Recounting the Past

A Student Journal of Historical Studies
at Illinois State University

Editor-in-Chief
Christine Varga-Harris

Acknowledgments

Abstracts

The articles in this issue of *Recounting the Past* are based on primary source research, informed by historiographical debates in their respective fields, and draw upon current historical methodologies. As the following abstracts illustrate, taken together they address race relations in the United States, pivotal episodes in the advancement of American women, significant moments in world history, and vital facets of American education.

In "The Jim Crow Origins of American Felon Disenfranchisement Laws," Kevin Pajor shows how the criminal justice system serves as a mechanism for the continued exclusion of African Americans from society. Specifically, he traces manipulations of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, as well as the implementation and adaptation of felon disenfranchisement laws stretching back to the late 19th century, to highlight continuities in legal tactics from the Reconstruction period to the present. Using race as an analytical category, he asserts that the disenfranchisement of convicts does not merely mimic historical Jim Crow laws, but was rooted in the demobilization of black voters in the South during the Jim Crow era.

Race is central also to "Joe Louis Pummels Racism In The Face." In this article, Pedro Olivarez portrays boxing as a microcosm of American ideas about race, as well as of the struggle between democracy and fascism in the interwar years. He does so by comparing media depictions of two critical fights that occurred between the black American Joe Louis and the white German Max Schmeling. Olivarez demonstrates that Americans as a whole generally rallied for Louis; however, the African American public attempted to imbue the fights with political import for racial equality, while the white public supported Louis chiefly to voice opposition to the Nazism with which Schmeling was conflated. Thus, he argues, although the fights united Americans in national sentiment against Germany, they failed to overturn racist ideology in the United States.

"Pinch Hitting," by Rebecca Kijek, also delves into the world of sports, but in this case, to examine its potential to effect gender equality. Specifically, this article delineates the ways in which participation in the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League shaped the work and lives of its players. As Kijek asserts, the women who made up the various teams within the League, which was formed 1943, did much more than simply

fill the positions of men in sports during the Second World War. They also challenged conventional norms and myths surrounding womanhood, served as an inspiration to girls of the next generation, and moreover, enjoyed personal fulfillment. When the League was disbanded in 1954, former players continued to exemplify a range of possibilities for women, pursuing higher education and professional careers rather than restricting themselves to family life.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) is another instance of public female participation explored in this issue. Namely, it is the subject of "WILPF and the Fight Against the Arms Race and Chemical Warfare." In this article, Lyndsey Eagle shows how American women used the international forum that WILPF provided to pursue gender equality in the United States, as well as to oppose war and try to eliminate the use of chemical weapons worldwide. With their fight for female suffrage intensifying just as WILPF was formed in 1915, American members presented equality between men and women, alongside the traits and roles with which women were associated, as integral to world peace. Then, after they were granted the right to vote in 1919, peace activism became their principal concern. As Eagle illustrates, this quest too had its challenges, as the pacifist stance of the WILPF rendered its activists "un-American" and subjected them to persecution during the first Red Scare.

While "WILPF and the Fight against the Arms Race and Chemical Warfare" focuses on American engagement in international concerns, the next two articles shift attention away from the United States. In the first of these, "Russian Perspectives on Cuba during the Khrushchev Years," William O'Farrell demonstrates that contrary to conventional interpretations – many of which center expressly on the Cuban Missile Crisis – the Soviet leadership did not aid Cuba simply to make it a satellite state. Furthermore, Soviet involvement in Cuba was not singularly intent on strengthening the position of the Soviet Union in the world or forcing concessions in Berlin or elsewhere. Instead, O'Farrell asserts, the Soviet leadership extended to the Cuban people both economic and moral support because it viewed their struggle as a metaphor for the Soviet struggle – essentially that of a communist society striving to survive in a hostile capitalist world.

Although in a very different way and under decidedly different circumstances, questions about capitalism arise also in "The Formation of Economic Policy in Post-Colonial India." In this article, Sidney Comstock compares the economic visions of Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi and concludes that the ideas of Nehru prevailed because the ones that Gandhi proposed were too drastic a departure from "Western" precepts. As he explains, each addressed nationalist concerns and incorporated critiques of the colonial legacy, as well as varying degrees of socialism. However, focused on industrial growth and aimed at generating wealth and mass consumption, the Nehruvian plan better served to rectify the stunted agricultural and industrial growth that India confronted in the aftermath of British imperial rule. Meanwhile, Gandhian economics was more preoccupied with religious than material goals, underpinned as it was by conceptions of morality and duty.

The final two articles in this issue delve into American education. In "Debunking Moscow in the Midway," Caleb Rowe broaches the topic of academic freedom by offering a glimpse into the attacks on higher education generated by myths proliferating about communism during the 1930s and 1940s. Then, in "Myth or Reality?," Valerie Gabaldo raises matters related to school instruction as she outlines the ways in which textbooks and monuments have served, at different times, to uphold or to debunk the mythology surrounding Christopher Columbus.

