



**Florida
Conference
of
Historians**

FCH Annals
Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians

Volume 18
March 2011

Michael S. Cole, Editor

FCH Annals: The Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians (ISSN 1076-4585), is published annually by the Florida Conference of Historians, and includes a selection of papers presented at the most recent annual meeting. Inquiries or requests to purchase copies should be directed to mcole@fgcu.edu, or to the History Program at Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Boulevard South, Fort Myers, Florida 33965.

Copyright: © 2011 The Florida Conference of Historians. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior written permission of the copyright holder. Requests should be directed to mcole@fgcu.edu, or to the History Program at Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Boulevard South, Fort Myers, Florida 33965.

Disclaimer: The Publisher, The Florida Conference of Historians, Florida Gulf Coast University, and the editors cannot be held responsible for any errors or consequences resulting from the use of information published in this journal. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher, the editors, The Florida Conference of Historians, Florida Gulf Coast University, or the History Program at Florida Gulf Coast University.

Editorial Board

Michael S. Cole, *Editor*

Editorial Board Members

Gregory J. Balan
Ryan M. Boyer
Jennifer Cannon
Dawn Cappiello
Terri L. Crowley
Christopher Epifanio
Charles E. Frost
Ashley N. Hall
Aaron Hoppenstedt
Ginger Kalinski
Matthew P. Kaye
Heather A. Kiszkiel
W.J.B. Mattingly

Published in memory of Dr. Thomas (Tom) M. Campbell, the driving force behind the creation of the Florida Conference of Historians.

**Florida Conference of Historians
Officers 2009-2010**

President

Mike Epple
Florida Gulf Coast University

President-Elect

David Proctor
Tallahassee Community College

Treasurer

Jesse Hingson
Jacksonville University

Secretary

David Proctor
Tallahassee Community College

Local Arrangements

Madeleine Hirsiger-Carr
Independent Scholar, Tallahassee Community College
Adjunct History Instructor, and Wakulla Springs State Park Volunteer.

Thomas M Campbell Award

Beginning with Volumes 6/7, the Florida Conference of Historians has presented the Thomas M. Campbell Award for the best paper published in the Annual Proceedings (now Annals) of that year.

Thomas M. (Tom) Campbell was the driving force behind the creation of the Florida Conference of Historians, at that time called The Florida College Teachers of History, over 40 years ago. It was his personality and hard work that kept the conference moving forward. Simply put, in those early years he was the conference.

Tom was a professor of US Diplomatic history at Florida State University. The Thomas M. Campbell Award is in his name so that we may recognize and remember his efforts on behalf of the Florida Conference of Historians

Recipients

2011: TBA

2010: Amy M. Porter, Ph.D., Georgia Southwestern University

2009: Christine Lutz, Ph.D., Georgia State University

2008: Vincent Intondi, ABD, American University

2007: Steve MacIsaac, PhD, Jacksonville University

2006: Dennis P. Halpin and Jared G. Toney, University of South Florida

2005: David Michel, PhD, Chicago Theological Seminary

2004: Robert L. Shearer, PhD, Florida Institute of Technology

2002-3: J. Calvitt Clarke III, PhD, Jacksonville University

2000-1: J. Calvitt Clarke III, PhD, Jacksonville University

From the Editor

With this volume The Florida Conference of Historians introduces a new title to the publication, which was formerly entitled the *Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians*. We hope that the new title, *FCH Annals: Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians*, will serve as a marker of the growth of the organization, and the increased scope and professionalism of the conference. The 2010 Annual meeting was attended not only by scholars from the state of Florida, but also by a number of scholars from other states and from outside the United States. This volume also marks the transfer of the editorship from Florida International University to Florida Gulf Coast University.

The papers published in this volume were selected from those submitted by authors who presented their work at the 2010 Annual Meeting in Wakulla Springs, Florida. The papers were screened by a panel of anonymous reviewers who made the final decision (with my collaboration) as to which of them were most suitable for publication.

There are a number of people whose efforts must be recognized for their contributions to the smooth transfer of this publication to Florida Gulf Coast University. The previous editor, Anthony Atwood, was most gracious in providing guidance and insight to me regarding the details of how to put the volume together. Donna Henry, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Florida Gulf Coast University, provided material support for professional printing of the volume. The support of Eric Strahorn, Chair of the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Florida Gulf Coast University, was instrumental. Nicola Foote, from the same department, helped me coordinate this effort with past and present officers of the FCH. Megan McShane of the Department of Visual and Performing Arts at Florida Gulf Coast University assisted me with a number of technical and aesthetic details. Dawn Cappiello, Graduate Research Assistant in the History M.A. Program at Florida Gulf Coast University, contributed many hours of time correcting obscure mistakes of formatting in the manuscripts (any oversights in this regard are strictly my responsibility, not hers). The work of Aaron Hoppenstedt in preparing the final layout of the volume was invaluable. If I have inadvertently omitted to mention anyone else who contributed to the success of this effort, please forgive the oversight as it was unintentional.

Michael S. Cole
Florida Gulf Coast University
19 March 2011

Table of Contents

- 1 Tudor Imagery and Crown Identity: The Reformation in Art
Jessica L. Hoeschen
- 8 Refugee Resettlement in Jacksonville: The Case of World Relief 1991-2009
Altaye Alaro Alambo
- 16 Pigs in Politics: Pigasus's Role in the 1968 Presidential Election
Elizabeth Bryant
- 25 A State To Build, A South To Save, A Nation To Convince: Governor
LeRoy Collins and Florida's 1956 Racial Primary
Seth A. Weitz
- 33 The Anti-Colonial Struggle of the Tiwa (Lalung) Peasants in Assam:
A Study of the Phulaguri Uprising from Selected Archival Records
Bandana Baruah
- 39 A Declining Monarchy in Crisis: The Reign of Guari Nath Singha
Pallavi Baruah
- 49 An Enterprising Spirit: Richard Hamilton, 1811-1819
J. Calvitt Clarke III
- 65 West Indian Workers and the Panama Canal: A Diplomatic Perspective
Ginger Kalinski
- 77 Patriotism and Protest: The Nicaraguan Contras Come to North Florida, 1986
Roger Peace
- 85 Revolutionary Violence and the Anarcho-Bolshevik Split
Frank Piccirillo
- 92 Batman as Moral Exemplar: A Way of Being in the World in Batman
Begins and The Dark Knight
Katie Grainger
- 105 Anne Rowe Goldman: Refashioning Women's News in St. Petersburg, Florida
Kimberly Voss
- 113 *Appendix:*
Program of the Florida Conference of Historians Annual Meeting, 2010

Tudor Imagery and Crown Identity: The Reformation in Art

Jessica L. Hoeschen
University of Central Florida

The Tudor period extended from Henry VII's 1485 victory in the War of the Roses to Elizabeth I's death in 1603 and was marked by political and cultural upheaval. As England moved into the early modern era, Henry VIII's desire to provide a strong male heir and secure the Tudor dynasty created a major catalyst for change. The most significant development of this period is the English Reformation, which initiated significant alterations, such as increased literacy rates and the political redrawing of Crown boundaries. Assessing Henry VIII's political motivations during this movement and their influence on English culture are critical to a holistic understanding of how the English Reformation restructured the popular mindset of government and religion.

Beginning with Henry VIII's dissolution of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon and ending with his death in 1547, the initial period of the English Reformation created a new understanding of the Crown.¹ Whereas religion was previously tied to kingship through the aspect of divine approval, the Supremacy Act naming Henry VIII as head of Church and State created a new identity of the king as a Church leader. Images and the artists responsible for their production functioned as active agents to justify this new Crown message and mitigate its radical changes. Uncovering the comprehensive role imagery played in both promoting and distributing a fluctuating royal identity requires a historical inquiry of intent, reception, and comprehension surrounding Tudor visual culture.² In this respect, the political use of images went beyond forming general royal propaganda, which is the common historical focus, to constructing an explanation for change and a directive for understanding the new Crown.

The political and cultural analysis presented here discusses these questions and addresses previous historiographical gaps in Tudor cultural studies by incorporating a diverse visual and printed source bank. Henry VIII's use of multiple imagery types requires an analysis that goes beyond examinations of restricted artworks

¹ While religious historians debate the conclusion of the English Reformation, an ending point between 1540 and 1550 often supported. See: Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980) and Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier, eds., *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

² Researching art and its functions through these terms offers a balance to standard historiographical approaches. It mediates between propagandist histories' assumptions of general, positive comprehension and revisionist accounts' rejection of successful visual communication. The propagandistic category is one of the most popular when analyzing Tudor art and is termed "the cult of the monarchy" by Roy Strong in *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography I* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1995), 4-5. For examples, see: John King, *Tudor royal iconography: literature and art in an age of religious crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989) and Christopher Lloyd and Simon Thurley, *Henry VIII: Images of a Tudor King* (London: Phaidon Press, 1990). For example of histories critical of visual culture analysis, see: Sydney Anglo, *Images of a Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992)

such as royal paintings to focus on the existence of a diverse visual communication of power between the Crown and the English people.³ The importance Henry VIII placed on visual culture is represented in his use of murals, painted state portraiture, coronations, and Bible engravings to represent an ideal Crown. By politically retooling culture through selective alterations and maintenance of various cultural traditions, Henry VIII formed a positive image of a new Crown and Church while still retaining some critical cultural and social continuity.

Thomas Talbot's goal of achieving the "true countenance" of Henry VIII in his royal portraiture history reveals Henry's intent to create one, iconic image of himself and his reign.⁴ Talbot's engraving contains similarities to other royal imagery, portraying Henry VIII's success in creating a standard, idealized representation that became an icon of his kingly identity and remained embedded in social memory.⁵ Creating this consistent image involved repetition of Henry VIII's desired representation in engravings and portraiture. Most likenesses of the king reveal this attention to standardized form by following consistent artistic conventions for displaying physical strength, such as strong figural and posture positions, and those displaying royal status, such as highly-detailed regal attire. Henry VIII focused on splendid fabrics and jewels as essential components in the creation and depiction of spectacle. The concept of spectacle as tied to visual culture was also represented in public performances such as coronations and jousts. Reports of jousting armor purposefully exaggerating Henry VIII's bodily dimensions reveal intent to use such cultural traditions as avenues for displaying royal grandeur.⁶

Aside from intended royal use of images, society's reception and comprehension are also critical questions when evaluating the existence of visual communication between the monarchy and the laity throughout the Reformation. Reception, or the availability of illustrations and their dissemination throughout society, explains the ability of the English population to interact with royal and religious imagery. Comprehension, or the probability of general understanding, focuses on studies of literacy rates and accounts of lower class interactions with imagery to reveal that a majority of English society was capable of understanding basic imagery and power symbols. Popular illustrated texts such as books of hours and calendars demonstrate a wide reception and possible comprehension of images through their reliance on

³ To fully address these concerns primary texts such as Parliament records and church injunctions are included to establish the changing political and social atmosphere of Henrician England. Additionally, other written sources such as such as treatises, descriptions of royal events, and calendars help gain understanding of possible royal intent and public response.

⁴ Thomas Talbot, Thomas Tymme, and Thomas Twyne, *A Booke ccontaining the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England, from William Conqueror, unto our soueraine Lady Queene Elizabeth...* ([London], 1597), cover page, in Early English Books Online Database (EEBO), <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed March 10, 2008).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Christopher Lloyd and Simon Thurley, *Henry VIII*, 69.

engravings to relay daily messages and clarify printed information. Books of hours and calendars' high reception rates, due to theft and reselling, combined with upper class perceptions that these basic images functioned as "bokes for the laymen, makes images in these works critical to the study of Reformation culture.⁷

The *Henrician Kalendar of the Shepards* (1518) offers an example of such visual communication by employing a woodcut of a plowman working to visually reinforce the printed caption, "[a]nd hereafter followeth the saying of the Sheparde to the Plowman."⁸ This method of combining image and text to increase comprehension across social levels demonstrates a dependency on image understanding as a means to distribute and clarify daily reference information. These cultural precedents left the majority of Tudor society prepared to interpret similar, simplistic symbols in Crown portraiture and ceremonies, especially those built on previous cultural and religious icons. The enhanced political function of visual culture during the Reformation period to establish precedent for the Crown's new political station is evident in Henry VIII's unusually high quantities of visual commissions and the large funds he spent on artistic commissions.⁹ Image comparison is the best method to illustrate the creation of this new kingly identity through art and the extent to which it depended on a dualistic narrative of maintaining some pre-Reformation cultural elements while removing others and incorporating new power symbols.

In pre-Reformation Tudor society the importance of imagery was widely established. The Catholic Church promoted a visually rich religion and this institution became the cornerstone of the English community through charitable economic ties and roles in local government. Additionally, rituals involving symbols were used in life events such as marriage, death and in proof of miracles.¹⁰ With the onset of the English Reformation, Henry VIII had to contend with a visual dilemma. Catholic images counter-productive to Henry's messages of new Crown power required removal, but he still needed to maintain some cultural stability in this frenetic period. The switch to Protestantism additionally dictated the need to remove idols from worship and to enhance the superiority of a text-based type of religion. Henry VIII used this transition to his benefit by using mandatory Bibles as one of the most effective cultural vehicles to communicate new royal power. This

⁷ Eamon Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580* (New Haven: Yale University, 1992), 1-9 and Tessa Watt, *Cheap print and popular piety, 1550-1640* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Martin Bucer, *A treatise declaring and showing that images are not to be suffered in churches* ([London], 1535), n.p.g., in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed April 8, 2008).

⁸ *Here begynmeth the kalendar of shepardes* ([London], 1518), iv, in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed March 13, 2008).

⁹ Susan Foister, *Holbein and England* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2006), 12-14.

¹⁰ Calvin Jean, *The mynde of the godly and excellent lerned man M. Iohn Caluhyne...* ([Ippyswiche], 1548), X.v. -A.vi., in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed January 6, 2010); David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999), 2.

need to promote some images, while removing others, generated a visual paradox evident in Henrician church injunctions mandating the removal of Catholic Church art during a period attributed to general imagery growth.¹¹ It is argued that this paradox was part of a Henrician political strategy allowing the monarchy to use visual culture when it was needed more than ever, at least when trying to rewrite authority in the realm, while still making changes necessary to erase papal ties.

Henry VIII's political strategies with imagery allowed him to mitigate and authorize changes while still maintaining cultural precedents. Maintaining and referring to precedent as a method of easing popular response to political and religious change is evident in Henry VIII's comparisons of his church alterations to those of previous Catholic kings. He referenced previous Catholic Church practices in his defense against rebellions, such as his claim to the Yorkshire rioters that, "in our owne church of Englande, wherof we be the supreme heed in erthe, we have done nothyng so onerous and chargeable to theym, as many of our predecessours have doone uppon moche lesse groundes."¹²

In addition to religious reforms, Henry VIII held to previous cultural concepts of monarchy through engravings, state portraits, and coronations. Henry VIII carefully selected and kept only those cultural traditions, such as the coronation, that successfully correlated with new displays of power. The coronation offered a familiar and understandable cultural event that could assuage new and possibly controversial political directions. The elaborate spectacle of Anne Boleyn's coronation exemplifies this concept. That Queen Anne's coronation was an attempt to visually celebrate, and thus glorify, a controversial change in power and royal lineage is evident in the descriptions of the event. They note the use of "goodly baners with newe armes" to promote changing heredity symbols of power, and in discussions of the ceremony's lavish display of wealth and divine approval through "golde and azure" colors on "riche cloth."¹³ Henry VIII's unprecedented display of wealth and power in this coronation, and his use of this opportunity to display the new heritage of the throne, demonstrates that the traditional cultural elements he did retain were adjusted to fit his political agenda.

Despite the social restriction of some of these performances, their descriptions in common publications demonstrate an avenue to convey these messages to the general public, and a receptive popular market. Positive and negative reactions to these cultural and political changes also show some basic comprehension of these

¹¹ Susan Foister, *Holbein and England*, 13-20.

¹² Henry VIII, *Answer made by the kynge's hygnes to the petitions of the rebelles in Yorkeshire* (1536), n.p., in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed January 6, 2010).

¹³ *The Coronation of Queen Anne*, (reprinted 1553), a.i, in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed January 6, 2010).

cultural precedents and the monarchy's changes. Queen Anne was still rejected in parts of society, and Henry VIII's religious alterations of Catholic images were often met with rebellions and continued worship of outlawed imagery.¹⁴ These responses demonstrate the importance of comprehension in considering Henry's successes and failures in using imagery to create an ideal visual depiction of English politics and religion.¹⁵

Henry the VIII's contrived continuity and disruption of culture to create and disseminate an ideal royal image is most evident in the symbols of power and wealth within state portraiture. A comparison of two Henrician portraits, the anonymous, pre-Reformation Henry VIII (ca.1520) and Jan Van Cleve's Reformation portrait Henry VIII (ca.1535), demonstrates representational similarities in body angles and positions, regal clothing, and intricate jewelry.¹⁶ The differences in these portraits, however, are significant for displaying key changes in royal intent to display and communicate power. In both images, Henry VIII's hands remain the focal point, but the earlier portrait depicts the monarch playing with a ring, while the later one portrays Henry VIII holding a scroll inscribed with Mathew 16:22, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."¹⁷ Similar attention to fashion detail and the depiction of rings in both images demonstrates continuing use of beneficial secular power motifs, but the new focus on religious text shows intent to communicate a new level of religious power. In pre-Reformation England, the same need to establish religious ruling authority did not exist. Instead, Henry and his court focused on emphasizing political power through common status and power objects, like rings. The incorporation of religious text demonstrates that, in the Reformation era, creating and disseminating a religious identity of royal power was more critical.

Another comparison demonstrating how Henry VIII could alter previous cultural symbols to fashion a new political meaning is evident in his use of David as a ruling icon throughout his reign. In the pre-Reformation environment, works describing David focused on how God "elected" and "chose" him.¹⁸ This language does not attempt to place Henry VIII in a position of religious control, but instead uses political language to demonstrate Godly support. In Reformation and post-

¹⁴ Henry VIII, *Answers made by the kynges hygnes to the petitions of the rebelles in Yorkshire* (1536), npg.; Edward VI, King of England, *A letter of that most religious and pious prince K. Edward the sixth to Nicholas Ridley Bishop of London...* ([London], 1641), in EEBO, in <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed January 6, 2010).

¹⁵ Patricia Seed notes a similar connection between spectacle, pageantry, and Catholic tradition in Spain. See: Patricia Seed, "Taking Possession and Reading Texts," in *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development*, 5th ed., edited by Stanley Katz, John Murrin, and Douglas Greenberg (New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 2001), 19-46.

¹⁶ Anon., *Henry VIII*, ca. 1520, in Christopher Lloyd and Simon Thurley, *Henry VIII*, 26; Joos Van Cleve, Henry VIII, c. 1535, The Royal Collection, London, in The Royal Collection Website, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/egallery/object.asp?maker=CLEVEJOOS&object=403368&row=3> (accessed March 28, 2008).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ John Ryckes, *The ymage of love* (1533), in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed March 8, 2008).

Reformation Biblical engravings, however, Henry VIII represented David as his visual parallel, thus assuming the identity of God's royal representative. This association was carried out through new Biblical engravings that equated David's reign to Henry VIII's, such as images focusing on David's right to rule through victory in battle and his role as God's earthly representative through banishing idolatry. Henry VIII could use these narratives to write his ruling legacy into the religious dimensions of David's royal life, such as using depictions of David's removal of idols as comparisons for Henry's removal of Catholic images.¹⁹ This change from association to direct connection with David created the necessary Biblical precedent for Henry VIII's radical breaks in religious and political environments.

While these images offered critical support, Henry VIII's main use of Biblical engravings as a method to visually construct support for the Crown's new religious identity was most evident in his emphasis on his role at the pinnacle of Bible dissemination. New Bible title pages began including engravings depicting Henry VIII on his throne at the top of the Bible disbursement chain. As Bibles became more prominent, both religiously and politically, the concept of books transformed from a pure textual source of knowledge to symbols of new religious truth. In the Coverdale Title Page, Henry VIII situated himself in the position of handing the Bible, and therefore religious truth, to the people. The power of the book to stand as an imagery device for the entirety of Henry VIII's religious program and truth was evident in the scroll on the Coverdale engraving stating: "I am not ashamed of the Gospell of Christ for it is the power of God."²⁰ This statement attests to the power of the book, labeled "Verbum Dei" or "Word of God" as a representation of God, making Henry VIII's connection to its dissemination a position comparable to the Pope's in previous imagery belief systems.²¹ The dissemination of these identical volumes down the page, originating first from a heavenly deity, and then Henry VIII enthroned, represented Henry VIII as the foremost earthly proprietor of religious truth. Thus, the Bible supplied Henry VIII with an avenue to construct and disseminate the Crown's new religious position, and also filled a cultural gap by becoming an image of devotion to replace other icons stripped from the Church.

Church injunctions reveal Henry VIII's intent to use Bibles as a way to transition previous Catholic devotion to Henry VIII and his new religious program. Injunctions, which housed the main instructions for carrying out Crown reform, consistently listed the required placement of new Bibles immediately after the

¹⁹ Hans Holbein, *The Images of the Old Testament* ([Lyons], 1549), in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed March 8, 2008).

²⁰ Hans Holbein the Younger, *Coverdale Title Page*, in *Biblia, the Bible*, trans. Miles Coverdale ([Cologne], 1535), in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed March 10, 2008).

²¹ *The Great Bible Title Page: Henry VIII Presenting His Bible to the Archbishop Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell*, in *The Great Bible* (London, 1539), in Christopher Lloyd and Simon Thurley, *Henry VIII*, 35.

mandate to remove images. This pattern created a removal and replacement correlation equating Bibles to previous Catholic imagery. Also, injunctions demonstrated the King's intent to shift loyalty and worship of images to devotion of new Church texts as concerns of whether or not the laity had "recanted" images were immediately followed with a requirement that every church have at least one "book."²² This systematic following of imagery issues with communication of holy text represented a royal appropriation of the religious power of Catholic images into a Protestant approved textual vehicle within Crown control.

Reception and comprehension of this royal message to replace previous images with text is apparent in public discussions of these changes in treatises, including Martin Bucer's plea, "[l]et us therefore have ymages not of stone, not of wood... but let us rather consyder bestye the worde of god: let us occupye and busye ourselves in it bothe night and daye."²³ Hugh Latimer's treatises and sermons conveyed similar messages, calling for a replacement program to weed out superstitions by having the laity "fed with worde and sacraments."²⁴ Henry VIII gained advantageous representation in the Church environment as the powerful devotions behind images relating to the Pope shifted to text promoting the new religious identity of the monarch.

Despite the Reformation's requirement for some necessary remodeling and reconstruction of imagery in the religious and secular arenas, Henry VIII purposefully maintained and politically calculated a visually-rich English society. This affected the Crown and the people's understandings of new political and religious environments. Aside from the general proof of images' power in society, however, the study of Crown messages and their reception demonstrates royal manipulation of visual culture to fit specific political goals versus to promote a generalized, propagandistic account of monarchy. Royal selectivity and intent played a major role in deciding which cultural traditions were maintained and which were eradicated. Themes that could be altered to fit and elevate new Crown identity, such as the use of fashion to display power and the use of hierarchal religious diagrams to promote a singular secular and religious authority, were maintained while other images, such as altars and idols, were removed. This political approach to culture demonstrates that there were royally-contrived elements of cultural continuity and disruption containing stronger and more distinct political roots than previously suggested.

²² Henry VIII, *articles to be enqyred of in the kynges maiesties visitacion* ([London], 1547), A.i – B.i., in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed March 10, 2008).

²³ Martin Bucer, *A treatise declaring and showing that images are not to be suffered in churches*, n.p., in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed April 8, 2008).

²⁴ Hugh Latimer, *The sermon that the reverende father in Christ, Hugh Latimer, Byshop of Worcester, 1537*, A.vi, in EEBO, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed April 8, 2008).

Refugee Resettlement in Jacksonville: The Case of World Relief 1991-2009

Altaye Alaro Alambo
Independent Scholar

Overview of Policy Environment

According to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1951, the UN Convention on Refugees Article 1(A2), “a refugee is someone persecuted on grounds of race, nationality, religion, political opinion, or membership to a particular social group and forced to leave his country and, “owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; [and] who not having a nationality, . . . is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return.”¹ At the end of 2009, the world refugee population was about 15 million of which two-thirds come under the care of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) while the remaining come under the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.²

The First World War dislocated millions of people. Massacres and deportations in Turkey during that conflict displaced about half-a-million Armenians. The collapse of Tsarist Russia, the Russo-Polish War and the demise of the Ottoman Empire worsened the problem.³ Most had no legal protections and were unable to get travel documents to legally cross international borders legally. Responding the League of Nations appointed Fridtjof Nansen as a High Commissioner in 1921 with a mandate to organize the repatriation of half-a-million prisoners of war and to supervise relief efforts to prevent 30 million in Bolshevik Russia from starving in that winter. He (Name) was also to amend the legal status of Russian refugees in Europe and sought their repatriation.⁴ The League tried to identify the ethnic and territorial origin of displaced persons and granted refugee status to those who had lost the protection of their country of origin. These displaced persons included Russian refugees in 1922 and Armenians Assyrians, Assyro-Chaldeans, Syrians, Kurds, and Turks in 1924.⁵

After 1933, the rise of Nazi Germany provoked massive dislocations of peoples in Europe. For instance, about 20,000 immigrants who had recently arrived in Germany were forced to immigrate to Poland. Facing persecution, in 1938, some

¹ UN Security Council Resolution 1951: UN Convention on Refugees adopted on 28 July 1951 by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons convened under General Assembly Resolution 429(v) of 14 December 1950; entry into force 22 April 1954 in accordance with article 43. <http://einshalon.com/archives/14>. (accessed December 1, 2009).

² <http://www.unhcr.org/4c176c969.html>. (accessed September 5, 2010).

³ UNHCR, “The foundation of Refugee Protection: 1920-1950.” Information Paper. http://migration.ucc.ie/immigration/what_is_a_refugee.htm. (accessed December 16, 2009).

⁴ UNHCR, “The foundation of Refugee Protection: 1920-1950.”

⁵ *Ibid.*

150,000 Jews fled Germany and another 126,000 left Austria. About half-a-million Spaniards escaped to France after the collapse of the Spanish Republic in 1939, but about 150,000 to 200,000 of them were repatriated.⁶

During World War II, some 40 million people in twenty-one countries were displaced due to forcible deportation and persecution, transfer of ethnic minorities to newly created provinces acquired by treaty or war, mass flight of civilians to escape violence, and population removals from strategic coastal lands. The situation worsened with the expulsion from Soviet-controlled, Eastern bloc countries of 12 million ethnic Germans who did not want to be repatriated. The Soviet Union argued that all the displaced persons should be repatriated, while Western Allies supported the refugees on the ground who insisted that their expulsions had taken place because of their political opinions, races, or religions.⁷

With the creation of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) in 1947, the definition of refugee moved from a general, humanitarian determination to a more legally precise, individual determinism. In this definition, refugees “included victims of the Nazi, Fascist, or Quisling regimes which had opposed the United Nations, certain persons of Jewish origin, or foreigners or stateless persons considered as refugees before the outbreak of the Second World War for reasons of race, religion, nationality, or political opinion.”⁸

On 1 January 1951 the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) replaced the IRO. Drawn up in the same year, the U.N. Convention on refugees enshrined the notion of *non-refoulement*, which prohibited removing a refugee to another country where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, social group, or political opinion. Now, international law prohibited returning refugees to countries of persecution and automatically bound all states. The convention, however, did not protect anyone who committed a crime against peace, a crime against humanity or a war crime. Originally, the convention was limited to developments in Europe before 1951. The 1967 Protocol redressed these limitations by extending protection to refugees beyond Europe and to events after 1951.⁹

However, the original convention and protocol, however, were silent on issues of asylum, which left contracting parties free to set up their own national, asylum procedures. For example, many European states introduced the concept of *de*

⁶ Astride. R. Zolberg, Astri Suhrke, and Sergio Aguayo, *Escape from Violence, Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989) 19.

⁷ Malcom J. Proudfoot, *European Refugees, 1939-52: A Study in Forced Population Movement* (London: Clarendon Press, 1957), 32; Goran Melander, “The Concept of the term refugee,” in Anna C. Bramwell, ed., *Refugees in the Age of Total War* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 7-14.

⁸ Guy Goodwin-Gill, *The Refugee in International Law* (London: Clarendon Paperbacks, 1996), 6; http://migration.ucc.ie/immigration/what_is_a_refugee.htm. (accessed December 16, 2009).

⁹ *Ibid*, International Law and the Movement of Persons Between States (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978) 141; http://migration.ucc.ie/immigration/what_is_a_refugee.htm. (accessed December 16, 2009).

facto refugees in their respective national legislation regarding those that flee violence, resist draft, , and others who did not meet all requirements of the Geneva Convention. Denmark, Finland, Sweden and Switzerland retain this *de facto* status. Most countries, however, grant some form of status on humanitarian grounds even if a particular person does not meet the provision of the Geneva Convention. This kind of protection is referred to as exceptional leave to remain or as humanitarian status to remain and is granted in the United Kingdom. This same protection is known as *Duldung* in Germany.

The UN Convention on refugees has been an integral part of United States' foreign policy, with the U.S. playing the leadership role in providing assistance, protection and durable solutions for refugees through collaboration with multilateral organizations, such as the UNHCR, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the International Organization for Migration. U.S. policy on refugee sought resettlement by supporting voluntary repatriation and local resettlement in countries of asylum. When neither of these solutions were available, the United States admits refugees for a resettlement on the basis of special humanitarian concern.¹⁰

Along with the Department of State, the Bureau of Population, Refugees, Migration (PRM), and the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) managed refugee admission to the United States. The PRM coordinated within the Department of State, as well as with the Department of Homeland Security U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (DHS/USCIS), and other agencies.¹¹

Admissions procedure and eligibility criteria are set on priority basis. Priority-1 refers to individual referrals and deals with considering refugee claims by any nationality in any part of the world. However, referrals of North Koreans and Palestinians require mutual agreement of the Department of State and DHS. These cases have been referred by the U.S. Embassy, UNHCR, or a designated Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). Priority-2 handles group referrals and is identified by the Department of State in collaboration with DHS/USCIS, UNHCR, NGOs, and experts. It includes particular groups, clans, and nationalities and involves ascertaining whether the “group is of special humanitarian concern to the United States.” Priority 3 concerns family reunification and refers to members of

¹⁰ Undersecretary for Democracy and Global Affairs, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, <http://www.state.gov/g/prm/>. (accessed December 13, 2009); US Department of State Dispatch, “World Refugee Population Doubles—US Committed to Assistance,” US Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, Jewel Lafontant-Mankarious to Senate Judiciary Committee, Transcript, Oct. 15, 1990, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi/1584/is_vi_9125076/?tag=content;coll. (accessed December 17, 2009); United States Department of State, United States Department of Homeland Security, United States Department of Health and Human Services: Proposed Refugee Admissions for Fiscal Year 2009. Report to the Congress submitted on the behalf of the President of the United States to the Committees on the Judiciary United States Senate and United States House of Representatives in Fulfillment of the Requirements of Section 201(e)(1)-(7) of the Immigration and nationality Act. <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/113507.pdf>. (accessed November 20, 2009); http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_1584/is_n1_vi_9125076/?tag=content;coll. (accessed December 17, 2009).

¹¹ United States Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/113507.pdf>, 6. (accessed November 20, 2009).

designated nationalities with immediate family members in the United States,” and the list need represent a finding by PRM that indicates the particular nationality is of special humanitarian concern to the U.S.¹²

Most view resettlement as the most appropriate solution for the growing refugee population. Their resettlement requires acclimatization and adaptation to the new social and cultural environment.¹³ Refugees accepted for admission into United States are placed into a cultural orientation program. Every refugee family receives a resettlement guidebook which was available in 15 languages: Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, English, Farsi, French, Karen, Kirundi, Kiswahili, Nepali, Russian, Somali, and Spanish.¹⁴

World Relief Jacksonville Begins

World Relief Jacksonville was established in 1991 as a sub-office to Tampa. In the same year, the World Relief Corporation recognized it as an affiliate office. Elaine Carson,¹⁵ the Affiliate Director, pioneered refugee resettlement in Jacksonville. She began her humanitarian service through benevolent services of her local church. In late 1980s, Lutheran Social Services Jacksonville approached members of her church, looking for volunteers to help refugees who had fled the Soviet Union and Carson volunteered. In 1988, Russell Bloom, Refugee Resettlement Director of Lutheran Social Services introduced Carson to refugee resettlement, and remained her mentor for many years. She found early success in November 1988, resettling an extended family of thirty-two and a nuclear family of thirty-five.

World Relief Tampa asked if Carson could assist them with a family reunion for a family with relatives in Jacksonville. She agreed and successfully resettled several families for World Relief Tampa by late 1990. World Relief Tampa called again, asking her to represent World Relief in Jacksonville. Carson agreed to work five hours a week from her home at \$5.00 per hour. At this time, she was also a full-time volunteer for Lutheran Social Services and occupied a small office in her church. This became the office for World Relief Jacksonville. By now, she was an experienced volunteer coordinator for the Soviet program, involved with administration, finance, and housing. She was well known within the Christian evangelical community, partly because her husband was a prominent pastor and partly because she recruited many churches to host Soviet refugees. Carson also cultivated relationships with government agencies, including the local Social

¹² United States Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/113507.pdf>, 7-12.

¹³ Alison Gray and Susan Elliott, “Refugee Resettlement Project ‘Refugee Voices’ Literature Review. New Zealand, Immigration Service, May 2001, ii, <http://www.immigration.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/DE39c519-13CA-48-B0-24-9A551642coAC/o.RefugeeVoicesLiteratureReview>. (accessed December 13, 2009).

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 16-17.

¹⁵ Unless otherwise indicated, the information in this section is based on questionnaire responses and an interview with Mrs. Elaine Carson, Affiliate Director for World Relief Jacksonville, November 18, 2009, hereafter cited as Carson Interview.

Security office, the Department of Children and Families, and the Department of Health, as well as with many schools.

In September 1991, World Relief officially hired Carson. She met her boss for the first time in December at a conference, where she had the opportunity to meet representatives of various denominations serving persecuted people. Her first official experience working for World Relief was in settling an Armenian family, whom an American family was hosting. The settlement plan had worked at the time, but in retrospect it had faced some challenges. No one was at home during the day to care for the newly arrived refugee family as people went to work or busy with other engagement.

Not long after Carson started working for World Relief, the Soviet program began to dwindle as did her volunteer work with Lutheran Social Services. Because she was working only five hours a week, she moved her office to her home while home schooling her daughters. After their graduation from high school in 1998, she moved her office back to the church, with World Relief Jacksonville contributing to the utilities.

The early organization of the World Relief Jacksonville office was simple, despite the steady arrival of refugees. A group of churches and volunteers supported the resettlement, mainly helping with collecting and organizing donations and setting up apartments. Before 1996 and 1997, Carson had no staff, but then twenty-nine cases with ninety-seven arrivals hit her office. The influx required an organized office and personnel. Her first employee was a Russian, Oksana Asylee, followed by Esad Hamzic, a Bosnian, who served Bosnian arrivals. As the number of refugee arrivals grew, transportation presented a major challenge. Her church office was not on a bus route, and Carson had to use personal vehicles to take refugees to social service centers, offices, and other locations. Another interesting story was the media of communication with the newly resettled refugees. Carson's office relayed messages and mail through messengers put up at each apartment complex. In kind, donations by approximately twenty-five churches through volunteers and financial contributions by two churches supported her budget.

Extended Resettlement

The Cooperative Agreement between the Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration and the World Relief Corporation, whose headquarters based in Baltimore, MD, is the principal legal instrument governing refugee resettlement. The Affiliate Director's office also issues a summary guideline.¹⁶

¹⁶ See the Preamble of the Cooperative Agreement and Attachment B: Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, Reception and Placement Program, Guidelines for Participants (effective October 1, 2009); Attachment C: U.S. Department of State Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration; Office of Admissions, Reception and Placement Program. Reception and Placement of Refugees Admitted to the United States for Resettlement. Operational Guidance to Resettlement Agencies. April 12, 2001 (revised November 6, 2006; April 18, 2007, November 9, 2009). Hereafter cited as Attachment B or Attachment C.

