens’ Council continued to exist but with little or no political force or influence. Most Councils outside of the South eventually either collapsed entirely over the next decade, or reformed into local groups under completely different names with more or less the same goal.31 In the case of the southern Councils the pattern tended to be divisive, as the remaining Council members split chapter after chapter over whom to support, whether it be a Republican, Democrat, or an American Independent candidate. These divisions proved fatal, as southern Councils stagnated and eventually faded away.32 They failed to make any progress in the decades that followed and they never made national news again. The few remaining chapters combined to produce a monthly journal titled The Citizen but its circulation remained small, and completely within its shrinking support base. Every month the circulation rate fell consistently until publication of the journal finally ceased. As the years passed all that remained for the Citizens’ Council was its formal dissolution in the decade to come.

In 1970 president Nixon decided to dedicate the world’s largest outdoor monument to the leaders of the Confederate army. This was an obvious move by Nixon to demonstrate his appreciation to his southern supporters, as well as an attempt to gain further votes from the remaining southerners who hesitated to vote for a Republican president. Nixon had to cancel his appearance because of student protests in response to the expansion of the Vietnam War into Cambodia forced him to remain in Washington. Nixon sent in his place the vice president Spiro Agnew who only managed to draw a crowd of 10,000 instead of
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the 100,000 conservative southerners predicted for the event with Nixon leading the ceremony.\textsuperscript{33} Nixon’s attempts at appealing to the South paid off in the 1972 presidential election. The ‘72 election signaled another major shift of segregationist sympathizers away from the Council and independent political parties to the Republican Party. In this election the Deep South finally conceded as they cast their votes in favor of Nixon. In a sense this switch gave the opportunity of a political rebirth for former segregationists. No longer associated with massive resistance, they were able to firmly place themselves inside the heart of the Republican Party.

The conservative Republicans lost some ground following Nixon’s resignation due to the Watergate scandal with the subsequent election of Democrat Jimmy Carter, governor of Georgia. However, the country increasingly became disenchanted with Carter and his administration, especially in regards to the handling of the Iranian hostage crisis. In 1980, Republican candidate Ronald Reagan easily won forty-four states and over fifty percent of the popular vote.\textsuperscript{34} Reagan’s conservative credentials were firmly in place. During his tenure as governor of California, he spoke of again attempting to repeal the RFHA, he opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and he described the 1965 Voting Rights Act as disgraceful to southerners. Apparently African-Americans in the South did not count as southerners in Reagan’s mind.\textsuperscript{35}

During his presidency, Reagan continued on much of the same path as his Republican forbearers. Nixon, to retain conservative southern support, continuously sought to cut the budget of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. Reagan restarted this practice after elected and he also shifted the shrinking division’s focus from defending civil rights to attacking various affirmative action programs, essentially changing the division’s entire purpose. The President also stood firmly against the implementation of busing in order to curtail the only real effective method of desegregating schools. By doing so Reagan continued to push the Council mentality of keeping schools segregated, no longer couched in the terms of race, but rather phrased in ways that spoke of individual rights and personal choice. However, to deny that a racial component existed in anti-busing supporters arguments is simply naïve.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Reg Murphy and Hal Gulliver, \textit{The Southern Strategy} (New York: Charles Scriber’s Sons, 1971), 255.
\textsuperscript{34} Carter, \textit{From George Wallace to Newt}, 54.
\textsuperscript{35} Carter, \textit{From George Wallace to Newt}, 56.
\textsuperscript{36} Carter, \textit{From George Wallace to Newt}, 56-57.
During Reagan’s presidency his administration could be generally described as hostile to any action that could be deemed discriminatory towards white men. The administration also worked off of the idea that no policies were to be crafted that promoted previously discriminated groups if it went against white interests. Despite this Reagan did renew the Voting Rights Act when the time came in 1982, but American historian Dan Carter believes that Reagan at first wanted the act to expire and only after it became apparent to him that widespread bi-partisanship for the bill existed, did he change his mind and renew the act.

By the mid-1980s those who remained with the floundering Citizens’ Council decided to finally lay the organization to rest and it formally ended its operation in 1985. Although they had failed in their initial goal of stopping Federal interference with segregation, council members could lay the organization to rest with a sense that the era of the turbulent and violent Sixties had come to an end and it had been replaced by the 1980s with a conservative era where order, stability, and individual freedom was championed. Yet, some former members refused to give in, instead creating a successor organization titled The Council of Conservative Citizens.37 While this organization garnered some support throughout the South from both the public and various politicians, it never came close to the potency of its predecessor. It still exists today as an all but defunct organization where people who simply refuse to change can find shelter from an otherwise hostile public.

By the time Reagan’s second term was over in 1988, many white Americans viewed him as a political hero. Every southern state reelected him to the presidency with a three-fifths majority with the exception of Tennessee, where he captured fifty-eight percent of the vote. Reagan made Martin Luther King Jr. day a national holiday but this was not enough to hide his past record of attacking people and programs aimed to help American minorities. First his slashing of the Civil Rights Commission budget was a red flag; second, his cutting of many federally funded job and training programs had a direct effect on low-income citizens; third, the war on drugs disproportionately affected African Americans, too often targeted by police for non-violent crimes; and finally, Reagan’s stacking of the federal courts with strict states’ rights judges.38 These successful actions solidified the Republican Party in the South. So when George H.W. Bush ran for president in 1988 he carried the southern states with an even larger share of the vote than did
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Reagan. The Republicans successfully took the South for three consecutive presidential elections, a feat never before accomplished.\textsuperscript{39}

The political championing of racism and segregation did not start with the Citizens’ Council, but its ability to rebrand and repackage these values in a way that made it digestible to white Americans nationwide was an achievement all its own. It took advantage of the new advancements in media, spreading their word on paper, radio, in person, and on television. In toning down rhetoric to appeal to a nationwide audience, Councils proved successful and many white Americans listened. Yet the Council remained too distinctly southern to many, and members’ fear of creating any sort of strong central power structure for the organization, despite the possibility of greater success, kept national popularity in check. Southerner’s centuries old fear of centralized government in the end spelled the demise of the Council. The Republican Party was distinctly non-regional and nationwide. It also had the power structure needed to turn first, segregationist, and then conservative ideas into action. Council members who had the foresight to search far and wide for political support were set to continue working for success after the fall of the Council’s unified southern resistance. Their approach, sufficiently subtle and encoded, allowed for people of the Council mindset to work inside the Republican Party. They would continue their work, as historian George Lewis puts it, “almost imperceptibly into a steadily evolving national climate of conservatism.”\textsuperscript{40}
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Unceasing Resistance

JUSTICE IS BLIND: THE SOVIET ADVOCATE’S STRUGGLE | Joshua Furtado

Dina Kaminskaya’s autobiographical book *Final Judgment: My Life as a Soviet Defense Attorney* depicts her life while she practiced defense law in the Soviet Union during the Stalin Era. Defense attorneys faced many obstacles and restrictions on their path to justice. Due to the nature of their job, defense attorneys found themselves persecuted and scrutinized by their government and judicial system. Every advocate walked a careful path, wanting to do more, but feared criminal charges, whether warranted or not. With everything against them, defense attorneys worked with and around the legal system in order to give their clients the best chance at a fair trial.