Rowe studies two investigations of the University of Chicago at a time when American culture was pitting democracy against communism, and even a perceived association with the latter could render an individual a traitor and subject them to harassment. Each of these inquiries raised the issue of First Amendment rights for college professors and students, and each involved Robert Maynard Hutchins, who was president of the university during the first of these investigations (in 1935), and chancellor during the second (in 1949). In detailing how the University of Chicago was able to withstand the pressures and threats of anti-communist organizations and government bodies, Rowe provides a unique instance of a university defending its academic freedom, one that he credits to the steadfastness that Hutchins exhibited.

As Rowe shows, the persecution of academia was rooted more in the fear and paranoia of its times, than in substantive evidence. Gabaldo also emphasizes the significance of historical context, as she demonstrates how varying portrayals of Columbus in school textbooks and monuments reflected the experiences and concerns of American society at the time they were produced. Since each was built to celebrate a major anniversary of his 1492 voyage, the two monuments that she discusses, understandably, did little to revise conventional narratives surrounding Columbus. Her sampling of textbooks from the 1960s through the 1990s, however, tells a different story. Surveying these for the quantity of coverage they afforded Columbus, the aspects of his life and explorations they favored, and the ways in which these were presented, Gabaldo underscores how revelations about the atrocities of colonialism in the Americas and changing mentalities have, over time, greatly complicated the heroic image that the "discoverer" once enjoyed.

Christine Varga-Harris
Editor-in-Chief

Recounting the Past

A Student Journal of Historical Studies
at Illinois State University

Table of Contents

The Jim Crow Origins of American Felon Disenfranchisement Laws

By Kevin Pajor

    The people of the United States, a land that Abraham Lincoln described as apparently "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," have had a long and strenuous road in realizing that liberty. In light of an oftentimes outrageous disparity between rhetoric and reality, scholars like Pauline Maier have come to view documents like the Declaration of Independence not as a summation of colonial American principles, but as an ultimate goal: an aspirational "living document," or model of perfect liberty born in an imperfect time.[1] The examples are plentiful — while white male property owners once had a monopoly on political and social power, other groups (such as women, Native Americans, immigrants, and the poor) have struggled for freedom and a voice in the democratic process. African Americans have had one of the most trying journeys of all in pursuing that freedom. Once bound in chains as less-than-human slaves, the black people of America have long been bound, *de jure* or *de facto*, to a second-class status in their country. Their civil and political rights have been compromised in countless ways, which persist even after the "success" of the Civil Rights Movement and the martyrdom of many black leaders. The African American community, while having made great strides over the last century, continues to face adversity. While poll taxes, grandfather clauses and literacy tests are a thing of the past, today one restriction to African American suffrage has gained some new attention.

    In nearly every state today, Americans convicted of crimes lose their right to vote for some period. Criminal disenfranchisement laws vary from state to state but Maine and Vermont are the only states in which incarcerated felons retain the right to vote.[2] In most states, however, a felony conviction results in the curtailing of suffrage, either following release from prison or after the total completion of a sentence. A few states allow those on probation to vote. In some states, however, a felony conviction practically constitutes "civil death." In Iowa, Florida, Virginia and Kentucky, those convicted of felonies are permanently stripped of their suffrage, and in seven other states the mark is also permanent, depending on the nature of the crime.[3]

---

[1] Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (New York: Knopf, 1997), 207.

[2] There is some debate over the word "disenfranchisement." Some opt for the alternate "disfranchisement," and you will find both in the notes of this article. While I have chosen "disenfranchisement," others may use an alternative term – see Michael Perman, *Struggle for Mastery: Disfranchisement in the South 1888-1909* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

[3] Brennan Center for Justice, "Criminal Disenfranchisement Across the United States," http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/d/download_file_48642.pdf [Accessed 10 November 2011]. The seven states that permanently disenfranchise *certain* felons are Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Mississippi, Nevada, Tennessee and Wyoming. It should be noted that in these seven states, as well as the other four, an ex-felon can regain his suffrage through government approval – on an individual basis.

When discussing the American justice system and its scope, it is impossible to avoid the issue of race. For a variety of reasons, certain ethnic groups in America have proved to be more prone to crime than others. In 2008, the incarceration rate for African Americans was 3,161 per 100,000, while for whites the rate was 487 per 100,000.[4] In 2009, 39.4% of the prison population was African American, though this group only made up 12.6% of the population at large in the 2010 U.S. Census. While allowing that blacks commit crimes disproportionate to their percentage of the U.S. population, many social commentators have alleged that the criminal justice system is racially biased against African Americans. Some have alleged that this fix permeates the entire process – beginning with biased law enforcement and continuing all the way through judges and juries.[5] In short, the criminal justice system is a significant mechanism through which African Americans are excluded from the social fabric. When viewed in this racial context, the removal of convicts' voting rights is yet another way that blacks are handicapped in the political system.