Under the operational guidance from the headquarters, the World Relief Jacksonville has resettled over three-thousand people from over forty different countries. In 2009, for instance, it received and resettled 546 Afghans, Bhutanese, Burmese, and Burundians, Central Africans, Cubans, Iranians, Iraqis, Eritreans, Ethiopians, Liberians, Sudanese, and Vietnamese.¹⁷

Refugee resettlement began by drawing up a set of pre-arrival and post-arrival services plans that require involvement of many, including the office of the affiliate director, the resettlement case manager, the community relations manager, case workers, church volunteers, and more.¹⁸

Finding a residence for the in-coming refugee is a pre-arrival task. According to Reception and Placement Program of the Department of State, housing must meet certain standards for acceptability, safety, affordability, and space for sleeping areas.¹⁹ Donated items furnish the rooms, and the refugees also receive kitchen items, linens and other household supplies along with cleaning supplies and toiletries. To make the reception complete, staff also provided meals-ready-to-eat and other food supplies and staples, including baby food appropriate to the refugees' cultural background. Finally, the refugees, welcomed by a member of staff or a volunteer, were placed in an apartment complex. After placement in an apartment, adults get an opportunity to choose seasonally appropriate clothing for themselves and their families, including footwear and diapers, from the small depot maintained by World Relief Jacksonville. These families also receive "an appropriate amount of pocket money for independent spending at the refugee's discretion."²⁰

Within the first twenty-four hours, a case worker and in most cases, the Affiliate Director makes the home visit to ensure that all immediate and basic needs have been met. The case worker also serves as an interpreter. If the family is not weary and wants to go out, the case worker takes them to the local Social Security Administration office and helps them apply for a social security card. While the revised reception and placement guidelines of the Department of State require that adults apply for social security within ten working days of arrival,²¹ the local office helps the refugees apply within seven days. The Department of State guidelines also stipulate that applying for cash and medical assistance and food stamps be done within seven days of arrival. As a practical matter, on the second day of arrival, the case manager for resettlement applies for Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF), Food Stamps, and Medicaid. TANF is a community service program originally designed for the native poor. Refugee children get immunization shots and adults are registered for employment.

¹⁷ Carson Interview.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Attachment C, Revised Nov. 9, 2009, 1-3.

²⁰ Attachment C, Revised Nov. 9, 2009, 4.

²¹ Ibid.

According to the practice of World Relief Jacksonville, on the third day of arrival resettled families receive an orientation to introduce the role of World Relief in refugee resettlement as well as inform them of procedural matters. Particulars discussed include housing needs; the importance of recording changes in address and employment status within ten days; household budgeting; options of public assistance; and warning that welfare programs are available only until the family becomes self-sufficient. Other issues include applying for immigration status, social security, and medical care; the availability of English language instruction; and timely repayment of their travel loan.

Part of realizing refugee resettlement involves setting up routine refugee appointments with government agencies. They include immunizations for pre-school children; employment registration on first Thursday after arrival; ESOL testing for school age children; refugee medical screening; Tuberculosis (TB) reading, School physicals for school age children, school enrollment for school age children, childcare for preschool age children, English class for adults, and follow-up immunizations for adults and children.

The budget of World Relief Jacksonville, according to the Cooperative Agreement²² partially covers the expenses for refugee resettlement. The budget funds administrative expenses and money funds allocated directly to clients or on their behalf, which include pocket money, initial groceries, rent, utilities, and bus passes. Administrative expenses include rent, utilities, salaries, and office supplies. The ratio of expenditures for fiscal year 2009 was 45 percent for administration and 65 percent went for Client Direct.²³

In 2005 the per capita expenditure to the direct client fund to cover the first thirty days in the U.S. was raised to \$400. It took many church volunteers and significant donations to make this small sum workable. In 2009, the per capita expenditure raised another fifty dollars. After their first thirty days, refugees move into local welfare programs. Adults with no children receive welfare benefits for no more than eight months. Families with minor children are eligible for TANF. Elaine Carson asserts that this program “is actually a hindrance for most of refugees in that there is no time for orientation, English and job readiness classes. For a fortunate few there is a Match Grant Program.”²⁴ The Jacksonville office prefers the Match Grant Program, because it offers in-house employment assistance, volunteer assistance, cash allowance and rent assistance for three months through World Relief.

Despite the success stories of the last nineteen years, refugees face many challenges, especially with Medicaid. The newly-arrived refugees have to choose

²² See 8.B.1, 5 “Purposes and Goals.”

²³ Carson Interview.

²⁴ Carson Interview.

their health plans and family physicians before knowing the neighborhoods where they will live. Can Mrs. Carson help? The answer is “no,” because it has been regarded as a private matter. Safety is another major challenge. For example, in August 2009, a refugee from Burma was killed and his wallet and cell phone were stolen.²⁵ Concerned by this incident, the United States Department of State sent a fact finding mission. I did not have access to get its report.

Conclusion

World Relief Jacksonville did commendable work in refugee resettlement for nineteen years. Its Director, Elaine Carson, pioneered the humanitarian work. She was honest with her staff, while they respected her commitment and compassion. In addition, U.S. foreign policy, based on humanitarian principles that welcome refugees, encouraged the success of refugee resettlement in Jacksonville. Moreover, the close cooperation with the World Relief headquarters has contributed to alleviate human suffering.

²⁵Jim Schoettler, “Refugee killed in Jacksonville robbery moved to U.S. five months ago,” Times-Union, Aug. 4, 2009, http://jacksonville.com/news/metro/crime/2009-0728/story/refugee_killed_in_Jacksonville_robbery_moved_to_us_five_month. (accessed November 15, 2009).

Pigs in Politics: Pigasus's Role in the 1968 Presidential Election

Elizabeth Bryant
Florida State University

The 1968 Presidential Election was one of the United States' most tumultuous. Issues such as Civil Rights and the Vietnam War plagued the election and were tearing the country apart. With the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy, some Americans worried that a civil war might erupt. This fear could be seen in the nominating conventions of both the Republican and Democratic parties. The Republican Party easily nominated Richard Nixon, who pledged to the "silent majority" of Americans, that he would bring law and order to the domestic issues plaguing the United States and an "peace with honor" to the Vietnam War.¹ The Democrats were much more divided about who their candidate should be. Eugene McCarthy, George McGovern, Hubert Humphrey, and, until his death, Robert F. Kennedy battled to be the Democratic nominee. For many young Americans, none of the Democratic contenders seemed able to fix the country's problems, and they were unwilling to continue voting for the candidate whom they perceived to be the lesser of two evils. Many young Americans wanted someone whom they could support enthusiastically, and for the Youth International Party, this candidate was Pigasus, a large pig from Illinois, hailed as the voice of a generation. Though his candidacy was short-lived, the role of Pigasus and the Youth International Party during the 1968 Presidential Election should not be overlooked.

How did Pigasus, become a presidential contender? Pigasus's candidacy came about through the Youth International Party. The Youth International Party, better known as the Yippies, was the creation of Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, and Paul Krassner. Though the exact date of origin for this organization is unknown, the myth surrounding the Yippies claims they were founded on 31 December 1967 in Abbie Hoffman's apartment. There, Hoffman, and his wife Anita, Krassner, and Rubin, and his girlfriend Nancy Kershan were sitting around smoking marijuana cigarettes and discussing the condition of America's youth and the need for change. Suddenly Krassner cried out "Yippie!" and a new organization was formed. None of the men considered the Yippies a formal group, but rather, as Krassner recalls, "a coalition between the psychedelic dropouts and the New Left activists, which had organized around the Vietnam War."² There were no membership requirements to

¹"Text of President Nixon's Address to Nation on U.S. Policy in the War in Vietnam," *New York Times*, November 4, 1969, 16; "Transcript of Nixon's Address on Troop Withdrawals and Situation in Vietnam," *New York Times*, April 27, 1972, 20.

²Paul Krassner quoted in Ron Chepesiuk, *Sixties Radicals, Then and Now: Candid Conversations with Those Who Shaped the Era* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, 1995), 37.

join the Yippie movement. Anyone who said that he or she was a Yippie was one.³ Jerry Rubin noted, “there are no ideological requirements to become a yippie... write your own slogan... protest your own issue.”⁴ The media promptly focused on this new group, and within a few months, even mainstream publications such as *Time and Newsweek* were carrying stories about the Yippies. This lack of structure was purposeful; it contributed to the intrigue and mythology. Referring to this lack of structure, Abbie Hoffman later recalled: “it was never our role to analyze ourselves. We knew better. We knew we couldn’t explain it.”⁵

Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin quickly became the de facto leaders of the Yippie movement. Immediately, plans were made to go to the Democratic National Convention. The Democrats were slated to hold their nominating convention 25-28 August in Chicago, and many young radicals wanted to go and protest. They felt sure that Lyndon Johnson would be running again and wanted to show their opposition to the policies of his administration, especially the Vietnam War. However, the Yippies wanted to protest in their own way. Rather than just picketing outside the convention, Yippie leadership wanted to broaden the Chicago experience for all. For this reason, they decided to hold a Festival of Life, which they promoted as a place where there would be “music, lights, theater, magic, and that was enough.”⁶ Musical acts such as Country Joe and the Fish, the Fugs, and Janis Joplin, among others, were scheduled to perform in support of the Yippies. Regardless, not all Yippies thought that going to Chicago was prudent. Indeed, in their meetings, many expressed serious doubts. However, others, including Ed Sanders, another prominent Yippie, believed that attendance was critical.

The Youth International Party was started to put on a youth festival in Chicago. There’s always the possibility of violence. To say that violence will be a consequence of the festival is bullshit. Chicago is the focus of YIP, and if you don’t like it, you should get out.⁷

Yippies, even those that wanted to protest the Democratic National Convention, feared the threat of violence. This fear grew out of the tactics of Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley.

Still shaken from the riots that had occurred following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., fearing that another riot would leave a scar on the city,

³ Different leaders of the Yippies had different expectations for how the group would function. “Ed Sanders looked on Yippies as a new inspirational force, something with the power of life and light. Abbie saw Yippies as a myth and as an organizing device, one which would turn large numbers of people on, inspire them to feed their own thing into it, and get them all to Chicago. Jerry Rubin saw them as the first step in a youth revolution.” See Naomi Feigelson. *The Underground Revolution: Hippies, Yippies, and Others* (New York: Funk and Wagnall’s, 1970), 84-85.

⁴ Jerry Rubin, *Do It: Scenarios of the Revolution* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), 84.

⁵ Abbie Hoffman, *The Conspiracy* (New York: Dell, 1969), 49.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁷ Ed Sanders quoted in David Lewis Stein, *Living the Revolution: The Yippies in Chicago* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), 16.

Daley wanted to ensure that the Democratic convention would be uneventful. On 15 April, eleven days after King's death, Daley gave his famous "shoot to kill" speech to the Chicago police department, in which he told police superintendent James Conlisk that the police should react forcefully to anyone who was attempting to hurt others and shoot to maim rioters or others disturbing the peace. Though Daley later denied this statement, it drew national attention and for many, this order seemed like a not-too-thinly veiled threat to those planning on coming to Chicago to protest at the convention. Daley attempted to ensure that protesters would not come to Chicago by refusing to cooperate with them in any capacity. When members of the Yippies met with the mayor's planning office to request that they be allowed to sleep in the city's parks, they were denied on the grounds that it would be a violation of the city's rules of not allowing anyone in the parks after 11PM.⁸ Daley's resistance only persuaded the Yippies that it was more essential than ever for them to come to Chicago.⁹ Yippie leadership believed that for all of his rhetoric, it would be in the best interest of Mayor Daley to allow their festival to occur. Hence, the Yippies continued to try to organize support and publicity, confident that Daley would ultimately issue them the permits they sought. Daley, however, "had no problem conveying his message that Yippies were not welcome."¹⁰

As plans for the Festival of Life progressed, the underground press carried news of the Yippie movement across the United States. The Yippies rapidly expanded from their New York base and sent out calls to other cities to urge sympathizers to prepare for Chicago. Soon, groups identifying with the Yippies were operating in several major cities. However, since the Yippies advocated no true political philosophy and membership in the group was open to anyone who identified themselves as such, those going to Chicago came with many divergent philosophies and expectations. This was fine with Hoffman: "We're cheerleaders. We encourage everything."¹¹

No exact count exists for the number of people who arrived in Chicago. Many estimates place the figure at around ten thousand. This contrasts sharply with the Republican Nominating Convention, where there were few protesters. As Reverend Raymond A. Schroth noted, "the arrival of these dissenters is an act of hope. They didn't go to Miami because there was no hope in being present

⁸ However, an article in the Chicago Daily News told delegates: "Don't hesitate to walk on the grass or to spread your coat to take a nap. Chicago likes its parks to be used by people so you won't see any 'keep off the grass' signs. And you can feel safe in the park. It is well-patrolled by policemen, and many Chicagoans sleep there on hot nights."

⁹ The City of Chicago had a different perspective on the situation. "In spite of the unpopular views espoused by the dissident groups and the notorious background of their leaders, the City of Chicago sought to protect their constitutional rights of freedom of assembly and freedom of speech." See *The Strategy of Confrontation: Chicago and the Democratic National Convention- 1968* (Chicago, 1968), 11.

¹⁰ Marty Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman: American Rebel* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 141.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 124.

in that situation for them.”¹² However, Hoffman and Rubin expected that many more people would arrive in Chicago to show their disillusionment. Hoffman initially believed that “we’d have half a million on account of LBJ,” but realized after Johnson decided not to seek re-election and Robert F. Kennedy entered the race that the numbers might be smaller because “Kennedy... had the same type of charisma, excitement, theater-in-the street thing that we had, and he had the money to buy the whole state.”¹³ Indeed, Yippie leaders such as Hoffman and Rubin did not look kindly upon Kennedy’s candidacy; it was seen as just delaying the inevitable, revolution. After Kennedy’s assassination, Yippie leadership decided that it was more important than ever to go to Chicago. They hoped that many of the youth who would have voted for Kennedy would now come to Chicago to show their disillusionment with the Democrats, especially since it seemed almost a certainty that Johnson’s vice president, Hubert Humphrey, would receive the Democratic nomination.

Despite some concerns that the Yippies were leading people into violence, many agree that Hoffman and Rubin made a good team. Many of America’s youth looked up to them and wanted to support them in Chicago. Journalist Daniel Lewis Stein argues that the Yippies could not have been successful if it were not for the leadership of these two men. He states:

Abbie and Rubin represented the two wings of Yippie. Those who had come through the New Left organizations were drawn to Rubin. Those who were drawn from flower power to street action were turned on by Abbie. But Abbie and Rubin were together in what they were trying to do.¹⁴

Known to some as the “Abbott and Costello of guerrilla theater in the sixties,” the men knew how to take advantage of the media.¹⁵ Even though some scheduled performers for the Festival of Life began to withdraw, citing concerns about safety, Hoffman and Rubin continued with their plans for a Festival. Activities included a “Pin the Rubber on the Pope” contest, a Yippie Olympics, a Miss Yippie contest, barbecues, and time scheduled for lovemaking. All of this was planned to gain time in the media for expressing their concerns about conditions in America. As Hoffman recalls, “...the cheapest means to communication on the national scale is the national media. I would say that the Yippies spent under \$5,000 on Chicago, but ABC, NBC, and CBS must have spent \$700,000...”¹⁶

One way in which the men hoped to draw attention was by nominating a pig for president. The week of the convention had gotten off to a rough start with

¹² Raymond A. Schroth quoted in Mark Lane, *Chicago Eyewitness* (New York: Astor-Honor, 1968), 16.

¹³ Hoffman, *The Conspiracy*, 54

¹⁴ Stein, *Living the Revolution*, 10.

¹⁵ Chepesiuk, *Sixties Radicals Then and Now*, 182.

¹⁶ Abbie Hoffman, *The Conspiracy*, 46.

the police shooting of Dean Johnson, a seventeen-year-old boy from Sioux Falls, South Dakota, who was said to be in Chicago for the Festival of Life. Additionally, the Mayor's office refused all of the Yippies' requests for permits. Despite this, Hoffman was optimistic that nominating Pigasus for President would alleviate some of the tension and show America that the Yippies were not in town to cause violence.¹⁷ The Yippies were facetious when discussing different threats, such as lacing Chicago's water supply with LSD and stating that Yippies dressed as drivers were going to kidnap delegates to keep them away from the convention. However, the police did not see the humor in these comments. By nominating Pigasus, the Yippies hoped to manipulate the media into showing America that they were not the street-thugs that Mayor Daley had tried to portray: instead, they could be anyone's son or daughter.

The decision to choose a pig as their presidential candidate reveals much about the Yippies. As Hoffman biographer Marty Jezer affirms, a pig would serve as a satirical symbol of what the Yippies opposed. He notes:

Cartoonists often used a pig to portray corrupt politicians. The Democrats had their pig, Lyndon Johnson; the Republicans would also have a pig, probably Richard Nixon. But the Yippies would nominate a real pig, and no matter who won the election a pig would be in the White House.¹⁸

Procuring Pigasus proved to be problematic. Hoffman initially decided to go to a farm auction, where he purchased the small pig. He believed that a smaller pig would be easier to control. However, when Rubin saw Hoffman's choice, he became enraged stating that the pig was too cute. This argument epitomizes the conflicts between the two men prior to the convention, especially regarding the role and tactics of the Yippies. Rubin acknowledges, "through the pig we were trying to define yippie... was yippie trying to make Amerika laugh? Or was yippie ready to blow Amerika up?"¹⁹ For Rubin, "our Pigasus has got to be the smelliest, most repulsive hog that ever stunk up the earth... just to look at him has got to make you puke."²⁰ Therefore, Rubin refused to use Hoffman's pig and went to several hog farms looking for one that he felt would be intimidating enough. However, the larger a pig was, the more likely it would die of a heart attack after being moved from the country to the city. Rubin pondered, "what about the theater of our candidate dying

¹⁷The cause of Johnson's shooting remains murky. The police contend that Johnson was carrying a small caliber weapon and shot at them after being stopped for violating curfew, while many members of the New Left insist that this incident was an example of the same police brutality that plagued the convention. In some accounts, Johnson is referred to as Jerome Johnson. See Frank Kusch. *Battleground Chicago: The Police and the 1968 Democratic National Convention*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2004; Ron Sossi. *Voices of the Chicago Eight: A Generation on Trial*. San Francisco; City Light Books, 2008; Marty Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman American Rebel*.

¹⁸Jezer continues by later stating: "recalling how political cartoonists often used a pig to portray political greed and corruption, the Yippies decided to nominate a pig...for president." Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman American Rebel*, 123, 153.

¹⁹Rubin, *Do It*, 177.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 177.

in the middle of his acceptance speech...could Amerika psychologically handle the death of yet a fourth major public figure?"²¹ For this reason, he decided that a four hundred pound hog would not be a strong candidate, and instead chose a six-month-old, two hundred pound pig to serve as their nominee. Rubin remembers thinking, "the Democrats nominate their presidential candidate and *he eats the people*. We nominate our candidate and *we eat him*. We devour our candidate before he devours us."²² He believed that Pigasus "was ready to begin his long descent into the White House."²³

Not everyone agreed with Jerry Rubin's militant and increasingly violent philosophy. As Anita Hoffman remembers, "it seemed to me that he was rigidly leftist. You know that idea leftists have- that the world has got to get worse before it gets better. That if people suffer enough, they will eventually rise up."²⁴ Rubin believed that violence was a necessity and that it was the only thing that poor whites and African-Americans would respond to. For him, "violence was an effective form of communication."²⁵ This was why he worked hard to get Oakland's Black Panthers to come to Chicago to speak to the Yippies. Tom Hayden, former head of Students for a Democratic Society, recalled:

The Panthers initially considered the Yippies foolish anarchists and urged their members to stay away from Chicago during the Convention. But under the lyrical spell of Eldridge Cleaver... the Panthers began to reconsider their stand on Chicago, embracing the notion that a cultural rebelliousness among young white people was a necessary prelude to their becoming real revolutionaries.²⁶

However, by aligning with the Panthers, the Yippies' nomination of Pigasus for president took on a whole new meaning. The Black Panthers often used "pig" to refer to policemen. Therefore, by nominating Pigasus, "what began as political satire became an ugly way of baiting the police."²⁷ Rubin recalls, "some were reluctant at first to call cops 'pigs'" because "it was an insult to Pigasus...but we took one look at Czechago's big blue and white porkers" and remarked that they "really do look like pigs."²⁸ By targeting the police as the enemy, attention was detracted from the policies of the Johnson administration and what the Yippies had initially come to Chicago to protest. In addition, a memorial service held for Dean Johnson prior to the Pigasus's nomination, the crowd was told that Johnson died of "pig poisoning," which garnered a sympathetic "oink oink oink oink." Tension

²¹ Ibid., 177.

²² Ibid., 176.

²³ Ibid., 178.

²⁴ Anita Hoffman quoted in Chepesiuk, *Sixties Radicals Then and Now*, 176.

²⁵ Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman American Rebel*, 124.

²⁶ Tom Hayden in *Voices of the Chicago Eight: A Generation on Trial*, 175.

²⁷ Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman American Rebel*, 124.

²⁸ Rubin, *Do It*, 170.

with the police heading into convention week was assured.²⁹

The Yippies decided to kick off the Festival of Life by introducing Pigasus to America. They knew that the media was in Chicago waiting for the convention to open and believed that nominating a pig for president would earn them good media coverage. In the light of Dean Johnson's death, CBS, and presumably other media outlets, had been trying to get a schedule of the Yippies activities so they could have their camera crews present.

On 23 August, Pigasus made his debut in Chicago. The candidate was introduced to a crowd of reporters and cameramen, as well as to many Chicago Police. The police were distrusting of the Yippies and trying to prevent the violation of the disorderly conduct statute that prevented farm animals being brought into city limits. Pigasus was running on a platform of "garbage" as well as endorsing the Yippies' Platform, which consisted of eighteen points including an immediate end to the war in Vietnam, immediate freedom for Huey Newton, the then-imprisoned leader of the Black Panther Party, and a prison system based on rehabilitation rather than punishment.³⁰ Rubin began the conference by stating, "today is a historic day for America--- we are proud to announce the declaration of candidacy for the Presidency of the United States by a pig...."³¹ Before he could get any further, the police stormed the stage and arrested Rubin, singer Phil Ochs, five other Yippies, and Pigasus. although Pigasus's nomination as the candidate for the Yippies lasted only a few minutes before the police intervened, the Yippies could not have asked for better media coverage. They came across as harmless pranksters while the police were shown as heavy-handed and humorless. For the rest of the week, the media generally referred to all protesters as Yippies, with the implication that the police were attacking America's white middle class youth. With cries of "the pigs have arrested a pig...that's pig control of a pig community," Pigasus was introduced to mainstream America.³² For many Americans, Pigasus came to represent the feelings of disenfranchisement of America's youth, and as the week became increasingly violent, the harmlessness of Pigasus and his platform was driven home by the media.

As the Democratic National Convention progressed, the Yippies continued their Festival of Life, which generally consisted of people sitting around, singing, and smoking marijuana cigarettes, while the police, at the behest of Mayor Daley, attacked protesters without provocation in front of the media. Though the police tried to cover up their actions by attempting to take away cameras from reporters,

²⁹ Stein, *Living the Revolution*, 40.

³⁰ For a complete list of the Yippies platform, see Stein, *Living the Revolution*, 35-36. Stein believes that the Yippies platform may have been broadcast on network television if Hoffman had refrained from using so much profanity.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 47.

³² *Ibid.*, 47.

and often beating them as savagely as protesters, the violence did not go unnoticed. The brutality of what took place shocked the entire nation, many of whom watched it on the evening news. The public saw members of the Chicago Police use tear gas and indiscriminately beat protesters and bystanders with their clubs. Though the Yippies were getting progressively angrier over their treatment by Chicago police, they, as an organization, did not advocate a platform of violence. Several times throughout the week, they urged their followers to comply with the curfews that the city had enacted so that no one would get hurt. There was the belief that “as long as the Yippies could keep the public amused and off balance with shows like the pig nomination,” they would be safe.³³ With the media attention they got from Pigasus, the Yippies were able to cast themselves as victims, garnering sympathy across America, even though many Americans did not agree with their views, clothing, or lifestyle choices. Pigs prominently played a symbolic role in the Yippies activities for the rest of the week. The police continued to react with overzealous force, at one point using six officers to catch one errant hog. Hoffman and Rubin’s tactic of guerrilla, or in this case pig, theater had worked.

The Yippies impact on politics should not be overlooked. Though they may not have seen Chicago as a victory for Hoffman “winning in Chicago would have meant bringing down the Democratic Party and the US government with it.” They, along with the other protesters had managed to make ordinary Americans aware of the extent of their discontent.³⁴ As Paul Krassner recalls, “the emergence of the Yippies forced people to see the police state in action. A lot of people were not aware of that until the 1968 Democratic Convention.”³⁵ For Jerry Rubin...

Demonstrations were fun. Riots were fun. Going home and seeing yourself on TV was fun. But the greatest fun of all was being part of a moral movement that you thought was changing history. We believed we had a purpose... that our lives made a difference. What we did was important.³⁶

He was correct. Though Pigasus was not nominated as America’s 37th President, the Yippies had made their point in Chicago.

Following the convention, “the Democratic Party emerged bitterly divided as a group, in chaos as a party.”³⁷ Prior to this, many Democrats hoped that Lyndon Johnson’s decision to not seek re-election would bring the Party together. Instead, by nominating Vice President Hubert Humphrey, who supported the administrations controversial Vietnam policies, they further alienated many liberals including the Yippies, who continued to support the candidacy of Pigasus. In September, they

³³ Ibid., 49.

³⁴ Abbie Hoffman, *Run, Run, Run: The Lives of Abbie Hoffman* (New York: Putnam, 1994), 105.

³⁵ Paul Krassner quoted in Chepesiuk, *Sixties Radicals Then and Now*, 37.

³⁶ Jerry Rubin quoted in Chepesiuk, *Sixties Radicals Then and Now*, 191.

³⁷ Congressional Quarterly Incorporated. *The Presidential Nominating Conventions, 1968* (Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1968), iii.

held a “pignic” in New York, where they fed the crowd ham sandwiches and gave them buttons and balloons. Hoffman even decided to continue Pigasus’s candidacy, sans Pigasus, stating “we will bring our revolutionary theatre to Washington to inaugurate ‘Pigasus’s- our pig- the only honest candidate” cementing the Yippies’ decision not to partake in the mainstream political process.³⁸ With live pigs being carried in anti-war demonstrations in London and Montreal, Hoffman honestly believed that Pigasus would serve as a symbol of the Yippies’ and the opposition of the 1968 election by many young Americans.

Despite the effort of the Yippies, after Chicago had faded from memory many Americans believed that they should participate in the political process and vote for a viable candidate. With George Wallace’s segregationist platform, many Southerners, who usually voted Democratic, decided to vote for the candidate who at the time best represented their attitudes. This, combined with the chaos of Chicago, allowed Richard Nixon and the Republicans to emerge victorious. It remains unknown whether the Yippies acknowledged the political risks of protesting in Chicago, which ultimately weakened the Democratic Party and to a Republican becoming president.

Though Pigasus himself was not a viable candidate in the 1968 election, his candidacy should not be overlooked. Many people saw his nomination as street theatre, but it should be discounted so simply. For the Yippies, and many young Americans who flooded the streets of Chicago, Pigasus, or at least his values, represented a candidate that they wished the Democrats would nominate instead of continuing to support an unpopular, albeit still powerful, administration. Pigasus’s stance on the Vietnam War and the future of America resonated with many who believed that they had been abandoned by the Democratic Party. Though the Yippies never again had as much power and influence as they did leading up to the 1968 election their mark on history should not be forgotten.

³⁸ Jezer, Abbie Hof

A State To Build, A South To Save, A Nation To Convince: Governor LeRoy Collins and Florida's 1956 Racial Primary

Seth A. Weitz,
Indiana University- Northwest

During the 1950s, Florida entered a nebulous political position. The state had rejected the Dixiecrats in 1948, and two years later, momentarily sidetracked the promising career of its most liberal politician, Claude Pepper. Northerners perceived Florida as the most progressive, urbanized, and diversified state in the South, however, being governed by a group of conservative North Florida Democrats, known as the Pork Chop Gang. These were politicians that were adherents of the “Lost Cause,” which prevented change and progress.

Approaching the 1950s, the Pork Chop Gang saw the Civil Rights Movement as a threat to their power. The African-American population of Florida was relatively small compared to its Deep South neighbors, but the possibility of having to counter the black vote, as well as the growing progressive base in South Florida, gravely concerned the Pork Chop Gang. What they did not expect was that Leroy Collins, a North Florida veteran of the state legislature and potential gubernatorial candidate would emerge to challenge them. When asked his stance on segregation in the early 1950s, Collins noted that he favored it as “a part and parcel of our way of life,” but when pressed on how to handle the issue if he were elected, he simply stated, “I’m going to do the right thing.”¹ Too many staunch segregationists, this was not enough, nor would it ever be. Collins labeled himself a racial moderate, but some historians have debated his true intent for the past fifty years claiming he was instead a “moderate in denial.”² No matter his true intentions, it was clear that Collins wanted to maintain stability and help Florida transform from an insignificant backwater state, to the leading state in the “New South.” In doing so, he walked a tightrope balancing himself between two worlds, and often questioning which one he belonged in, or wanted Florida to be a part of.

In order to oppose change and progress, the Pork Chop Gang supported Florida's 1885 Constitution. The document had provisions that called for segregation of the races in all aspects of society. Article XII, Section 12 simply stated that, “white and colored children shall not be taught in the same school, but impartial provision shall be made for both.”³ Despite this provision, Florida represented the rest of the South by having inequities in its school systems. During the 1940s, the state spent \$62.78 on each white student and only a mere \$27.63 on African-American students.⁴

¹ Martin Dyckman, *Floridian of his Century: The Courage of Governor LeRoy Collins*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007), 2.

² *Jacksonville Florida Times-Union*, March 16, 1991.

³ *Florida Constitution 1885*, Article XII, Sec. 12.

After World War II, African-Americans became more strident in protesting against segregation. On 17 May 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court, led by Earl Warren, aided their cause by attacking the entire Jim Crow system maintaining that “in the field of public education, the doctrine of separate but equal has no place.”⁵ The policies of the Pork Chop Gang were once again under assault.

Reaction from Southern white leaders was swift but not unified. Staunch segregationists such as Georgia Governor Herman Talmadge lashed out at the Supreme Court for usurping power from the individual states. Despite the results from a *Gallup Poll* showing that close to 80 percent of white Floridians opposed integration, state politicians were divided on the issue and what course of action to take.⁶ Many who favored segregation, like Collins, were not ready to fight a second civil war to preserve the separation of the races.

The 1952 election of Dan McCarty of Fort Pierce as the thirty-first governor was the beginning of a tumultuous history in Florida’s politics. McCarty was a former citrus grower and cattle rancher who began his career as a staunch conservative, but by 1952, was no longer an ally of the Pork Chop Gang. Florida looked to be heading down a more moderate road as McCarty succeeded former Klansman, Fuller Warren. Soon after assuming power, McCarty suffered a heart attack which took his life eight months later. One of the infamous quirks surrounding the 1885 Constitution came into play upon McCarty’s debilitation and subsequent death as the document did not provide for succession through the office of Lieutenant Governor.

Following McCarty’s death, Charley Johns of rural Starke in North Florida, the future ringleader of the Pork Chop Gang, Florida’s designated Joseph McCarthy, assumed the role as acting governor. Johns had a nineteen-year career in the state Senate before and after his time as governor. He was a rabid racist, segregationist, and adherent to the doctrine of states’ rights and the myth of the “Lost Cause.” After assuming the governorship, Johns attempted to replace McCarty’s appointees with those who he could trust to carry out his agenda and, more importantly, create an infrastructure for his 1954 campaign. Johns, as the acting governor, was denied the right to finish McCarty’s four-year term. Therefore, a special election was held to meet this pressing need. The 1954 gubernatorial election determined the path the state would take toward an integrated and progressive future. When McCarty’s appointees refused to resign, Johns suspended them, creating a backlash throughout the state and unifying a solid opposition to his election bid the following year.⁷

One member of the growing opposition was LeRoy Collins, a member of the

⁴ Harry S. Ashmore, ed., *The Negro and the Schools*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), 153-156.

⁵ *Washington Post*, May 18, 1954.

⁶ Thomas Wagdy, *LeRoy Collins: Spokesman of the New South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 61.

⁷ *Tampa Tribune*, December 12, 1953.

state legislature, and a native of Tallahassee. He had worked closely with McCarty during his short time in office and was appalled at Johns' actions and arrogance leading to his decision to challenge him in the 1954 election. Collins announced his candidacy by taking a swipe at Johns when he proclaimed, "I hate despotism and dictatorship in any form."⁸

On 4 May 1954, at the Democratic primary, there was a three way race when Seminole County's Brailey Oldham decided to run against the acting governor. Prognosticators looked to Oldham, a former state Senator from Central Florida, to divide Collins' progressive base and swing the election in Johns' favor since he was backed by a unified North Florida. The split awarded Johns a victory, but not the landslide he had hoped for. Although he had achieved the division of votes, which afford him a plurality, it did not eliminate the need for a runoff. Johns polled 38 percent of the vote, while Collins finished second with 34 percent and Oldham at third receiving 28 percent.⁹

Johns wasted no time in launching a campaign against Collins. The day after the primary he attempted to distinguish himself from the Tallahassee native by labeling Collins a "Big Corporation Lawyer... who lives in a \$200,000 colonial mansion" and portrayed himself as a man of the people, or at least to North Floridians.¹⁰ Collins fired back, accusing the acting governor of shady business and political practices, subtly insinuating that Johns' administration was corrupt, both morally and literally.¹¹ Collins continued his onslaught reminding voters that as a state legislator, Johns had refused to support a measure designed at "unmasking" the Ku Klux Klan, to which Johns could only mutter a feeble response, "I made a mistake."¹²

As the candidates moved towards the second primary, the Supreme Court in Washington moved towards a decision on the *Brown v. Board of Education* case. In the end, Collins' support in progressive South Florida proved to be the difference. Collins won 54.8 percent of the vote, but an in-depth analysis of the returns illuminates the deepening divide between North and South Florida. Collins won 58 percent of his home county of Leon, but was trounced in many of the neighboring counties who supported Pork Chop Gang member, Charley Eugene Johns. Madison County, located 30 miles east of Tallahassee, awarded Johns 63 percent of the vote and Wakulla, due south of the capital, cast 66 percent of its votes for Johns. Conversely, Collins won 70 percent of Dade County's 101,709 votes and won similar victories in Florida's southern region.¹³

⁸ Dyckman, *Floridian of his Century*, 64.

⁹ Annie Mary Hartsfield and Elston E. Roady, *Florida Votes, 1920-1962: Selected Election Statistics* (Tallahassee: Institute of Governmental Research, Florida State University, 1963), 63.

¹⁰ *Miami Herald*, May 5, 1954.

¹¹ *Tampa Tribune*, May 14, 1954.

¹² Wagy, *Governor LeRoy Collins*, 39.

¹³ Hartsfield and Roady, *Florida Votes, 1920-1962*, 63.

Florida, like the rest of the South, was ablaze with concern and debate following the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*. Collins initially threw his support behind State Superintendent Thomas Bailey who had called for a calm, sober, and rational responses to the ruling. When this drew a backlash from extremists, he tried to mollify them by restating his stance on the issue of integration, vowing to do everything within the law, and his power as governor, to keep the dual school system intact. His approach was labeled "legal opposition," and he was proclaimed as leader of the so-called "moderate segregationists."¹⁴

Despite Collins' moderation, the Pork Chop Gang took solace in knowing that Collins' political future was uncertain since governors, according to the 1885 Florida Constitution, were not afforded the opportunity to succeed themselves in office. However, the Pork Chop Gang was dealt a crushing blow when the Florida Supreme Court ruled that Collins was allowed to seek reelection since he had been elected to finish Governor McCarty's term. This ruling set up the 1956 Democratic Primary, which Helen L. Jacobstein labeled, "the crucial decision in Florida's racial history."¹⁵ Floridians had the chance to vote for moderation and retain Collins, or replace the governor with someone willing to employ a more radical and proactive approach to integration.