The defense attorney, also known as an advocate, in the Soviet Union appeared as nothing more than a formality in the judicial system. The advocate’s purpose in the system consisted of appearing in the court as a representative for a defendant who the court had probably already presumed guilty. Judges in the court seldom acknowledged the advocate’s rights to defend his or her client properly. Kaminskaya explains, “During a trial the judge would rudely interrupt an advocate or forbid him to put questions whose necessity was obvious even to me. Yet the same judge would never permit himself to treat a prosecutor that way.”

Although on equal terms with each other, advocates and prosecutors never received equal treatment in any capacity within the court. This attitude towards advocates began with Vladimir Lenin. In his article, "The Bar in the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia," Ivo Lapenna quotes Lenin: “It is better we fear the advocates and place no faith in them, especially if they say they are social democrats…. This intellectual cesspool is frequently guilty of abominable business.” Lenin’s words echoed through the Soviet Union, causing the masses to distrust the advocates.

Distrust continued to grow in the Soviet Union when, in 1946, the Yugoslav party drafted a law that discredited advocates. According to Lapenna, one particularly damning section accused advocates of "adapting the law to the interests of his client, and of extracting from the law in concrete cases all which might be of use to the greedy representatives of the ruling strata.” Naturally, the law failed to mention the dangers that the advocate posed to the corrupt judicial
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system. According to Lapenna, “the unobjective nature of this official document, which intentionally ignores the fact that many advocates courageously defended before the courts—particularly in political cases—precisely the ‘interests of the people,’ frequently representing the impoverished defendants without any fee and risking prosecutions directed against themselves, is of no importance.” Advocates had the difficult job of fighting against the system in many cases, and therefore were seen as unpatriotic. Simona and Roman Pipko sum up the situation: “The advocate’s position as a champion of individual rights has not earned him the respect and support of his fellow countrymen.”

No amount of work defending innocent people would bring to light the true nature of an advocate. The public’s view of them mirrored that of their government. When the citizens of a city or village wished to have someone charged for a crime against their village, they saw the advocate as someone who robbed them of their right for justice to be served, regardless of who was put away for the crime.

Yet, it was not only the general population that distrusted advocates. Choosing the profession of advocate represented political suicide. Kaminskaya says, “For these people the switch to advocacy meant a sharp drop to the very bottom of the hierarchical pyramid, and it denied them any chance of further advancement, either professionally or in the ranks of the Party.” This placed all those who wished to pursue the path of an advocate in a very difficult position. They had to choose whether or not risking their careers and political affiliation was worth the struggle they would face going forward.

Within the Soviet judicial system, the constitution called for judges to remain independent in their political views, “and subject only to the law (Article 112).” However, Karel Hulicka reminds us that "no court and no judge in the U.S.S.R. can be apolitical. Courts are expected to further the cause of communism and the judges must be ‘builders of socialism’." Judges were not allowed to be part of any political party and were to remain both neutral when conducting cases, and unbiased while deciding the fate of the accused. Kaminskaya, on the other hand, often witnessed judges taking sides and voicing their opinions very openly in public and in the courtroom. She recalls, “in all my years as a practicing lawyer I never encountered a truly independent
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judge. The judiciary’s complete subjection to Party and governmental directives on penal policy has always existed in the Soviet Union and remains unchanged to this day.” ⁹ With many judges favoring the government, advocates had not only to convince the judge of their client’s innocence, but also that they were not enemies of the state, regardless of the nature of the crime, in the eyes of the judges, any defendant became an enemy of the state in some regard.

Every citizen charged with a crime had the right to an advocate. Advocates had to put together a case to defend their clients. Kaminskaya shows how courts vilified advocates as enemies of the government by stating, “An advocate in the Soviet Union is endowed with certain prerogatives and duties which must inevitably create almost universal animosity towards the bar in the Soviet society. The officialdom must see the advocates as potentially the most dangerous opponent, because he possesses a legal right to oppose the system in a courtroom.” ¹⁰ Every advocate was sworn to defend those who had been wrongly accused by the system. Kaminskaya voices her own view on this while practicing law: “I saw it as my job to defend the right of free speech—a right guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution and violated every time the authorities prosecute someone for expressing dissident views.” ¹¹ The government wished to silence those who opposed its views and it was the hard job of the advocate to be a voice in the court of law for those wrongly accused as enemies of the state. This created danger for advocates themselves, who the court marked as enemies of the state, just like those they defended.

Furthermore, with judges set against advocates, an advocate in court had to proceed with caution with every request. Anything an advocate said or did might be considered unlawful and risk investigation. Kaminskaya was very clever when it came to requests and working with the system, rather than against it. Of one judge, she recalls, “He was about to declare the session closed and so deprive Lev and me of the opportunity of lodging an official objection. I interrupted him, to put forward a firm argument in support of a meeting with my client, quoting the articles of the law which gave me that right. I had to insure that the clerk entered my objection in the court record.” ¹² These steps insured compliance with the law while avoiding any record of the request. As with any case, the only information that could be brought up was that which had been documented. This process insured that if
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the court brought an advocate in for investigation, those records could be used to prove that no law had been broken or misused.

Soviet law did not just make it hard for advocates inside the courtroom; they also hindered advocates prior to trial. Many advocates had little time to gather the information needed to build a case. This was in part due to the fact that the preliminary investigation could take weeks or even months. The defendant was imprisoned during this time and denied access to counsel.¹³ During this time of imprisonment, the prosecutor had time to build a strong case, without the interference of an advocate. But an advocate might have mere weeks to build a case strong enough to defend their client against a prosecutor that had months to prepare. The length of the investigation determined an advocate’s time allotment. The amount of time a prisoner could be detained prior to trial was limited by law to a maximum of nine months.¹⁴ Regardless of the crime committed, prisoners and no recourse to bail and were confined to prison until their case had been heard and a verdict given.