For these reasons, along with other political and social issues involving the incarceration of African Americans, the disenfranchisement of ex-felons has been dubbed part of "The New Jim Crow."[6] This proclamation, however, is only half-right. The reason that the restriction of voting rights mimics historical Jim Crow laws is that the disenfranchisement of criminals was *part and parcel* of the Jim Crow era.

Jim Crow and the postbellum African American experience have received considerable attention from scholars, particularly in light of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. These works have analyzed the implementation of the various laws that sought to decrease black rights in the South in significant and devastating ways. One of the most important ways this was done was through the curtailing of African Americans' constitutionally-guaranteed right to vote. Yet in this Jim Crow context, some methods of disenfranchisement have received more attention than others.

In this context, felon disenfranchisement has by and large gotten short shrift from the academic community. There is a considerable body of literature on the subject dealing with its modern implications.[7] However, rarely has it been placed in the specific historical context as part of the

---

[4] Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Prison Inmates at Midyear 2009-Statistical Tables," http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/pim09st.pdf and U.S. Census Bureau, "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010," http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf [Accessed 28 November 2011].

[5] The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, *Justice on Trial: Racial Disparities in the American Criminal Justice System*," 2000, http://www.protectcivilrights.org/pdf/reports/justice.pdf [Accessed 14 December 2011].

[6] Michelle Alexander, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* (New York: The New Press, 2010).

[7] Alec C. Ewald and Brandon Rottinghaus, ed., *Criminal Disenfranchisement in an International Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

demobilization of black voters in the South during the Jim Crow era. Jeff Manza and Christopher Uggen, who have authored a general overview of American felon disenfranchisement, have analyzed its history as a racial institution that dates back to the late 1800s, as has Katherine Irene Pettus.[8] Yet this research has, in whole or in part, been done to give background or provide support for modern discussions about disenfranchisement, not to deal with it in purely historical terms. There has been no major historical work that deals solely with these issues. In this article, then, I will examine the implementation and adaptation of felon disenfranchisement laws, as they relate to Jim Crow laws in the late 19th century. The current implications of these racially-based laws will also be explored.

The practice of limiting the political participation of criminals or "infamous" people is an old one. It can be found in several forms in the history of Western society. Specific concepts in Ancient Greece and Rome have been seen as Western antecedents to the modern practices of criminal disenfranchisement. Under Athenian democracy, citizens found guilty of crimes such as bribery and embezzlement were branded with *atimia*, or "loss of time and honor." An *atimos* was unable to participate in the assembly, serve on a jury, or bring charges before the courts. In some cases, *atimia* was even hereditary. Similarly, in Rome certain types (pimps, prostitutes, etc.) could have *infamia* conferred upon them, marking an exclusion from Roman law and its protections. [9] Succeeding European societies restricted the political and civil rights of certain criminals. Many scholars of criminal disenfranchisement have focused on "attainder," the English variety of civil death. Attainder referred to the "tainting" or corruption of one's blood, and the attainted would be stripped of property titles and civil rights. In American history the concept of "attainder" is most closely identified with a "bill of attainder" – that is, an act by a legislature or monarch (as in the case of Henry VIII) to proclaim an individual attainted without being convicted in court. Section Nine of Article One in the Constitution explicitly precludes such bills, but the deep-seated concept of attainder would persist in other forms in early America.[10] The disenfranchisement of felons would persist but would truly be solidified as a component of a larger package of African American disenfranchisement during the Jim Crow era in the South.

---

[8] Jeff Manza and Christopher Uggen, *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Angela Behrens, Jeff Manza and Christopher Uggen, "Ballot Manipulation and the 'Menace of Negro Domination': Racial Threat and Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States, 1850-2002," *American Journal of Sociology,* no. 3 (2003): 559-605; and Katherine Irene Pettus, *Felony Disenfranchisement in America: Historical Origins, Institutional Racism, and Modern Consequences* (New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing, 2005).

[9] Pettus, 12. For an expanded definition of the terms, see William Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (1890), at "Perseus Digital Library," ed. Gregory R. Crane, Tufts University [Accessed 14 December 2011].

[10] Pettus, 30-31.

Following the Civil War, the South was faced with one of the most difficult challenges in American history: to rebuild a society devastated and humbled by a great sectional conflict. Probably the most striking challenge in the postbellum South was to integrate freed slaves into the social order, and their right to vote was a particularly difficult issue for the white establishment. While blacks were enfranchised during the Reconstruction period and a number were elected to Congress, they nevertheless lost out in the long term, as former Confederates returned to power in the South.