Collins had the advantage of not only being the acting governor, but also being somewhat of a local celebrity. No less than eight national publications ran articles on Collins's vision for a "New South" and a progressive Florida. *U.S. News and World Report* compiled a six-page interview with the governor in which he never mentioned segregation. Collins even graced the cover of *Time* in December 1955.¹⁶ Much to his dismay, Collins soon realized that race was all that mattered in Florida, and although he tried to focus on other issues, not even positive national press could change the focus of the campaign. Heading into the primary, the *Tampa Tribune* agreed, noting that most Floridians "have an abiding faith that the state government, political, and economic leaders, will find a way to maintain the color line." Aware of this sentiment, Collins desperately tried to straddle the line, maintaining that as governor, he had "avoided furor and hysteria and at the same time had effectively supported our traditions." Many in Florida began to question Collins, and ultimately five candidates threw their names into the race including former governor and Klansman, Fuller Warren, and former Florida Speaker of the House, Farris Bryant, a staunch segregationist in his own right. In addition, retired Florida National Guard General Sumter Lowry of Tampa, a political novice joined the race, ensuring that race would remain the only issue of importance in

¹⁴ Wagy, *Governor LeRoy Collins*, 61.

¹⁵ Helen L. Jacobstein, *The Segregation Factor in the Florida Democratic Gubernatorial Primary of 1956* (Gainesville: University of Florida Social Sciences Series, no. 47, 1972), 3.

¹⁶ Dyckman, *Floridian of his Century*, 112.

the contest. Lowry exclaimed that integration was nothing more than a part of the:

international Communist conspiracy...part and parcel of their three pronged attack to destroy our national independence through world government; to destroy our Christian Church through infiltration; and to destroy our race by mixing it with the blood of the negro race¹⁹

Lowry advocated and pushed for an interposition bill, act, or resolution in the state Legislature, which would nullify the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in Florida. Lowry signaled out Collins stating that “he (Collins) would sell out the children of the state for the dollar bill.”²⁰ His most famous quote mocked Collins by claiming that Floridians were “tired of governors who pussyfoot and evade the issue while the NAACP program of integration marches on.”²¹ Not one to mince words, Lowry issued a stern warning to Collins and the people of Florida by advising them that they would have “violence if integration is attempted” and that he was willing to lead a “march on Washington” with the purpose of overthrowing the Supreme Court to preserve the separation of the races.²² He also accused Collins, Bryant and Warren of remaining silent and weak on the main issue. Lowry leveled the most damning blow at Collins when he exclaimed, “the few evasive remarks he has uttered on this vital subject indicate he either favors race-mixing or that he has not yet decided what is the politically expedient course for him to follow.”²³

Collins tried in vain to steer clear of Lowry, but knew he would inevitably have to confront his adversary. At first he tried to downplay Lowry’s remarks and highlight the virtues of moderation stating, “our leadership has been far more effective than has been the case in many other states in which a great deal more noise and confusion have been generated.”²⁴ Collins believed that Lowry’s policy proposals and virulent rhetoric would tear Florida apart by inciting racial warfare.²⁵ He continued by maintaining that, “I am against defiance of constituted authority. I am against any effort to make political capital out of segregation. I am for the orderly and effective assertion of our rights under authority of law.” Lowry continued to assail Collins by proclaiming, “It is high time he quits pleading the cause of the NAACP.”²⁶ Collins quickly shot back, claiming that if the general had

¹⁷ *Tampa Tribune*, December 18, 1955.

¹⁸ Dyckman, *Floridian of his Century*, 111.

¹⁹ *Southern School News*, February 1956.

²⁰ *Jacksonville Florida Times-Union*, March 10, 1956.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Jacobstein, *Segregation Factor*, 19.

²³ *Tampa Tribune*, February 2, 1956.

²⁴ Dyckman, *Floridian of his Century*, 114.

²⁵ “Statement by LeRoy Collins” February 2, 1956, Correspondence of Governor LeRoy Collins, box 328, file “Race Relations-1956”, Florida State Archives, Tallahassee, Florida.

²⁶ Dyckman, *Floridian of his Century*, 114.

his way, "I fear we will actually lose ground in our efforts to maintain segregation and carry Florida forward."²⁷

When Lowry did not back down, Collins appointed retired Judge L.L. Fabinski to chair a committee to study the issue and formulate a legal response to the *Brown* decision. While the committee would not meet until after the primary, Collins hoped the announcement and creation of the body would be enough to stem the rising tide of radicalism in Florida. Collins was gambling with his future, and Florida's on the belief that while a majority of white Floridians did not support integration, they also did not support massive resistance. This had been Collins's dilemma from the outset of the campaign how to balance the situation and stay true to his pledge in the face of a continuous barrage levied by Lowry.

When the votes were counted, Collins' gamble seemingly paid off. He received 51.7 percent of the vote and won the election in a landslide that did not require a second primary as was the case in 1954. However, the results were not a clear mandate for Collins though, as the opposition vote was split between three candidates. When added together, the opposition accounted for almost 49 percent of the vote. Lowry, the political novice, finished second showing Collins that many in Florida were still willing to openly defy Washington. The retired general received 21.3 percent of the votes placing him well ahead of Bryant who garnered 110,000 (13 percent), as well as Warren who polled 108,000 (12 percent).

Collins received most of his support from South Florida, where Broward County gave the incumbent 78 percent of the more than 50,000 votes filed. Likewise, Dade (72 percent), Brevard (60 percent), Monroe (66 percent), Martin (70 percent), Pinellas (68 percent), Sarasota (68 percent) and Palm Beach (64 percent) all contributed to Collins's landslide victory. Lowry fared best in the Panhandle and other rural counties. He received over 40 percent of the vote in and carried the counties of, Lafayette (55 percent), Suwannee (55 percent), Holmes (54 percent), Liberty (54 percent), Dixie (53 percent), Gilchrist (51 percent), Taylor (50 percent), Levy (46 percent), Hamilton (45 percent), Santa Rosa (45 percent), Sumter (45 percent), Walton (44 percent), Washington (43 percent), De Soto (43 percent), Madison (43 percent), Okaloosa (43 percent), Jefferson (42 percent), Hardee (40 percent) and, Okeechobee (40 percent). Overall Collins won thirty-three counties with Lowry winning twenty-six, Warren six and Bryant one. Clay County outside of Jacksonville cast the same number of votes for both Lowry and Collins.²⁸ The 1956 election also saw 32 percent of Florida's African-American population register and most voted for the "moderate segregationist."²⁹

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Hartsfield and Roady. *Florida Votes*, 61.

²⁹ Wagy. *Governor LeRoy Collins*, 73.

Collins, realizing that he could not stall integration, looked to silence critics within his own party. State legislator Prentice Pruitt was one of the first to attack Collins's moderation, and was soon joined by Tallahassee's J. Kenneth Ballinger in calling for an interposition resolution: the action previously sought by Lowry during the primary campaign. Still in the minds of Floridians, Lowry appeared before the legislature to plead for interposition telling the United States Supreme Court "we openly defy you."³⁰ Collins responded to his opposition by using an archaic and largely forgotten power granted to him by the 1885 Constitution to bring the debate to an end by closing the legislative session. Key West Representative William Neblett was prompted to remark sarcastically, "Well, I guess that's interposition. The governor interposed."³¹

During his 1957 inaugural address, Collins urged Floridians to remain calm in the face of the violence, which had rocked Tallahassee and other cities throughout the state. He concluded the speech by stating, "This is the call of history, a history which grows impatient. Ours is the generation in which great decisions can no longer be passed to the next. We have a state to build, a South to save, a nation to convince, a God to serve."³²

Florida's newspapers were overly supportive and the speech even gained national attention and recognition when *Newsweek* commented favorably on his message.³³ However, his address received mixed reviews from legislators. James E. Conner exclaimed that the Supreme Court was not the law of Florida, as Collins had stated, but instead that role was reserved for the Constitution of Florida, which upheld and mandated segregation. State Senator Henry Stratton lamented, "now that Collins has yielded to the philosophy of the U.S. Supreme Court, I guess we are officially integrated."³⁴ To many members of the Pork Chop Gang, Collins was no longer even striving to maintain his initial campaign pledges, which had called for opposing integration.

While most Floridians disapproved of integration, the intensity of this opposition varied as evidenced by the fight between Collins and the Pork Chop Gang. A special legislative session called by Collins in September 1957 reached new emotional levels as Senator Harvie Belser impulsively and angrily announced his resignation after charging Collins with bringing about the general "decline of the South" and accusing the governor of lacking the "guts to fight for the traditions and customs of our land."³⁵ Marianna's Tony Peacock claimed to speak for all white Floridians

³⁰ *Jacksonville Journal*, July 31, 1956

³¹ *Fort Lauderdale News*, August 2, 1956; *Miami Herald*, August 6, 1956.

³² "Governor LeRoy Collins: Inaugural Address, January 8, 1957", Governor's Papers, box 1, folder 38.

³³ *Newsweek*, January 21, 1957, 31.

³⁴ *Tallahassee Democrat*, January 8, 1957.

³⁵ *Jacksonville Florida Times-Union*, October 10, 1957.

when he proclaimed, “I think he (Collins) is completely out of touch with a majority in both houses and a majority of the people of Florida at this time.”³⁶

Collins was condemned by everyone from the Pork Chop Gang to Jacksonville’s Martha Reid Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, who passed a resolution admonishing the governor for what they deemed meek submission to the NAACP.³⁷ What is often overlooked regarding Collins’ stance is the fact that he harbored national political ambitions, and thus, never wanted to portray himself as a candidate for the South alone as Strom Thurmond had been in 1948. To this end, national newspapers and periodicals lauded his efforts with *Newsweek* asking, “wouldn’t LeRoy Collins make a good national candidate?”³⁸

Floridians were divided on the issue of race as well as their opinion of Collins. Even though the election was a controversial time for Florida, violence was averted. Despite publicly supporting segregation, this was Collins’ main goal throughout the racial crisis of the 1950s. Feeling betrayed by Collins, the Pork Chop Gang, led by Charley Johns, came out swinging in the late 1950s, attacking everyone they deemed a threat to their way of life through the creation of the Florida Legislative Investigation Committee. Despite the moderation of their governor, by the late 1950s, McCarthyism had come to Florida.

³⁶ *Tallahassee Democrat*, April 8, 1959.

³⁷ Wagy, *Governor LeRoy Collins*, 95-96.

³⁸ *Newsweek*, September 30, 1957, 40.

The Anti-Colonial Struggle of the Tiwa (Lalung) Peasants in Assam: A Study of the Phulaguri Uprising from Selected Archival Records

Bandana Baruah
Cotton College

Assam, known formerly as Pragjyotisha and Kamrupa, is the gateway to India's north eastern region. The land is home to both a tribal and non-tribal population that migrated in the region in the remote past. The Scheduled Tribe population per 2001 census report is 3,385,700 of the total population of 23,338,000 of the state. While some of the tribes dwell in the plains, others have settled in the two hill districts of Assam. Each tribe has its own distinct culture, dialect, religion and historical identity. The term tribe here indicates a segment of society whose social structures are densely woven, its members strictly adhere to kinship norms, are tied together by their respective customs, and there is a strong sense of belonging together. S. Sen states: "Tribal culture is collective and participatory with total psychic involvement of all the individuals as members of a composite group."¹

Among the numerous tribes are the Tiwas, also known as Lalungs. They have been designated as Lalungs in government records, books, monographs and maps. The other name Tiwa has been used by scholars, writers and researchers, without however discarding the official name Lalung.² The members of the tribe however prefer to use the name Tiwa as it is a word of their dialect.³

The Tiwas have played a great role in the History of Assam. Ethnically belonging to Mongoloid stock, they are believed to have migrated to this land in the remote past. S.K. Chatterjee writes: "The history of the arrival into India of the various Mongoloid groups speaking dialects of the Sino-Tibetan speech family is not known... It would appear that their presence in India was noted by the tenth century B.C. the Sino-Tibetan speaking Mongoloids were confined to only a part of India, namely its northern and northeastern tracts, corresponding to the present day Nepal (particularly central and eastern) and the sub-Himalayan areas, North Bihar, North Bengal, East Bengal and above all, Assam... the area of characterization for the primitive Sino-Tibetan speech appears to have been North-Western China between the headwaters of the Hwang-Ho and the Yangtse-kiang rivers... The Tibeto Burman groups of the Sino-Tibetan speaking tribes would appear to have formed an area of dispersion in some tract to the west and north of Tibet (the present day Chinese province of Si-Kaing) from, where they began to spread east and south."⁴

¹ Sen, S, *Khasi Jaintia Folklore, Context, Discourse and History*, Chennai, 2004, 32.

² Sen, S, ed. *Folklore in Northeast India*, Delhi, Guwahati, 1985, 113.

³ Field Study.

⁴ Chatterjee, S.K. *Kirata Jana Kriti*, Calcutta, 1974, 15-26.

Like other tribal groups in the world, the Tiwas do not have a script or a written history of their own, which is a corollary of pre-literate societies. Yet, they had an effective medium of communication through which they managed to preserve their tradition by transmitting it orally from one generation to the other. Such oral traditions in the form of myths, songs, legends, ballads, proverbs, sayings, riddles, folk tales, and poems guided, molded, and influenced them in all aspects of their lives and have also served as chronicles of their history. The early history of the tribe is thus rendered obscure by the dearth of historical evidence and is steeped in myths and legends.

During the medieval period, the Ahoms, a group of Tai-Shans from upper Burma who entered Assam in 1228 under their leader Sukapha, laid the foundation of their kingdom in the extreme northeast corner of India and later extended their hegemony over the entire region. The Ahoms traditionally kept records of political events in a type of chronicle called *Buranjis*. It is in these *Buranjis* that one finds mention of the Tiwas (Lalungs). One such *Buranjistates* that twelve families of Lalungs and twelve families of Mikirs migrated from Jayantia kingdom to Ahom territory to escape from the matrilineal system of inheritance prevalent in that land. The Ahom king Jayadhvaj Singha (1648-1663 A.D.), being sympathetic to their cause, directed the *Rahial Barua* (Ahom Officer) to settle them in Ahom territory. Therefore, they settled in Nowgong district in five principalities: Topakuchi, Baropujia, Mikirgaon, Sorah, and Khaigor.⁵ Later, Tiwa immigrants were settled in seven more principalities: Kumoi, Ghagua, Sukhnaguha, Kacharigaon, Baghara, Tetelia and Tarani under Jagi administrative circle. The chiefs of these principalities were addressed as Rajas in their society and referred to as *Paacho Rajas and Saato Rajas*.⁶ The Tiwa principalities of Gobha, Nelli and Khala, on the periphery of the Ahom Kingdom, were under the Jayantia kin.⁷ During the colonial period, trouble between the Tiwa peasants and British began and reached its climax in 1861, when Lieutenant Singer, the Junior Assistant in Nowgong district was killed as an expression of the Tiwa peasant's wrath.⁸

Unlike the pan-Indian scenario, the British East India Company's relations with Assam began in 1826 with the signing of the treaty of Yandaboo with the Burmese, by which the latter agreed not to interfere in the affairs of Assam. Thus, the first part of the nineteenth century witnessed the gradual subjugation of Assam and then began the stage-by-stage penetration of British imperialist control over its economy and Nowgong district was no exception to this. That the uprising at Phulaguri was a sequel to the transgression of the rights of the Tiwa peasants by the

⁵ Bhuyan, S.K., ed. *Deodhai Asam Buranji*, DHAS, Guwahati, 1962, XVIII, XIX, XX.

⁶ Moffatt Mills, A.J., Report on the province of Assam, Publication board, Guwahati 1984, 446.

⁷ *Ibid*, 446.

⁸ Assam archival records, extract taken from volume no.26-1862 (letters received from the miscellaneous officers), 4.

despotic Raj with an uncompromising attitude is to be examined.

Goaded by their desire of revenue maximization and profit, the British East India Company, which was a commercial company, observed that the imposition of fresh taxes, enhancement of land revenues, and the levy of duties and tolls were the possible means to achieve their ends in the newly acquired province of Assam. The Burmese war had caused a tremendous drain on the company exchequer, and the transfer of power from the East India Company to the Crown in November 1858 led to further exploitation of its subjects.

Taxation and enhancement of the land revenue were a few of the measures which the British Raj adopted to tide over the financial crisis arising out of the 1857 uprisings. In 1858, stamp duties were introduced, followed by Income tax. Excise duties were levied at the *sadar* stations of Kamrup, Darrang, and Nowgong but were not extended to tribal areas on the grounds that establishment required for the purpose would swallow up all the profit.⁹ Already the washing of gold was farmed out and the *jalkar*, or the right to fish in rivers and *beels* (water body), was offered to the highest bidder. Taxes for cutting timber (*gorkhati*), reeds (bunker) and a grazing tax (*khusary*) became common.¹⁰ Such proliferation of taxes antagonized the masses. There was an apprehension among the peasants that the colonial regime was contemplating imposing taxes on their houses, *baaries* (gardens) and betel leaf (*paan*). This apprehension instilled an aura of fear in the peasants. The introduction of license tax around that time heightened their impending fears.

Yet another source of revenue which attracted the attention of the British Raj was poppy from which the juice was extracted to make opium. Opium consumption was high in the land at that time and was produced locally. Poppy was cultivated on *baari* and *chaapori* lands and were assessed at a lower rate than the rice lands.¹¹ The British Raj soon realized that it was losing out on revenue since opium was produced locally. In order to benefit from the revenues accruing from opium, the British government made arrangements to sell Bengal opium through government treasuries at cheaper rates than the local opium. It was hoped that such availability would deter the peasants from cultivating the crop, and the British Raj would then be the beneficiary. But, the growing monetization of the economy led the peasants to cultivate more poppy at times, even at the cost of other crops. Therefore, in order to compel them to be entirely dependent on government opium, the British government banned the local cultivation of poppy in 1860. The ordinance banning poppy cultivation led to widespread resentment and protest among the tribes, particularly the Tiwa peasants in Nowgong district as they were adversely affected by it.

⁹ Barpujari, H.K et al, *Political History of Assam*, volume 1, 1826-1919 Gauhati, 1977, 88.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Bengal revenue proceedings 19 March, 1827, no.8.

Antagonism was further aggravated by a series of blunders committed by the British Raj as revealed in the correspondence of colonial authorities.¹² Herbert Sconce the Deputy Commissioner of Nowgong district recommended to the Commissioner to abolish the post of Assessorship of Nowgong and permit him instead to discharge the duties of Assessor and that was the first of the series of blunders.

Though Herbert Sconce undertook the work of Assessor himself voluntarily and the existing Babu Pudlab Barooah was removed, he entrusted the work of assessment to be done by his Collectory Sheristadar and the *Mouzadars*. The latter, who were empowered, misused their powers by assessing those who were not fully taxable and wholly exempting others who were, which complicated the issue. The *Mouzadars* even threatened the peasants by telling them that according to the new rate of assessment, which they had to furnish to the Collector, each peasant would be taxed on their *paan and tamool* trees. They concealed the fact that according to Act XVIII the tax was very trifling and that three rates - rupees 1, 2 and 3 had existed and further that such taxes would be levied according to the means and the size of their *paan and tamool barees*. In an attempt to extract something from the poor peasants, the *Mouzadars* told them that they would be taxed 20 rupees, and those peasants who had means to pay 3 rupees were told that they would have to pay fifty rupees.

Irrked at such hearsay, the peasants went *en masse* several times to the cutcherry (*Sadar* court) to apprise the Deputy Commissioner of the exorbitant rates of taxation and their difficulties to live in the district with their families if such rates of taxation were implemented. But, instead of giving a patient hearing, Herbert Sconce placed twenty of the principal peasants into the *thana* (judicial custody).¹³ Disillusioned and in despair, the others returned to their villages and organized *raij mels* (mass assemblies of villagers) or meetings in different places of the district to create an awareness of the evil designs of the British Raj, and to raise a sufficient amount of subscription to appeal to higher authorities. Several such meetings were held near the cutcherry.

The atmosphere became surcharged with tension. The Rajas (chieftains) of Topakuchi in collaboration with the Rajas of Sorah and Khaigor made secret preparations to wage war against the British Government. It may be mentioned here that the chieftains were all of Tiwa origin. People were instructed to rally round their Rajas. Secret meetings were held under a banyan-tree at Topakuchi area which later became known as Mel-Ahot.⁷ The final decision of the meeting was sent to the Rajas (chieftains) of Sahari, Nelli Sarah, Mayang and Dimarua urging

¹² op cit, 1.

¹³ op cit, 3.

them to prepare themselves for the onslaught against the British Government.¹⁴

Preparations were made for an attack against the British. One ironsmith Bhibi Konwar was entrusted for the manufacture of war-materials. At Mulankata, Bhibi raised a smithy and that place was called 'Mulankata Bhjbi Kunwor Salor Ahot.' About twelve hundred persons were enrolled as soldiers, and Lakhshman Singh of Kotohguri village was made the commander.¹⁵

When Herbert Sconce received information of the meetings or 'mels' he initially ordered the thana Jemadaar to disperse the mel at Phulaguri and to arrest the offenders. (Phulaguri was a place situated about seven miles from Nowgong and assumed significance due to the uprising). When the thana Jemadaar reached Phulaguri, the peasants made a bold assertion that their object was to appeal to the higher authorities against unjust taxation and other injudicious actions of the Deputy Commissioner. The Jemadaar returned and reported everything back to the Deputy Commissioner and further added that thousands of peasants armed with lattees and jaathis (indigenous weapons) had openly resisted the authority of the police and were even ready to assault him. The Deputy Commissioner did not re-act and instead sent the Sudder thana Daroga and police sepoys to disperse the mel but he too reported what the Jemadaar had earlier reported.¹⁶ The Deputy Commissioner next ordered his Junior Assistant Lieutenant to go to Phulaguri to disperse the mel. On his arrival, Lieutenant Singer was apprised that the objective of the gathering was to *implore the* authorities for the reconsideration of the enhanced rates of taxation, which the assessment was entrusted to the Collectory Sheristadar and the Mouzadars. The peasants argued they would be ruined from overtaxation. They further added that it would be difficult for them to remain in the district with their families. Also, when they went to the *Burra Saheb* instead of listening put twenty of them into the thana.

Lieutenant Singer, with only a year of experience in Assam, was not able to understand the language and habits, when he ordered the police officers to seize the peasants who were armed with *laathis and jaathis*.¹⁷ When Lieutenant Singer himself and the Police Officers seized four or five of them and tied their hands, one of the peasants retaliated by striking Lieutenant Singer on his head with a lattee which caused him to fall unconscious to the ground.

The Jailor and the Thana *Mohurir* who were near Lieutenant Singer also received several blows from the lattees wielded by the peasants. The Police Daroga, being afraid did not go near Lieutenant Singer and when they ran backwards the peasants followed them and assaulted them with their indigenous weapons.

¹⁴ Assam archives, an official account of the Phulaguri Uprising vol no.1, file no.36, 2.

¹⁵ Ibid, 2.

¹⁶ Assam archives, extract taken from vol no.26 – 1862 letters received from miscellaons officers, 3.

¹⁷ Ibid, 3-4.

The police Darogah, Jail Darogah, The Thana Mohurir and others deputized to tackle the situation were assaulted also before they could escape leaving behind Lieutenant Singer to his fate. Lieutenant Singer was left alone and when the peasants saw that the others had escaped, several of them again dealt more blows to Lieutenant Singer until he was dead.¹⁸

The situation was eventually brought under control. Lt. Sconce should not have recommended to abolish the Assessorship of Nowgaon, if he did not wish to perform that responsible duty himself with due conscience. If Mr. Sconce had gone to Phoolagooree instead of sending Lieutenant Singer and explained the ryots the just views of government about taxation according to act XVIII... They would never have then perpetrated such a vile deed on an European officer or any one else.¹⁹

Regarding the Phulaguri uprising, H.K. Barpujari stated, "There is hardly any doubt that the Lalungs and Kacharis of Nowgong being hard hit by the prohibitory measures of government were in the vanguard of the movement, but they were blessed, if not actively cooperated with the educated and well-to-do middle class consisting of small land owners, government servants, *Mouzadars*, traders and merchants who were no less affected by recent taxes on income, trades and dealings."²⁰

In due course, trials began and criminal proceedings were drawn against several peasants. Seven of them, Lakshman Singh, Sangbor Lalung, Rongbor Deka, Sibsing Lalung, Shakbor Lalung of Topakuchi area, Bahu Dorn of Deobali and Debera Lalung of Kotohguri were found guilty for being involved in the murder of Lieutenant Singer and assault on many officers.²¹

Beginning in the eighteenth century, Colonial authorities maintained laws that provided for the exile of trouble makers. Most of the trouble makers and those convicted were deported to the Andaman Islands as one of the punitive measures adopted by the British Raj. Those convicted in the the Phulaguri uprising were also sent to the Andaman Islands.²²

The Phulaguri uprising of 1861 was one of the earliest coordinated and powerful anti-colonial struggles spearheaded by the Tiwa peasants in Assam. Though the uprising was a failure, the fact remains that the Tiwa peasants consciously or unconsciously refused to kneel to their alien masters. Their indomitable courage and resistance to British imperialism was a reflection of unity based on tribal social structure in the face of economic incursion by the despotic British Raj.

¹⁸ Assam archives, extract taken from vol no.26 – 1862 letters received from miscellaons officers, 4.

¹⁹ Ibid, 4.

²⁰ Barpujari H.K, et al ed.Political History of Assam, vol.1,1826-1919,Guwahati 1977, 94.

²¹ Op.cit.vol.1,file 36, 4.

²² Op.cit.vol.1,file 36, 4.

A Declining Monarchy in Crisis: The Reign of Guari Nath Singha

Pallavi Baruah

Loknayak Omeo Kumar Das College

Introduction

This paper is an attempt to analyze the significance of certain eighteenth century events in the history of Assam. Archival sources are rare in this connection hence literary sources are exploited to analyze the significance of the period. The period can be regarded as significant because the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century witnessed the decay of the Ahom monarchy, which had ruled the whole Brahmaputra valley for nearly six hundred years, a rare phenomenon in the history of Assam. An attempt is made here to explain how the reign of Gauri Nath Singha was partly responsible for the decline of the Ahom dynasty which led the Ahom Monarchy to a crisis.

Origin of the Ahoms

Situated on the northeastern extremity of the Republic of India, the province of Assam included the valleys of the Brahmaputra and Surma (Barak) as well as the North Cachar and Karbi Anglong Hills, which incline slightly northward where joined by the Patkai Hills.¹ Assam, is bordered on the north, east and south by great mountain ranges inhabited mostly by different hill tribes. Mongolian stock speaking different dialects, and representing different social and political institutions, manners and customs, gives rise to ethnological peculiarities in the state of Assam.² There are many hills, e.g., Bhutan, Aka, Dafia (Nishi), Miri and Abor, which can be regarded as offshoots of the Great Himalayan range north of the Brahmaputra Valley. On the southwest side is the Patkai range, which forms a natural boundary between Burma and Assam. Despite geographical barriers between Assam and Burma, the Ahoms successfully entered Assam through the Panchou Pass from Burma, over the Patkai Hills via the Nongyong Lake. Assam was the first abode in India of the Mongolian immigrants from the Hukong Valley and southwestern China.³

The origin of the Ahom is still shrouded in mystery. The legendary account in Ahom (Tai) and Assamese Bhranjis alleges that Su-Ka-Pha, who led the Tai or Shan to the Brahmaputra Valley, was a descendant of the line of Khum-Lung, but the narratives about his parentage are rather incoherent.⁴ Professor D.G.E.Hall says that the Shans, Laos and the Siamese of today are all descended from a common racial group, cognate to the Chinese and known among themselves as Tai. From

¹ Shrutidev Goswami, *Aspects of Revenue Administration in Assam 1826 to 1874*, 1.

² Dr. Lakshmi Devi, *Ahom Tribal Relations*, 1.

³ *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, 2.

⁴ N.N. Acharya, *A History of Medieval Assam*, 2.

the sixth century B.C. onwards, Chinese records make frequent references to the Barbarians south of the Yang-tse-king. Early in the Christian Era, the Tai came under the Chinese sovereignty, but were often in rebellion, and ever anxious to assert their independence. In the middle of the seventh century A.D. they formed a powerful kingdom at Nanchao. The Tais also found their way into southeastern China on one side, and the Northern Shan states of Burma on the other. In 1228, the Tai immigrants founded the Ahom kingdom of Assam in the Brahmaputra valley.

In his History of Assam, Sir Edward Gait says that the Tais were an offshoot of a great Shan or Tai race which spread eastward, from the border of Assam over nearly all of India, and far into the interior of China.

Political Condition of Assam Before the Coming of the Ahoms and the Assimilation Process

At the beginning of the second quarter of the thirteenth century, when the Ahoms first penetrated into the southeastern corner of Assam from Burma, the political condition of the area was not favorable. The whole country was divided into a number of states ruled by tribal chiefs. The Thai prince Swargadeo Sukapha entered Assam in 1228 A.D. and established the first Ahom settlement in the southeastern corner of what is present the Sibsagar district between the Burhi Dihing and Dikhaw Rivers. The Ahoms befriended the indigenous tribes of the valley, e.g., the Morans and the Barahis, assimilated with them, entered into matrimonial alliances with them, and never tried to impose their culture or traditions on these people. This proved quite beneficial in the long run. By adopting friendly attitudes towards these tribes, the Ahoms showed farsightedness, and thus enable themselves to rule over the Brahmaputra valley for six hundred years, as recorded in many literary sources as well as in few archival sources.

Consolidation of Ahom Power

Gradually the Ahoms extended their territories to occupy Chutiya country on the east, and Kacharis on the west. The process of expansion over the Brahmaputra valley took a long time to complete. There was bloodshed, but diplomacy and statesmanship also played an important role. The Ahoms had the additional responsibilities of protecting their territories from the hill tribes.⁵ The Ahoms carved out an extensive kingdom by subjugating various powers like the Kacharis, the Chutiyas, the Koches, and other small kingdoms, and kept the whole kingdom under Ahom control for six hundred years, an impressive achievement. From the thirteenth century onward, the rapid growth of Ahom power forced the other powers to retreat further, giving the former a free hand in the valley. During the reign of Rudra Singha (1696-1714) most of these powers were subjugated and

⁵ D.G.E.Hall, A History of South East Asia, 70.

compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of the Ahom king. At the expense of local chiefs and tribes, the Ahom kingdom reached its zenith, and was raised to a considerable height by their kings until the seventeenth century. The eventful reign of the Ahom kings was a landmark for expansion and consolidation of Ahom power, as they waged victorious campaigns against the disintegrating forces. The Moghuls made repeated unsuccessful attempts during the seventeenth century to bring Assam under their imperial domination. The Ahom army defeated the Moghuls decisively in the battle of Itakhuli in 1682, forcing the Moghuls to accept the Manas river on the north bank, and a line on the south bank of the Brahmaputra as the stable international frontiers.⁶

Constructive Activities

Despite heavy engagements in wars, the Ahom kings never neglected their constructive activities on behalf of their subjects. The Ahoms, who enjoyed political dominance over the whole of the Brahmaputra valley, won the confidence of the people by encouraging external trade with other parts of India., Assam exported muga silk endi, elephant tusks, manjistha (madder) and imported salt, valuable jewels, and stones. Their political stability, military strength and economic enrichment were eye-catching. It was during this period that a much wider contract in economic, cultural and religious spheres was made between Assam and Bengal. Trading activities were greatly expanded between Assam and Bengal, and at the same time, a monetary economy began to take root in place of a barter economy. The Ahoms attained their highest point of development until the seventeenth century, and enjoyed supreme authority over the Brahmaputra Valley. But the mighty Ahom Empire began to show signs of decline soon after Gauri Nath Singha ascended to the throne. The political situation worsened from 1782 to 1794. It was at the beginning of the eighteenth century that Assamese society became sharply divided on sectarian lines.⁷

Signs of Decay

The Ahom monarchy, which had been enjoying political dominance over the Brahmaputra Valley since the beginning of the thirteenth century, began to show signs of decay during this period. The Ahoms came from southwestern China, built up a powerful political kingdom which grew in size and power, and extended their empire to encompass the whole Brahmaputra Valley, covering more than seven hundred kilometers from east to west. Besides repulsion of foreign invasions, like the Muslim invasions of Ahom territory, and occasional raids of the hill tribes on the borders, the Ahom rulers also heroically resisted the advance of the Moghuls

⁶H.K. Barpujari, *Comprehensive History of Assam V1- II*, 67; Lakhi Devi, 6.

⁷Sir Edward Gait, *A History of Assam* (hereafter HAG), 96.

to push their frontiers toward the east. When the prospect of foreign invasion receded at the beginning of the eighteenth century, a period of peace and prosperity followed. However, this new situation had a quite peculiar effect on the decline of Ahom power. Devoid of any foreign war, the royalty and nobility, as well as the common people, engrossed themselves in religious affairs. The Ahom themselves came under the spell of rapid hinduization, resulting in religious sectarian division among them.

Moamaria Insurrection

This situation, combined with other important factors like installation of young and inefficient kings, brought decline to the Ahom power. The signs of the decline of Ahom monarchy began to appear toward the middle of the eighteenth century, and reached a climax during the reign of Gaurinath Singha. Civil war divided the people of Assam into two camps, one led by the Moamarias representing the peasant masses, and another led by royalists representing the nobility. War intermittently plagued the eastern and central parts of the kingdom during the period from 1783 to 1806. But the western parts were not trouble-free. During the same period hundreds of armed freebooters, disbanded soldiers, barkandazes, sanyasis and faqirs from the territories in western Assam carried on their depredations on the people, either independently or as employees of local chiefs.⁸

In April 1784, a group of Moamaria conspirators launched a daring night attack on the twin capitals of Rangpur and Garhgaon, but were repulsed after heavy fighting. This was followed by a general massacre of the Moamarias throughout the kingdom. Maniram Dewan wrote in 1838, “[the air] became tainted with stinking smell of corpses. Half of the country was depopulated”. The Moamarias rose in an open rebellion again in 1785. At first the Moran tribesman in their own jungle habitat, and the Dafla Bahatias in Japoribhita, revolted. The peasant masses throughout eastern Assam followed suit. They roamed about burning and looting the houses of the nobles and the rich royalist monasteries. Armed rebel contingents continued taking village after village until they finally encircled the royal city of Rangpur.⁹

The Royal Army could not halt the insurgency because of large scale defection in their own camp. The situation was so critical that King Gaurinath and his courtiers had to flee the capital of Rangpur on 19 January 1788. The king himself, accompanied by some ministers and officials, proceeded to Guwahati in western Assam, while Purnananda Burhagohain, the prime minister (1783-1817) retreated some 36 miles southwest to Jorhat to build up a fortified defense line. The evacuated city remained in the hands of the Moamarias continuously for six years, and after

⁸ Dr. S.K. Bhuyan, *Anglo Assamese Relations, 1771 to 1825*, (hereafter AAR), 62-63.

⁹ *Tungkhungia Buranji* (hereafter TB).

a brief break, Bharat Singha, a relation of Moamaria Mahanta, was elected to the throne of the fugitive king. There is evidence to prove that he continued to strike coins in his name from 1791 to 1797.¹⁰ Though they succeeded in breaking up the Ahom feudal power in its heartland, the rebels failed to break through and advance beyond the defense line set up by Purnananda Burahgohain at Jorhat. Because the rebels could not set up a centralized administration while Bharat Singha ruled in the old capital and its vicinity, Sarbananda was elected to rule from his headquarters at Bengmara (modern Tinsukia). Sarbananda also struck coins in his name in 1794 and 1795. Hawha Tanti, also known as Harihar, ruled over the Majuli Island and its adjacent areas on the north bank of the Brahmaputra.¹¹

Central and western Assam were also in a chaotic state. Members of Ahom nobility and their assistants came in large numbers as refugees to the Nowgong and Darrang districts. There was a food shortage in 1789, and as a result, sporadic popular uprisings began to occur in many parts of the kingdom, led by local chiefs, peasants and bairagies.