While in prison, the prisoners were restricted to whom they could speak to by the courts. In her experience, Kaminskaya reveals the bias of the judicial system “in the overwhelming majority of cases, the accused were held in prison in the strictest isolation, without privilege of correspondence, without meetings with their families, and without the right to consult a lawyer until the investigation is completed.”¹⁵ This isolation from their loved ones put a lot of pressure on the accused. The torture of the prisoners did not end with the refusal to allow them to speak with their family, friends, or lawyer: “The prison diet is extremely meager; food parcels may be received only from close relatives and only up to a maximum weight of five kilograms per month. These prisoners, who have not yet been found guilty by a court, may be kept in these conditions for several months.”¹⁶ This brand of torture served to disorient the accused in hopes they would confess to a crime in order to gain access to food, their loved ones, or an advocate.

Many advocates feared taking on powerful political clients. Defending such a client put the advocate in the position of possibly being seen as an enemy of the state, just like their client. Taking on a political client was “a sacrifice, and not such a little one. . . but not so great that many of those I knew in my circle of the ‘educated rabble’ refused to make it.”¹⁷ No advocate wanted to lose their profession.

¹³ Hulicka, 167.
¹⁴ Kaminskaya, 52.
¹⁵ Ibid.
¹⁶ Ibid.
¹⁷ Ibid., 39.
which they had studied so long and hard to obtain. Those who risked their careers, like Kaminskaya, did so for personal reasons and for the purpose of protecting the innocent and fighting the system.

Advocates have feared high profile clients; however any client could jeopardize an advocate’s career. Kaminskaya recalls one such case in which her client, "Alik, has kept on denying everything, but Sasha later told the prosecution investigator that it was his lawyer who had persuaded him to renounce his confession and that in fact both he and Alik are guilty. Irina Kozopolyanskaya [Sasha’s previous lawyer] was taken off the case and is under threat of expulsion from the College of Advocates.”\(^{18}\) One mis-statement from a client might cost the advocate dearly. An advocate, being thought of as someone who twisted the system to further a personal agenda, could be prosecuted under suspicion of misuse of law or alleged false testimony of their client. Mere suspicion of a crime was enough for prosecutors to detain a suspect and begin an investigation.\(^{19}\)

An advocate chose this profession for many different reasons. Kaminskaya talks about her reasons for becoming an advocate: “At the beginning I merely wanted to appear in court and to make speeches (all of which, I was sure, would be good); but I intended to do so only under conditions of maximum independence and intellectual freedom.”\(^{20}\) Although she did not yet have a passion to defend those who were wrongly accused, Kaminskaya wished to be independent from the state, to have the freedom to choose her own cases and proceed with each case as she saw fit, unhindered by the state. In contrast, prosecutors could not do anything on their own whim; they had to receive an okay from the district prosecutor in order to proceed in any direction with their cases. This type of hindrance did not affect an advocate. The advocate chose how to defend a client, when to withdraw information, and had control over every step of a client’s defense.

Although Kaminskaya chose to become an advocate in order to have freedom in the clients she chose to defend and how to defend them, she did not deny those in need of her services. She went so far as to take on political clients, the most dangerous for an advocate to defend. Kaminskaya bravely answered anyone who questioned why she chose to take on such dangerous clients. “My answer was that I defended anyone who needed my help; that it was my profession, and I saw no reason to withhold my help from Gabay or Vladimir Bukovsky, Pavel Litvinov or Yurii Glalanskov. Even though my own political

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 65.  
\(^{19}\) Hulicka, 167.  
\(^{20}\) Kaminskaya, 24.
views influenced me, I acted basically from ethical convictions, from a simple sense of professional duty.”21 In a corrupt system, the innocent needed someone to help them and Kaminskaya proved one of the rare individuals who became an advocate.

Throughout her years as an advocate, Kaminskaya walked a path filled with resistance. Her own accounts of trials and unfair judgment did not affect her belief that the system was not completely corrupted: “In spite of all I have said, the judicial system in the Soviet Union does work, and not only convictions but verdicts of acquittal have been given—less often than true justice required, but given they were.”22 The legal system may not have always proceeded to administer impartial justice, but it did more often than one might expect. This was all an advocate could ask for, the chance that the right decision would be made and not pushed aside in favor of the prosecution. Advocates knew the difficult journey they undertook with each case, and many lost faith in the system. This did not happen to Kaminskaya, who continued to believe that the system was not entirely broken.

Soviet era defense attorneys found themselves in the harshest battles of any legal professional. They fought long and hard against nearly-impossible odds. A defense attorney’s one true goal was to discover the truth and expose it in order to protect her client from the wrath of an unjust system. Each time they stepped foot into a courtroom, the advocate realized it could be their last. With the system poised against them, judge’s distrust for them along with the people's desire for “justice” at any cost, defense attorneys fought within the boundaries of law. Few people heard the calling to become an advocate, but the ones who did pushed the limits of the legal system in the Soviet Union.

---
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Ken Kesey and the Merry Pranksters traveling on their Day-Glo bus. The Merry Pranksters traveled across the United States in this bus attempting to spread the idea of ingesting LSD. As a notable author and advocate for consciousness-opening drugs, Kesey was a prominent figure during the counterculture (source: http://huckcdn.lwlies.com/admin/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/merry-pranksters-2-958x559.jpg).
LSD AND THE AMERICAN COUNTERCULTURE
| Nora Smith

The counterculture movement in the 1960s had a multitude of characteristics. There were key locations, a new genre of music known as acid rock, a variety of new literary magazines, and new social beliefs and lifestyles. One of the most prominent characteristics, though, was the widespread use of recreational drugs. Most of the aspects of the counterculture were based around the idea of taking drugs and the effects of drugs on the body, so without the emergence of a drug culture, the counterculture would have never occurred.

While LSD became popular among hipsters and hippies in the 1960s, it had been around for a couple decades prior. Created in 1938 by chemist Albert Hofmann in a laboratory in Basel, Switzerland, lysergic acid diethylamide, otherwise known as LSD-25, was found to have mind-altering properties. At first, reports showed that society and the government viewed LSD as a drug that emulated mental illness, producing hallucinations and anxiety. While there were LSD tests and experiments happening during the 1940s and 1950s, many members of the public did not engage in the drug use.

Early proponents of drug use and drug culture included the Beats. In Jack Kerouac’s novel, On The Road, he wrote about smoking marijuana and taking Benzedrine. He highlighted both the good and the bad; throughout his book Kerouac described how drugs opened up the mind, while also illustrating the addictive nature of narcotics. Allen Ginsberg, too, mentioned drug use multiple times in his famous poem, Howl. His first few lines depicted a drug user, “I saw the best minds of my generation destroyed by madness, starving hysterical naked, dragging themselves through the negro streets at dawn looking for an angry fix.” Author Peter Whitmer argued that Ginsberg’s “reading of Howl…had no doubt helped to pave the way for all that was to follow. In reading Howl, Ginsberg opened up a can of consciousness for which the world was not quite ready.” Many literary figures and society as a whole were not necessarily ignoring drug usage before the 1960s, accounts of it appeared in many works that are considered influential in modern times, but it was just a small group of people who engaged in it
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during the 1950s into the 1970s. Aldous Huxley, too, wrote about his experience with drugs. After taking mescaline, he was inspired to write *The Doors of Perception* and *Heaven and Hell*; he “redefined taking mescaline and LSD as a mystical religious experience,” as Steven Novak illustrated. These popular figures broke through the literary blockades that were preventing more explicit writings to be released. Because these books became popular among early counterculture communities, the authors’ use of drugs influenced readers to mimic them.

Timothy Leary was one of the strongest advocates for recreational drug use. His first experience with recreational psychedelic drugs was when he took psilocybin mushrooms on a vacation in Mexico, which Leary regarded as a religious experience. Starting in 1960, Leary and Richard Alpert started the Harvard Psilocybin Project “to document [psilocybin’s] effects on human consciousness by administering it to volunteer subjects and recording their real-time descriptions of the experience.” During their time at Harvard, Leary and Albert hosted well-known figures including Allen Ginsberg, who participated in the tests. In their experiments, Leary and Alpert found that out of the 400 volunteers, “73 percent of their subjects had a ‘very pleasant’ experience under the drug and that 95 percent said it had ‘changed their lives for the better,’” according to David Solomon. Leary and Albert believed this occurred because of the setting around the test subjects, and in order to create a “beneficial consciousness-expanding experience,” one needed to be comfortable and relaxed with their surroundings. LSD was even able to create an atmosphere in the counterculture, the love and peace attitude known as “The Love Generation.” The ideas that came out of early experiments with LSD influenced the trends of the counterculture, in that members of the movement preached love, peace, and consciousness.

Unfortunately, Harvard eventually fired both Leary and Albert, but that did not end their psychedelic experiments. They
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moved into a large estate known as Millbrook and continued their tests with a group of people also living at the estate. Leary, despite being fired, was still motivated to continue his LSD research. In an interview, Leary said, “we have dedicated men who manufacture LSD and other psychedelics and release them under controlled circumstances in given arenas to see what will happen.” He discussed how there were over one million doses released in Haight-Ashbury, an area in San Francisco known as a countercultural haven for hippies and the like.

One of the leading figures in the counterculture that did the most to spread the message of ingesting LSD was Ken Kesey and the Merry Pranksters. Recorded in Tom Wolfe’s *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, Wolfe portrayed Kesey as having only one real goal: for everyone to do acid (granted he had to be the one to facilitate it and decide who does how much at what time). Kesey first tried LSD-25 as a volunteer for drug experiments at Menlo Park in late 1959, before it became well-known. As Wolfe wrote, “how many?—maybe two dozen people in the world were on to this incredible secret!” LSD was still relatively unknown to the mass public when Kesey first started to do it. When he set off on his bus trip with the Merry Pranksters, he wanted more people to know about LSD and to take it to experience it for themselves because Kesey believed it was a mind-opening substance. By driving cross-country, Kesey was able to influence many to join the counterculture by trying LSD. He also created an image associated with the counterculture, which was Day-Glo colors and disheveled looking youth, a contrast from the styles that were popular in the early 1960s.

Throughout the 1960s, the public’s view of LSD was still hostile, even with the work that Leary and Albert did. A *Time* Magazine article from 1966, entitled “Drugs: The Dangers of LSD,” described multiple stories illustrating the negative effects of taking LSD. The media sensationalized the dangers of consuming drugs; LSD was a new psychedelic that people knew very little about, and therefore the public feared it. In 1966 the New York Times featured pictures of people looking like they were in deep despair while on LSD with quotes like, “I saw myself walking through a graveyard… I saw things I didn’t want to look at….A dream was not like what I was
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going though….This is more real, vivid.”16 While this was written after the Merry Pranksters launched their bus tour, the media highlighted LSD and drugs in general as bad and dangerous. With the feeling of danger surrounding drugs, it became almost exhilarating to do them; it was another way to rebel against mainstream media. The counterculture was dubbed the counterculture because the people involved went against the norm and what they believed society expected everyone to do. By taking LSD and other drugs, people were acting out against typical societal rules, and they believed they were opening up their consciousness.

As Kesey’s journey with The Merry Pranksters continued, LSD started to gain popularity and the counterculture community was forming. Journalist René Dubos argued that “for thousands of years there have been attempts to provide alternatives for the existing social order in response to the perennial grounds for dissent: hierarchy and privilege, distrust of bureaucracy, disgust with hedonism and consumerism.”17 Dubos was correct here, but the 1960s counterculture was more than just disobeying authority and creating a counter society, it included the idea of expanding consciousness, brotherly love, and trying new things, all which could be done using drugs.

While Ken Kesey’s influence was the strongest, he alone could not have created the counterculture community. Acid rock bands helped to further spread the message of engaging in drugs and opening one’s mind. As Richard Goldstein illustrated, “musical ideas are passed from group to group like a joint.”18 As the Beatles turned more and more psychedelic sounding, and the Grateful Dead grew in popularity, more acid rock bands popped up, singing songs of good vibrations and drugs. Charles Kaiser described John Lenin and George Harrison’s first time doing LSD, in which John thought he was in a submarine, which may have been the inspiration for Yellow Submarine.19 Kaiser also pointed out that “Beatlemania and the psychedelic era reached their common peak.”20 Bands like the Beatles and the Grateful Dead were able to spread the gospel of drug culture more rapidly and widespread than prominent figures could. People who did LSD and listened to their

---
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music felt it in a different way, which helped create the signature sound of acid rock. Often, these bands became the faces of certain recreational drugs, and people associated the bands, like the Grateful Dead, purely with LSD.

The underground press, too, had a large influence on the spread of ideas during the counterculture. In fact, in a study done by James L. Spate for the American Sociology Review, he analyzed the major values in underground press, and found that expressivity was the most important one, with instrumental themes as the least important, and political concerns between the two.21 Alan Young, a member of the Liberation News Services, described underground newspapers during the 1960s as focused on “psychedelic graphics, poetry and articles on drugs, which appealed to the hippie generation.”22 Allan Katzman, the managing editor of Manhattan’s East Village Other, which was the initiator of the Underground Press Syndicate, expressed, “we hope to transform the middle class by internal and external stimuli, by means of media and LSD.”23 These publications were mostly aimed at the counterculture, and, because they featured drug content, they linked the counterculture and drug use.