Rebellion in Darrang

The revolt of the Moamarias inspired the people in different parts of the country to rise in open rebellion against the Ahoms. It was in Darrang that the rebellion assumed a popular form. The Darrangis had earlier demonstrated their strength by organizing a protest against the oppression of the Ahom government, and compelling it to yield to their demand. They now flared up when they suffered fresh injuries in the form of fugitives infiltrating their country, and plundering the fertile province of Darrang for sustenance.¹²

People became angry, and to meet the crisis, they called a “raijmel” (a people’s meeting), and asked king Gaurinath to stop atrocities in Darrang. They threatened not only King Gaurinath, but also the Darang Paiks, with dire consequences, if they refused to obey the people’s summons. What followed was a peaceful mass rebellion, engulfing the whole of Darrang. Of the five leading spirits, Phatik Hazarika and Bhatar Konwar were born in noble families, while the other three--Sarup, Mainapowa and Kalia--were ordinary peasants.¹³

The Raja of Darrang tried to justify their act but his explanation could not satisfy Gaurinath. Royal troops were sent to capture two princes of Darrang, Hanganarayan Dekaraja and Haradutta. Haradutta escaped, but Dekaraja was captured, brought to Guwahati, and executed. His son Krishna Narayan and Haradutta joined forces to forcibly free Darrang and Kamrup from Ahom dominancy. All of this happened in 1790 before Gaurinath had shifted himself to Nowgong.¹⁴

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., 90-105.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Wade, *Accounts of Assam, 1800-1890* (hereafter AAW), 259, 261-265.

¹⁴ Ibid., 261-265.

Anticipating trouble in Nowgong and Darrang, King Gaurinath had been trying since November 1789 to recruit mercenaries from the company's territories. He was helped by European private merchants like Hugh Baillie and Daniel Raush. But Krishna Narayan interfered and engaged most of them in his own army. With these mercenaries he stayed in Darrang, and Phatik Hazarika, Haradutta and Bhotai Konwar left for North Bengal with the intention of recruiting more burkanbazeas. However, a band of 700 barkandezes sent from Dhaka by Raush reached Gaurinath. With a large band of mercenaries, Krishna Narayan occupied north Guwahati, posing a threat to Lachit Barphukan's establishment at Guwahati.¹⁵

Appeal from the King

King Gaurinath made the mistake of not listening to the advice of Purnananda Burahgohain to follow a mild and conciliatory policy toward the Moamarias, and instead took stern action against the rebels. The King appealed for help to the Cachar and Jaintia kingdoms, but they refused. However, Manipur sent troops and 4000 infantrymen along with a cavalry unit, led by King Jai Singha, which reached Gaurinath's Khutarmur camps in December 1790, and was immediately sent to the Burahgohain with an escort. But King Jai Singha was a failure.¹⁶

In lower Assam, the situation became so critical that the Ahom monarch found it impossible to proceed without foreign help. Gaurinath Singha invited the assistance of the East India Company. In February 1792, Gaurinath appealed to Lumsden, the collector of Rungpore, for British help. Governor General Lord Cornwallis decided in favor of an armed intervention in Assam to oust the barkandazes. Small forces of 360 sepoy, commanded by Captain Welsh, arrived at Goalpara on the 8th of November, and proceeded toward Guwahati on 16 November 1792.¹⁷ Welsh restored king Gaurinath Singha to the Ahom throne, as the legal claimant to the kingdom. On New Year's Day of 1793, Welsh wrote to Cornwallis that his first objective of cleaning Assam of Barkandazes was achieved.¹⁸

Effects

The British intervention, though temporary, had its effect. The crisis was over, but the monarchy never regained its former position and prestige. The crisis also presented itself in the economic spheres. Assam's self-sufficient economy could not meet the monetary demand that arose due to the British intervention. King Gaurinath Singha had agreed to open up Assam trade to the Bengal merchants, and entered into a trade agreement with the company's management on 28 February, 1793 to establish liberty of commerce between Bengal and Assam. At this juncture,

¹⁵ Ibid., 271-280.

¹⁶ Ibid., 232, 273-280.

¹⁷ Ibid., 231, 233-236.

¹⁸ HAG, 290-292, 300-302, 305-307.

the retirement of Cornwallis and his replacement by Sir John Shore further exacerbated the situation.¹⁹ The British intervention in 1792-1794 failed to bring peace to the country. Nevertheless, it gave the old experienced Prime Minister an opportunity to consolidate Ahom power. After the departure of Welsh, the Ahoms decided to maintain their own standing army, which was earlier run only by 'Paiks'. They opted for paid professional soldiers.²⁰

Period of Imperialism

The ruin of civil war-torn Assam was completed by the Burmese invasions. The country was plundered and totally devastated.²¹ This was a period of extreme degeneration and chaos. There were law and order problems, as well as political instability and uncertainties. King Gaurinath, who ruled Assam for 14 years, was described by Captain Welsh as "a poor, debilitated man, incapable of transacting business, always either washing or praying and when seen intoxicated with opium."²² The decline of the Ahom rule, and its eclipse from the political scenario of the Brahmaputra Valley, was a miserable event. S.N. Sen and S.K. Bhuyan agree that much of the Assamese people's miseries could have been avoided, had Welsh's expedition not been summarily and abruptly recalled.²³

The reign of Gaurinath Singha was a phase in the decline of the Ahom monarchy. The Moamarias, Darrang revolts shook the very foundation of the monarchy due to inefficiency of King Gaurinath.

Weak Administration

The seeds of decay of the Ahom monarchy were sown long before the whole territory was handed over to the ministers to rule in 1376-1380 A.D. and 1389-1397 A.D. (the period of ministerial supremacy) for lack of an efficient successor to the throne. But immediately after Sudangpha or Bamuni Raja ascended the throne in 1389, the empire gradually regained its strength, and lasted until the seventeenth century. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the Ahom kingdom was already an over-burdened hierarchical structure with no standing army of salaried professional soldiers recruited on a long-term basis. The Paiks who fought for the Ahom royalty were recruited on a temporary basis, and their contracts were service-based. Hence their commitment to the country was always in question. Strong supreme authorities like Pratap Singha and Uddyaditya Singha exploited the Paiks. As the Ahom monarchy followed a path of decay during the later part of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Paiks started to disobey the royalty, and refused to give proper attention to their obligation to

¹⁹ Ibid., 207-210.

²⁰ Tungkhungia Buranji, 138-143, 147-148.

²¹ Ibid., 175-176, 195.

²² AAR, 466-511, 552-553.

²³ HAG, 220.

the state. The system was becoming totally inactive and the administration had collapsed. Signs of breakdown of the Ahom land revenue policy and military system were already visible during the reign of Rajeswar Singha (1751-1759). The adult male population required to give service to the state managed to avoid registration, and opted for religious mendicancy like joining Vaisnava monasteries in remote areas as wasteland settlers.²⁴ The Brahmins were denied a mediating role in their religious rituals.²⁵ Lakmi Singha's reign was also not free from political turmoil, palace intrigues and brewing discontentment, and there was no unity among the nobility.

Challenges to the Monarchy

The decadence of the Ahom monarchy began with the reign of Lakhmi Singha [1765-80], the youngest son of Rudra Singha. After his ascension, a section of the Vaishnavas--the Moamariyas long seething under the oppression of the Ahom government-- organized the first popular challenge to the Ahom monarchy, by deposing the reigning king, and placing their own ruler on the throne. This success of the Moamariyas, though short lived, had a far-reaching effect on the history of Assam. This was a challenge not only to the concept of divine right of kingship, but also to the seven collateral Ahom families forming the core of bureaucracy. The popular rebellion shook the very foundation of the Ahom kingdom. It seems that the Ahom powers, so long considered unchallengeable, rested on a foundation so weak that any ambitious and courageous person commanding a few hundred men could pose a potential threat. The monarchy, instead of making any attempt to heal the wounds of the people, pursued a ruthless policy of persecution, which created wide resentment throughout the kingdom. As a result, all of the dissatisfied elements rose in action, and the Ahom monarchy found itself in a sea of troubles. It was in this crucial moment that Premier Purnanda Burha Gohain strove to maintain the tradition of Ahom monarchy by following a policy of conciliation. But the rebelling people joined hands with the Moamariyas, and compelled King Gaurinath Singha to take flight to Gauhati. Once more the insurgents became the masters of the Ahom metropolis and named their own king. Most of the hill tribes also lent their support to the Moamariyas. Under the circumstances Gaurinath sought help from the Burkundazes and the company management and thereby opened the gateway of the kingdom for the alien powers.

Conclusion

The Ahoms, having resisted several Muslim invasions, became the masters of the Brahmaputra Valley up to the Manah River in the west by the beginning of the seventeenth century. Under Ahom rule, the Assam region enjoyed the benefits of

²⁴ Prachin Bangla patra Sankalan; AAR, 551-553

²⁵ HAG, 249; Amalendu Guha, "Neo-Vaishnavism in late 18th century Assam," 43.

a strong efficient government, as well as peace, prosperity and order for several centuries. The Ahoms subjugated all petty chiefs, both within their kingdom as well as in the frontiers. This led to the emergence of a closely-knit geographical and political unit named Assam. The most notable contribution of the Ahoms was the political unification of the country from the Sadiya in the east to the river Manah in the west, which, over the course of a year resulted in a social, cultural and linguistic unit, and succeeded in awakening the spirit of homogeneity among the people.

But the inefficiency of the later Ahom rulers prevented them from sustaining the glory and pride for long., and led to their eventual downfall. King Gaurinath Singha sat on an already sinking boat in a sea of rising social forces and imperialistic designs of foreign powers. He was facing the music played by his predecessors. Even then he could have averted the already aggravated situation if he had tried to make a correct analysis of the situation. His ministers were all villains. Gaurinath believed in the traditional policy of his forefathers, i.e., a policy of blood and iron. He dismissed the officers appointed by Captain Welsh, and inflicted severe punishment on a number of persons appointed by Welsh. All of those, who supported the Moamariyas “were hunted down, robbed, and tortured to death, and the brutalities to which they were subjected were so appalling that many committed suicide to avoid falling into the hands of their persecutors.”²⁶ Continuous civil war, anarchy, confusion and oppression shattered the peace, and stopped all progress in social and cultural life. The royal treasury was drained, and the country as a whole reached the point of complete economic breakdown. The sun of Ahom power was gradually setting in the midst of chaos and anarchy, as large scale violence, oppression and inhuman cruelties brought the country to the verge of total ruin.

Gaurinath created controversy during his last moment by expressing his wish to the Premier to kill Baskatiya BarBarua and Sindhura Hazarika. But this reveals the general character of the princes and the nobles of the period, bearing testimony to the extent to which mutual distrust and jealousy reigned over questions of general interest. The monarchy started to decline creating crisis, and the shadow of imperialism began to appear. During this period of confusion, the plunder and chaos created by the royalists and the rebels caused the common masses to suffer, dragging down the country to ruin and disaster. It was difficult for common masses to maintain hope as they were plunged into a thick blanket of misery and despair. Gaurinath’s responsibility for the whole situation cannot be denied or overlooked. Had the administration paid proper attention to his warnings instead of indulging

²⁶ Buranji Bibek Ratna.

in intoxication and womanizing, the Ahom empire could have been saved. His amorous relations with Taravati, daughter of a fisherman named Sonadhar, are the subject of a popular ballad.²⁷

Due to the inefficiency of the King, people belonging to the lower strata of the social hierarchy raised the banner of revolt. Widespread and long-lasting rebellion prepared the burial ground of the Ahoms, who made lasting contributions to the stabilization of Assamese society by bringing the entire Brahmaputra Valley under one political rule.

²⁷ AAW.

An Enterprising Spirit: Richard Hamilton, 1811-1819

J. Calvitt Clarke III
Jacksonville University

Family Memory Ninety Years Later

On 3 June 1906, Judge Joseph Hamilton of Albion, Nebraska, sat at his desk to write a letter to his daughter.¹ “I recollect of some old letters that my father wrote while a prisoner of War of 1812. He was in the employ of the government, and sailed under “letter of Marck.”² In an enclosure, “An Enterprising Spirit,” he described his understanding of his father’s career:

Capt. Richard Hamilton, of New London, commanded a privateer, and he was a seafaring man...He was captured in the war of 1812 and imprisoned twenty months in Dartmouth prison, Eng. He made his escape a month before the war closed and the American prisoners released.

Capt. H. was shipwrecked off the French coast in his last voyage, and floated on the companionway door three days before he was picked up by a passing vessel. He, the mate and the cabin boy were the only survivors. . . . While floating, he cut a strip off the door with his knife, and tied a piece of red handkerchief to it. This improvised flag called the rescuers’ attention to him, and probably saved his life. . . .

Before Capt. Hamilton’s ship left port on the last cruise, the mate came to him, and asked him to go to a fortune tellers. . . . As a reason for the request he said that the fortune teller had told such a story that the mate would not go to the sea unless the captain did as requested. Capt. Hamilton refused at first, but in the end went the day before they sailed. The fortune teller said. “so You’ve come to ask the old Hag something, have you? You’ll know it three days out.”

The prophecy was fulfilled, as the wreck occurred “three days out.”³

Twenty-five separate letters that Richard Hamilton wrote to his parents and brothers between 1811 and 1819 survive. They provide personal insights to major historical events as they affected Richard, and they put the accuracy of Judge Hamilton’s family memories to the test.

¹ After Richard Hamilton, his wife held the letters. On her death, they passed to their son, Richard II. The Mariners Museum of Newport News, VA received copies of the Hamilton letters in the mid-1970’s from a private donor in Midlothian, VA. The donor provided no provenance documentation. The museum is unaware of the current location of the originals. Email, Bill Barker (Mariners Museum) BBarker@MarinersMuseum.org, July 08, 2009. Judge Hamilton’s letter came to me as part of a small collection of family papers held by my father. An expanded version of this paper can be found at <http://users.ju.edu/jclarke/familyhamilton.htm>. It includes extended transcriptions of Richard’s letters, annotations, and more historical context.

² Letter of Marque, a license granted by a state to a private citizen to arm a ship and seize merchant vessels of another nation. All spelling, punctuation, and underlining are as in the original letters.

³ To Kate Hamilton, June 3, 1906.

Captivity in France, 1811-1912

In his first extant letter, dated 4 September 1811, twenty two year-old officer, Richard Hamilton, wrote his parents explaining that a French privateer, the *Eleanor*, had taken his brig for violating Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte's Continental System.⁴ The French removed all the crew except Richard and two others. After three days, these three arrived at a small town, Tréguier, where the French took them ashore without allowing them to take their extra clothes. The three men were taken to the Commissary of Marines,⁵ "as worthy an old scamp as ever existed," and the commissary had the three Americans searched for money. Finding some on Richard, he ordered it taken. Richard threatened "to break the first ones head that attempted it." Before a guard of soldiers could take him to prison, the town's mayor arrived and listened to Richard's complaints. The mayor told the commissary that, because the Americans were not prisoners of war, he had no authority over them. Promising to be their friend, the mayor also told the Americans to put their protection certificates⁶ and money in his hands for security.⁷ The next day, the French owner of the *Eleanor* arrived and questioned the Americans about their brig. Afterward, they went to the mayor, who restored their protection certificates and money. The mayor then sent guards to take them the seventy five miles to Morlaix and to the care of the American Consul there.⁸

On the first day of their journey, the soldiers treated the Americans well. The next day, however, a party of horsemen relieved the guards, and they often tried to ride over any prisoners walking too slowly. Angered, the American cook grabbed a stone and knocked one of the horsemen from his horse. The French chained the Americans to their horses and forced them to walk that way the rest of the day. The next day, the guards allowed the Americans to hire horses, but, fearing escape, they chained the prisoners' feet under the horses bellies. In this way, they entered the town of Morlaix.⁹

The commissary in Morlaix threw the Americans in jail, where they remained for three days until claimed as citizens of the United States by the American Consul,

⁴David S. Heidler and Jeanne T. Heidler, eds., *Encyclopedia of the War of 1812* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 1997), 48, 348, 441, 521; Greg H. Williams, *The French Assault on American Shipping, 1793-1813: A History and Comprehensive Record of Merchant Marine Losses* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2009).

⁵Commissaries organized supplies of food and equipment for armies or the naval fleet.

⁶The Fourth Congress of the United States on May 28, 1796 authorized the Seamen's Protection Certificates to protect American merchant seamen from British impressments, ultimately one of the causes of the War of 1812. For Richard Hamilton's certificate, issued on Sept. 30, 1805, see Seamen's Protection Certificate Register Database, Mystic Seaport, <http://library.mysticseaport.org/initiative/ProtectionDetail.cfm?id=40829>, accessed Sept. 29, 2009. The Mystic Seaport: The Museum of America and the Sea has provided a copy of the original page with Richard Hamilton's application for a protection certificate. See Ruth Priest Dixon, "Genealogical Fallout from the War of 1812," *Prologue Magazine* 24 (Spr. 1992): no. 1, <http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/1992/spring/seamans-protection.html>. Accessed Sept. 2, 2010.

⁷CK 79 (2): To Joseph Hamilton, Sept. 4, 1811.

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹*Ibid.*

Jean Diot. Once released, they had the liberty of the town by day but had to be at their lodgings by dark. Four weeks went by before the captain could get passports to go to Paris to attend the court hearing that would determine the fate of their brig. He had great hopes for regaining his ship and part of the cargo.¹⁰

Jonathan Russell, the American Minister, ordered Diot to not allow the Americans to leave France until the trial was over. Richard wrote that they would most likely have to pass the winter where they were if the French condemned the cargo. If the French condemned the brig, Russell had received permission for the American crew to fit out one of the sequestered ships at Lorient in Brittany and to sail home with dispatches for the American government.¹¹

Richard told his parents that he had already written a number of letters, and had put them on cartels sailing to England, but that they had all been detected and returned to him. Richard warned his parents that he might not be able to write again for some time.¹² Belying that fear, Richard again wrote his parents on 1 October, 1811. His health was good, but he had no news of the trial regarding the brig—its fate depended on the larger political relations between France and the United States. Richard expected that he and his compatriots would lose all their books, quadrants, and clothes. While he had more liberty than before, he was less optimistic about being able to leave quickly and certainly not before the trial was over: “I expect to remain in this Country long enough to be a complete Frenchman as I already begin to sputter the Language so as to be understood by them.” Asking for news of family and friends, he again warned that he might not write again for some time; this time because no vessels in Morlaix were sailing for America.¹³

Six weeks later, Richard wrote his parents. Once more tying his fate to the larger political conditions, he expected the French would decide the fate of all American captives on Napoleon’s return to Paris from Belgium. He hoped the trial would quickly clear his brig, but if condemned, he said the French would immediately send the detainees home at American expense. “I think that you may expect me home about the first of March,” he wrote. Richard further explained,

there is great expectations in this Country of a speedy war between America and G Britain which is hurrying all of the Americans in France to return home as soon as possible. since the Emperor has been in Holland he has sent the most of the Dutch Seamen into his Country to man his fleets at Brest, Amherst and the flotilla at Bologne. since we have been here there has been two general draughts [drafts]. through this province that swept the most of the young men.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*; Heidler and Heidler, eds. *Encyclopedia*, 456-57.

¹² CK 79 (2): To Joseph Hamilton, Sept. 4, 1811. A cartel ship is a vessel commissioned to exchange prisoners or to carry any proposals between hostile powers.

¹³ CK 79 (3): To Joseph Hamilton, Oct. 1, 1811.

they are comforted with the promise of some great estate in England and seem as positive of it as if they had it in hand. they are sent to the flotilla at Bologne.¹⁴

Richard noted that the Americans were not the only foreigners in France: “there has lately been marched through this place upwards of four hundred Spanish prisoners.” These prisoners had been sentenced to hard labor in the dock yards at Brest. “I think that they are the most miserable set of beings that ever I saw.”¹⁵

Richard turned to more personal matters for the remainder of the letter. “We have much more liberty than we had when we first arrived here. we are allowed to walk in the Country . . . but not near the Seashore.” He explained how he hoped his letter would get home. “These will go in a Gersy smuggler and from thence to England before it can get on board of an American vessel.” The French had returned his trunk of clothes but none of his sea clothes or his quadrant.¹⁶

Richard again wrote his parents on 4 February 1812. While in good health, he was less hopeful “of a speedy termination to our process” because, “all of the American tryals have been suspended.” Their captain still hoped for the return of his vessel and “to be indemnified for the plunder of our Clothing. . . . Since Mr. Barlowe [Minister to France] has arrived in this Country he has given orders to Mr. Diot the Consul at this place to furnish us with a Suit of Clothes which we stood much in need of.”¹⁷

He casually mentioned what would become the two primary causes of Napoleon’s destruction: the Emperor’s dramatic invasion of Russia in 1812 and the grueling Peninsular War in Spain that entangled France between 1807 and 1814. He wrote, “The Emperor is to go up the north shortly with his whole army. It is expected to be against the Russians. he has drawn all the best of his troops from this part. . . . there is great scarcity of grain in this Country at present. they are gathering all that is possible to be had for the army in Spain.” Turning more personal, Richard continued, “I am obliged to make a virtue of necessity and inform myself in the French tongue which I begin to understand sufficient to hold a conversation in it.” Hoping to get home soon, he added “I am heartily fatigued with such a lazy line of life.”¹⁸ This languid observation is the last Richard’s family and friends heard from him for the next twenty two months.

¹⁴ CK 79 (1): To Joseph Hamilton, Nov. 20, 1811.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.* Jersey [Gersy] is the largest of nine Channel Islands in the English Channel between north western France and southern England.

¹⁷ CK 79 (4): To Joseph Hamilton, Feb. 4, 1812.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Captivity in England, 1813-1815

The United States and the United Kingdom, as the French had hoped, were soon at war. On 1 March 1813, Richard set sail from Brest aboard the famous American privateer, the *True-Blooded Yankee*, to prey on British shipping in the Irish Sea. The captain soon placed Richard in command of one of the captured prizes and ordered him to take it to Norway, “and to open a Correspondence for all others that she might send there, after disposing of them agreeable to my orders.” Completing his task, Richard tried to return to France by way of Sweden, but by this time the Swedes had declared war on Denmark and had joined the coalition fighting Napoleon. Richard was stopped at a border crossing and had to find another route to France. In laconic words Richard explained: “I was thereby necessitated, if possible, to cross from Norway to Jutland in a small boat and was taken for the attempt on the 22nd of July.” Richard was captured by the British.¹⁹

By December, the British had thrown Richard into a prison ship, the *Crown Prince [Frederic]* anchored at Chatham, England.²⁰ Protesting the barbarity of British imprisonment, Richard grumbled at “being confined in a place where there is no respect shown to either quality or colour,²¹ and likewise being mostly composed of persons that have released from H.B.M’s service.” He explained that, before the war, the British had impressed American seamen, who now had chosen prison over fighting against their compatriots. Richard continued in a more reflective, even dispirited, tone. “When I reflect on the past scenes of my life, it seems next to an impossibility for me to perform any undertaking without meeting with some blasting obstruction.” He then described himself as “a Journeyman to Misfortune.” While Richard was in “tolerable good health,” he admitted he had to guard it. He venomously continued:

the place that we are confined in reminds me more of a Dog kennel than place of confinement for Human Beings for we are allowed the open Air, only from 8 in the morning until 3 PM and as for the Moon & Stars I positively protest that I have seen neither since my confinement. candlelight we are allowed, at

¹⁹ CK 79 (5): To Joshua Hamilton, Dec. 15, 1813. For the *True-Blooded Yankee*, see George Coggeshall, *History of the American Privateers, and Letters-of-Marque, During Our War with England in the Years 1812, '13 and '14. Interspersed with Several Naval Battles Between American and British Ships-of-War* (New York: The Author, 1856), 149, 168, 202-04 and Edgar Stanton Maclay, *A History of American Privateers* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1899), 274-77, 356.

²⁰ For life aboard British prison ships, see Francis Abell, *Prisoners of War in Britain, 1756 to 1815: A Record of Their Lives, Their Romance, and Their Sufferings* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), 37-91, and especially 82-91 for the prison hulks at Chatham; for specific mention of the *Crown Prince*, see 79, 82, 84-90, 152.

²¹ Since the Revolution, the American merchant navy had provided employment for free blacks, and the regular American Navy also recruited black seamen. The British imprisoned many of them on the prison hulks. Of the Americans sent to Dartmoor, about one out of seven was black. At first, the British mixed blacks with other prisoners, but by early 1814 whites had petitioned that blacks receive separate quarters, arguing that they were dirty by habit and thieves by nature. It would seem likely that Richard participated in this petition or at least sympathized with it. Reginald Horsman, “The Paradox of Dartmoor Prison,” *American Heritage* 26 (Feb. 1975): 12-17, 85; Abell, *Prisoners*, 251.

our own expence, until 10 in the evening and that is a privilege granted in such a manner as to make us consider it a great favour.²²

There was one ray of hope. In a postscript, Richard enigmatically wrote, “I have a friend in London, who write She is in great hopes of obtaining my liberty in the course of this or the next month. This Friend is a Lady I formed an acquaintance with while I was in France.” He promised that “should I be once more emancipated, I shall endeavour to seek recompence for my present situation, as soon as an opportunity may offer.”²³

Seven months later, on 15 June 1814, Richard wrote his parents from the prison hulk, though there were evidently other letters from that seven month interim that no longer exist. Though in good health, his “great hopes of being speedily liberated” had fallen through because of the “inattention” of the universally reviled American agent, Reuben G. Beasley. He placed his hopes in peace talks, but he did not expect too much because the British were hoping for “a division between the northern and southern States,” which would “thereby overthrow the independency of America.”²⁴ This was Richard’s last known letter from Chatham. On 26 November, he wrote from the infamous Dartmoor Prison.²⁵ He does not explain his transfer, some time in August or shortly thereafter, but the British removed the Americans from the *Crown Prince Frederic* to Dartmoor. Surely, Richard was part of this mass transfer.²⁶

By this time, his family’s fortunes had changed. He had heard news from fellow citizens of New London of the death of his father, Joseph: “of all of misfortunes cups this is the bitterest for me to swallow.” Worried that he was unable to assist his “tender and most disconsolate Mother,” he took solace that his younger brother, John, was now of age. He could “take charge of the family affairs which were in a very intricate situation at the time of my leaving home, and also to assist his Mother in advising and settling the younger Brothers.”²⁷

In that same letter Richard turned his attention to describing the horrors of Dartmoor., “[A] task that I am inadequate to paint... the daily accounts of mortality

²² CK 79 (5); Benson John Lossing, *The Pictorial Field-Book of the War of 1812, or, Illustrations, by Pen and Pencil, of the History, Biography, Scenery, Relics, and Traditions of the Last War for American Independence* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1869), 1068. See CK 79 (7): To Widow of Joseph Hamilton, Nov. 26, 1814.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ CK 79 (6): To Joseph Hamilton, June 15, 1814.

²⁵ Horsman, “Paradox of Dartmoor Prison,” pp. and Heidler and Heidler, eds., *Encyclopedia*, 143-44. For life at Dartmoor, see Abell, *Prisoners*, 235-61; Andrews, *Prisoners' Memoirs*; Maclay, *History of American Privateers*, 367-78; and Charles Andrews, *The Prisoners' Memoirs, or, Dartmoor Prison; Containing a Complete and Impartial History of the Entire Captivity of the Americans in England, From the Commencement of the Late War Between the United States and Great Britain, Until All Prisoners were Released by the Treaty of Ghent. Also, a Particular Detail of All Occurrences Relative to that Horrid Massacre at Dartmoor; on the Fatal Evening of the 6th of April, 1815* (New York: Printed for the author, 1815).

²⁶ Abell, *Prisoners*, 90.

²⁷ CK 79 (7).

from the Hospital is from six to eight which might be prevented were we more comfortably situated and proper attention given to us.” In truth, conditions at Dartmoor varied. Some suffered under harsh conditions, but most fared quite well the majority of the time. Richard vowed that if restored to liberty, he would take “any means to defend myself for I would rather sacrifice my existance than again to be dragged to this place as food for vermin.” Richard had lost hope that there would soon be peace, but he allowed, “There is at present more hopes of an exchange when I may once more be able to restore to your embraces of a long long lost...but affectionate Son.”²⁸

A month later on 24 December 1814, the Americans and British signed the Treaty of Ghent. The treaty formally ended the War of 1812, but the British told their prisoners about it three months later in March. On 31 December, a week after the signing, Beasley visited his countrymen at Dartmoor for the first and last time. He brought them extra clothing but little else. Because Beasley did not have a plan for prisoner transportation, not only did the Americans already at Dartmoor continue to languish there after the peace, the British further added to the prisoners’ ranks well into March.²⁹

Fully aware at last that peace had been signed, Richard wrote again on 1 April. He assured his brother Joshua that he was in good health. Because of his family’s situation, he declared his wish to come home, but that he had responsibilities and a need of money. He wanted to return to France to settle with the owners of the *True Blooded Yankee* and “to secure what may be justly my dues, the earning of which have been attended with as many difficulties and disappointments—for to return home after a tedious absence of four years without a farthing to bless myself with and thereby exposed to the censure and ridicule of the more fortunate is what I cannot at present think of without extreme pain.”³⁰

Clearly tired, Richard despaired of his life at sea: “Should everything on my arrival at France answer my expectations, I am in hopes of being able to realize sufficient to settle myself in some permanent business on shore, without being necessitated to follow the precarious employment of the Seas for a livelyhood.” Noting postwar economic dislocations, he promised Joshua, “I shall make it my business to return home from France as soon as possible, when I am in hopes of finding you engaged in some mechanical trade which is far preferable to following the Seas in the present fluctuating state of affairs not only at home but also throughout all Christendom.” He worried about his brother, William. “tell him that I am really unhappy to learn that he has embraced a Sailors profession and am fearful that he will find when too late that there is nothing permanent to

²⁸ CK 79 (7).

²⁹ Heidler and Heidler, eds., *Encyclopedia*, 144; Abell, *Prisoners*, 84, 86, 249-1, 254, 258.

³⁰ CK 79 (8): To Joshua Hamilton, 1 April 1815.

be expected from it but Chagrin and Disappointments which I have learnt to my Sorrow.³¹

Liberation and Commercial Stagnation, 1815-1816

Two weeks later, on 16 April, Richard announced to his brother Joshua that he was back in Morlaix, “emancipated from the horrors of captivity and once more restored to the blessings of liberty.”³² He hoped to arrange his affairs so that he could leave in about a month. Richard learned that some of the privateer’s prizes had reached ports in the United States and he asked Joshua to tell the crew of the *True-Blooded Yankee* that he been empowered to act in their behalf. Richard promised he would do everything he could to find out “the amount of what is due to them.”³³

Richard then turned to French politics; Napoleon had returned to power during “The Hundred Days.” Richard sympathetically, if mistakenly, viewed the directions he thought France was heading. “Every thing appears to be in perfect state of tranquility in this Country,” he wrote, and “the Emperor is universally acknowledged and it is next to an impossibility for any foreign coalition to again hurl him from that throne.” Sympathetic to the French, Richard added, “it is the cry of all the inhabitants that they are determined to have who they please for a monarch and not to be dictated by any foreign Potentates... this determination they appear to be well able to support.”³⁴ Five months later, with Napoleon was once again wrested from power. Richard wrote that he was going to Ostend, where he remained for a couple of months searching for cargoes, and then working on leads in Antwerp, Lisbon, and Germany.³⁵ After another nine months, Richard expounded on what he felt were the causes of Europe’s economic problems. “The unhappy and distressed situation that this Country is placed in by the wars of Monarchs against their subjects has renders all commerce so fluctuating that its merely impossible to obtain a return Cargo for vessels direct from America and compels most of the Americans to return in ballast.” He blamed the Allies, who, in leaving France, “completely relieved it of every thing but Misery which will occupy the inhabitants a great number of years.”³⁶ Richard’s personal lot, however, had improved. He was about to leave Antwerp for France, where there was a cargo waiting to go to the United States. As a consequence, he hoped to be back home by August.³⁷

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² In the extant letters, Richard does not mention how he left Dartmoor. His last letter from the prison is on Apr. 1, and by the time of his next letter on Apr. 26 he was already in Morlaix. The British released the first group of Americans on 20 April and the rest several days later. See Abell, *Prisoners*, 254-55. It seems most likely that he left Dartmoor among the released Americans.

³³ CK 79 (9): To Joshua Hamilton, 26 April, 1815.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ CK 79 (10): To Joshua Hamilton, 17 September 1815.

³⁶ CK 79 (12): To Rebecca Hamilton, 1 June 1816.

³⁷ Also see CK 79 (11): To Rebecca Hamilton, 25 January 1816.

Richard's plan to sail home as captain of a cargo-laden vessel fell through. He wrote his brother, William, from Bordeaux on 7 October 1816: "You will undoubtedly be surprised to receive news of me from this place...having unfortunately lost the Brig that I was in. I have proceeded on here in order to obtain a passage once more to my native Country." Richard continued, "misfortune... happened on my sailing from Morlaix through fault of my Pilot, [who lost the ship and its cargo]of linens of different qualities and some articles of provisions bound to Port au Prince." Sadly, Richard had put everything he had earned since his liberation into this adventure, and all of the credit he had been able to acquire. His French creditors, however, behaved "very honourably...in forcing the sales of the Auction on my damaged articles at so high a price that I was able to answer all my Creditors to their full demands." Still, Richard was left "with a bare sufficiency for getting home." His experiences over the last several years had left him despondent. "But as Madame Adversity troubles herself so much with my affairs I begin almost to look on her as my Step Mother and by force reconcile myself to her favours in the end hoping she prove like most other Ladies a little capricious and place her affections on some other favorite." In closing his correspondence, Richard promised William, "If I can find any employ from this place previous to the sailing of the vessel that I have engaged my passage in, I shall certainly embrace it owing to the stagnation of all Commerce in the US."³⁸

Again in Bordeaux, Richard wrote William by mid-November, but with good news this time around. He was now First Officer aboard the brig *Amazon* of Philadelphia, "with the promise of commanding her on the arrival at New Orleans, the place of her destination." In lieu of returning directly, he sent a present: "I send you by Mr Robertson Mate of the Ship *Minerva*, of New York, my Portrait, who promises to forward it immediately on to you." Hoping to leave Bordeaux in two or three weeks, Richard asked that his family should forward their letters to New Orleans.³⁹

Just one month later, Richard communicated with William from Bordeaux final time to announce his imminent departure for New Orleans.⁴⁰

Affairs of the Heart

Affairs of the heart and marriage prospects preoccupied many of young Hamilton's thoughts while away from home, but Lady Fortune did not smile on him. He apparently had a commitment from a Miss Rogers, presumably of New

³⁸ CK 79 (17): To William Hamilton, 7 October 1816. In addition to the economic dislocations in Europe following the Napoleonic Wars, which Richard wrote about, the Tariff Act of 1816, the first complete protective tariff adopted by the United States, further debilitated the North Atlantic trade.

³⁹ CK 79 (18): To William Hamilton, 15 November 1816.

⁴⁰ CK 79 (13): To William Hamilton, 12 December 1816.

London, and permission from his and her parents.⁴¹ Aboard his prison ship, *Crown Prince Frederic*, a lovelorn Richard in June 1814 asked his parents: “To Miss R..... I wish you to present my warmest respects and beg my excuse for not writing to her, as I have to smuggle this, an addition to it would be too bulky. I know that it is not common for Parents to be the bearer of Love dispatches.”⁴² Soon at Dartmoor Prison, melancholy and nostalgic, in November 1814, he asked that his “Brothers treat her in every way that may be due to an intended Sister.” He allowed for disappointment, commanding his mother, “should her sentiments be altered, which doubtedly they may know you may suppress this altogether.”⁴³ After his release from Dartmoor Prison, when he was back in Morlaix, Richard plaintively implored his brother to tell him about Miss Rogers, as he had not heard anything about her since he had left home.⁴⁴

By July 1816, while Richard was yet in Morlaix, he had received unpleasant news. He wrote to his brother William, expressing his hope that their brother might soon marry:

I should be extremely happy to learn that our Brother John might be well established in business at home, or at least well enough to warrant him in marrying as undoubtedly it would be a great comfort to our aged Mother to have the society of a Daughter in the house, and can I be able to assist him in any family affairs, I will be happy to do all that lies in my power for my age, and situation will (perhaps) never allow me to establish a family. therefore I shall always consider his as my own.