On January 14 1967, Timothy Leary spoke to the crowd at the Human Be-In in San Francisco and told them to “turn on, tune in, drop out.”24 He wanted people to dedicate themselves to LSD and open their consciousness. He even “suggested that the use of drugs would decondition youth, allowing them to be deprogrammed and reprogrammed (apparently for the better good of society).”25 Unfortunately for Leary, only a minority of the population would partake in the mind-altering experiences that Leary, Kesey, and others advocated so considerably. In fact, according to a Gallup poll taken in 1969, “only 4% of American adults said that they had tried marijuana.”26 Even with such a small amount of drug users in the United States during the 1960s, drug culture was still huge in the counterculture community. Without it, it would be difficult to imagine exactly how the counterculture would have played out.

25 Perone, James, Music of the Counterculture Era (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2004), 113
The American counterculture in the 1960s created a lasting *zeitgeist* in the United States. Aspects of it can still be seen in the modern world. If it were not for drugs, then the core ideas and trends of the counterculture would not have existed. By influencing the music, writings, clothes, and ideas, drugs were the main cause of the counterculture.
The Chico Historian
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The Pill and 1960s American Society

THE PILL AND 1960S AMERICAN SOCIETY
Jeanette Adame

The introduction of the birth control Pill as a contraceptive in 1960 was arguably one of the most revolutionary legalizations in the history of the Federal Drug Administration. For the first time in United States history, prescription medication would be given for social, rather than medical purposes. The Pill sparked controversy across the nation, and while American citizens argued over its morality, women of all ages and marital statuses lined up for the magical Pill that would prevent pregnancy. Emerging as a materialized dream of feminist Margaret Sanger, the Pill flew off the manufacturing line and into the hands of women across the nation. In 1962, just two years after the legalization of the contraceptive, approximately 1.2 million American women used the Pill. By 1965, 6.5 million women took the Pill, making it the most used form of birth control in the United States.2

Initially legalized as a menstrual agent, the creators of the Pill carefully crafted the way in which they presented the Pill to the FDA. American attitude toward morality remained stuck in the sexually rigid spirit of the 1950s, and most viewed premarital sex as a sin. As a result, Margaret Sanger petitioned for the Pill’s use as a population-controlling agent, an issue that captured the paranoia of mainstream American society during the Sixties.3 Americans believed that the contraceptive would help family planning, and ultimately inhibit the population growth. However, the result was instead an increased ability for women to enjoy their private sexual lives, and discuss their sexuality with friends and lovers without fear or shame. In this paper I will argue that despite the claims of the American majority, the Pill did not act as a population regulator, and instead became a liberating agent for women’s sexuality, both in the public and private sphere.

Margaret Sanger’s dream of a new type of birth control began when she was a small child, living in the slums of New York. When she saw her mother and families around her living in poverty with a seemingly exponential amount of births in the slum, Sanger imagined a pill that would prevent women from becoming pregnant, and was also reversible, so that women could have children again when they chose. After a long life of searching for the elusive pill, Sanger reconnected

---

with her old friend Katherine McCormick, a wealthy widow who inherited her late husband’s fortune when he died from Schizophrenia. In 1950, McCormick became equally obsessed with Sanger’s dream of a birth control Pill, and inquired about how to most effectively fund the costly project of its creation. McCormick ultimately provided the connection to the Pill’s creator, Gregory Pincus, who not only believed that the creation of the Pill was possible, but was also willing to research and develop it.

In 1954, with help from Harvard doctor John Rock, Pincus discovered the effectiveness of progesterone as an anti-ovulating agent, but the chemical turned out to be costly and time consuming to extract from natural sources. When Carl Djerassi created an artificial version of progesterone, it gave the creators the manufacturing ability they needed. In 1955 progesterone was developed into Pill form and the drug company Searle manufactured Envoid, the first available Pill. Pincus, conscience of the Pill’s illegality in the United States, took his seemingly successful creation to Puerto Rico in 1956, where he tested the Pill on women. Catholic priests in the areas where the Pill was distributed immediately warned women about the “immorality” of the Pill. Yet even with the Catholic community’s disapproval, women lined up by the dozens to receive the contraceptive. Distributions focused on Puerto Rican slums, where population control persisted as a mounting issue. The success rate of the Pill as a contraceptive in these neighborhoods provided evidence for when Pincus and Rock argued for the use of the Pill in the United States. With increasing successful test results from numerous trials, the Pill was legalized as a contraceptive by the FDA in 1960, and Americans started to learn about a Pill that would allow women to control their reproductive systems.

Immediately, women and men across the nation debated the morality of the Pill. Many common Americans initially opposed the Pill for the fear of the immorality it may cause. Echoing the moral rigidness of American attitudes, Comstock laws of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries banned the distribution of birth control
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information and items provided either by physicians or through the mail during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Severe penalties for breaking these laws discouraged women and physicians alike from obtaining information on birth control practices. Although Comstock Laws were reversed in 1936, twenty-four states used imitation Comstock Laws after the Pill’s legalization. Since many Americans feared the immorality that the Pill might cause, population control became the default opinion of the majority. Upon its introduction into the pharmaceutical industry, the Pill was only available to married adults, noted in a case study in Lawrence, Kansas. The study emphasized Dr. Dale Clinton as the main distributor of the Pill in Lawrence. Upon its introduction, Dr. Clinton stated that he did not want to focus on the poor or on health care distribution. Instead, he wanted to fight the population growth that he felt was out of control in the mid-west city. These sentiments seem to have perpetuated across the United States. The majority, fearful of being labeled as sexual deviants, did not want to attribute any other reasoning to the validity of the Pill other than that the nation was in dire need of a population control agent. Meanwhile, women recognized the liberating components it could provide in their personal lives. Women also understood that the Pill would prevent them from producing excessive children within their families and from serious health hazards as a result of too many pregnancies.

The population increase in the United States resulted from the baby boomer generation that came of age in the Sixties. Many Americans became concerned about the potential poverty and unemployment that might result from a sudden inflation of young people into the job market. Coming from a generation that encountered the Great Depression, the eminent population explosion also sparked conversation about overcrowding, both within the United States and on a global level. In the minds of many Americans, the Pill emerged as the solution.

While the Pill was introduced and accepted to regulate the population, one Gallup poll contradicted the common theory that Americans wanted the Pill to function solely as population manager.
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The poll took a sample of American adults, age 20 and over, as well as a sample of teens, age 15 to 19. Conducted in 1967, well after the introduction of the Pill into American society, the poll concluded that only a small number of Americans considered themselves actually concerned with population growth. While the vast majority heard or read about the expected population explosion, only 20-30% voiced concern about it. The poll also stated that only 30% of people approved of the use of contraceptives such as the Pill in overpopulated areas where it was arguably needed most.

Coming from the age of purity in the fifties, many Americans used population control as an excuse to use the Pill, but women increasingly utilized it for their own sexual lives instead. Women gained unprecedented amounts of control over their bodies with the legalization of the Pill. However, mainstream American society thought this freedom should be given only to married couples. In the previously mentioned Gallup poll, only four percent approved of the use of the Pill among unmarried teens. Minority groups within American society spoke out against the Pill for a variety of reasons, including morality and fear of sexual liberation for women.

The Catholic Church represented the most outspoken of those who feared the Pill’s immorality during the Sixties. The Church commonly opposed any form of birth control, and generally saw the hindrance of biology during sex as an opposition to God’s will. Until 1951, the Church approved of abstinence as the only form of birth control. If one wished to engage in intercourse, the Church held that one should allow God to decide if conception would occur or not. Under Pope Pius XII, the Church officially approved the rhythm method as a form of birth control, which relied on abstinence during the height of fertility in a woman’s menstrual cycle. Couples monitored when the woman menstruated and planned their sexual activity outside of the ovulation period.

Upon the Pill’s legalization, Pope John XXIII did not immediately discredit it as immoral. In June 1963 the Pope convened a Papal commission on population growth and family planning. The result challenged the Church’s teachings of the rhythm method as the only acceptable form of birth control—by a very vocal 60 to 4. This led many to believe that the Church would officially change its stance on
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birth control and the Pill. However, upon the death of Pope John XXIII and the ascension of Pope Paul VI, these hopes were quickly stifled. In 1968 Pope Paul VI issued *Humanae Vitae*, which stated that every sex act must be open to the transmission of life.\(^{20}\) Although Pope Paul VI quickly became a staunch opponent of the Pill, many followers of the Catholic Church did not agree with him or follow the church doctrine.

While members of the Catholic Church often strictly followed the doctrines decreed by the Pope, when *Humanae Vitae* was issued, the adherents of the Church mostly did not follow the doctrine. In 1964, four years prior to the issue of the doctrine, 45% of the American Catholic population approved of artificial contraceptives. In 1974 an astonishing 83% of American Catholics approved of artificial contraceptives including the Pill. Additionally, in 1966, one out of five married Catholic women under the age of forty-five used the Pill, demonstrating their perceived sexual liberation.\(^{21}\) Using the Pill allowed for family planning within the Catholic population, and would consequently help families avoid poverty and the inability to provide for their children. After *Humanae Vitae*, families did not willingly relinquish this freedom within their personal lives. Despite issuing an official doctrine that opposed the Pill, American Catholics chose sexual freedom over the Church’s teachings.

The main argument against the use of the Pill by the Catholic Church was that it disrupted the natural cycle that occurred during sexual intercourse. Some leniency existed in very few forms of natural birth control such as the rhythm method, and in 1930, Pope Pius XI stated that married couples who did not produce life because of “natural reasons either of time or certain defects” did not sin.\(^{22}\) The Pope protected those who felt they sinned because the woman was not ovulating or either person was sterile. John Rock, the Catholic doctor who partnered in the Pill’s creation, used Pope Pius XI’s statement to his own advantage in the Sixties. In 1963, Rock published *The Time Has Come*: A Catholic Doctor’s Proposal to End the Battle Over Birth Control, a book that argued the acceptability of using contraceptives within the Catholic community. The Pill was instructed to be taken after a woman’s menstrual cycle ended, and continued for the following twenty days, taking one pill per day; Rock argued that this pattern suspended the natural ovulation cycle, but did not prevent it.\(^{23}\) During
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the intermittent ten days that a woman did not take the Pill, doctors suggested alternate forms of birth control to prevent pregnancy. Furthermore, Rock argued the Pill did not hinder the natural biology that takes place during intercourse, but simply acted as a time controlling agent, and gave women the ability to control the timing of their ovulation cycles, including when they could become pregnant. Rock’s book validated the American Catholic attitude toward the Pill and birth control in general; they no longer wanted to allow their freedom of family choice taken away by their faith. They wanted control over their sex lives and their sexuality in general. The Pill liberated Catholic women and Catholic families everywhere from the trap of unexpected pregnancies and allowed for Catholic women to enjoy sex without the fear of becoming pregnant.

The Catholic Church was not the only demographic in America to be staunchly outspoken against the Pill. African Americans vocalized their vehement opposition to the Pill, but not for the cause of morality. During the Sixties, African Americans mobilized their fight for equal citizenship and equal rights. Fighting for basic civil and human rights, the movement included a host of tactics, ranging from non-violent pacifism to military action. For many African Americans, the Pill was another form of white oppression, one that tried to prevent the growth of the American black population.

Well after the development and mass distribution of the Pill, black activists spoke out against the use of the Pill. In Ebony, an African American magazine, a 1968 article discussed the issue of the black community’s attitude towards the Pill. The article observed that many African Americans felt that the Pill was a plot by the American government to keep the black population down. During the 1967 Black Panther Conference in Newark, the Pill was labeled a form of “black genocide.” The term stuck and black opposition toward the Pill increased after the conference convened. Douglass Stewart, director of the National Office of Community Relations, stated that, “Many Negro women have told our workers, ‘There are two kinds of pills—one for white women and one for us…and the one for us causes sterilization.’ This is very real for some women.” The overarching aim of the article was to steer women away from this view, and to educate women on how the Pill worked.
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The poor within the black community could benefit from the Pill in terms of social mobility. Families living below the poverty line, white and black, could provide better futures for their children if they had the ability to control how many kids they conceived. Many black women understood this, and despite male African American disapproval, women took the Pill for both social and medical reasons.\(^\text{27}\) While women genuinely feared that the Pill might cause sterilization, they took that risk because the Pill gave the family unit the ability to focus on the children born out of planned pregnancies. This was especially important to low income and poverty level African American mothers who wanted to support their children, and fight their personal exploitation from black males within the family.\(^\text{28}\) Black activist women, such as Toni Cade, spoke dually about the Pill as a liberating agent and as a means of oppression through population control. In her speech, Cade did not take a stance on the issue, but instead asked women to formulate their own opinions on the issue, because, in the end women are subject to the “tyranny of the child burden,” not men.\(^\text{29}\)

While opposition to the Pill prevailed among African American males, African American females took the Pill anyway, ignoring their fear of its potential sterilizing effects.\(^\text{30}\) Many reasons have been given as to why black males opposed the Pill, but one included the reasoning that many militant black activists held, which was that the Pill was a genocidal agent, prescribed by the U.S. government to keep the black population down. This paranoia resulted from Jim Crow laws and violence against blacks, especially in southern states. Population growth in the Fifties and Sixties spurred discussions over the need for birth control among white county and state officials. One North Carolina official observed that, “on one occasion a health officer didn’t think his county needed contraception… When he discovered that the Negroes were accounting for 85 per cent of the births, he quickly changed his mind.”\(^\text{31}\) African Americans believed that as a severely oppressed minority, they needed high birth rates in order to maintain their culture and identity. Many also argued that a high black population would help aid the Civil Rights movement and the coming revolution. The need for a “black army” was a main concern for militant African Americans, especially militant Civil Rights
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activists. An African American doctor said, “Our birth rate is the only thing we have. If we keep on producing, they’re going to have to either kill us or grant us full citizenship.” This was a common attitude held especially by black activists in the Sixties, yet African American women still used the Pill.