Why this resignation at age twenty-seven? Evidently, Miss Rogers had found another. Richard asked William to “demand those letters that I have forwarded to her as I can’t altogether hold her excusable in retaining them, after she saw fit to accept of the address of another.” Understanding that his long “absence might warrant her in making another choice,” Richard wished she might “enjoy every happiness.”⁴⁵

Only two weeks later, he sent another correspondence to William, explaining he had heard news from two compatriots. The first was “an officer in the Navy . . . perfectly acquainted with all the Gossips and walking Newspapers of the town,” and the second was a gentleman he had seen in Antwerp. He continued in the sad and philosophical spirit of someone who had seen and suffered much:

the hypocrisy of those who stiled themselves my Friends I am not greatly surprised at for what can one expect from those who have had so little

⁴¹ CK 79 (1) references a letter Hamilton likely sent from Morlaix to Mr. I. Rogers.

⁴² CK 79 (6).

⁴³ CK 79 (7).

⁴⁴ CK 79 (10).

⁴⁵ CK 79 (14): To William Hamilton, 6 July 1816. Richard sent this letter twice. The one cited above was postmarked in New York on 17 October. The duplicate was postmarked in New York on 1 November.

experience with mankind as to think their conduct is or ought to be a criterion for the universe. The conduct of Miss R. gives me so little pain that I hardly have given a thought since you have verified the reports that I had previously heard.

It seems safe to infer that Richard had heard that Miss Rogers had justified her behavior by claiming he had, in effect, abandoned her. He continued: “to be unfortunate is not to be criminal. therefore always even when all correspondence was so precarious I used every endeavor to inform her of my attachment to her either by direct or indirect means, ‘ever’ not wishing to sport with the affections of a Woman.” As if to stress his lack of bitterness, he added, “however I wish you (in my name) to give her Brother my most sincere thanks for his attachment for me, wishing him every happiness with his amiable Consort.”⁴⁶

More upset over Miss Rogers than he allowed, a year later Richard tried to justify to Joshua his not having yet returned home after his release from Dartmoor. He explained, “to return and view another coby strutting in the Heaven that I was preparing for myself would be an Amertume to the happiness of revisiting my aged Mother and native home. I should have returned immediately after my Arrival in France from Prison, had I not heard a young gentleman recounting his Amours in N. London.”⁴⁷ It would seem that he had even suffered the indignity of hearing directly from the victor in the contest for Miss Rogers’ affections.

For the moment, Richard seemed not to have long mourned love lost. In mid-December, he wrote from Bordeaux, asking William to send notarized certificates attesting to the death of their father and another attesting that he was unmarried and had his mother’s permission to marry whomever he wished. Fearing “miscarriage,” Richard advised his brother to get duplicates; the first William was to send immediately to Bordeaux to an intermediary—“as the sooner it may arrive the better.” The second he was to keep until he heard of Richard’s arrival in New Orleans, “from whence I will be more particular as there will be no danger of miscarriage by the Post.” Richard declined to describe his amour, but he did allow that, “the young Lady that has gained my affections is a Miss Kroger daughter to a very respectable Merchant of this City. and as she is from a Family both able and willing to assist me in the Command of a Ship.” Richard swore, “that by marrying in this Country it is not my intention to abandon my home, neither is it the wish of the young Lady that I should.”⁴⁸

⁴⁶ CK 79 (16): To William Hamilton, 16 July 1916.

⁴⁷ CK 79 (20): To Joshua Hamilton, 1 November 1817. I believe “cobyly” is the correct transcription. I, however, do not know the meaning of the word. “Amertume,” is French for bitterness.

⁴⁸ CK 79 (13). Also see CK 79 (19): To Joshua Hamilton, 24 December 1816, in which Richard again asked for the notarized certificates and stresses even more strongly that his family be discrete about his betrothal.

Richard finally arrived in New Orleans, and on 12 March 1817, he wrote William, asking about the fate of the certificates he had requested. At last, he added more detail of his “amour,” although he was still sketchy: “The Father of the young Lady is a German by birth. a very respectable Commercial Merchant and is herself qualified to shine in any society of Life. she is about twenty years of age, not the greatest of Beauties, but is, as far as I can discover possessed of sweet, amiable, character.” Richard promised that soon after they married, they would visit, when they could judge her for themselves. He again asked his brother, “not to mention the affair to anyone out of our own immediate Family as it is useless to publish an affair of this nature until it is passed.”⁴⁹

Richard wrote nothing more about his amours. For whatever reason, his proposed betrothal with Miss Krogër never flowered into marriage.

Captivity in Mexico, 1818-19

As he had promised in his last letter to William from Bordeaux in December 1816, Richard returned to the United States. 12 March 1817, Richard wrote William from New Orleans, again commenting on “the great stagnation of Commerce” which had “greatly frustrated my expectations. but I have every reason to hopes that in few weeks I may able to write you under more favorable circumstances, although at present I cannot call myself badly situated.” Richard worried for his brother and his choice of occupations:

you mention to me that you are engaged in the Smack fishery, let me caution you (my dear Brother) against imbibing too many of their idle habits and conduct. you will certainly allow me to advise from experience being perfectly acquainted with their technical terms and phrases, which may well serve in their particular society, but will appear rather insipid when some more proffitable employment may call you from them, which I am greatly in hopes may shortly be the case.⁵⁰

From New Orleans on 1 November 1817, having just returned from the “Coast of Mexico where I have made a short voyage in an armed Brig to protect our trade against the Corsairs Patriotic (or rather Pirates of Mexico),⁵¹ Richard answered a letter from Joshua. His pride threatened, Richard explained why he had not yet

⁴⁹ CK 79 (23): To William Hamilton, 12 March , 1817.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ “Corsairs” were pirates in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, who ranged the Gulf of Mexico. This sufficiently explains why Richard sailed “in an armed Brig to protect our trade.” But this does not explain his use of the phrase, “Corsairs Patriotic (or rather Pirates of Mexico).” Against the backdrop of Napoleon’s occupation of Spain, Mexico had begun its struggle for independence. Many of the pirates involved themselves tangentially in Mexico’s War of Independence. Herbert Ingram Priestley, *The Mexican Nation: A History* (NY: Macmillan Co., 1923), 243-44; Henry Bamford Parkes, *A History of Mexico* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1938), 164-65; Justo Sierra, *The Political Evolution of the Mexican People* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969), 164-66. For Mexico’s larger struggle for independence, see 149-71. Also see William C. Davis, *The Treacherous World of the Corsairs of the Gulf* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2006).

returned home. “why return in the present stagnation of Commerce to northward? to pull of my hat and beg for employ from those that I am now totally a stranger to? no. that I can’t do. for to meet those that once saw me in a prosperous situation among Strangers would be an alloy for the great happiness of once again kissing my beloved Mother and Brothers.⁵²

On 18 March 1818, from Campeche on the Yucatan Peninsula in Mexico, Richard wrote his mother describing a traumatic, “almost unparalleled shipwreck” his vessel, the *Tippo Saib*, had suffered on 3 February.⁵³ In this and subsequent letters he told the full story. He explained that the *Tippo Saib* had been fitted out in New Orleans to take a cargo invoiced at \$400,000 to the coast of Mexico, where “suitable vessels” would meet the ship “to convey the Cargo to its destination.⁵⁴

The *Tippo Saib* had sailed from New Orleans, bound for Campeche. A few days out, the hull suffered damage in a gale, and the crew spent “a long time at sea repairing damages to enable her to proceed.”⁵⁵ The jury-rigged vessel sailed to its destination, but “our Commerce not allowing a too near approach we anchored about ten Leagues to the Southward in the open Sea in about 4 fathoms of water,”⁵⁶ and a Spanish brig received the *Tippo Saib’s* cargo.

The next night, another gale struck from the north, “and our vessel being under jury spars (having in a previous gale broke the head of the Fore Mast) we were forced to ride by our anchors.” The ship struck bottom, the bilges filled, and the seas broke over the ship so that the small boats, with only some of the crew aboard, could no longer stay close to the ship.⁵⁷ He dramatically continued:

by remaining on board to endeavour to stop the confusion of, and encourage the Seamen, I lost my passage in the Launch, and seeing no possibility of gaining either of the boats, by reason of the Sea being strewed with pieces of the wreck, I with difficulty mounted the stump of Fore Mast, the only Spar then standing

After securing himself, he saw an officer and seamen swept over the stern and hanging to different fragments of the wreck to the leeward of me, such as gained light pieces drove so far to leeward as to be saved by the boat the most of the remainder were either killed or drowned among the wreck of the deck plank and spars washed from the main part of the wreck

⁵² CK 79 (20).

⁵³ CK 79 (21): To Rebecca Hamilton, 18 March 1818.

⁵⁴ CK 79 (24): To Joshua Hamilton, 13 March 1819.

⁵⁵ CK 79 (22): To Rebecca Hamilton, 21 February 1819.

⁵⁶ CK 79 (21).

⁵⁷ CK 79 (21): To Rebecca Hamilton, 18 March 1818.

Richard explained his salvation:

The Vessel breaking up let the Foremast in the water, and finding impossible to remain in that situation any longer, and seeing the Stern disengaged from the hull, I swam to it and commenced driving to the leeward, in a direction nearly parallel with the shore

I remained driving in this manner with the Sea breaking over me and washing my cloathes from off me with no other nourishment that a piece of green hide with which one of the boom crutches were lined for two days, when I was taken off by a small Spanish Schooner.⁵⁸

His rescuers took him, the sole surviving officer, to Laguna,⁵⁹ and then to the city of Campeche, “on acct. of the Cargo that we had landed.”⁶⁰ To Richard’s surprise, he “found one of the Vessels, containing the greatest part of the Cargo, under seizure, having been forced there by the same gale in which the *Tippo Saib* was lost.”⁶¹ Spanish authorities had taken control of the cargo “as there was no manner of proof in what manner or where it was shipped, excepting the declaration of the Captain and Crew who declaring received from a vessel dismasted at Sea, and after wrecked on the Banks, with the probability of the loss of the Crew.” A year-long law suit to restore the cargo began.⁶²

As the sole surviving officer of the disaster, Richard made “a claim of the property in behalf of the Owners, until an agent for them might arrive empowered to support their defence and demand a restitution of their property.” Fortunately, Richard had managed to save every document regarding the vessel and its cargo, and thus “we were fully able to frustrate every action commenced against the Cargo. after a tedious and disagreeable length of time, which in any other than a Spanish country, would have been decided in less than two months they having nothing but suspicion to support their action.”⁶³

The Spanish confined Richard, and “the four first months was none too agreeable being in a strict state of confinement in that burning clime and debarred from every manner of communication till finding they were unable to frighten me, they placed me in a more eligible situation until a demand was made for me by the government of the U.S. when I was immediately restored to liberty.”⁶⁴ He still complained about the heat.⁶⁵

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Richard was likely taken to Carmen Island, which stands in the Laguna de Términos.

⁶⁰ CK 79 (21).

⁶¹ CK 79 (24).

⁶² CK 79 (22).

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ CK 79 (26): To Rebecca Hamilton, 20 July, 1819.

⁶⁵ CK 79 (22).

Once an agent of the ship's owners arrived, the Spanish authorities sent Richard to the capital and excluded him "from all communication purposely to embarrass" the defense "or to exact a heavier bribe" than he had already offered. The Spanish, however, found it impossible "to debar" him from writing the owner's representative. The "convincing justice" of his case and a bribe of \$50,000 won the "tedious" twelve months. The Spanish now allowed him to leave immediately. He was pleased that his "health during my detention in that burning climate was much better than I could have expected, after my great sufferings at the time of the loss of the vessel." Richard confided to his brother that his voyage had not been "as lucrative" as he had hoped, but it had not lost money. He did not yet know his next steps, as his employer, Paul Lanusse, a leading merchant, wanted him to stay in New Orleans for a few weeks, when he would have a vessel for him in the French trade.⁶⁶

From New Orleans, on 2 April 1819, Richard wrote Joshua that he was confident in finding permanent employment through Paul Lanusse. He had given Richard the command of a brig, but he did not know when he would go to sea, "as at this season trade is generated at a stand here, owing to the low state of the waters in the back Country debaring the decent of produce for exportation."⁶⁷

This is the last of Richard's extant letters.

Conclusion

Presumably Richard worked for a while with Lanusse, but he was soon back in New London. Despite his earlier skepticism about finding a wife, Richard married Mary Williams in Stonington, Connecticut on 3 July 1822. They lived in New London, where they had their first child in 1823. Sometime between then and 1826, the family moved to New York. How Richard made his living—at sea or in some other trade as he had so often threatened—in New London or New York is unknown. He died on 26 March 1845, likely in New York. Presumably, he managed to keep in touch with his contacts in New Orleans. In 1876 in Brooklyn, NY, his granddaughter married the son of a prominent New Orleans lawyer.

Richard's letters depict a man caught up in the dramatic history of his times. Like many New Englanders in the first decades of the nineteenth century, he made his living from the sea—a dangerous and adventuresome life. He fell afoul of Napoleon's Continental System and with the onset of the War of 1812, he turned to privateering, until the British captured and imprisoned him. After the Napoleonic Wars, he suffered through the economic travails tormenting the North Atlantic trade. Finally, he again faced confinement when caught up in the throes of

⁶⁶ CK 79 (24).

⁶⁷ CK 79 (25): To Joshua Hamilton, 2 April 1819.

Mexico's struggle for independence from Spain. All of Richard's letters reflect the sense of personal honor, duty, and formality so prized among respectable classes of the time.

Eighty-seven years later, Judge Hamilton respectfully described his father as "an enterprising man . . . finely educated, and an astronomer." His memory of his father's stories, however, was muddled. Richard had not commanded a privateer. The judge conflated Richard's two wrecks into one, and he mistakenly associated his capture by the British with that one wreck. His story about his father's dramatic rescue off the coast of France clearly came from the events off Campeche. Richard did not escape from Dartmoor. As for the story of the fortune teller, it presumably happened in New Orleans—if true. It is, however, too good a story to not want it to be.

West Indian Workers and the Panama Canal: A Diplomatic Perspective

Ginger Kalinski
Florida Gulf Coast University

While notable founders Philippe Bunau-Varilla and Colonel Goethals are praised as the builders and planners of one of the greatest human-built wonders of the world, the Panama Canal, many people often forget about the manual laborers, the majority of whom lost their lives during construction. Many early brochures and books commemorating the Panama Canal portray white, American laborers as the main canal diggers and contributors to Panamanian society. However, what these early reports lack is recognition of the West Indian laborers and their contributions to Panamanian culture and nationalism. West Indian laborers, some as recent immigrants and others already established in Panama from other projects, performed most of the hard labor of digging and dredging as “silver men” laborers. While facing death from disease and injuries, West Indian laborers experienced severe racism and discrimination from Americans as they were ousted from the all-American Panama City and their children were denied an education in the English-speaking American schools. These people were also denied citizenship from both the United States and the Republic of Panama despite many of them being born in Panama, then an American protectorate. This discrimination also led the West Indians to mobilize and join with the native Panamanians against American possession of the Panama Canal. The purpose of this research is to discuss how West Indian migrant workers and their descendants contributed to the Panamanian nationalist movement through labor and educational movements despite being oppressed by both the United States and Panamanian governments.

The social stratification and race relations within Panama were a result of the use of West Indian migrant labor by the American government for the construction of the Panama Canal. Current Panamanian social and race stratification can be best seen as a social hierarchy with the few elite whites at the top of the hierarchy. The influential whites, known as *rabil Blancos* in Panamanian society, are primarily from notable families of Spanish background. The *mestizos* and mulattos form a large middle class in Panamanian society. The Indians and blacks, seen as the bottom of the social hierarchy, are also stratified according to the level of Hispanicization they obtained in Panamanian society. The Indians and blacks that speak Spanish follow Catholicism, and take up Spanish names are at a higher social level than the English-speaking blacks in Panama. Another factor in this social stratification in Panama is the concept of race and skin color, as Panamanians associate lighter skin color with higher social status. As a result, the darker skinned Panamanian men often marry lighter skinned Panamanian women in order to produce lighter skinned

offspring as way to rid their families of this dark skin “curse” that Panamanians thought hampered their society.¹

The presence of West Indian blacks in Panama began in the 16th century during the Spanish slave trade and the black, West Indian population continued to grow during earlier British and French canal construction projects. During the mid 1500’s, Spanish slave traders established trade posts and sugar plantations in many Central American regions and the Panamanian isthmus was no exception. Escaped slaves established communities with free blacks in maroon colonies in order to provide mutual protection from slave traders and pirates. However, these maroon communities were often raided by Spanish slave traders and pirates with blacks captured and either imprisoned or sold back into slavery. After the independence of Gran Colombia from Spain, the slaves were emancipated and the majority of them migrated to either Colon or Panama City. Some of the earlier maroon colonies, including Portobelo and Toboga, still exist.²

The influx of migrant laborers to Panama began in the 1850’s when French contractors attempted to build a canal across the Panamanian isthmus. Laborers from Europe, China, and the Caribbean migrated to Panama. The European migrants that came to the isthmus came from Ireland, Spain, Italy, and Greece with hopes of a better future. However, the European migrant population dwindled as the majority of the migrants died from tropical diseases, or migrated back to Europe or other places with better opportunities. The French made another attempt at using migrant labor by recruiting Chinese laborers to dig the canal. The use of Chinese labor also failed as many of the Chinese migrants faced depression or died from disease. Those that faced depression either committed suicide or migrated back. After these failures, Ferdinand de Lesseps suggested the use of Caribbean blacks as laborers because of their supposed hardiness and ability to work in harsh tropical conditions.³

Ferdinand De Lesseps along with other canal planners in the French Canal Company thought that migrants of African descent were the best suited for migrant labor in the tropics because of their immunity to tropical diseases and their ability to survive in warm to hot climates. De Lesseps noted that English-speaking blacks from the Caribbean were seen as lazy and child-like and that French-speaking blacks were thought of as better workers, but he strongly suggested recruiting blacks from the English-speaking islands rather than the French-speaking islands. One of the reasons

¹ Thomas O’Reggio, *Between Alienation and Citizenship: The Evolution of Black West Indian Society in Panama 1914-1964* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc, 2006), 30-32.; American University Foreign Area Studies. Panama: A Country Study. (Washington DC: United States Government, Secretary of the Army, 1981) 77-78.

² O’Reggio, *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 27-28; AUFAS, *Panama: A Country Study*, 73; Leonard Carpenter Panama Canal Collection, *Panama Canal 25th Anniversary*, (1939) 7-10, 44-47.

³ Gerstle Mack, *The land Divided, A History of the Panama Canal and other Isthmian Projects* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1944) pp 155; Orlando Martinez. *Panama Canal* (London: Gordon and Cremonesi Publishers, 1978) 113; Leonard Carpenter Panama Canal Collection, *Panama Canal 25th Anniversary*, 31.

why de Lesseps preferred to use the English-speaking blacks was that the French still resented past slave revolts in the French colonies, as had happened in Haiti, and they feared the possibility of another revolt. Another factor in hiring English-speaking blacks from the West Indies was that the French saw the costs of recruiting people from Jamaica and Barbados as being cheaper than anywhere else.⁴

The French involvement in the canal and railroad construction projects soon ended as a result of bankruptcy and the numerous deaths of migrant workers. The concept of blacks being best suited for labor in tropical environments was soon proved wrong as migrant workers from Jamaica and Barbados died from tropical diseases and the harsh labor conditions in similar numbers as the Chinese and European migrant workers. Some reports also show that a larger percentage of blacks than whites died from disease and tropical conditions because black workers were more exposed to the conditions in the field and the whites took up managerial work. As a result, the French companies went bankrupt and left the canal uncompleted. Many of the West Indian migrant workers migrated back to their home islands, but a considerable number of migrants were unable to return to their homelands and remained in Panama and took up residence in Panama City and Colon.⁵

Shortly after the French departed from Panama, United States president Theodore Roosevelt attempted to draft a treaty with Colombia that would recognize Panamanian sovereignty and allow the United States to complete the canal project. This treaty was rejected by Colombia, but an American-backed rebellion led to the creation of the independent Republic of Panama. The United States government negotiated with French engineer Philippe Bunau-Varilla over plans to construct the canal. In this process, the United States government obtained and renovated abandoned labor camps and bases for United States-recruited laborers. New sanitation measures, such as spraying for mosquitoes and healthcare systems, were developed by Colonel William Crawford Gorgas in order to prevent further deaths from tropical diseases. John F. Stevens, Secretary of the Labor Department, established a recruitment system for both skilled and unskilled laborers and planned separate labor camps for the skilled and unskilled workers. The division between skilled and unskilled labor led to racial stratification because American whites were primarily recruited as skilled laborers and non-Americans were primarily unskilled laborers.⁶

⁴ Gustave Anguizola. *Philippe Bunau-Varilla: The Man behind the Panama Canal*. (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc, 1980) pp 18-19; Elizabeth Mclean Petras. *Jamaican Labor Migration: White Capital and Black Labor, 1850-1930*. (Boulder, Westview Press, 1988) pp 86-88; Martinez, *Panama Canal*, 113;

⁵ David McCullough. *The Path Between the Seas: The Creation of the Panama Canal, 1870-1914*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977), 241; Gerstle Mack, *The Land Divided*, 374; Velma Newton. *The Silver Men: West Indian Labour Migration to Panama, 1850-1914*. (Mona Kingston, Jamaica: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1987), 161-161.

⁶ AUFAS, *Panama, A Country Study*, 26; Leonard Carpenter Panama Canal Collection. *The Panama Canal: Twenty-fifth Anniversary*, 22-23

This labor system also led to social stratification because recruiting procedures called for hiring based on nationality as well as skill. The United States government under Roosevelt signed an order for labor equality, but Panama Canal officials disregarded this order and implemented the above labor system. Laborers were paid according to the gold and silver labor codes; “gold workers” were the skilled workers paid in gold-backed United States currency and the unskilled “silver workers” were paid in Panamanian silver-backed currency. The “gold worker” payments were worth twice as much as “silver worker” payments. The labor camps were segregated according to gold and silver worker status. The facilities, recreation centers, and other activities were also segregated according to gold and silver designations.⁷

The gold workers were skilled workers involved in canal planning and development, supervisory fields, and other white-collar fields. “Gold worker” status required American citizenship and five years experience in a particular skill. Thus the majority of “gold workers” were white American citizens, though there were a few black American “gold workers” and some from Europe. The facilities of “gold workers” included suite style bachelor apartments, cutting-edge health care facilities, and recreation facilities styled in the same manner as those back in the United States. The living establishments of “gold workers” were also located nearer to Panama City to make the “gold workers” feel at home. Even though there were a small number of black Americans that worked as “gold workers”, these workers were prevented from accessing “gold worker” facilities and had to reside in “silver worker” camps. This shows that the gold-silver labor system was racially discriminatory.⁸

The ‘silver workers’, on the other hand, were involved in blue-collar jobs like canal digging and dredging. Unlike skilled American workers recruited into the gold system, the “silver workers” were migrants recruited from the West Indies, Spain, Italy, and Greece. American blacks were prevented from recruiting in silver work due to their demands for advancement into “gold worker” status after certain amount of time in “silver worker” service. Unlike the “gold workers”, the “silver worker” camps were established outside of Panama City and far from “gold worker” living establishments. The “silver workers” also were stationed in barracks with about a hundred people living in three-level bunks along the walls with shelves above the top bunk for personal belongings. Because the “silver workers” got paid less than “gold workers”, the “silver workers” were restricted to meals and services provided at their work sites. The “silver workers” were also given limited health care options, as compared to “gold workers”.⁹

⁷ Willis J Abbot. *Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose*. (London: Syndicate Publishing Company, 1913) 324-325; Velma Newton. *The Silver Men*, 131.

⁸ Michael L Conniff. *Black Labor in a White Canal, 1904-1981*. (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985), 5; Lancelot Lewis. *The West Indian in Panama: Black Labor in Panama, 1850-1914*. (Washington, DC: The University Press on America, 1980), 131.

⁹ Ira E Bennett. *History of the Panama Canal: Its Construction and Builders*. (Washington DC: Historical Publishing Company, 1915), 166; Lancelot Lewis, *The West Indian in Panama*, 131; Gerstle Mack, *The Land Divided*, 539

In order to recruit “silver workers”, the United States government sent recruitment forces out to various West Indian islands, primarily Barbados and Jamaica. Many West Indians already residing in Panama entered into the silver work force. The Jamaican government was concerned about United States recruitment of Jamaicans because many Jamaicans did not return home after the bankruptcy of the French Canal Company. To assure the return of Jamaican migrants, the Jamaican government imposed a per capita tax on the United States for all Jamaicans working abroad in the Canal Zone.¹⁰

Nevertheless, many Jamaicans, Barbados islanders, and other West Indians voluntarily migrated to the Panama Isthmus in order to escape the hardships of their home islands and start a new life. Many Jamaican migrants were unemployed because massive layoffs stemming from the decline of the sugar cane industries and the closings of other Jamaican industries. Some Jamaicans also wanted to experience a sense of adventure by traveling to other countries to work. Another factor in West Indian migration to the Panama Canal Zone was escape from natural hazards, such as hurricanes and flooding. These disasters caused tremendous devastation and the workers hoped for a calmer environment to raise families. Most recruits were bachelors, but many West Indian husbands migrated alone in order to save enough income to bring their families to the Canal Zone later.¹¹

Shortly after work began, the majority of “silver workers”, primarily those of West Indian background, found themselves worse off than before the project began. Many of the workers felt that they were still foreigners in a different nation despite having worked in Panama for a considerable length of time. The “silver workers” also remained segregated as blacks were kept separate from the Italians, Greeks and Spaniards. While the European “silver workers” were provided opportunities for better health services and choice in meals, the West Indian “silver workers” were limited to meals they had to prepare themselves and they had no laundry or other domestic services. It was customary for West Indian women to cook meals and wash clothes, while the men worked in the fields. Many West Indian migrant workers lacked knowledge in domestic work and as a result the majority of the West Indian “silver workers” ended up eating raw foods and wore clothing that was only washed once per week. The heavy rains of the tropical environment made it worse for the workers as they ended having to wear and sleep in the same soiled clothing for extended periods of time. The damp and unsanitary conditions led to breakouts of pneumonia and other tropical diseases. The harsh work conditions

¹⁰ Ira E. Bennett *History of the Panama Canal*, 196; Gerstle Mack. *The Land Divided*, 538; Elizabeth McLean Petras. *Jamaican Labor Migration*, 101

¹¹ Michael L. Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, pp 20; Trevor O’Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, pp 37; Matthew Parker. *Panama Fever: The Epic Story of One of the Greatest Human Achievements of all Time – The Building of the Panama Canal*. (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 103-106

that West Indian “silver workers” faced led other people to believe that “silver workers” were child-like and insolent.¹²

West Indian “silver workers” were also seen as being dumb and slow because of the high numbers of accidental deaths. West Indian “silver workers” were unskilled and had little to no experience in canal construction. Many lacked training in the use of dynamite and heavy machinery. West Indian workers were given orders to use dynamite to blow up rocks and holes, but many did not understand the dangers of explosives and falling debris. Some workers accidentally blew themselves up because they were too close to the detonation point. Others died because they did not stay in safe areas and were hit by falling boulders and debris, while others were crushed or mutilated by construction machinery. Construction-related deaths aside, workers were killed by jaguars and other predatory animals while clearing paths or digging.¹³

The deaths of West Indian “silver workers” caused little reaction. Many workers were simply dumped into makeshift graveyards and buried with little to no sympathy. Many of the “gold workers” and “silver workers” of non-West Indian background saw West Indian laborers as valued only for their work and nothing else, and so West-Indian “silver workers” were often sent to do the more dangerous work while non-West Indians were reserved for less dangerous duties. There were also reports of Spaniards digging through piles of dead West Indians to see if they had any money or other valuables prior to disposing of their bodies. The only groups that showed concern for West Indian laborers were the hospital and healthcare facility workers. West Indians were given the same treatment as other patients with malaria in their hospital stays and quinine treatment. West Indian patients noted that hospital workers were much nicer and more caring than the supervisors they worked under.¹⁴

Discrimination against the West Indians continued through the segregation of the schools established for the workers’ children. White children were sent to government-funded primary and secondary schools and later community college. The white students were taught in smaller classrooms learning different academic subjects. The West Indian students, on the other hand, were denied student screening by the government and were only provided a basic education at Panamanian schools. The students were only provided a basic education up to the eighth grade, and learned subjects pertaining to agriculture and vocational fields. West Indian students learned in far more crowded classrooms because there were fewer schools that admitted West Indian students, and so there were classes of over a hundred West Indian students. The overcrowding of classrooms and little teacher-student contact stifled learning and led many West Indian students to drop

¹² Willis J Abbot. *Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose*, 343-345; Lancelot Lewis. *The West Indian in Panama*, 156-161;

¹³ Lancelot Lewis. *The West Indian in Panama*, 139, 143-145.

¹⁴ Lancelot Lewis. *The West Indian in Panama*, 150-151; David McCullough *The Path Between the Seas*, 583-584.

out prior to completion of the eighth grade.¹⁵

West Indian parents strongly opposed the idea of their children being taught only basic education that limited them to manual labor after completion of school. Many of the Jamaicans were educated in English-run schools during their childhood in Jamaica, so they expected their children to be taught as they were back in Jamaica. This desire prompted many to form community-based education services for students as an alternative to the Panamanian schools. Some of the Jamaican migrants were former teachers and principals in Jamaica and this facilitated the establishment of the community schools. Some of the communities also collaborated with churches to organize private schools for students. Unfortunately, only a small number of students were able to obtain an education from the private schools because the cost of attendance exceeded their parents' income. "Silver workers" typically only made enough income for necessities and to pay taxes. These schools used discarded textbooks and supplies from British schools in Jamaica and England, as the school faculty did not have enough in the budget for new textbooks. As a result, many West Indians learned from traditional British sources rather than the updated American curriculum. Some of the notable schools were Panama Private Academy led by Jamaican principal, Dr J.T. Barton and La Boca School, led by George Westerman.¹⁶

New influences and changes within the school curriculum led to changes within the West Indian educational policy in Panama, which also led to the push for West Indian responses to discrimination in Panama. During the 1930s and 1940s, the New Education Movement brought the study of arts, humanities, and social sciences into the educational curriculum along with traditional math and grammar. Jamaican teachers and other faculty that migrated into Panama were exposed to this new thought in education. These teachers learned of the new education movement from attending some of the universities in the United States. Alfred Osborne, a notable Jamaican migrant that helped shaped education for West Indians in Panama, was a native Jamaican that was taught in the United States at Columbia University where he learned new methods of teaching West Indian students. Osborne is noted for training West Indian teachers to expose their students to a variety of subjects including notable black people in history and science, which led to the study of black education.¹⁷

As the educational system evolved in Panama, West Indians developed a new awareness of the Black Nationalist Movement started by Marcus Garvey. Marcus Garvey, also a native Jamaican, started the Black Nationalist Movement in the

¹⁵ Michael L Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, 39; Willis J Abbot. *Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose*, 355-358; Trevor O'Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 55

¹⁶ Michael L Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal: Panama, 1904-1981*, 18, 96-97; Velma Newton. *The Silver Men*, 155; Trevor O'Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 71

¹⁷ Michael L Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, 13, 92-93

1920s. Garvey promoted the relocation of African descendants back to Africa. He made several trips to North America and to various countries in Latin America to spread the idealism of black independence and self control. While in Panama, Garvey urged West Indians to fight for the right to participate in government by denouncing white American control. His views reached thousands of West Indians in Panama as many began to criticize the American government for discrimination and oppression against the West Indians. However, when Garvey attempted to return to Panama for a second wave of speeches and persuasive rhetoric, he was refused reentry by Panamanian officials. As a result, many West Indians in Panama never heard his message of Black Nationalism. Some criticized the concept of Garveyism, suggesting that many West Indians in Panama became disillusioned with Garvey's persuasive rhetoric which did not provide a solution to the continuing problems of discrimination in Panama under the United States government.¹⁸

Further problems persisted after the completion of the Panama Canal including massive layoffs and pay reductions. Many gold workers migrated back to the United States to search for further opportunities, while a majority of the silver workers were financially unable to leave Panama. In response to the employment crisis, silver workers formed several labor organizations that attempted to persuade the United States government to change employment policies or to offer other opportunities. In 1914, West Indians organized labor organizations in response to discrimination and layoffs. West Indian leaders organized a labor union known as Colon Federal Labor Union to respond to labor injustices by organizing strikes and walkouts. Another union, the United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employee and Railroad Shop Laborers recruited silver laborers to take part in planned protests, marches, strikes, and walkouts. This labor organization grew more successful as the membership grew to approximately 13,000 silver employees.¹⁹

While the United States government hired migrant workers and United States citizens in the Canal Project, the United States government declined to hire native Panamanians. This caused further Panamanian resentment towards people of non-Panamanian or Spanish heritage. In 1919, Panamanians mobilized and formed the International Labor Organization to protest the United States' discriminatory employment practices in Panama during canal construction. U.S. recruiters were worried that native Panamanians would demand the use of American-owned facilities and services. This denial of opportunities for native Panamanians led many to resent the presence of West Indian workers within the Canal Zone. Native Panamanians were outraged that black West Indians were given more job opportunities than Panamanians.²⁰

¹⁸ Michael L Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, 71; Trevor O'Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 73.

¹⁹ Michael L Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, 52-54

²⁰ LaFeber, Walter. *The Panama Canal: The Crisis in Historical Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979, 65, 79; Velma Newton. *The Silver Men*, 161; Trevor O'Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 101-101.

In response to Panamanian resentment, Minister of Defense Ricardo Alfaro sought to establish peaceful relations with the United States through the draft and implementation of a treaty which would allow the United States to complete the second phase of the Canal Project. On July 21st, 1939, Alfaro signed a Treaty with Hull that stressed equality in U.S. labor requirements for the next phase of the canal project. The treaty allowed Panamanians to work for the United States government in the next project as well as phase out the gold-silver work system. The United States signed the Hull-Alfaro Treaty, but did not enforce it. The use of the gold-silver labor system continued. President Roosevelt, pressured from the gold worker union MTC, signed an order permitting canal officials to recruit 4,000 more West Indian migrant workers. Alfaro criticized the United States for its continuous use of the gold-silver labor system and the labor injustice against Panamanians.²¹

In 1941, Panamanian resentment of American imperialism began to emerge in Panamanian politics with the election of Panamanian President Arnulfo Arias, who was known for his anti-American sentiment. Arias served as President for three terms under the Panamanian Nationalist Party. His main goal was to end United States presence in Panama. Arias believed that only native Panamanians should be permitted to remain in Panama while all others were deported to their countries of origin. Arias demanded that the United States send West Indians back to their native countries. At the same time, West Indians also became frustrated with the American government for denying them citizenship the people that retained West Indian culture and language were still denied Panamanian citizenship, but those that integrated into Panamanian society and learned Spanish were granted Panamanian citizenship.²²

During his presidency, Arnulfo Arias also contributed to Panamanian Nationalism with his concept of Panamenismo, the idea that the Panama government should govern itself without United States intervention. Part of Arias' national plan was to replace English with Spanish as the Panamanian official language. Street signs, news media, and other information sources written in the English language would be rewritten in Spanish. The Panamanian government also attempted to prevent Panama from becoming a "black" nation by allowing Spanish and Italian migrants to become naturalized Panamanians while West Indians were denied Panamanian citizenship. Furthermore, Arias confiscated all businesses owned by non-Panamanians and redistributed them to Panamanian business owners. While Arias sought to maintain peaceful relations with the United States, anti-American sentiment flourished in Panama. During Arias' terms as President, a large population of middle class of mestizos and mulattos began to develop. This middle-class group also shared the anti-American and anti-black sentiments while

²¹ Michael L. Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, 86-87; Trevor O'Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 98-99

²² AUFAS, Panama, A Country Study, 32; Michael L. Conniff. *Black Labor on a White Canal*, 89-90.

promoting an end to American influence in Panamanian government.²³

West Indian workers also shifted in attitude towards the United States government as Panamanians and various labor organizations organized strikes in response to United States imperialism over the Panama Canal. Panamanian leaders made a demand that the United States deport all West Indian migrants to their native countries. The United States government refused to send back West Indian migrants while promoting the recruitment of more West Indian laborers. This led to the 1947 Panamanian revolt against Americans in some of the major Panamanian cities. On December 12, 1947, over 10,000 women and children revolted against the American government for unfair labor practices. A few days later, a massive group of Panamanian boys threatened United States officials with knives and other forms of weaponry to protest against United States imperialism. West Panamanians blamed the Panamanian government for allowing United States imperialism and discrimination which also influenced the West Indian shift towards integration into Panamanian society.²⁴

During the 1940s, both the gold and silver labor forces established unions in order to address labor concerns. One of the main concerns shared by gold workers was their request for retirement and compensation for their work in the Canal Zone. Gold worker representatives argued that many of the skilled workers suffered from harsh tropical climates and diseases while working in the Canal Zone. The Canal Diggers of Panama guide states that the physiology and biology of a white person hinders their ability to work in tropical environments with lot of sunlight. This labor organization also argued that the Canal Zone was no place for widows and their children if the husband dies because there were no opportunities for these women. West Indians are also blamed for taking job opportunities from older children and younger adults of gold employee families. In general, blacks from the West Indies were labeled as the problem for gold workers in search for opportunities in the domestic field.²⁵

Also during the 1940s, the West Indian communities considered integration with Panamanian culture and society in response to United States oppression against West Indian silver workers. The Panamanians already demanded control of the Panama Canal by denouncing American leadership over the Canal Zone. The Panamanians also criticized West Indians for being part of American society. However, the American government denied the West Indians request for American citizenship for themselves and their children that were born within the Canal Zone, The older generations and silver workers still retained British culture and the English language as they sought to preserve the heritage they gained from their

²³ Walter LsFeber. *The Panama Canal*, 93-96.

²⁴ Walter LaFeber. *The Panama Canal*, 91, 99-101; Trevor O'Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 1139, 143.

²⁵ Leonard Carpenter Panama Canal Collection. *The Canal Diggers in Panama, 1904-1928*. (Panama Canal Retirement Association, 1928), 3, 14-15, 22-23, 42.

home islands. However, the younger generations became more frustrated with the inferior status of being West Indian and English-speaking. In order to integrate into Panamanian society, they moved away from Anglo culture and learned to adapt to Panamanian society. As a result, the younger generations became Hispanicized.²⁶

The United States power over the Panama Canal shifted after World War II. During the years from 1945 through 1962, Truman attempted to abandon the traditional gold-silver labor system and use a more fair labor practice. The United States military took over the Panama Canal construction projects. The military replaced the gold-silver worker codes to another labor system using the terms “rate,” describing skilled labor, and “local rate,” describing unskilled labor. President Truman also promoted the ten-point labor system that provided equal opportunity for all applicants without regard to race, religion, nationality, and other aspects. However, the military’s new labor system still discriminated against some of the workers as this labor system still mirrored the traditional gold-silver labor system.²⁷

At the same time, West Indians started integrating and assimilating themselves into Panamanian culture as the concept of Black Nationalism and Garveyism started phasing out. West Indians began to view themselves as Afro-Panamanians or Panamanians with African ancestry. Many also disregarded the English language. West Indians dropped their English names and adopted Spanish names. West Indians sought to integrate into Panamanian culture through marriage with lighter-skinned Panamanian women so that they would produce lighter-skinned offspring that would be accepted into Panamanian society.²⁸

In sum, United States imperialism along with the concepts of Panamenismo and other social movements had been the main factors of race relations in Panama since the construction of the Panama Canal. West Indians had been residing on the Panama isthmus since the 16th century during the Spanish slave trade and development of maroon colonies. Later in the 19th century, more West Indian migrants arrived on the Panamanian isthmus for construction of a transoceanic canal and railroad under the French Canal Company. After the French companies went bankrupt, the United States government took over the project and recruited thousands more West Indian migrants. The United States government introduced racial segregation and labor inequality with the creation of Americanized cities in Panama and a gold and silver labor system that segregated West Indian silver workers from white American gold workers. Panamanians responded to United States imperialism and influence of West Indian migration with charges that the

²⁶ Trevor O’Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 124.

²⁷ Trevor O’Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 128-129.

²⁸ Trevor O’Reggio. *Between Alienation and Citizenship*, 124.

United States discriminated against Panamanians by offering migrants opportunities, which also led to conflicts between Panamanians and West Indians. After the advent of Garveyism and the Black Nationalist movement, many West Indians criticized American imperialism and injustices found through segregation from the gold-silver labor system. Shortly after conflicts between Panamanians and West Indians, many West Indians left behind Caribbean roots and soon assimilated into Panamanian culture through intermarriage, Spanish language, and integrating into Panamanian culture in order to achieve a higher status within Panamanian society.

Patriotism and Protest: **The Nicaraguan Contras Come to North Florida, 1986**

Roger Peace
Tallahassee Community College

The Florida Panhandle features a long string of Gulf Coast beaches, a thriving tourist industry, and a military reservation that is two-thirds the size of Rhode Island. In late 1986, the Reagan administration deemed this 724-square-mile reservation, home to Eglin Air Force Base and Hurlburt Field, the best location for training Nicaraguan contras.¹ The arrival of the contras brought the heated debate over the Contra War to North Florida.

The contras - Spanish shorthand for counter-revolutionaries - were formally organized in August 1981, under the direction of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Their goal was to undermine or overthrow the leftist Sandinista government of Nicaragua, which came to power through a popularly supported revolution in July 1979. Led by former National Guardsmen of the ousted Somoza government, the contras destroyed economic assets, attacked rural villages, and killed or kidnapped civilians deemed pro-Sandinista. The CIA also undertook military actions on its own, bombing oil storage tanks and mining Nicaraguan harbors. Although the Reagan administration's covert war against Nicaragua began in secret, once it was revealed in the press in 1982, it became the focus of a vociferous debate in Congress and across the nation. President Ronald Reagan called the contras "freedom fighters" and heralded their efforts to overthrow the "totalitarian" Sandinista government.² Opponents insisted that the U.S. had no right to intervene in Nicaragua and decried contra attacks against civilians as "terrorism." Congress vacillated in its support for the contras. First, Congress appropriated aid for the sole purpose of arms interdiction (the Sandinistas were accused of transferring arms to Salvadoran rebels), then cut off aid completely following the CIA's illegal mining of Nicaraguan harbors in early 1984, then approved "non-lethal" aid in mid-1985, and finally followed with full military support in mid-1986. The latter measure also allowed for contras to be trained in the U.S.³

The Reagan administration tried to keep the location of contra training a secret,

¹ The main counter-revolutionary (contra) force, the *Fuerza Democrática Nicaragüense* (FDN), was led by former National Guardsman Col. Enrique Bermúdez. Based in Honduras, the FDN recruited poor peasants from the northern rural areas of Nicaragua and grew to some 25,000 fighters. See Ariel C. Armony, in *Argentina, the United States, and the Anti-communist Crusade in Central America, 1977-1984* (Athens: Ohio University Center for International Studies, 1997); and Alejandro Bandaña, *Una tragedia campesina: testimonios de la resistencia* (Managua: Centro de Estudios Internacionales, 1991).

² President Ronald Reagan frequently accused the Sandinista government of seeking to establish totalitarian rule. See, for example, "Address to the Nation on United States Policy in Central America, May 9, 1984" (broadcast on nationwide radio and television), The Public Papers of President Ronald W. Reagan, Ronald Reagan Presidential Library online: <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/publicpapers.html> (March 4, 2011).

³ "First group of Contra rebels graduate from U.S. training course," *Fort Walton Playground Daily News* (reprint from *The Los Angeles Times*), Dec. 24, 1986, 5A.

but after two months of rumors and speculation, the *Washington Post* announced on 27 November 1986 that seventy contra guerrillas were on their way to Hurlburt Field, home of Air Force special operations, located near Ft. Walton Beach in the Florida Panhandle. Representative Earl Hutto (D-Panama City), whose congressional district encompassed the region, at first denied any knowledge of the contras coming to Hurlburt Field, but once the story broke, expressed his full support for the training operation. "We have to do what we can to prevent the solidification of another Marxist-Leninist regime like we have in Cuba," he told the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*.⁴ Hutto's views were undoubtedly shared by many in this politically conservative region, where patriotism was generally linked to support for America's wars and military actions abroad. The Reagan administration's aggressive foreign policy included support for guerrilla factions in Angola, Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Mozambique as well as in Nicaragua, countries either led by Marxist governments or embroiled in civil wars.

Upon hearing that the contras were coming to North Florida, the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice (FCPJ), a statewide network of some sixty peace groups, sent staff member Bill Lazar to Ft. Walton Beach to lay the groundwork for a demonstration against the contras' presence in Florida. FCPJ was established in early 1982 as the Florida Coalition for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze. The group soon branched out to include anti-intervention and military budget issues and changed its name to reflect this broader agenda in 1985. The mostly liberal peace advocates of FCPJ's member groups took issue with the popular equation of patriotism and militarism, arguing that diplomacy, international cooperation, and disarmament were the best means of achieving national and global security. They viewed their actions as contributing to the well-being and progress of the nation, and thus as eminently patriotic.

While Lazar was still laying plans for the demonstration on 13 December, a small group of antiwar protesters arrived in town to conduct an impromptu protest on Sunday, 30 November. In a scripted civil disobedience action, three priests were arrested for trespassing at the Hurlburt base, while another twenty demonstrators conducted a four-hour protest outside the gate. Father Roy Bourgeois, a Maryknoll priest and also U.S. Navy veteran, refused to give his name and was held in custody until trial on 16 December. The two other Catholic priests, Father James Sinotte and Father Tony Egan, were released the same day. Bourgeois later told U.S. Magistrate Susan Novotny, "I tried to stop a crime from taking place: the arming and training of Contras in Florida."⁵ He served a thirty-day jail term. Lazar hoped to attract a larger crowd at the upcoming FCPJ demonstration and thus obtained co-sponsorship from a dozen national peace organizations and twenty-three Florida groups.⁶

⁴ Tracy Wenzel, "Secrecy Cloaks Contra-Training Plan," *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Nov. 29, 1986, B1.

⁵ "Priest Won't Promise to End 'Contra' Protest, Is Ordered Held Without Bail," *St. Petersburg Times*, Dec. 2, 1986.

⁶ Betsy Crites, "Endorsers of Hurlburt Field Action December 13, 1986, as of 12/5/86," Memo to Witness for Peace Steering Committee, Dec. 9, 1986, Swarthmore College Peace Collection archive, Witness for Peace files, DG-149.

The idea of another antiwar demonstration was too much for Harry Aderholt, a retired Air Force brigadier general and the past president of the Air Commando Association, an organization made up of retired Air Force personnel from Hurlburt. Aderholt began planning a counter demonstration on the same date and at the same place, a “protest against the protesters,” in his words. “I support our government, and our government has said we’re going to work to stop communism in Nicaragua,” he told the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*. Carl Gustman, an employee of a local defense contractor, joined Aderholt in organizing the pro-contra demonstration. “We support the contra training and the role it plays in our defense,” said Gustman, “We want to show that our country is doing what needs to be done – we don’t need more communist countries.” Lazar, meanwhile, denounced the contras as “terrorists,” telling *The Log*, another Ft. Walton Beach newspaper, “They have no business being in this country, and we don’t want them here.”⁷

The potential for a clash between the two groups of demonstrators led Aderholt and Lazar to sit down and talk on 10 December. As reported in the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Lazar asked Aderholt to help divide the space in front of Hurlburt Field, but Aderholt refused. Aderholt wanted a list of all the peace activists who planned to participate as well as Lazar’s assurance that they would “behave themselves.” Lazar refused to give such assurance, expecting another round of civil disobedience actions to take place. Aderholt commented, “You people are the violent ones, not us. You throw blood; you carry coffins. What you are is professional agitators. You aren’t from here and you don’t belong here.” In fact, only a few people in the anti-contra group were local. One was Patricia Edminsten, a University of West Florida associate professor, who told *The Log*, “Although there are people out there who might back us, there are many who tend to draw the line when it comes to getting out and marching with a placard.”⁸

The editors of the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News* were decidedly pro-contra. On 6 December, they wrote, “If the Contras are being trained here, the government ought to say so and say where. That would give the legions of their boosters the chance to share in the glory, perhaps attend the graduation festivities.” The following day, the newspaper published an informal poll of six shoppers at the Santa Rosa mall, posing the question as follows: “Nicaraguan Contra rebels are rumored to be training at Hurlburt Field. If they are, how would you feel about that?” Three of the six indicated that it was “up to the president,” one indicated strong support for the contras, one indicated strong opposition to their presence, and one said that she did

⁷Tracy Wenzel, “Protesters Plan Vigil Over Contra Funding,” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 3, 1986; Tracy Wenzel, “Aderholt Denies Contra Dealings,” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 6, 1986; and 9. Bob Benz, “Pro-Contra Demonstration Planned,” *The Log* (Fort Walton Beach), Dec. 8, 1986.

⁸Tracy Wenzel, “Rivals Debate Contra Situation,” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 11, 1986.14. Bob Benz, “Marchers Air Opposing Contra Views,” *The Log*, Dec. 13, 1986, 1A.

not know much about it, “but I don’t think the U.S. should support the contras.”⁹ The conservative consensus, it seems, was not complete.

Among those who came to town for the antiwar demonstration was Fred Royce, a native Floridian who co-founded an agricultural mechanization school in the Matagalpa province of Nicaragua in January 1983. Royce told the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News* the U.S. should be helping the poor people of Nicaragua improve their lives rather than fomenting counter-revolution. “It wouldn’t be at all difficult to win them over through decency instead of trying to conquer them through force of arms,” he said, “From what I know of the Contras, I wouldn’t want them in my community.”¹⁰ The arrival of two veterans, Charles Liteky and Bill Gandall, added another dimension to the anti-contra group. The two spoke at a conference held at the Ft. Walton Beach Municipal Auditorium on 12 December, the night before the demonstration. Liteky served as an Army chaplain in Vietnam and received the Congressional Medal of Honor for rescuing his fellow soldiers during an attack. At a recent demonstration against the Contra War in Washington, D.C., he returned his medal in protest, leaving it in an envelope marked “Ronald Reagan” at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Liteky spoke of his experience in Vietnam. “For 4 ½ years I was a Catholic chaplain in the Army,” he said. “And, at the time, I supported the Vietnam War, until I found out the whole thing was a lie. Now I see it starting again in Central America, with the tapestry of lies starting to unravel before our eyes. . . . What we want to do is stop the killing in Nicaragua.” Gandall, then in his seventies, had been part of the U.S. Marine force sent to Nicaragua in 1927 for the purpose of quelling an anti-U.S. “rebellion” led by Augusto Sandino. Gandall recounted his experiences and the lessons he learned. “We were a completely brainwashed outfit,” he said. “But when I came home, I began to see that our policy of manifest destiny was all wrong.” Gandall also talked about his recent visit to Nicaragua and gave the Sandinista government high marks for instituting beneficial health and education programs for the Nicaraguan people.¹¹

Most people in the local community did not attend this meeting, but they could read about it in the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*. The editors, to their credit, allowed both sides to air their views in news coverage, however much they supported the pro-contra side in editorials. Aderholt, for his part, continued to publicly refer to the opponents of the Contra War as “professional agitators.” Yet the mix of religious leaders, development workers, and military veterans indicated a more substantial constituency. In 1985, a new national veterans group was formed, Veterans for Peace (VFP), for the purpose of changing U.S. policies toward Central America.

⁹“Editorial: Why All the Secrecy About Contras’ Training Camp?” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 6, 1986; and “Our Inquiring Photographer.” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 7, 1986.

¹⁰Tracy Wenzel, “Peace Groups Eye Long-Term Hurlburt Vigil,” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 10, 1986.

¹¹Tracy Wenzel, “Peace Activists Ready for Rally,” *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 13, 1986, 1.

The demonstrations took place as planned on 13 December. The antiwar demonstration was attended by some 200 protesters, while approximately 100 pro-contra demonstrators rallied on the other side of the street. The antiwar crowd included a caravan of seventeen people from Gainesville, Florida, and others from as far away as Albany, New York, and New Haven, Connecticut. Thirty-four members of the press were present along with twenty plain-clothes police officers and a twenty-five-member squad of the Florida Highway Patrol's riot unit. There was no serious disorder, however, only a ritual civil disobedience action by eleven antiwar protesters at the Hurlburt Field gate. As each protester was arrested for stepping across the Hurlburt property line, the pro-contra group across the street applauded. Tom Fischer of the Tallahassee VFP checked with police officers to make sure that the larger antiwar group was not blocking traffic or otherwise breaking the law. VFP members carried a banner with the message, "Be All You Can Be – Work for Peace." Other signs on the antiwar side of the street read "Contra Aid is Murder" and "Stop Training Contra Terrorists." Signs on the pro-contra side of the street countered, "Help Contras, Stop Communism" and "Free Nicaragua from Slavery." Gustman appeared at the pro-contra rally wearing a T-shirt emblazoned with the words, "I'm a Contra, too." Waving an American flag, he yelled to motorists, "They're passing out communist propaganda. You don't want to read it." Aderholt was pleased with the 100-person pro-contra turnout. "I'd have been happier, of course, if everyone in Fort Walton Beach had come out," he said. "But I think this is great."¹²

The front-page photograph in the *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News* on the day after the demonstrations showed anti-contra protesters lying motionless on the street, with their placards partly covering their bodies. The adjacent article was titled, "Protesters Ask for Arrest and Get It." The article itself nevertheless noted that Liteky, with Bible in hand, and other protesters carried out their civil disobedience action in a dignified manner. Liteky even spoke well of the Hurlburt security officers, describing them as, "very courteous. I have no complaints whatsoever about the Air Force people." Liteky's politeness may have unsettled some stereotypes of unruly antiwar protesters of the Vietnam era. *The Pensacola News-Journal* quoted one local anti-contra protester, Ft. Walton Beach resident Jackie Delacruz, as saying, "I am standing up for my country, my town, my friends, and neighbors." Delacruz's husband had fought in Vietnam.¹³

¹² Tracy Wenzel, "Contra backers give their side of story at rally," *Fort Walton Playground Daily News*, Dec. 14, 1986, 1A.

¹³ Robert Kuntz and Tracy Wenzel, "Deputies Prepared for Protest," *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 14, 1986, 1B; Tracy Wenzel, "Contra Backers Give Their Side of the Story," *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 14, 1986, 1; Tracy Wenzel, "Protesters Ask for Arrest and Get It," *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 14, 1986, 1B; "Hurlburt Protests Are Peaceful, But 10 Are Detained and One Arrested," *Pensacola News Journal*, Dec. 14, 1986, 13A; Elizabeth Donovan, "Anti-Contra Protester: Those Arrested Give Up Freedom for Beliefs," *Pensacola News-Journal*, Dec. 14, 1986; and Debbie Lord, "Trip to Hurlburt Was 'Worth It' for Anti-Contras," *Ft. Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 3, 1986.

The end of the demonstrations did not end local controversy over this issue. Gustman told the press that his next step was to organize a pro-United States parade on December 22. "It's not the contra issue," he said, "It's more being proud to be an American type of thing."¹⁴ Father Bourgeois returned to Hurlburt to conduct another civil disobedience protest on 24 March 1987. Dressed in an "Uncle Sam" outfit of red, white, and blue striped pants and top-hat, he paraded in front of the gate holding four ropes attached to the necks of four "peasants" representing El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. As Father Bourgeois crossed the property line onto the base with Tom Fischer, who represented Nicaragua, he threw a vial of his own blood on the ground, symbolizing the blood spilled by U.S. actions in Central America. Bourgeois went limp and was dragged off by security officials as twenty anti-contra protesters stood outside the gate along with a dozen reporters and photographers. Fischer was released on his own recognizance and paid a \$100 fine. He returned to Tallahassee the next day to lead a demonstration at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.¹⁵

The antiwar demonstrations and accompanying news articles may or may not have persuaded anyone to change their mind about the Contra War, but they did bring the issue out into the open and stimulate debate on the issue. Their immediate educational value may have been limited, but it is likely that at least some area residents were impelled to explore the issue further and become more knowledgeable about U.S. foreign policy. Those who wished to do so could find ample materials on Nicaragua and the Contra War, as books and articles on these subjects were proliferating at the time. Most Central American scholars opposed the Reagan administration's war against Nicaragua.¹⁶ This was due in part to an understanding of the indigenous causes of revolution in poverty and oppression rather than "communist subversion;" in part to knowledge of the long history of U.S. interventionism in Latin America, which began before the Cold War; and in part to an awareness of the actual nature of the Contra War, which consisted largely of contra attacks on the civilian population. The latter point was often raised by opponents of the Contra War and, ironically, corroborated by former CIA director Adm. Stansfield Turner, who testified before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee in mid-April 1985:

Rightly or wrongly, there are many of us today who see the actions of the contras as being beneath the ethical standards we would like the United States to employ. And specifically, I believe it is irrefutable that a number of the contras'

¹⁴ Barbara Janesh, "Pro-Contra Rally Organizer Plans Pro-American Parade," *Pensacola News-Journal*, Dec. 14, 1986.

¹⁵ Tom Fischer provided the author with an account of this demonstration and newspaper clippings, including Clare Raulerson, "Activists Stage Bloody Protest Against Contras," *Florida Flambeau* (Tallahassee), March 25, 1987, 1.

¹⁶ See Stephen Webre, "Central America and the United States in the 1980s: Recent Descriptions and Prescriptions," *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (1986), p. 184. See also Thomas Walker, ed., *Reagan Versus the Sandinistas: The Undeclared War on Nicaragua* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987). Walker, an expert on Nicaragua, described the Contra War as "one of the greatest human tragedies of the second half of the twentieth century," xiii.

actions have to be characterized as terrorism, as State-supported terrorism. Until we put this issue of the contras behind us, I believe we are going to have a deeper controversy in our body politic than is healthy. And I believe that the CIA already has been badly hurt by its involvement with the contras, and will be hurt more if we continue.¹⁷

Despite the substantial support of academic experts and much of the mainline religious community- Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish - the anti-contra protesters arguably had a steeper hill to climb in making their case to the public. Beyond informing citizens about the real effects of the Contra War, they were opposing a popular president on this issue and challenging a deeply ingrained belief in America's benevolence abroad, a belief that became part of American identity since World War II. The demonstrations held in North Florida against the Contra War and the media publicity surrounding them did not level the playing field, but did allow for both sides to be heard. Renee Williams, a Ft. Walton Beach resident, reflected on her participation in the anti-contra demonstration on December 13, saying, "I think it was an excellent example of how people with opposing views can express them without becoming violent. . . . We carried flags and crosses. We felt as much patriotism as they did."¹⁸

¹⁷"Statement of Adm. Stansfield Turner, Former Director of Central Intelligence" (April 16, 1985), *Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, First Session, April 16, 17 and 18, 1985* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985), 4.

¹⁸Lee Forst, "Opponents Uncertain of Future Contra Rallies," *Fort Walton Beach Daily News*, Dec. 15, 1986, 1A.

Revolutionary Violence and the Anarcho-Bolshevik Split

Frank Piccirillo

Florida Gulf Coast University

Radical elements have played a tremendous role in the development of Russia into a modern state. The existence of underground radical and terrorist organizations captured the bourgeois imagination in Russia, and often times these groups and individuals found themselves in the political spotlight. With the October Revolution, these radical elements united into a loosely coordinated coalition of interests, and became the prominent political identity in Russia by seizing the positions of power, and by struggling to modernize Russia through the overthrow of Tsarism. Throughout their history these radical elements have never completely agreed on everything. Past movements to establish inter-ideology relations often served to highlight these differences, causing the movements to disband, and sometimes causing violence to break out between the differing factions. The Bolshevik party was the primary orchestrator of the October Revolution, and like its predecessors, quelled movements initiated by their former allies, the Anarchists, primarily because of ideological differences, rather than truly practical motives.

The Bolshevik Revolution of 25 October 1917 headed by Vladimir Lenin, overthrew Alexander Kerensky's Provisional Government, which had overthrown Tsar Nicholas II just a few months before.¹ Almost immediately following the ascension of the Bolsheviks to power, Russia found itself mired in civil wars and internal strife, instigated primarily by the White Armies, a coalition of Tsarist forces that were formed under the command of Admiral Kolchak, General Yudenich, General Alekseev, and General Kornilov.² Violence intensified on the battlefield as well as in civilian life. Following an attempt on Lenin's life on 30 August 1918 by Fanya Kaplan, a supposed sympathizer with non-Bolshevik Socialist revolutionaries, Lenin initiated the Red Terror.³ The Red Terror was intended to target specific classes who were perceived as threats to the Revolution, and to instill fear in those who sought to aid the counter-revolutionaries. But the Red Terror had an even greater unforeseen effect that gave rise to new political rivals. The Red Terror and the Civil War had created an intensely stratified, quasi-militaristic approach to party and government organization. Since a majority of the Bolshevik leaders had served in the Red Army, they "acquired the habits of command."⁴ The Bolsheviks were also criticized because "the workers... called for an end to the Bolshevik monopoly of political power."⁵ The groups that arose to break this monopoly of political power

¹ Robert Service. *A History of Modern Russia: From Tsarism to the Twenty-First Century*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 62.

² *Ibid.*, 102.

³ Robert Service, *A History of Modern Russia: From Tsarism to the Twenty-First Century*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 107-108.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 118.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 119.

were primarily non-Bolshevik left-wing groups. These groups opposed both to the regimentation of political power under the Bolsheviks as well as their economic policies, most especially War Communism. Perhaps the most vociferous of these left-wing groups were the Anarchists, who were able to boast powerful support in such areas as Kronstadt and Ukraine. Anarchist opposition to the policies of the Bolshevik leadership led to armed conflict on several occasions. Two well-known examples of such conflict are the battles between the Bolsheviks and Nestor Makhno's Insurgent Army and the Kronstadt uprising.

Kronstadt, located near the Gulf of Finland, was home to communes that were established at the outset of the October Revolution. Described by historian Paul Avrich as "a lost revolutionary utopia,"⁶ the communes remained largely independent from the Bolshevik government until 1921, and had a population of roughly 50,000 residents, about half of which were military personnel, including Ukrainian peasant sailors. The communes created at Kronstadt usually consisted of around forty to sixty people who were "rewarded according to labor or special need. Housing and building space plots were distributed according to family size. Sailors (who got "special" rations on the mainland) shared their portions equally with all the rest - including Bolshevik prisoners taken during the fighting of 1921!"⁷ A very important element to the Kronstadt commune was the extreme anti-authoritarianism of its sailors, whose experiences in the navy "had taught them to hate shipboard discipline. On their island, they resembled pirates or mutinous crews in control of their own vessel, and like pirates of a bygone day, they made equal sharing and solidarity an operative social ideology."⁸ The long-held Anarchist tendencies of the Kronstadt sailors contributed to their eventual violent confrontation with the Bolsheviks.

The ideological tendencies of the Kronstadt sailors to oppose the top-down organizational patterns -- political and economic -- implemented by the Bolsheviks under their policy of War Communism, led to their eventual mutiny. Strikes occurring on the mainland in the city of Petrograd prompted the Kronstadt sailors on board the battleship *Petropavlovsk* to vote on a resolution they hoped would earn themselves certain concessions from the Bolshevik leadership. The resolution included, new elections to the Soviets, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to organize into unions, the liberation of political prisoners, the abolition of political sections in the armed forces (such as the infamous Cheka), and even peasants' rights to possess a certain amount of property.⁹ The *Petrapavlosk* resolution was not well-received by the Bolsheviks because it threatened their

⁶ Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 55.

⁷ Stites, 55.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁹ Paul Avrich. *Kronstadt, 1921*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 73-74.

political monopoly, by calling for new elections to the Soviets, and sought to put the power of the revolution directly into the hands of the workers themselves.

By March 3rd, the Kronstadt communards had established a Provisional Revolutionary Committee under the leadership of Stepan Maximovich Petrichenko, had jailed three Bolshevik leaders, and had taken full control over the city.¹⁰ The first assault by the Bolsheviks began on the very same day. A detachment of *kursanty* and three batteries of light artillery from Petrograd arrived at Oraniebaum, surrounded the barracks of the air squadron, and arrested all of its occupants. Forty-five men from that barracks were later questioned and shot. Among these men were the chief of the Division of Red Naval Aviators and the chairman and secretary of the Revolutionary Committee.¹¹ The Bolsheviks' crackdown on this uprising disheartened the Kronstadt mutineers, who had hoped to push their revolt further into the mainland.

On the evening of 7 March 1921 at 6:45, Bolshevik artillery units stationed at Sestrotesk and Lisy Nos opened fire on Kronstadt.¹² Bombardment of the fortress at Kronstadt was not intended to completely dismantle the structure, but simply to weaken it so that Red Army troops could attack it directly. The next morning, Bolshevik soldiers laid siege to the building. The attack was a disaster. A combination of a heavy snowstorm and intense machine gun fire prompted several Bolshevik soldiers to either retreat or defect to the insurgents.¹³ The Kronstadt mutiny proved to be more difficult to suppress than expected. However, Kronstadt was in shambles, and although the morale of the mutineers was high, they could not hope to last long. Bombardments resumed on 9 March and on 12 March.¹⁴ On 17 March a full attack on the remaining forts at Kronstadt was initiated.¹⁵ The uprising was finally suppressed. In finding more suitable means to quelling the uprising through violence rather than negotiations, which failed on numerous occasions, the Bolshevik leadership signaled to its ideological opponents its commitment to carrying out the Revolution on its own terms.

The creation of the Ukrainian Free Territory by Nestor Makhno occurred at about the same time as the Kronstadt uprisings. Born on 27 October 1888, Makhno was raised in poverty.¹⁶ In the year 1906, when he was just 18 years old, Makhno became involved with the local Anarchist group in his home town of Gulyai-Polye.¹⁷ The Gulyai-Polye group was terroristic and engaged itself with what it referred to as acts of "expropriation" against local businessmen by attacking and robbing them.¹⁸ It is

¹⁰ Avrich, 87.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 138.

¹² *Ibid.*, 152.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 153-154.

¹⁴ Avrich, 196.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 205.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 17-18.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 22.

from these incidents in his youth that Makhno's ideas on revolution and the methods of direct action became solidified.

Makhno spent several years in prison due to his involvement with the Gulyai-Polye group, but was released from his prison in Moscow when the February Revolution occurred in 1917.¹⁹ Makhno thereafter became involved in local peasant, union, and Anarchist groups in Ukraine that sought to organize themselves into a soviet. This changed several months later following the October Revolution. With the Bolsheviks newly in power, Lenin negotiated with the Germans and the Austrians the Brest-Litovsk treaty which declared independence for Finland, Poland, Georgia, and Ukraine; but these territories came under the protection of an Austro-German occupation.²⁰ For Ukrainian revolutionaries, as well as revolutionaries affected by this treaty elsewhere, this was seen as a betrayal on the part of the Bolsheviks. Brest-Litovsk simultaneously prepared Makhno for his future military career as well as the imminent rivalry between his militia forces and the Red Army.

Makhno's partisan campaign began on 22 September 1918, when he and his fellow Gulyai-Polye Anarchists sought to remove the presence of Austro-German forces from the city.²¹ While Makhno participated in grassroots militarist movements in Ukraine, the Bolsheviks found themselves engaged in a civil war. The Bolsheviks turned to Makhno and his militia, which began to refer to itself as the Insurgent Army, and he agreed to help.²² The alliance between the Insurgent and Red Armies was an uneasy one and was only sustained by setting aside ideological differences against the perceived common threat of the Civil War. Quite often, the Red Army did not supply the Makhnovist forces with the supplies they needed. A Bolshevik official later recalled that this was due to a fear of Makhno and his forces, which represented "petit-bourgeois anarchist and Left SR tendencies, utterly opposed to state communism. Conflict between the Makhnovschina and communism is inevitable, sooner or later."²³ The under-arming of Makhno's troops, then, was an intentional policy undertaken by the Red Army; this, perhaps more than anything else, was the principal occurrence that led the two groups into conflict.

By the time the White Armies were in their last throes, the Insurgents and the Red Army had already engaged in fighting. During the campaigns against the White Armies, Makhno's forces became terribly afflicted with typhus which forced him and his troops to fall back from their position along the Polish front. The Red Army chose this moment to order Makhno to surrender his forces guarding the front so that the Red Army could, potentially, launch an invasion of common territory held by

¹⁹ Alexandre Skirda. *Nestor Makhno - Anarchy's Cossack: The Struggle for Free Soviets in the Ukraine 1917-1921*. (Oakland: AK Press, 2003), 32.

²⁰ Skirda, 44.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 58.

²² *Ibid.*, 77.

²³ *Ibid.*, 108.

Germany in Poland. When Makhno objected, the Bolsheviks had enough cause to outlaw his forces on 9 January 1920.²⁴ This marked the beginning of the Bolsheviks' hunt for Makhno.

The year 1921 was marked by a series of skirmishes all across the Ukrainian territory between Makhno's Insurgents and the Red Army. Despite Makhno's military prowess, time ate up his precious few resources. Perhaps in desperation, Makhno decided to attempt to conquer Kharkov, the capital of the Bolshevik-controlled areas of Ukraine, at the end of May.²⁵ As would be expected of such a desperate effort, Makhno's forces were routed. By the end of July, Makhno managed to slip out of the reach of the Red Army, but the time for his long campaign's conclusion was fast approaching. On 24 August, Makhno's Insurgents fought their final battle. Makhno attempted to retreat into Romania, but was captured by Romanian border guards.²⁶ With his capture, the Insurgents were defeated.

The hard-lined measures taken by the Bolsheviks in response to these various post-revolutionary Anarchist uprisings must be understood not simply as practical reactions to political opponents who threatened the legitimacy and stability of their newly established government, but as a direct result of the ideological differences that had existed between the two groups for many years. One of the most important actors in these episodes is Lenin, and as such his thoughts on Anarchists and anarchism must be understood. In his seminal work *State and Revolution*, Lenin devotes a good deal of time denouncing "the Proudhonists, the 'autonomists' or 'anti-authoritarians'"²⁷ by stating that "the Anarchist idea of the abolition of the state is muddled and *non-revolutionary*."²⁸ Lenin further argues that "we do not at all disagree with the Anarchists on the question of the abolition of the state as an aim. We maintain that, to achieve this *aim*, temporary use must be made of the instruments, means, and methods of the state power *against* the exploiters, just as the dictatorship of the oppressed class is temporarily necessary for the annihilation of classes."²⁹ Lenin's basic argument, then, was that the state could be used as a bulwark to stifle the potential for counter-revolutionary movements, as well as to ensure the success of their movement. This difference in thinking -- between viewing the state as a necessary evil for the purpose of protecting the revolution on one hand, and viewing the state as always evil and perpetually threatening the revolution on the other -- is but one area in which the Bolsheviks and the Anarchists disagreed.

Another principal participant in these events on the side of the Bolsheviks was

²⁴ Skirda, 165-166.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 258.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 260.

²⁷ V.I. Lenin, *State and Revolution*. (Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 2001), 51.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 53.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 52.

Leon Trotsky, who has been both praised and rebuked for his involvement in the suppression of these Anarchist uprisings. Describing the radical group *Narodnaya Volya*, Trotsky stated that behind them “there really was no revolutionary class.”³⁰ He went further by opposing the methods used by Anarchists to implement political change. When describing the group as terrorists and claiming that their tactics were “outdated by history,”³¹ Trotsky states that “by its very essence terrorist work demands such concentrated energy for ‘the great moment.’ Such an overestimation of the significance of individual heroism, and finally, such a ‘hermetic’ conspiracy, that – if not logically, then psychologically – totally excludes agitational and organizational work among the masses.”³² To solidify how the ideas of Anarchism and Marxism are counterpoised to one another, Trotsky describes how theoreticians within each school of thought view the other as being in conflicting with their own, as the two groups are involved in “the struggle the ideologists of terror have had to conduct against the Marxists – the theoreticians of mass struggle.”³³ The idea that Trotsky is discussing, generally, is that the tendency for Anarchist movements to put emphasis on individual, spontaneous action with regards to political affairs is ultimately inefficient when compared to the more coordinated and planned tactics of professional revolutionaries espoused by the leaders of the Bolshevik movement.