In addition to the fear of a “black genocide” brought on by the Pill, African American men feared the power shift that the Pill would bring in the form of sexual liberation. Family planning workers in the Sixties observed a substantial backlash from black males because they feared the sexual liberation of their partners. One worker stated, “they [black males] feel that ‘The Pill,’ for example, puts the wife on an equal sexual plane with them—that it makes it easier for women to ‘two-time’ them because there is little or no danger of pregnancy.”

As noted by Toni Cade, black women had to choose which form of oppression they feared more—the minority status of African Americans in the country, or the sexual slavery and the burden of child bearing that their male partners could put on them.

Black women feared both the oppression of the U.S. government and the oppression of childbirth. As the Sixties pressed on, women increasingly aspired for important roles in the larger societal sphere. While many black women feared that the Pill was causing “black genocide,” they also wanted to be a part of the activism to stop the oppression of African Americans, which for them, included the emancipating choice of parenthood. Combined with a desire to provide a better life for the children they did have, African American women chose the Pill to liberate themselves and their children from poverty and oppression.

Ironically, emerging in a country that did not approve of sex outside of marriage in the nineteen sixties, the Pill as a form of contraception gained surprisingly rapid popularity. The Pill not only survived this culture, but ultimately changed it, and became a major factor in the phenomenon known as the sexual revolution. Despite backlash from entities including the Catholic Church and the African American community, women took the Pill as soon as they could obtain it.

The Pill led to the sexual revolution because it allowed women to experiment freely without fear of pregnancy and talk about their sexual desires for the first time. Although women gained access to birth
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control for a considerable time prior to the sexual revolution in various forms, including condoms and diaphragms, the Pill was immensely more effective and reduced the risk of a woman needing an abortion. Abortions were illegal during the Sixties, and women sought to obtain them from both practicing family doctors and back alley doctors. The latter often proved painful and scared women both emotionally and physically. The Pill did not immediately and significantly change American’s behavior regarding sex, but instead liberated women from the fear of pregnancy and the social stigmatization that came with premarital sex and pregnancy during the Fifties and Sixties. A staunch double standard existed that allowed men to explore sex freely but imprisoned women from fear of child conception. The Pill enabled women to dilute this double standard, as married and single women across the country explored their sexuality independently. Conversations began between women and their partners and friends about what was sexually pleasing and desirable for women—a dialogue unknown to generations before. The sexual revolution had many positive impacts on women’s private lives, which carried over into the decades that followed.

College students quickly recognized the liberating agents of the Pill, and broke away from the oppressive natures of their universities. The youth of the Sixties explored their sexuality and vigorously joined in the sexual revolution. From its initial introduction into American medicine, many college students and counterculture youth saw the Pill as a sexual liberator. After the introduction of the Pill, many universities abandoned in loco parentis. Although college administrators warned their students to hold themselves to a high moral standard, many students felt that if they were old enough to be drafted off to Vietnam, then they should also be old enough to have sex with who they chose—and be free of worry from pregnancy. As a result, young adults started to engage in sex more openly, and some doctors discreetly prescribed the Pill to women because they did not want to have to them coming back for abortions six months later. By 1969 half of all college students in coed facilities took the Pill. Although the Pill was available to single college students, it was not legally prescribed to single people until 1972. The Baird v. Eisenstadt decision overturned that and barred the government from
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discriminating against who could and could not receive birth control. Bill Baird, a professor at the University of Boston, fought in the lawsuit for the right of single women to obtain the Pill. Baird responded to a petition signed by nearly 700 students at the University of Boston to challenge the Supreme Court’s decision, which at the time allowed only married individuals to receive birth control. Baird strategically placed himself in front of law authority and intentionally handed a single nineteen-year-old woman a condom and contraceptive foam, which led to his arrest and the resulting court case. Planned Parenthood did not back Baird in his fight for single adults to obtain the Pill because they feared the association with the charges of immorality. However, single people still obtained the Pill in the Sixties, and liberated themselves from the fear of pregnancy. As men and women had more sex for the purpose of pleasure instead of procreation, scientific discovery would result in a revolution for women’s sex lives.

In the mid-nineteen Sixties, the door was thrown open for women to be free from the fear of pregnancy, and to discuss the satisfaction that they did or did not experience during sex. Scientists explored the female orgasm, and as a result, women became sexually liberated almost overnight. Previously, men viewed women who did not orgasm during sex as “frigid,” a derogatory term used during the Fifties for females who could not reach the same pinnacle of pleasure as their male partners. In reality, “frigid” women lacked the biologically correct stimulation for female sex organs, and consequently became frustrated with their sexual lives and partners. With the introduction of the Pill, and increased sexual exploration, women realized that they were not “frigid,” but instead lacked fulfillment from their partners, and scientific studies backed up their claims.

The female orgasm was explored in a 1966 experiment conducted by Dr. William Masters and Virginia Johnson. In the experiment, the test subject was a woman who had sex with a plastic tube with a camera inside of it while stimulating her clitoris. The findings from the experiment unveiled an orgasm that was completely unrivaled by any orgasm experienced by a man. Women previously thought achieving orgasm was extremely rare, and only vaginal orgasms were deemed significant. After the findings, women suddenly became obsessed with the quest for the “Holy Wail,” in orgasms both

vaginal and clitoral.\textsuperscript{41} Dr. Masters explained that the experiment turned sex into an act of physiology, and female sex quickly became something that the government could not regulate. Dr. Masters further stated that, “lawyers and legislators have taken a hand in telling us how to regulate sexual activity. They don’t, of course, presume to regulate heart rate.”\textsuperscript{42} The result of the experiment had vast social implications. Sex became a personal and physiological matter that the government could not infringe on, and as females became increasingly equal in the bedroom, men struggled to keep up. Women also started to talk about their sexual experiences and desires. Conversations about sex were improper for women in the early twentieth century, but the emergence of the Pill and the Master’s-Johnson experiment changed this social stigma forever.