One of many of Trotsky’s most vociferous critics was Alexander Berkman, an Anarchist activist who was living in Russia at the time of the October Revolution. Berkman wrote of the Bolsheviks: “*politically* the aim of the Revolution was to abolish governmental tyranny and oppression and make the people free. The Bolshevik government is admittedly the worst despotism in Europe, with the sole exception of Italy.”³⁴ Berkman continues his criticism, “the dictatorship and the red terror by which it was maintained proved the main factors in paralyzing the economic life of the country.”³⁵ Whether the Bolsheviks’ more centralized measures with respect to handling political and economic matters was a pragmatic response to pressing issues that threatened a very weak and newly established order, or the true intent of the Bolshevik leaders from the outset of the Revolution, is ultimately unimportant; what matters is the perception of these acts by the parties involved. The Anarchists’ concern with the Bolsheviks’ ever-tightening control over the various strata of Russian life, and the Bolsheviks’ doubts about a spontaneous Revolution without any clear sort of order arising directly from the masses, ultimately helped to color each groups’ perceptions about the other,

³⁰ Leon Trotsky. “The Bankruptcy of Individual Terrorism.” Marxists Internet Archive. <http://trotsky.org/archive/trotsky/1909/xx/tia09.htm>.

³¹ Trotsky,

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Alexander Berkman. *What is Anarchism?* (Oakland: AK Press, 2003), 131.

³⁵ Berkman, 132.

heightening their differences and invoking the sort of heavy-handed measures that each group would take against the other during their confrontations.

Soviet society was marked by the suppression of dissenting political groups and parties, trade unions, workers' councils, and other such organizations. The suppression of Anarchist uprisings in the immediate aftermath of the October Revolution was one of the first signs of the future political repression that ultimately occurred there. Considering the relative weakness of the military power of the various Anarchist militias when compared to their former Bolshevik allies, as well as the clear tensions that had previously existed between the groups, the eventual split between the Anarchists and the Bolsheviks, and the forceful quelling of Anarchist movements during the Civil War and during the post-Revolutionary period in Russia, cannot be understood except by highlighting the ideological differences that had always existed between the two factions.

Batman as Moral Exemplar: A Way of Being in the World in Batman Begins and The Dark Knight

*Katie Grainger
Wofford College*

Throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century of American popular culture, Batman has been modified as a comic book figure to suit society's changing styles. Artist Bob Kane and writer Bill Finger collaborated in the May 1939 issue #27 of *Detective Comics* to create the superhero originally referred to as the Batman.¹ He was the "playboy detective with a double identity of the '30s" who later went on to become an "ex officio cop" carrying a police badge in the forties, a time traveler in the fifties, and a comedian in the sixties and seventies due to the popularity of the campy 1966 television series starring Adam West.² By the end of the seventies and well into the eighties, the character had transformed into a dark and brooding avenger. Frank Miller's 1986 series *The Dark Knight Returns* is especially known for revitalizing Batman's character during this time, helping to elevate his popularity as both an icon and a commodity. Since then there have been very little alterations made to the character, although the degree of Batman's dark and brooding nature depends largely on the artists, writers, and editors working behind the creation. Every author is expected to contribute something new and different:

Each new Batman graphic novel – with its quality paper, glossy art and on occasion, hard covers – thus became a high concept piece, and the question in each case was the same: what would this creative team 'do' with the Dark Knight? After Frank Miller, what would Alan Moore and Brian Bolland do? ... And implied in 'do', of course, was 'do different': rather than a functional ticking-over, the industry and the fans now anticipated something radical, or surprising, or at least inflected in some way with the personal, individual style of writer or artist.³

The constant reinventions of Batman's character through the decades are what make him so complex and intriguing as both an icon and a commodity, revealing insights about us, our history and culture, and our values as Americans.

Following Frank Miller's *Dark Knight*, Batman began to appear not just in graphic novels, but also in the media. The release of Tim Burton's 1989 film *Batman*, which starred Michael Keaton, is responsible for extending the character's presence as a cultural icon beyond the comic books. The film generated three sequels, *Batman Returns*, *Batman Forever*, and *Batman and Robin*. Although the first two films were well received, fans were not as impressed with director Joel Schumacher's interpretation

¹ *Detective Comics* issue #27

² Dennis O'Neil, *Batman Unauthorized: Vigilantes, Jokers, and Heroes in Gotham City* (Dallas, Texas: Ben Bella Books, 2008), 4.

³ Will Brooker, *Batman Unmasked: Analyzing a Cultural Icon* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 263.

of the character in *Batman Forever* and *Batman and Robin*. In 2005 Christopher Nolan directed *Batman Begins*, a re-creation of the film franchise that focused on Batman's origin story. Nolan, who has a reputation as a filmmaker for preferring substance over style, chooses to focus on Batman's emergence as a force for good in Gotham. In 2008, the sequel to *Batman Begins*, *The Dark Knight*, set the record for the highest grossing opening weekend of all time in the United States, "earning approximately \$158.4 million" and becoming the "fastest film to reach the \$400 million mark in the history of American cinema."⁴

The success of Nolan's *Batman* films may be partly attributed to the terrorist attacks which occurred on 11 September 2001.

Shaun Treat argues that because of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, there is an influx of superhero films being created solely for the purpose of suggesting that America's comic book heroes can fight against terrorists for us.⁵ Nolan's films have helped our society to think about the role of superheroes, particularly Batman, more than ever. What does it mean that we seem to be looking to superheroes, or vigilantes, to address or deal with our current social and political problems? Do they provide moral solutions to our problems with terrorism and surveillance? I will argue in this paper that in both *Batman Begins* and *The Dark Knight*, Batman represents an ethical way of responding to these societal problems as well as a way of being in the world.

In *Batman Begins* and *The Dark Knight*, Batman represents a coherent system of ethics that is distinguished by an authentic goal for justice. He is neither a strict deontologist nor a brooding vigilante, but rather, both a hero and anti-hero with the will to act and make sacrifices that we often cannot fathom ourselves making in our society. Although Batman does not always take deontological measures when fighting, he knows how to distinguish perfect and imperfect duties. Batman knows when he is obligated to act and when he is not. Constantly throwing himself in harm's way in order to protect the lives of Gotham's citizens, Batman is a much more commendable superhero for his flexibility, for his decision and ability to act quickly in difficult situations in which he is not obligated to help. Batman is a moral exemplar because of his goal for justice, his sense of duty, his willingness to help others, and his motivation for society to work together.

Most comic books and their cinematic adaptations begin with origin stories. We must start at the beginning of the superhero's life in order to better understand what caused him or her to begin the journey toward fighting injustice and saving lives. Christopher Nolan's film *Batman Begins* explores Batman's origin story and the process that Bruce Wayne underwent in order to become a superhero. The movie

⁴ Brandon Gray, 'Dark Knight' Soars Past \$400 Million (2008) <http://www.boxofficemojo.com>.

⁵ Shaun Treat, "How America Learned to Stop Worrying and Cynically ENJOY! The Post-9/11 Superhero Zeitgeist," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* (2009).

opens with a sequence of extremely short, quick shots that track eight year old Bruce Wayne's movement across a greenhouse where he takes an arrowhead from young Rachel Dawes and runs away to hide from her, stumbling onto unsettled ground and consequently falling into a bat cave.⁶ These opening shots in the film establish Bruce Wayne's character through the use of flashbacks to his traumatic childhood and fear of bats. The distressing experience of falling into a bat cave will continue to haunt him as a young adult. His memory of being in the bat cave triggers his fear as well as the impulse that will later help him to distract and defeat his opponents by making himself a symbol of that fear—Batman.⁷

The camera then cuts to a close-up shot of an older Bruce Wayne's face, covered in facial hair and looking anxious and disturbed. "Did you have dream?" a cell mate asks, and Bruce responds with "Nightmare."⁸ The camera zooms out and in; he sits up and we can see that he is seated in a jail cell. The flashback informs us of Bruce's memory of being eight years old, frightened and powerless in the bat cave where several bats swarmed around him in an attack on him out of fear. This state of intense fear is felt during another scene at the beginning of the film, when young Bruce is watching an opera involving a choir and dance of bats with his parents, Thomas and Martha Wayne. Afraid of the images that remind him of falling into the bat cave, Bruce decides to leave the theater—an act that will lead to the death of his parents. Bruce watches Joe Chill shoot his parents for their money and jewelry. Instantaneously, Bruce is left alone; we see him frightened and bewildered in spite of his father's last words, "Don't be afraid."⁹ We can empathize with young Bruce as he experiences death and the loss of loved ones, and understand this single event to be the moment that changes the course of his life forever. Through these linked experiences of fear and pain as a young boy, Bruce Wayne initiates his journey as a hero in which he seeks the means to fight injustice.

As reinforced by both *Batman Begins* and its sequel *The Dark Knight*, Batman is more than just a man. He makes himself into something incorruptible and everlasting by becoming authentic, which allows him to assume a pattern of energy or archetype that is meant to inspire good action in people. Joseph Campbell argues that archetypes or mythic symbols are best conveyed through metaphors and stories.¹⁰ Peter and Roberta H. Markman further articulate Campbell's idea that as humans, we can find truths in these myths which apply to our lives:

The 'best things,' the most fundamental truths about the meaning of life, must be conveyed by metaphor because they cannot be fully explained through logic. Logical explanations can convey only partially the full truth communicated by

⁶ David S. Goyer and Christopher Nolan, *Batman Begins*, DVD. Directed by Christopher Nolan (Burbank, California: Warner Video, 2005).

⁷ *Batman Begins*

⁸ *Batman Begins*.

⁹ *Batman Begins*.

¹⁰ Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1949), 3-20. SPECIFIC PAGE NUMBER?

the mythic narrative, as anyone who has been involved in an attempt to ‘explain’ the meaning of a great work of literature or art must realize.¹¹

The stories, or mythic narratives, help us as readers to better understand ourselves and to develop our awareness of the social and political concerns that we have as individuals or as a nation, particularly through the metaphoric identification with the heroes of those stories. Regardless of time and place, mythic stories embody us and our point in time: “the archetypes to be discovered and assimilated are precisely those that have inspired, throughout the annals of human culture, the basic images of ritual, mythology, and vision.”¹² We can aspire to be moral exemplars, and to inspire such goodness in others.

Campbell identifies similarities between the journeys or quests undertaken by various heroes that serve as such mythic symbols. No hero experiences the same journey; however, Campbell argues there is a basic pattern of the journey experienced by all. Firstly, the hero must set out on a journey to another land in order to overcome a series of trials or obstacles. The hero must leave behind their home as well as every aspect of the life they know and feels to be secure. They must willingly die to the world they know in order to be born again, which is created by the process of looking inward. The purpose of the journey is “to return to [the world], transfigured, and teach the lesson he has learned of life renewed.”¹³ After a time, they are able to return to their home “fully conscious of his experiences on the journey” and from “his trials and victories armed with the knowledge that made possible the conquest of the forces threatening the world to which he returned.”¹⁴ In *Batman Begins*, Bruce Wayne goes on this journey, leaving Gotham in search of understanding the underlying fear and guilt that are within him: he becomes fully engaged in conquering the external forces that have barred his knowledge of himself and of the criminals that are trying to destroy Gotham City.

Bruce Wayne surrounds himself with criminals by willingly putting himself in jail. Here, he attempts to understand better the mind of a criminal. As Bruce says, “the first time I stole so that I wouldn’t starve, yes. I lost many assumptions about the simple nature of right and wrong. And when I traveled, I learned the fear before a crime and the thrill of success. But I never became one of them.”¹⁵ He refuses to be like the criminals he encounters, and chooses to learn from them instead so that he can fight against them. In his exploration of criminality by “[locking himself] in to take them on one at a time,” Bruce Wayne must first understand the source of his own fears and how to conquer them before he is able to “turn fear against those

¹¹ Markman, 3.

¹² Campbell, 18.

¹³ Campbell, 20.

¹⁴ Markham, 5.

¹⁵ *Batman Begins*.

who prey on the fearful” and manipulate fear against the criminals of Gotham.¹⁶ Bruce seeks inward knowledge about his guilt, anger, and fear over his parents’ death, over injustice—this is necessary so that he may be able to reconcile the opposing forces with which he comes into contact upon his return to Gotham.

After a fight scene between him and six criminals, Bruce Wayne is thrown back into his jail cell where he is confronted by Henri Ducard, a member of the League of Shadows and Ra’s Al Ghul, a group devoted to destroying cities that have become so morally corrupt that they are considered to be beyond saving. Ducard calls himself “a man who can offer [Bruce Wayne] a path” if Bruce wishes to share his “hatred of evil, his desire for true justice.”¹⁷ Bruce immediately dismisses the idea by calling them vigilantes, to which Ducard responds, “A vigilante is just a man lost in the scramble for his own gratification. He can be destroyed or locked up. But if you make yourself more than just a man, if you devote yourself to an ideal, and if they can’t stop you, then you become something else entirely... A legend.”¹⁸ Bruce Wayne strives to make himself into a legend as Batman. He learns that it is important to live out his parents’ legacy as opposed to trying to avenge their deaths. In refusing to kill his opponents, Bruce Wayne devotes himself to an ideal, a noble cause in which he desires to protect Gotham from criminals and terrorist groups like Ra’s Al Ghul. In combating injustice and cleaning up the crime-infested streets of Gotham, Bruce makes himself into a symbol by dressing like a bat to instill fear in his enemies. He devotes himself completely to this ideal in which he believes; thus, creating a legend, a story of his identity as Batman that is larger than life himself. Batman cannot merely be cast off as a vigilante, for he is not self-interested in his acts to fight crime nor is he an executioner. As Batman, working alongside the authorities to capture criminals and give them over to Gotham’s judicial system, *and* inspiring the city’s individuals to protest against crime on their own, Bruce Wayne has made himself into both a mythic symbol and moral exemplar. Bruce Wayne’s legend as Batman is morally exemplary for two major reasons: he leads an authentic life and as an autonomous being, he inspires autonomy in others.

Batman’s authenticity allows him to refuse Ra’s Al Ghul in their effort to destroy Gotham in *Batman Begins*. Ra’s Al Ghul believes that killing is an act of courage, and that the will to act is everything. They want to obliterate Gotham because its society has become completely dehumanized. Gotham is a city of crime and despair where criminals run rampant, murdering innocent citizens not for personal gain, but to survive in a city of chaos and destruction. Bruce Wayne refuses to believe that destroying an entire city, much less killing people, is necessary. He has compassion and, more importantly, faith in Gotham’s citizens and their ability to reshape the city

¹⁶ *Batman Begins*.

¹⁷ *Batman Begins*.

¹⁸ *Batman Begins*

for the better. As shown in the scene before he begins his journey, Bruce goes to the courtroom where Joe Chill has agreed to testify for early parole with the intention of avenging his parents' deaths. Joe Chill is killed by the mobsters upon his release, before Bruce can even point his gun at Chill. Bruce realizes that killing is not the answer and that it will not resolve the anger or guilt that he feels over his parents' murders. He throws his gun over a railing, acknowledging that vengeance is no longer a path he will pursue, and that he will now seek the appropriate means to fight injustice in Gotham. He does not think that Gotham is beyond saving, and Batman's decision to reject vengeance allows him to become a more authentic self.¹⁹

In distinguishing himself from the group in this way, he is embodying Martin Heidegger's notion of going against the "they-self": "The self of everyday Dasein is the *they-self*, which we distinguish from the *authentic Self*—that is, from the Self that has been taken hold of in its own way."²⁰ In this context, by following what the "they-self" says, we accept what society deems important or valid, and consequently, we do not think or act for ourselves. Through the choices we make and the beliefs that we hold, each of us, as individuals, has the ability to define the meaning of our own existence. Since Batman lives up to these standards—in spite of the physical, emotional, and psychological challenges that he faces—he leads an authentic life. In being consumed by the lifestyle or ideas of the "they-self" or majority, we experience what Heidegger calls the state of "fallenness."²¹ Bruce Wayne's personal struggle with affirming his own identity in order to become an authentic self in *Batman Begins* is exemplary of the struggle against such "fallenness."²¹ His rejection of taking a life in order to join the League of Shadows exemplifies the rejection of the "they-self." Bruce's rejection of the "they-self" and the realization of his own autonomy are what make him a true moral exemplar as Batman. He develops the abilities or skills necessary for him to think and act on his own, instead of relying on Gotham or Ra's Al Ghul to determine his existence. He explains to Rachel Dawes that "it's not who I am underneath, but what I do that defines me" and places emphasis on his character, as opposed to the reputation of his mask or his identity as Bruce Wayne.²² Rachel tells him:

I never stopped thinking about you, about us, and then, when I heard you were back, I started to hope... Then I found out about your mask... this is your mask. Your real face is the one the criminals now fear. The man I loved, the man who vanished, he never came back at all. Maybe he's still out there somewhere. Maybe one day, when the world no longer needs Batman, we'll see him again.²³

¹⁹ *Batman Begins*.

²⁰ Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, Trans. John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc, 1962), 167.

²¹ Introducing new term. We need a citation of where it came from.

²² *Batman Begins*

²³ *Batman Begins*.

There is more to Bruce than his superficial, cliché presence in Gotham, which involves driving sports cars, buying hotels that are not for sale, and dating supermodels. Bruce Wayne, the flesh and blood man who can be easily ignored by Gotham, is now his mask: his authentic self is Batman, the symbol of fear that is incorruptible and everlasting.

Batman's good judgment and action not only provide hope for the community, but also inspire them to act on their own to help the city. This is shown at the end of *Batman Begins*, when Henri Ducard creates widespread panic and fear by emitting massive amounts of poisoned gas into Gotham City. A train is set up to hit the main water line, ultimately causing "a chain reaction that'll vaporize the entire city's water supply" and kill everyone.²⁴ To prevent this from happening, Batman gives Gordon his car to tear down the railways so that the train will be diverted from hitting the water line while he gets on the train to stop Ducard from working the controller system. Batman also gives an antidote, which was created by Lucius Fox, to Rachel Dawes. She distributes the antidote to Gotham's citizens as they become poisoned. Once Ducard has been defeated, Batman meets Gordon on the rooftop to discuss how they still have not "picked up half the inmates [of Arkham Asylum] that were freed" and other criminals that are running rampant on the streets. "We will, we can bring Gotham back," Batman tells Gordon.²⁵ Batman knows that by working alongside of Gordon and his unit, he can clean up Gotham's streets.

Batman motivates others to work together in an effort to save Gotham at the end of the film. He knows that he can only accomplish his goal for justice in Gotham with teamwork, cooperation, and diligence. In rejecting the they-self in *Batman Begins*, thus establishing his own autonomy and leading an authentic life, Bruce Wayne as the mythical symbol Batman inspires others to do the same. The acts of being autonomous and encouraging others to be more autonomous beings are what make Batman a moral exemplar.

Similar to *Batman Begins*, its sequel, *The Dark Knight*, throws us immediately into the action of the film as viewers. We see an aerial shot of skyscrapers, and follow as the camera zooms in on a building in which a window breaks. The camera cuts to what is inside the building: a man wearing a clown mask and holding the tool that has broken the window. The camera pans so that we are able to see over his shoulder, outside the window, and then the shot ends abruptly with a straight cut, leading to a long-wide shot of the Joker standing on a street corner in which the camera zooms in on his clown mask, which he is holding in his left hand. In the opening shots, we find ourselves observing the Joker; unlike *Batman Begins*, which begins with shots focused on Bruce Wayne. We do not see Batman until the second scene at the beginning of *The Dark Knight*. Nolan chooses this sequence deliberately to place

²⁴ *Batman Begins*.

²⁵ *Batman Begins*.

emphasis on the Joker, indicating to us that he is as much of the focus in this film as is Batman—although we never learn who exactly the Joker is or where he comes from. Unlike *Batman Begins*, which focuses on Bruce Wayne’s internal conflicts, *The Dark Knight* focuses on Batman’s external actions, namely his interactions with the Joker. Batman is devoted to fighting crime and saving lives, while the Joker is focused on destroying Gotham’s sense of morality and goodness through crime and murder, thereby challenging the premise of Batman’s existence.²⁶

Following the opening shots of *The Dark Knight*, we see the Joker kill people as well as his assistants during a bank robbery, revealing to us that he has no rules, no honor or respect as a criminal. Established from the onset of the film as a human killing machine, his actions are so calculated that he drives a school bus onto Gotham’s streets into a row of school buses, disguising himself from the police and avoiding punishment for his crimes. Throughout the film, the Joker continues to kill more innocent people and get away with it. The Joker is not easy to capture, not only because of his skills, but also his lack of identity. His stories of how he got his scars are constantly changing throughout the film, something that the audience never learns the truth about. In Gordon’s unit, they find him with no fingerprints, “nothing in his pockets but knives and lint,” and “no other alias.”²⁷ Even though he is contained in Gordon’s jail, he manages to escape by using explosives to blow up the building and, thus, he leaves no trace behind.

We do not know much about the Joker other than that he is an anarchist, and that he argues in favor of chaos: “Introduce a little anarchy. Upset the established order, and everything becomes chaos. I’m an agent of chaos. Oh, and you know the thing about chaos, its fair.”²⁸ The Joker is not delusional, and Batman’s fight with him is not so much about good versus evil as it is about fighting for an established moral order in opposition to chaos. By calling it fair, the Joker finds a kind of justice in advocating chaos, suggesting that it is reasonable to create destruction in Gotham. He also perceives the performance of his actions as a rational and logical decision-making process in order to promote chaos. To him, it is a way of subverting the schemers. In describing himself as a “guy without a plan” and a “dog chasing cars,” the Joker is scheming not to have a plan as his plan.²⁹ He may “just do things” in an attempt to “show the schemers how pathetic their attempts to control things really are,” but he is scheming nonetheless in his effort to control the men who try to control Gotham City. By scheming in order to subvert other schemers, the Joker gets what he wants: chaos.

²⁶ Christopher and Jonathan Nolan, *The Dark Knight*, DVD. Directed by Christopher Nolan (Burbank, California: Warner Studios, 2008).

²⁷ *The Dark Knight*

²⁸ *The Dark Knight*.

²⁹ *The Dark Knight*.

Raymond J. de Souza explains the Joker's perception of morality and resultant motive for societal destruction:

There is no order built into human nature, no moral law written on the heart. There are rules of common agreement. But they are only manufactured rules, entirely arbitrary, without enduring value. They do not correspond to any truth—and they cannot, for there is no order or design at the heart of reality. There is only chaos, and the Joker embraces it.³⁰

The Joker does not believe in an established moral order nor does he believe that people are inherently good. He tells Batman, “See, their morals, their code... it’s a bad joke. Dropped at the first sign of trouble. They’re only as good as the world allows them to be. I’ll show you; when the chips are down, these civilized people [will] eat each other.”³¹ Through chaos, the Joker strives to prove that every man is capable of becoming a villain—that even the best of men can fall. He threatens the people of Gotham that if they want order in their city, then “Batman must take off his mask and turn himself in.”³² If Batman refuses to reveal his true identity, then the Joker will kill more people on a daily basis. The Joker poses the ultimate threat to all of Gotham’s citizens, including Batman. It seems that the only logical solution for stopping the Joker from generating chaos and killing people is for Batman to kill him. However, at the end of the film Batman chooses to save the Joker’s life and we as viewers are left wondering why. Why doesn’t Batman kill the Joker and demolish the biggest threat to himself and Gotham’s citizens? Is he being selfish by refusing to remove his mask (as the Joker demands) and, thus, allowing more innocent people to die because of his decision?

Mark D. White writes that Batman does not kill the Joker because he is a deontologist.³³ Since we live in what is often described as a utilitarian society, it is harder for us to understand why Batman would not kill one person in order to save the majority of lives. Deontologists, unlike utilitarian’s, do not endorse “saving many lives at the cost of just one, [which] would represent a net increase in well-being or utility.”³⁴ When deontologists claim they will not kill, they do not kill, no matter what the cost or even if they have been provided with sufficient reason to do so:

Deontologists judge the morality of an act based on features intrinsic to the act itself regardless of the consequences stemming from the act. To deontologists, the ends never justify the means, but rather the means must be justifiable on their own merits. So the fact that the killing would prevent future killings is

³⁰ Raymond J. de Souza, “Saint Batman,” *The National Post*, July 31, 2008.

³¹ *The Dark Knight*.

³² *The Dark Knight*.

³³ Mark D. White, “Why Doesn’t Batman Kill the Joker?” in *Batman and Philosophy: The Dark Knight of the Soul*, ed. Mark D. White and Robert Arp (Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008), 7

³⁴ White, 7.

irrelevant—the only relevant factor is that killing is wrong, period.³⁵

Deontology is not limited to the opposition or disavowal of killing a person. By focusing on the right action, deontology is centered on the person's established code; it consists of personal rules that apply in all circumstances. White identifies Batman as a deontologist in the graphic narratives and comic books; however, in *Batman Begins* and *The Dark Knight*, Batman's actions cannot be labeled as strictly deontological.

For example, in *The Dark Knight*, Batman stands before a surveillance machine in which he can view what every citizen in Gotham City is doing. "Beautiful," he calls it, while Lucius Fox stands by and argues that it is "unethical, dangerous... you've turned every cell phone in Gotham into a microphone."³⁶ Batman knows that the high frequency generator will allow him to find the Joker, but at what cost? Lucius says, "This is wrong. This is too much power for one person. Spying on thirty million people isn't part of my job description. I'll help you this one time, but consider this my resignation. As long as this machine's at Wayne Enterprises, I won't be."³⁷ Both Lucius and Batman understand that this machine is deadly, that one individual should not be capable of having complete and total power over the rest of society. Batman tells Lucius to "type in [his] name" once he is finished helping him, which will cause the machine to destroy itself.³⁸ While Batman's initial decision to use the machine is unethical in spite of its well-intended purpose to capture the Joker, he knows that this is not the best system nor is it necessary for Gotham, and therefore, he destroys the machine.

Batman goes to great lengths to find the Joker and, in doing so, commits acts that are not deontological. That being said, he refuses to break his one rule—to kill—in order to eliminate the Joker as a threat. His refusal to kill is what makes him pure and incorruptible; a moral exemplar. However, if Batman is not strictly a deontologist, then how can we describe his ethical response to the Joker? In *Batman Begins* when Bruce refuses to kill a thief in order to join the League of Shadows, he not only displays compassion, but also a strong sense of duty. Immanuel Kant argues that to act out of duty is to overcome obstacles and to respect moral law. An action cannot be considered morally good if it is "done solely out of self-interest."³⁹ That is, one must act on a law that is valid for all rational human beings and one cannot act on his or her desires. This law is independent of all personal desires; it is a "law of duty, a law which commands or compels obedience."⁴⁰ In this sense, one's will is subordinated to a universal law, and one is only morally good if they seek to obey this

³⁵ White, 8.

³⁶ *The Dark Knight*.

³⁷ *The Dark Knight*.

³⁸ *The Dark Knight*.

³⁹ Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, Trans. H.J. Paton (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964), 19.

⁴⁰ Kant, 21.

law. Batman follows the universal law—a categorical imperative that states “I ought never to act except in such a way that I can also will that my maxim should become a universal law.”⁴¹ He accepts and obeys the universal law, or the deontological stance of refusing to kill, regardless of his impulse or desire to kill in any given situation.

Kant further distinguishes actions of duty as being perfect and imperfect: “we must consider first an action done solely out of inclination and not out of duty, and then an action done solely out of duty and not out of inclination.”⁴² Batman’s moral principles, which include but are not limited to strict deontological practices, are especially commendable because he knows how to tread the line between such imperfect and perfect duties. Perfect duties, such as the deontological stance of “do not kill,” can be willed into universal law: they are actions that people should commit to throughout their lives.⁴³ Imperfect duties, on the other hand, are actions that we are not obligated to perform, for they require more obstacles to overcome, which in turn, make us more admirable beings if we choose to act in such a manner. For instance, Batman says to Henri Ducard at the end of *Batman Begins*, “I won’t kill you, but I don’t have to save you.” Batman chooses to save the Joker’s life, but not Ducard’s, because there is a difference in the two cases. In the Joker’s case, Batman deliberately throws him over the edge of the building: an act that would result in the Joker’s death by Batman’s hand. Because Batman refuses to kill, an action that is willed into universal law, he must save the Joker from falling. While in Ducard’s case, Batman derails the train to prevent it from hitting the major water line, which would completely obliterate Gotham City and kill everyone. Batman does not intend to kill Ducard in his effort to save the city and, thus, he is not obligated to save Ducard. Ducard’s death would be an accidental side effect if he were unable to get off the train, which, considering his skills as a ninja, he potentially has plenty of time to do. Batman must save the Joker because he caused him to fall; Ducard, by his own choice, placed himself on the train in a suicide mission to destroy Gotham. While Batman is preventing that suicide mission from being accomplished, he is not responsible for Ducard’s failure to act once Batman has derailed the train. He is not obligated to act on Ducard’s behalf, and knowing this, Batman chooses to leave him alone to fend for himself. In knowing how to balance perfect and imperfect duties, knowing when he is and is not obligated to act and making the appropriate choices when necessary, Batman is a moral exemplar.⁴⁴

Batman is not a vigilante despite using violence to combat violence. Les Johnston argues that “popularly, vigilantism is assumed to involve people ‘taking the law into their own hands,’ but there are problems with this conception: not least, with the definition of an illegal act.”⁴⁵ The ideology of vigilantism is said to have three major

⁴¹ Kant, 22.

⁴² Kant, 19.

⁴³ Kant, 70.

⁴⁴ *Batman Begins*.

⁴⁵ Les, Johnston, “What is Vigilantism?” *British Journal of Criminology* 36.2 (Spring 1996), 232

components: self-preservation, popular sovereignty, and the right of revolution.⁴⁶ Vigilantes act in opposition to the “transgression of institutionalized norms.”⁴⁷ They react in an effort to provide both individual and group security through acts of force. Batman, unlike a vigilante, is not acting out of self-interest nor is he concerned with preserving his own life. He does not kill; therefore, he does not endorse killing in order to refrain from being killed, either. And if Batman’s ultimate goal was self-defense, he would not throw himself in harm’s way continuously just to protect the lives of innocent people. More importantly, Batman is not a proponent of rejecting the social or legal institutions of Gotham. Instead, he supports Gotham’s citizens and the city’s own law enforcement, working alongside police officers and ensuring others’ safety over his own. Batman does not take away from society’s need to reinforce its own laws and jurisdiction. He contributes to Gotham’s already established judicial system by capturing criminals and turning them into the authorities, instead of passing his own judgment and taking lives. In this way, he is not trying to revolutionize Gotham, but rather, he is trying to contribute to its already existing establishments.

Like *Batman Begins*, *The Dark Knight* provides us with a prime example of a vigilante: Harvey Dent, the so-called “hero with the face” that Gotham is said to need.⁴⁸ Dent is an ambitious, idealistic district attorney who becomes caught up as a cog in the Joker’s machine of chaos, and consequently, finds himself following his own projected notion that “you either die a hero or live long enough to see yourself become the villain.”⁴⁹ Dent becomes the villain known as Two-Face after half of his face is badly burned and he has lost his girlfriend, Rachel Dawes, from explosions caused by the Joker. As Two-Face, he says to Batman, “you thought we could be decent men in an indecent time. But you were wrong; the world is cruel, and the only morality in a cruel world is chance. Unbiased, unprejudiced, fair.”⁵⁰ If morality is left completely to chance and no order exists in reality, how can we measure good or evil? Unlike the Joker, Two-Face believes in an established moral order, and the violence that he creates in Gotham serves his purpose for revenge, which he considers to be a form of justice. By using chance as his definition for morality, he targets people specifically out of revenge because he believes that chance will eventually hurt someone and avenge Rachel’s death. In acting as an executioner out of self-gratification, Two-Face makes himself the vigilante. If Batman had not thrown away the gun and had not given into the they-self, the League of Shadows, then he would be just like Two-Face. Consequently, Dent has ruined his reputation as the White Knight for killing Gotham’s innocent citizens and holding Gordon’s family hostage.

⁴⁶ Brown, Richard Maxwell. Richard Maxwell Brown, *Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 115.

⁴⁷ Johnston, 232.

⁴⁸ *The Dark Knight*.

⁴⁹ *The Dark Knight*.

⁵⁰ *The Dark Knight*.

Batman's authenticity of self allows him to choose to make the most personal sacrifice of all: his reputation. In order to preserve Dent's image so that Gotham's citizens will not lose hope in their "hero with the face," Batman takes on Dent's crimes as his own.⁵¹ While Batman may not sacrifice his mask, his identity of Bruce Wayne, in order to save Gotham's people by becoming the hero with the face, it is the sacrifice of his own face and his own integrity as a hero that makes it possible for him to endure, to be the hero that Gotham truly deserves. As Batman tells Gordon at the end of *The Dark Knight*:

You either die a hero, or you live long enough to see yourself become the villain. I can do those things, because I'm not a hero. I'm not Dent... I'm whatever Gotham needs me to be... you'll hunt me. You'll condemn me, [you'll] set the dogs on me. Because that's what needs to happen. Because sometimes the truth isn't good enough. Sometimes people deserve more, sometimes people deserve to have their faith rewarded.⁵²

Batman sacrifices his own credibility in order to preserve Dent's. In this sense, Batman is saint-like: "yes, the world needs a witness to the truth, the goodness and beauty of reality; a witness to the order of creation; a witness to the enduring reason through which all things were made; a witness with a human face. We don't call those people superheroes. We call them saints."⁵³ Batman is the both the hero and anti-hero, the soldier-like figure that Gotham casts out of their society for doing their dirty work. He does not act out of self-interest, but rather, duty and the need to help others when he can: "it is precisely in this that the worth of character begins to show—a moral worth and beyond all comparison the highest—namely, that he does good, not from inclination, but from duty."⁵⁴ Gotham's citizens expect Batman to watch over them, fight for them, and to make the choices that they cannot. Ultimately, Gotham rejects him for the sacrifices that he has made. In spite of his ability to reassure Gotham that there is good in the world, that there are citizens ready to believe in good and to work together to fight injustice in Gotham. Gotham also rejects him for attributing the killings committed by Two-Face to himself. This is the greatest sacrifice of all, because Batman has willingly submitted himself to their criticism, and as a result, he has allowed society to condemn him even though he has done nothing wrong. Even Gordon acknowledges this at the end of the film: "We have to chase him. Because he's the hero Gotham deserves, but not the one it needs right now. So we'll hunt him, because he can take it. Because he's not our hero. He's a silent guardian, a watchful protector, a dark knight."⁵⁵ This is the sacrifice of a saint or martyr, and that is why Batman is not simply a superhero, but rather, a moral exemplar.

⁵¹ *The Dark Knight*

⁵² *The Dark Knight*.

⁵³ deSouza, 2.

⁵⁴ Kant, 66.

⁵⁵ *The Dark Knight*.

Anne Rowe Goldman: Refashioning Women's News in St. Petersburg, Florida

Kimberly Voss
University of Central Florida

Nestled amid the fashion photos and the recipes in newspapers' women's sections, questions about women's roles in the post-World War II era were beginning to take shape. This was especially true at the St. Petersburg newspapers under the wise leadership of Anne Rowe Goldman. She helped the traditional pages develop into a progressive section, which launched her career. Women's pages were a part of American journalism for more than a century. Started by Joseph Pulitzer in the late 1800s as a way to increase advertising products for women, these sections evolved over the decades until their elimination in the 1970s. In the early years, the editorial content mainly contained household tips or fashion images. Yet, over time, more news was added to the sections, creating a mixture of tradition and progress. While women's sections were largely overlooked as insignificant, the women's pages in some newspapers featured progressive stories and questions about gender inequalities. A close examination of the sections reveals a more complex set of messages.

The changing role of women in the 1950s and 1960s was a complex web of events and people. In many communities, that change was aided by the training received as clubwomen from women's page journalists. These clubs took political and social stands as well as raised money for social causes. According to women's historian Anne Firor Scott, "While the social status was that 'woman's place' was in the home, the fact was that for a certain kind of woman - generally, but not always, of the middle class - 'woman's place' was clearly in the voluntary association."¹ These scenarios played out across Florida as women's clubs supported legislation that helped children and raised money to build libraries.

Women's page journalism was in its heyday in Florida in the 1950s and 1960s. In the first three years of the national Penney-Missouri Awards for best women's sections, Florida newspapers won one-third of the awards – nine of twenty-seven in the three circulation brackets.² Groundbreaking Florida women's page editors included Gloria Biggs at *Florida Today*, Beverley Morales at the *Sun-Sentinel*, Edee Greene at the *Fort Lauderdale News* and Marie Anderson at the *Miami Herald*.³ Penney-Missouri Awards' Director Paul Myhre regularly communicated with the Florida winners about their progressive sections. He wrote to Greene: "It's wonderful to hear what the Florida contingent is doing for this laborious cause."⁴ In a letter to Anderson, Myhre again

¹ Anne Firor Scott, *Making the Invisible Woman Visible* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 282.

² George Beebe, "Women's Pages in 1973," February 1, 1963. *The Bulletin*. 2.

³ Kimberly Wilmot Voss, "Florida Women's Page Journalists Spread News of a Movement," *South Florida History*, 2006, 22-25.

⁴ Paul Myhre letter to Edee Greene, November 10, 1966. Papers of the Penney-Missouri Awards, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri.

noted his appreciation: “It is tremendously gratifying that you Floridians are doing the big missionary job that you are doing across the country”.⁵

This study examines the story of one these Florida women’s page journalists: Anne Rowe Goldman⁶ of the *St. Petersburg Times and the Evening Independent*. She was a regular winner of the Penney-Missouri Award as women’s page editor of the two newspapers. Former *St. Petersburg Times Editor* and President Don Baldwin said of Goldman, “Of all the journalists I’ve worked with over the years, she was among the very best. She was a gifted writer, but her creative imagination and talent for organizing and bringing to completion any project she undertook really set her apart.”⁷

Unlike many of the progressive women’s page editors who had worked on the news side during World War II before going back to the women’s pages, Goldman was too young for these experiences. Instead, she worked for women who had been on the news side during the war and wanted to redefine women’s news. Goldman worked her way up from the *St. Petersburg Times*’ library clerk to the editor of the women’s section. Later, she became one of the first women to oversee a section that included as many men as women. In the late 1970s, she became the newspaper’s ombudsman, a readers’ advocate – another role that was unique for women.

The *Times* had “a reputation for being one of the most liberal and most progressive papers in the South. They were very anxious to stay up with the trends, do everything, [and] try things that were new.”⁸ This reputation was based in large part on Nelson Poynter who had a progressive editorial policy and sought to publish quality journalism. Poynter became president and editor of the *Times* and its principal stockholder in 1950. In 1969, he became chairman of the board of the Times Publishing Company.⁹ Poynter’s wife, Henrietta Poynter, was also a well-known journalist before her sudden death in 1968.

Yet, while Poynter was known for his liberal stances, he was not generally forward-thinking about women’s roles. For example, in 1968, Nelson Poynter gave a talk at the Tampa Bay chapter of Women in Communications, Inc. One of his reporters said it was wrong that women were not allowed to be members of the National Press Club. Yet, women were finally accepted as members in 1971. Poynter stated that he disagreed with the reporter and noted that women were inferior and largely defined by marriage: “I had a very interesting wife, but most men have dull wives.”¹⁰

⁵ Paul L. Myhre letter to Marie Anderson, November 10, 1966. Papers of the Penney-Missouri Awards, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri.

⁶ While she went by either “Anne Rowe” or “Anne Goldman,” others also referred to her as “Anne Rowe Goldman.” For consistency sake, she will be referred to as “Goldman” after the first reference in this paper.

⁷ Craig Basse, “Anne Goldman, Former Times Feature Editor,” *St. Petersburg Times*, February 6, 2003.

⁸ Marjorie Paxson, “Women in Journalism,” Washington Press Club Foundation. Session 3, 73.

⁹ “History,” *St. Petersburg Times*, <http://www.sptimes.com/connect/corporate/history/>.

¹⁰ Elizabeth Whitney, “Swamp Sales to Out-of-Towners Was Story of a Lifetime,” *St. Petersburg Times*, February 18, 1990, 6.

Information about Goldman came from several sources. Some references were found in the boxes of the Penney-Missouri Awards in the Western Historical Manuscript Collection at the University of Missouri. There were a few pages devoted to Goldman in a thesis from the University of South Florida.¹¹ She was briefly mentioned in the book, *Orange Journalism*, as an example of the inequities women faced at newspapers.¹² There was no significant mention of Goldman in the Nelson Poynter papers at the University of South Florida. This paper writes Goldman into the record of Florida journalism history. Her story is important to understand the role of women in journalism during a changing time in society and in newsrooms.

Anne Rowe Goldman Background

Anne Lapointe Rowe Goldman, a New Jersey native, moved to St. Petersburg at a young age. In January 1953, Goldman visited the *St. Petersburg Times* on career day as a high school senior. She shadowed two police reporters and gained interest on journalism. Three days after she graduated from St. Petersburg High School, she worked at the newspaper's library at the age of only seventeen-years. In 1956, she was named teen editor for the newspaper. Four years later, she became assistant women's editor. In 1962, she became women's editor of Poynter's newly acquired newspaper, the *Evening Independent*. By 1963, she was women's editor of both newspapers. During the 1960s, she won three Penney-Missouri Awards.

Goldman became the news-features editor in 1966—a job that also included editing the Sunday magazine. This position was typically held by men. Ultimately, she resigned her full-time position in 1971 to spend more time with her growing family. She continued to work for the newspaper on a part-time basis. Later, she returned to the newspaper and became editor of the features section in 1973. She balanced her home and family life thanks to a helpful husband and a hands-on housekeeper. Goldman said of the woman: “She’s a friend and surrogate mother, as conscientious about her job as I am about mine.”¹³

In 1978, Goldman was named assistant to Eugene Patterson, then editor and president of the *Times*. In this position, she worked as one of the first ombudsman in the country. She retired at age forty-three from the newspaper in 1979. In her final column, she wrote:

I have loved the *Times* and the heady mix of excitement, security and warmth it has given me as my second family since I was 17 years old. Yet, much as I have treasured each day here, I find that 24 hours a day these past few years

¹¹ Richard J. Kenney, *The Times Ombudsman: An Historical Case Study and Trend Analysis*, Master's Thesis, University of South Florida, August 1994.

¹² Julian Pleasants, ed., *Orange Journalism* (Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2003).

¹³ “Working with readers is ‘interesting, fascinating,’” *Times-O-Gram*, July 14, 1978. Papers of Nelson Poynter, University of South Florida.

just haven't been quite enough. My days are too long, my nights are too short, as I have rushed from job to home to dinner, to homework with the children, to story time with the baby, to a quiet [?] moment of shared time with [husband] Sanford before bedtime.¹⁴

Women's Page Reporting

Goldman covered numerous topics – both traditional and non-traditional – while reporting for the women's pages. In 1962, she wrote a story about fashionable new uniforms for hair dressers, waitress and nurses. "Today, a woman who wears a uniform can be as fashionably dressed as a secretary or salesgirl."¹⁵ The story included photos of the uniforms and readers were instructed to call the newspaper for more information on where to buy the clothing. She later covered the semi-annual fashion shows in New York City, wearing a fur coat borrowed from Henrietta Poynter.¹⁶ Goldman sent back daily stories tailored to her local readers as she wrote in one story: "Seems as though almost every design could walk off the runway right into St. Petersburg."¹⁷

The content of other stories was more progressive. For example, in one story, Goldman interviewed Cuban residents who had just arrived in Miami. She described the poverty of the island country and the impact on families who had fled to Miami. The interviews included strong quotes about their feelings concerning Fidel Castro: "We put all our faith in Fidel – all our belief and trust – we thought of him as our savior. Now he has betrayed us. I would like to see his throat cut. To see him dead."¹⁸ In another story, Goldman was one of many journalists reporting on the first day of school as the district began integration. In the summer of 1971, the federal court entered an order approving a plan to desegregate the Pinellas public schools.¹⁹ Reporters were assigned to each school in anticipation of potential unrest. Goldman, covered Bay Point and wrote: "The atmosphere was patient and helpful and there were no major problems in the school, which has fewer black students this year than last year."²⁰

Interviewing Elvis

Goldman was probably best known for one specific story she wrote early in her career about young Elvis Presley. It was the summer of 1956 and Goldman was twenty-years-old – the youngest reporter on the staff. She and photographer Bob Moreland were sent to cover the singer who was just gaining popularity as Presley's appearance on the Ed Sullivan Show was still a few weeks away.

¹⁴ Anne Goldman, "A Midlife Journey Begins," *St. Petersburg Times*, July 16, 1979.

¹⁵ Anne Rowe, "Fashion Minded," *The Evening Independent*, November 27, 1962.

¹⁶ Robert Pierce, *A Sacred Trust: Nelson Poynter and the St. Petersburg Times* (Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 1993), 235.

¹⁷ Anne Rowe, "Feeling a Bit Ruffled?" *St. Petersburg Times*, January 8, 1964.

¹⁸ Anne Rowe, "We gave all our faith to Fidel – We Hate Him for His Betrayal," *St. Petersburg Times*, Sept. 27, 1960.

¹⁹ "History of Desegregation," Pinellas County Schools, <http://www.pinellas.k12.fl.us/USI/history2004.html>.

²⁰ Anne Goldman, "Elementary Children Easily Make Grad," *St. Petersburg Times*, September 8, 1971.

Moreland had Goldman and Presley pose for photos in the parking lot outside of the Armory. Later, she interviewed the young singer in his dressing room, which her story began, “Dressed as sharp as a cat in black pegged pants, blue shirt, white tie, maroon jack and white buck shoes, the king of rock ‘n roll picked up a broom and started sweeping out his dressing room.” Presley then turned the broom into a microphone and sang “Don’t Be Cruel” to the young journalist.²¹

Goldman later recalled: “Elvis managed to have a good time and yet be very respectful. He even called me ‘ma’am,’ and I was a year younger than him. He was such fun to be with. So sparkly. You knew that he loved this time of his life, that he couldn’t get over how much people liked him. I liked him. He was really a very nice young man.”²² The result of that meeting was a photo spread that included Presley nuzzling Goldman’s neck while she held her notebook in hand. When Presley saw the photo in the *St. Petersburg Times* the next day, he mimicked a sneeze that ended with the newspaper over his face. That picture ran in newspapers across the country. These images were later published in a book of photos of Elvis shot by Moreland.²³

Five years later, Presley was back in the area to film the movie, *Follow That Dream*. Goldman and Moreland went to visit the singer in Crystal River, north of St. Petersburg. They conducted another interview and took photographs. In 1977, Presley returned to the area and Goldman went to the concert, while that time Goldman was forty-years old and pregnant. It was three months before his death and it had been two decades from their initial meeting. She said: “I remembered him young and full of fun and life. I could hardly look at him now. The sparkle was gone. His face was bloated; he had a belly. He looked like a sick man.”²⁴

Transitioning into Features Sections

In 1966, Goldman was promoted to news-features editor, becoming the first woman in that position in the newspaper’s history and one of the first in the country. By 1969, the features section underwent what was described as a “dramatic change” in format. Under the change, Goldman oversaw a staff of twenty-two male and female editors and writers, plus copy desks and specialists in religion, fashion, food, music, drama and art.²⁵ The new DAY section began on 15 September 1969. According to Baldwin: “We want to write about people and what they are doing and why they are doing it. I think we should be ahead of Women’s Lib. Women are people and they should be treated like people and not have a special section anymore than lefthanders or red-heads and electricians.”²⁶

²¹ Anne Rowe, “Broom-Sweeping Elvis A Regular Guy,” *St. Petersburg Times*, August 5, 1956.

²² Jacquin Sanders, “When Elvis Came to Town,” *St. Petersburg Times*, Aug 10, 1997.

²³ Ger J. Rijff and Jan Van Gestel, *Elvis: The Cool King* (Wilmington, Delaware: Atomium Books, 1989).

²⁴ Jacquin Sanders, “When Elvis Came to Town,” *St. Petersburg Times*, Aug 10, 1997.

²⁵ Craig Basse, “Anne Goldman, former Times features editor,” *St. Petersburg Times*, February 6, 2003.

²⁶ Buddy Martin, “The St. Petersburg Times, Our Changing Women’s Pages: Where Are We Now?” APME Modern Living Committee, October 1975, 16.

Goldman wrote of the design of the DAY section and its appeal to readers: “We didn’t abandon her. We drew her closer to us by writing about things that concern her. And we have absorbed her into our concept women ARE people.”²⁷

According to a history of the newspaper, the new DAY section was intended as a clear change from traditional women’s pages. Managing Editor Bob Haiman was described as having “an almost evangelistic zeal for sweeping away the sexism of old concepts that features were for women as sports were for men.” Goldman wrote about the transformation in the national *Women in Communications magazine*. She noted the break in tradition much as changing the focus on society news – a staple of many women’s section. Goldman wrote, “We’ve broken with tradition. We took on the debutantes this year – had a young man look at the ritual of the debutante ball. The story was fair – but it wasn’t puff, and we weren’t very popular for it.”²⁸

A Place in Management

Few women’s page editors were groomed for management. Decades later, when asked if the *St. Petersburg Times* was ahead of its time in regard for women in the 1960s, newspaper executive David Lawrence responded that they were not. He also said of Goldman,

“She clearly could have been editor of the paper. The whole business was sort of shabby on the subject. Women made distinctly less, had fewer jobs, and had less of a chance to gain more responsibility and more money.”²⁹

Goldman, however, did have better training for management than many of the other women’s page editors.³⁰ She was mentored, poised for promotions, and served as a role model for other women journalists. For example, Goldman served as a mentor to Elizabeth Whitney, who started at the newspaper in 1962. In 1967, Whitney told Goldman that she was hoping for a change to “real estate editor” after the retirement of Douglas Doubleday, who covered real estate and urban development news. Instead, Goldman suggested that Whitney reach higher. “I think you should go for more than the title,” she said. “Your name already is on a list with six men for Doug’s job. If you want it, I suggest that you make a pitch for it in a memo.”³¹

When women like Goldman reached decision-making positions, the content of the newspaper changed. For example, Whitney’s *St. Petersburg Times* Sunday magazine piece in January 1969, called “The Status of the Sexes” which explored

²⁷ Buddy Martin, “The St. Petersburg Times, Our Changing Women’s Pages: Where Are We Now?” APME Modern Living Committee, October 1975, 19.

²⁸ Anne Goldman, “It’s a New DAY – Women’s Pages Are Out,” *Matrix*, Spring 1970, 16-17.

²⁹ Julian M. Pleasants, *Orange Journalism: Voices from Florida Newspapers* (University Press of Florida, 2003), 50.

³⁰ Paxson, “Women in Journalism.”

³¹ Elizabeth Whitney, “Once Upon a Time,” *St. Petersburg Times*, February 11, 1990.

inequalities women faced. She later recalled her male editor did not want to publish the essay, but his boss, Goldman, overruled him.³²

Ombudsman

The *St. Petersburg Times* was an early leader in creating an ombudsman position. The first newspaper to create this position was the *Louisville Courier-Journal* in 1967. The *Times* began its section four years later. This job served as a liaison between readers and the newspaper. As a result, this position was sometimes considered the “public’s voice.” The person in this role answered questions and responded to complaints. The results of a 1974 academic study of the two Poynter newspapers found that the position could be controversial. According to the findings, “It is likely that staff members would support the concept more once the ombudsman proves himself.”³³

In 1978, Goldman took over the column as the first woman in the position. It appeared on the op-ed page under the title, “Other Opinions.” At times, this column ran the entire page of the newspaper. Her debut column asked her readers to contact her with questions, compliments and comments. She wrote, “You complain – and too often you’re right – that our news columns contain errors and that occasional headlines reflect carelessness. Yes, you’re out there and I’m listening.”³⁴ She received numerous letters and calls through a reader hotline. In one month, the newspaper received more than 1,300 calls. She noted that these readers truly cared about what was covered in the news.

Some of her columns were used to highlight good reporting or strong photographs through a feature known as “Editor’s Pride.” Other columns addressed topics, such as the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion rights, and control of the Panama Canal. In the case of abortion coverage, one reporter had questioned whether the newspaper’s editorial policy was impacting news coverage – a serious breach of journalistic ethics. Goldman asked the editor to explain how the newspaper was able to work to keep the news and editorial sections separate.

In her debut column, she questioned whether the new position would be too easy. She later explained that her concern was groundless. She noted the ombudsman’s position was “one of the most varied, interesting, fascinating things I’ve ever done.”³⁵ It is likely that this position was a natural one for Goldman as women’s page journalists were regularly in contact with their readers. This constant responsiveness would have been great training for an ombudsman. As she wrote of her readers, “I have found a cache of characters, interests and insights that have

³² Elizabeth Whitney, “Swamp Sales to Out-of-Towners Was Story of a Lifetime,” *St. Petersburg Times*, February 18, 1990, 5.

³³ David R. Nelsen and Kenneth Starck, “The Newspaper Ombudsman as Viewed by the Rest of the Staff,” *Journalism Quarterly*, 1974, 455-457.

³⁴ Goldman, 1978a, 15A.

³⁵ Goldman, *Times* newsletter, 1978.

astounded me, amused me, touched me, and always, always enlightened me.”³⁶ She retired from the newspaper in 1979.

Conclusion

Florida women’s page journalists of the 1950s and 1960s were seen as trailblazers. They negotiated progressive stories with the traditional structure that pleased advertisers and longtime readers. They created sections that other newspapers copied – although their names are not part of journalism histories. They helped negotiate a new position for women in their communities, especially clubwomen who were exploring a new role outside of the home. They were laying the foundation of feminism that other media were slow to accept.³⁷ However, women’s page journalists are not a part of most journalism history³⁸ as it has been more than three decades after Marion Marzolf wrote that women were only found in the footnotes of journalism history. Sadly, little has changed. Today, the women in journalism history are notable because they escaped traditional female positions. Despite the fact that the women’s pages were the only place for women in newspapers for decades, these sections continue to be overlooked.

Goldman’s story deserves to be part of Florida and journalism history. She was one of the groundbreaking women’s page journalists who redefined women’s news. Her impact was felt not only in South Florida but across the country at speeches she gave at the Penney-Missouri Awards workshops and the American Press Institute workshops. Later, she was one of the few women’s page journalists who promoted through the management ranks. Her career demonstrates the path that some women journalists faced during the heydays of the women’s pages through their elimination in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Florida women’s page stories further supports a revision in the history of women’s pages and their role in the understanding of the women’s liberation movement. While traditional women’s pages, often filled with society, home and wedding news, appeared in many newspapers, this was not the full story. There were some sections, such as those in Florida, that were progressive in their content and writing style. The invisibility of women in journalism history leads to not recognizing the differences among sections at various newspapers and overlooks the important role played by women journalists in pressing for change in their individual communities.³⁹

³⁶ Anne Goldman, “A Midlife Journey Begins,” *St. Petersburg Times*, July 16, 1979.

³⁷ For example, the national coverage of the peaceful March for Equality in August 1970. ABC began its coverage by quoting Spiro Agnew: “Three things have been difficult to tame. The ocean, fools and women. We may soon be able to tame the ocean, but fools and women will take a little longer.” On CBS, anchor Eric Sevareid said, “The plain truth is, most American men are startled by the idea that American women generally are oppressed, and they read with relief the Gallup poll that two-thirds of women don’t think they’re oppressed either.”

³⁸ Marion Marzolf, *Up From the Footnote: A History of Women Journalists* (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1977), ix.

³⁹ Joan Wallach Scott, “The Problem of Invisibility,” *Retrieving Women’s History*, ed. S. Jay Kleinberg (New York: Berg Publishers Limited, 1988), 5.

PROGRAM

Florida Conference of Historians

50TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
WAKULLA SPRINGS, FLORIDA
18-20 FEBRUARY 2010
WAKULLA SPRINGS STATE PARK

Host Institution
Tallahassee Community College

OFFICERS OF THE FLORIDA CONFERENCE OF HISTORIANS

President

Mike Epple

Florida Gulf Coast University

President-Elect

David Proctor

Tallahassee Community College

Treasurer

Jesse Hingson

Jacksonville University

Secretary

David Proctor

Tallahassee Community College

Editor, Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians

Anthony Atwood

Florida International University

Local Arrangements

Madeleine Hirsiger-Carr

Independent Scholar, Tallahassee Community College
Adjunct History Instructor, and Wakulla Springs State Park Volunteer

THURSDAY FEBRUARY 18

6:30-7:30PM: Registration and Reception (Cash Bar)
Wakulla Springs Lodge Lobby and Terrace

FRIDAY FEBRUARY 19

8:00AM-9:00AM: Registration in Lobby

9:00AM-11:45AM: CONCURRENT SESSIONS

CYPRESS ROOM, MAGNOLIA ROOM, ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM

SESSION A1 9:00-10:15 CYPRESS ROOM: WESTERN CIVILIZATION

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Blaine Browne**, *Broward Community College*

“Tudor Imagery and Crown Identity: The Reformation in Art”

Jessica Hoeschen, *University of Central Florida History Graduate Student*

“The Holy Roman Empire on the Road: The Study of a Court’s Voyage, 1569-1570”

Joe Patrouch, *Florida International University*

“Unrealistic Visions: The Representation of Women and Civic Conflict in the Plays of Aristophanes” **Dawn Capiello**, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

SESSION A2 9:00-10:15 MAGNOLIA ROOM: AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Will Benedicks**, *Tallahassee Community College*

“The Decision to Use the Bomb: Gar Alperovitz and His Critics”

Kazuo Yagami, *Savannah State University*

“Refugee Resettlement in Jacksonville: The Case of World Relief 1991-2009”

Alaye Alaro Alambo, *Independent Scholar*

**SESSION A3 9:00-10:15 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM:
AMERICAN POLITICAL HISTORY**

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Anthony Esposito**, *St. Leo University*

“Barry Goldwater and the Political Readjustment of the South”

Michael Murphy, *UF History Undergraduate Student*

“Pigs in Politics: Pigasus’ Role in the 1968 Presidential Election”

Elizabeth Bryant, *FSU History Graduate Student*

“LeRoy Collins and Florida’s Racial Democratic Primary of 1956”

Seth Weitz, *Indiana University- Northwest*

SESSION B1 10:30-11:45 MAGNOLIA ROOM: HISTORY OF INDIA

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Madeleine Carr**, *Independent Scholar*

“The Anti-Colonial Struggle of the Tiwa (Lalung) Peasants in Assam: A Study of the Phulaguri Uprising from Selected Archival Records”

Bandana Baruah, *Cotton College, India*

“A Declining Monarchy in Crisis: The Reign of Gaurinath Singha”

Pallavi Baruah, *Loknayak Omeo Kumar Das College, India*

SESSION B2 10:30-11:45 CYPRESS ROOM:

MODERN GERMANY AND RUSSIA

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Anthony Esposito**, *St. Leo University*

“Mikhail Gorbachev’s Policies during Perestroika:
Reconciling Effective Economics with the Dissolution of the Soviet State”

Christopher Zakroff, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

“Operation T4: Secret Death”

Sara Gottwalles, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

SESSION B3 10:30-11:45 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM:

ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Jack McTague**, *St. Leo University*

“Beyond the Noble Savage: A Historiography of Traditional North American Ecological Misconceptions and Contemporary Attempts at Clarification”

Renee Waller, *FGCU History Graduate Student*

“Like a Drunken Heir on a Spree: Coal, Culture, and the Modern Subterranean”

Bob Johnson, *New College*

11:45-1:00PM: BUFFET LUNCH ON TERRACE “FIESTA BAR” or
Sandwiches in Snack Bar (Cash)

1:00PM-3:45PM: CONCURRENT SESSIONS

CYPRESS ROOM, MAGNOLIA ROOM, ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM

**SESSION C1 1:00-2:15 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM:
ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY OF FLORIDA**

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Sean McMahon**, *Lake City Community College*

“A Human History of Ichetucknee Springs to 1970”

Sean McMahon, *Lake City Community College*

“New Deal for Wakulla: Art and Marble in the Swamps”

Madeleine Hirsiger-Carr, *Independent Scholar*

“Miami Beach Sewerage 1890-1950”

Marlin Kann, *Miami-Dade County Public Schools*

**SESSION C2 1:00-2:15 CYPRESS ROOM:
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY**

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Alexandra Cornelius-Diallo**, *Florida International University*

“The New York Intellectuals and Evergreen Review: A Crossroads of the Old and New Lefts”

Darrow Darby, *FSU History Graduate Student*

“Argumentative Observations: Debating Slavery, Race and Science in the Streets of Philadelphia” **Alexandra Cornelius-Diallo**, *Florida International University*

**SESSION C3 1:00-2:15 MAGNOLIA ROOM:
AMERICAN MILITARY HISTORY**

CHAIR: **J. Calvitt Clarke III**, *Jacksonville University*

“Election Fraud, Quaker Soldiers, and Fenians: The Men of the 4th Delaware Volunteer Infantry, 1862-1865”

Mark O’Neill, *Tallahassee Community College*

“An Enterprising Spirit: Richard Hamilton 1811-1819”

J. Calvitt Clarke III, *Jacksonville University*

DISCUSSANT: **Kyle Eidahl**, *Florida A&M University*

SESSION D1 2:30-3:45 MAGNOLIA ROOM: FRANCE AND AMERICA
CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Chris Meyers**, *Valdosta State University*

“The Legacy of Napoleon and the American Civil War”

Kyle Eidahl, *Florida A&M University*

“Toujours la France: An Interpretive Analysis of the Consequences of French Involvement in the American Revolution”

Donald Barry, *Tallahassee Community College*

**SESSION D2 2:30-3:45 CYPRESS ROOM: MANAGING NATURE:
RESPONDING TO ENVIRONMENTAL CRISES IN NORTH AMERICA**

CHAIR: Hendry Miller, FSU History Graduate Student

“Symbols of the West: Feral Burro Management in American History”

Abe Gibson, FSU History Graduate Student

“The Good Friday Fire of 1788: Managing Disaster in a Spanish Colonial Urban Landscape”

Cindy Ermus, FSU History Graduate Student

“Preservation in the Everglades: Commercial Exploitation and the Idea of Wilderness”

Christopher Wilhelm, FSU History Graduate Student

DISCUSSANT: Jonathan Sheppard, Florida State University

4:30 PM: World Famous Wakulla River Cruise on Historic Tour Boats (Free with Registration)

6:30-7:30 PM: BANQUET ON TERRACE

7:30PM: BANQUET SPEAKER

Ed Ball Conference Room (2nd floor)

DR. JAMES P. JONES

Florida State University hired Dr. Jones as an instructor in 1957 while he was completing his doctorate in history from the University of Florida (1960). FSU appointed him to an Assistant Professorship in 1961 and since then he has taught the US Civil War, US Political History, World War II, Historical Methods, Sport in America, and many survey courses. He is the author of “Black Jack:” John A. Logan and Southern Illinois in the Civil War Era (1967) and Yankee Blitzkrieg: Wilson’s Raid Through Alabama and Georgia (1976, 1987) and he has authored or coauthored numerous other scholarly and popular books and journal articles. He chronicled, along with UF Professor Kevin McCarthy, the epic football rivalry between Florida State and Florida in *The Gators and the Seminoles: Honor, Guts, and Glory*. A recipient of FSU’s Distinguished Teaching Professor Award in 1991, Dr. Jones has earned an FSU school record of eight university teaching honors and he has directed 26 master’s degree students and 26 doctoral degree students. He served on the selection committees for football coach Bobby Bowden and baseball coaches Dick Howser and Mike Martin. A true Florida teaching legend, Professor Jones’ keynote speech is appropriately entitled “Thoughts and Reminiscences about the Teaching of History at Florida State University, 1957-2010”

7:30PM: Dessert and Refreshments in Ed Ball Conference Room

SATURDAY FEBRUARY 20

8:00AM-9:00AM: Registration in Lobby

9:00AM-11:45AM: CONCURRENT SESSIONS

CYPRESS ROOM, MAGNOLIA ROOM, ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM

SESSION E1 9:00-10:15 CYPRESS ROOM: NEW LIGHT ON FLORIDA'S ANTEBELLUM LEADERS

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Nicholas Steneck**, *Florida Southern College*

“William P. DuVal, The Founding of Tallahassee, and the ‘First Removal’ of the Seminoles”

James M. Denham, *Florida Southern College*

“William D. Moseley: Florida’s First Governor, The Early Years”

Francis Hodges, *Florida Southern College*

“Quincy, Florida’s Dr. John Henry Gee: War Criminal or Man of Honor”

Richard Soash, *Florida Southern College*

SESSION E2 9:00-10:15 MAGNOLIA ROOM: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON US-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Nicola Foote**, *Florida Gulf Coast University*

“US Journalism and Representations of Latin America, 1836-1898”

Matthew Kaye, *FGCU History Graduate Student*

“West Indian Workers and the Panama Canal: A Diplomatic Perspective”

Ginger Kalinski, *FCGU History Graduate Student*

“The ‘Big Stick,’ Big Guns, Money and Policy: A Century of US Gunboat Diplomacy in the Caribbean and Central America, 1900-1983”

Richard Ramos, *FCGU History Graduate Student*

“Our Hand Doesn’t Show: Collusion, Culpability, and Plausible Deniability in the Nixon Administration and the Coup in Allende’s Chile”

Paul Chartrand, *FGCU History Graduate Student*

**SESSION E3 9:00-10:15 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM:
NARRATIVE, IDENTITY, AND COMMUNITY: PRESENTATION AND
REPRESENTATION OF THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN EXPERIENCE**

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Julian Chambliss**, *Rollins College*

“Resisting and Enforcing White Meta-Narratives: The Bittersweet Community of Toni Morrison’s *Sula* and *The Bluest Eye*”

Jason Carney, *Case Western Reserve University*

“She Walked on Worlds: Intertextualizing Myth, Sexuality and Class in DuBois’ *The Quest of the Souls of Black Folk*”

Carrza DuBose, *Morgan State University*

“The Black Church and African-American Education: The African Methodist Episcopal Church and Educating for Liberation, 1816-1893”

David Childs, *Central State University*

**SESSION F1 10:30-11:45 CYPRESS ROOM: THE COLD WAR IN
EUROPE AND CENTRAL AMERICA**

CHAIR: **Francis Hodges**, *Florida Southern College*

“From Hausfrau to Civil Defense Worker: Women in West German Civil Defense in the Early Cold War”

Nicholas Steneck, *Florida Southern College*

“The Hispanic American Press and the Overthrow of Jacobo Arbenz: A Case Study in Cold War Press Manipulation”

Charlie Fanning, *Florida Southern College*

“Patriotism and Protest: The Nicaraguan Contras Come to North Florida, 1986”

Roger Peace, *Tallahassee Community College*

DISCUSSANT: **James Denham**, *Florida Southern College*

SESSION F2 10:30-11:45 MAGNOLIA ROOM: PERSPECTIVES ON THE US SOUTH DURING WORLD WAR II

CHAIR: **Burton Kirkwood**, *University of Evansville*

“Crackers in White and Black: A Narrative of Atlanta Baseball During the Second World War”

Hendry Miller, *Florida State University History Graduate Student*

“From Tourists to Tanks: The Social Impact of Military Bases on the Florida Homefront During the Second World War”

Daniel Hutchinson, *Florida State University History Graduate Student*

“Study to Show Thyself Approved unto God: Life and Work in Civilian Public Service Camp #27, Crestview Florida”

Angela Tomlinson, *Florida State University History Graduate Student*

DISCUSSANT: **Vincent Mikkelsen**, *Florida State University*

SESSION F3 10:30-11:45 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM: POLITICAL AND CULTURAL RESISTANCE IN EARLY 20TH CENTURY EUROPE

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Stefanie Babb**, *FCGU Undergraduate History Major*

“Revolutionary Violence and the Anarcho-Bolshevik Split”

Frank Piccirillo, *FCGU Undergraduate History Major*

“The Dada Movement: Its Origins, Impetus, and Influence”

Will Murphy, *FCGU Undergraduate History Major*

“The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising’s Influence on Jewish Resistance, 1943-1945”

Deniece Vella, *FCGU Undergraduate History Major*

11:45-1:00PM: Lunch in Lodge Restaurant (Cash)

11:45-1:00PM: Florida Conference of Historians Business Meeting Lodge Restaurant

1:00PM-3:45PM: CONCURRENT SESSIONS

CYPRESS ROOM, MAGNOLIA ROOM, ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM

SPECIAL INTERESTS SECTION: MEDIA AND CULTURE

SESSION G1 1:00-2:15 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM: AMERICAN GRAPHIC MEDIA: COMICS AND THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: **Julian Chambliss**, *Rollins College*

“Batman As Moral Exemplar: A Way of Being in Batman Begins and The Dark Knight”

Katie Grainger, *Wofford College Undergraduate English Major*

“Wonder Woman and Nelvana of the Northern Lights as Nazi Fighting Female Superheroes”

Amanda Murphy, *History Graduate Student, Carlton University, Canada*

“I Love Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Rethinking Fandom in Popular Culture”

Ashley Green, *Rollins College Undergraduate History Major*

“Making Weapons Right: Tony Stark/Iron Man and the Cold War in Marvel Comics”

Julian Chambliss, *Rollins College*

SESSION G2 1:00-2:15 MAGNOLIA ROOM: UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH ON CIVIC CONFLICT AND CIVIL WAR IN ANCIENT GREECE AND ROME

CHAIR: **Nadya Popov-Reynolds**, *Florida Gulf Coast University*

“Can’t We All Just Get Along? An Investigation Into why Greeks and Romans Raised Armies Against Native Cities”

Billy Mattingly, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

“Athens versus Sparta: The Eternal Conflict”

Andrew von Ohlsen, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

“Socrates versus the Athenian Democracy: How One Citizen Can Create Civic Conflict”

Stefanie Babb, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

“Plague and Moral Decline: Classical Athens and Medieval Europe”

Janet Schalk, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

DISCUSSANT: **Janet Schalk**, *FGCU Undergraduate History Major*

SESSION G3 1:00-2:15 CYPRESS ROOM: WOMEN'S HISTORY

CHAIR: Kimberly Voss, *University of Central Florida*

“The Taboo of Tattoos: Women and Tattoo Parlors in the United States, 1930-1945”

Tiffany West, *Jacksonville University*

“Anne Rowe: Refashioning Women's News in 1960s St. Petersburg, Florida”

Kimberly Voss, *University of Central Florida*

“Married Women's Property Acts in Illinois, 1860s-1870s: Squaring Common, Equity, and Statutory Law in the Jurisdictional Conflicts Between Law and Politics”

Patricia Farless, *University of Central Florida*

DISCUSSANT: Charles Upchurch, *Florida State University*

SESSION H1 2:30-3:45 CYPRESS ROOM: HISTORY OF SOUTH AMERICA

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: Jesse Hingson, *Jacksonville University*

Women, State Violence, and the Politics of Restitution in Argentina, 1829-1862”

Jesse Hingson, *Jacksonville University*

“Whenever did an Army enter into a Campaign with such a Faith in Victory as Ours?: Heroism and Virility in the Liberation of Northwest Colonial Brazil from the Dutch viewed through the Sermons of Father Antonio Vieira”

Rui Goncalves, *University of Coimbra*

**SESSION H2 2:30-3:45 ED BALL CONFERENCE ROOM:
FLORIDA MUSEUMS**

CHAIR/DISCUSSANT: Anthony Atwood, *Florida International University*

“This Old Headquarters: The Miami Military Museum”

Anthony Atwood, *Florida International University*

“The Culture of Here: Preserving Local History in a Local Museum” (Film Presentation)

Jacqueline Fewkes, *Florida Atlantic University* and *Abdul Nasir Kahn, Florida Atlantic University*

**CONCLUSION OF THE FLORIDA CONFERENCE OF HISTORIANS
50TH ANNUAL MEETING**