Women who participated in the sexual revolution of the Sixties found that men did not equally match their quest for orgasm. Men still viewed the female orgasm as inferior, and as a result, many women faked orgasms in order to please their partners. Some American women blamed the Pill, since it gave men an excuse to have more sex with their partners without worrying about pregnancy. And while men often utilized this excuse, more and more women complained about their inability to climax with their partners. Women fully explored their sexuality in its entirety with the development of the Pill, including its shortcomings. The Pill sparked conversations about sex that would have never occurred had the Pill not enabled couples to engage in sexual activity without the fear of pregnancy. However, some Americans have theorized that men used the Pill to their own sexual advantages, and did not focus on woman’s sexual needs, and reasoned there was no true sexual revolution during the Sixties.

An article written in \textit{The Saturday Evening Post} in 1968 stated that the sexual revolution did not and was not occuring in America. Arno Karlen argued that sexual activity was not increasing or evolving. People did not abstain from sex because they worried about pregnancy, they just worried about getting pregnant after the fact. Karlen added that he believed in the need for a “real” sexual revolution that could allow “people to live healthy, expressive sexual lives without legal penalties and social obstacle courses.”\textsuperscript{43} Natalie Angler wrote a similar article that argued the expansion of cities and the “car culture” that came with the automobile allowed for unmarried adults to have
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premarital sex. Angler further contended that the Pill did not lead to any sort of a sexual revolution because married women’s usage far outpaced that of single women throughout the decade. However, she stated that the Pill did attribute to the liberation of women from the domestic sphere and allowed females to enter more areas of social and political life. This social mobility would not have been available to most women without the “Pill’s power of predictability.”44 Both authors failed to recognize that the sexual revolution also meant that Americans now had the ability to hold important conversations regarding sexual desires and needs. While the sexual revolution of the Sixties may not have achieved every idealist goal that many Americans desired, it began a conversation that continued into the decades that followed, and changed the sexual lives of women forever.

The double standard of the emphasis of male pleasure during sex versus female satisfaction was not the only consequence of the sexual revolution. Although the Pill acted as a sexual liberator for many women, they also recognized its family planning abilities. Single women wished to avoid pregnancy, and married women who had an abundant amount of unplanned pregnancies not only feared for the health of their unborn children, but also for their own well being.45 Despite the Pill’s effectiveness in preventing pregnancy, women were uncertain of how to use the Pill correctly and would often find themselves pregnant due to incorrect usage. In fact, studies that analyzed out-of-wedlock births after the introduction of the Pill highlight its liberating factors, rather than its control over family planning and population expansion. In 1965, five years after the introduction of the Pill, 24% of black infants and 3.1% of white infants were born to single mothers. In 1990, well after the introduction of the Pill and during a time of less moral rigidity over the issue of premarital sex, 64% of black infants and 18% of white infants were born to single mothers. Although introduced as a family planning agent, the Pill actually increased births among single women, illustrating its instrumentation as a sexual liberator for females. Because women felt free to have sex before marriage, shotgun marriages—a practice employed during the Fifties that included a quick marriage for the prize of sex—increasingly diminished. As women started to explore their sexuality, men pressured their unmarried partners to have sex, and when the couple procreated, the male often felt he was responsible for
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the child. While the Pill did serve as a liberalizing agent to women, it consequently put more pressure on them when they did become pregnant. Women felt more responsible for their sexual acts as society became more open to the idea of sex outside of marriage. This attitude resulted in more out-of-wedlock births that are seen in the decades that followed the introduction of the Pill, and in society today. While sexually liberated, women often participated in the same oppression of childbirth that they did before the Pill.

The increase of single mother births may have resulted from the lack of information on how to use the Pill correctly. Many magazines, including Ebony and The Saturday Evening Post, published articles in the Sixties to educate their readers on what the Pill did, how it worked, the potential side effects, and the myths associated with its use. However, education, especially among single women, was increasingly difficult because of the constant debate over morality of premarital sex in the Sixties and the legislation surrounding the Pill. An experiment conducted from 1966 to 1968 at Mt. Sinai Hospital observed the trends of poverty level youths that obtained different information on birth control and family planning from the hospital. Most women came from low-income families, and were part of African American communities that received little to no information on the Pill and family planning. During their pregnancies, approximately 400 girls separated into two groups. The first was enrolled in a family clinic plan, where they received an abundant amount of information on the Pill and family planning. The second group was enrolled in an outpatient program, and received very basic information on the Pill and family planning. The results showed that 84% of girls in the family clinic plan used birth control regularly, while 68% of girls in the outpatient program used birth control regularly. Both programs provided information about birth control, but the family clinic plan provided better assistance on how to use birth control. Only 8% of the girls in the family clinic plan became pregnant within a year of having their first child while 16% in the outpatient program became pregnant again. Most of these girls revealed their disappointment at the prospects of a second pregnancy. In some case studies outside of the experiment,
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girls reported to have taken the Pill after intercourse, and in another account, one teen ingested an entire 20 day’s supply before a date, “just in case.”\textsuperscript{50} The findings from the experiment, along with outside case studies, suggest that availability of birth control was not enough. Women also needed information on how to use birth control effectively.\textsuperscript{51}

In communities across the globe, the Pill acted as a liberating agent for married and single women. However, the liberation of sexuality among women produced negative and positive effects. While it placed women on a more equal sexual standing to men, its availability increased the likelihood of single parenting due to lack of information about the Pill. Women explored their sexual freedom, and men continued their ignorant attitude toward female needs during sex, and evaded their responsibility when procreation occurred.

Ultimately, the Pill was not the solution to population control, and perhaps it was never meant to be. While conservatives questioned the morality of the Pill, women from every demographic eagerly took this new form of birth control upon its introduction in the Sixties and consequently became sexually liberated from the fear of unexpected pregnancy. Even though the Pill was effective in preventing pregnancy, women did not always receive the proper education to utilize it correctly, especially those in poverty. Considerable backlash occurred as a result of the Pill, but many women ignored the criticism, and enjoyed sex as men had—without the fear of childbirth. The freedom to engage in sex without worry of pregnancy sexually liberated women throughout the decade of the 1960s, and enabled women begin having conversations about their sexual desires and needs during intercourse. The introduction of the Pill led to a slow but steady emancipation of women in both their public and private lives.
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2016 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:

Jeanette Adame

Liam Bird

Jake Houshmand

Gregory A. Johnson

Mark Ohlmann

Benjamin Selfaison

Matthew Williams