African American suffrage had long been a focal point for white elites in the South, and it was certainly not a foregone conclusion that the way to control the black vote was to eliminate it. Indeed, as post-Reconstruction politics took shape, the votes of African Americans were sought after by white politicians. Initially, blacks were overwhelmingly supportive of "the party of Lincoln," and understandably so. Yet the Republican Party in the South was hardly unified, and white members of that party in the upper states were particularly detached from black interests. As the Populist movement began in the Southern states, Democrats and Populists alike became acutely aware that the threat of a three-party system meant that every last voting block had value. Many black voters felt betrayed by white Republicans, and according to Ayers, "made it known that they would consider switching their allegiance to a party that would grant them a fairer deal."[11] Suddenly, after years of public racial resentment, black votes were in demand, and Populist leaders in particular attempted to appeal to the African American community. While it would be naïve to assume that Populists were anti-racist, for rhetoric's sake leaders extended a hand to blacks. Since a major tenet of Populism was the unification of the votes of poor people, a voting alliance between poor blacks and whites alike was seen as desirable by men like Tom Watson.[12] His opponents would embark on a "brutal" campaign against him, arguing that the Populist agenda was akin to "un-American" class warfare.[13] A number of Southerners supported the aims of Watson and the Populists, and Edward Ayers has argued this shift should not be seen only as campaign talk, but also as an example of "the fluidity of the world and of race relations."[14] Populist leaders thought blacks would vote with them due to self-interest.[15] Self-interest is an appropriate word here – while the Populists were willing to campaign for African American votes, they also made it clear that

---

[11] Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 269.

[12] Watson was a prominent Populist politician for decades to come – he was William Jennings Bryan's running-mate in 1896 and later became a fierce anti-socialist who advocated for the return of the Ku Klux Klan and called for the eventual lynching of Leo Frank, a Jewish factory owner accused of raping and murdering a young employee. "Tom E. Watson, the Voice of the People on Leo M. Frank, 1914, 1915, 1916 and 1917," The 1913 Leo Frank Case and Trial Research Library, http://www.leofrank.org/tom-watson/ [Accessed December 14, 2011].

[13] Ayers, *Promise*, 271-2.

[14] Ayers, *Promise*, 272.

[15] C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State Press, 1951), 257.

they did not desire social equality between blacks and whites.[16] Due to this complex web of issues and emotions, blacks tread carefully on this new political battleground. The Populist political movement was largely unsuccessful, and did not inspire the unity it intended to. Poor whites were often bound to Democratic leaders, and were reluctant to identify with the blacks who they had felt were incompetent leaders through Reconstruction. A significant number of black voters also voted Democratic in the 1892 election. The Populists' ideal coalition of poor whites and blacks did not materialize, and it appeared that racial solidarity had won out.[17] It was in this context that many Democratic state governments went about drafting new constitutions to curtail the impact of the black vote – not by utilizing it, but by marginalizing it.

The leaders of the white-dominated Democratic governments that arose in the South following Reconstruction have been called the "Redeemers." Inherent in the "Redemption" discourse was the idea that the "true" (white) South had been lying dormant for decades following its defeat in the Civil War and then Northern "oppression" during Reconstruction. Finally free of the shackles of federal power, the Redeemers were merely restoring the grand old Southern civilization.[18] The terminology of "Redemption" has been adopted by various groups of historians throughout the years with different meanings. The Dunning School, a historical movement that was dominant in the early 20th century, held that Reconstruction was fraught with errors and had a disastrous effect on the South, and that "the most grave of these errors was the indiscriminate bestowal of the franchise upon the newly liberated slaves."[19] Many modern historians, such as Eric Foner, have retained the term in their work but in an ironic fashion.[20] According to C. Vann Woodward, the foremost historian on the "New South," (and one of the key "revisionists" of Reconstruction vis-à-vis the Dunning School) the Redemption governments were created as an amalgamation of various political groups – and in Virginia in particular, Redemption was made possible due to a joining of forces of former Confederates, more conservative elements of the Southern Republicans, Whigs, and even some African Americans.[21]

---

[16] Ayers, *Promise*, 273.

[17] Ayers, *Promise*, 278-281.

[18] This mentality has been revisited time and time again throughout American history. Southerners routinely think of themselves as underdogs, restricted from free expression of their culture by a domineering North. The Southern pride found in neo-Confederate slogans like "The South will rise again" is commonplace, and its persistence has even been addressed in an article in the satirical online newspaper *The Onion*: "South Postpones Rising Again For Yet Another Year," *The Onion,* April 12, 2000, http://www.theonion.com/articles/south-postpones-rising-again-for-yet-another-year,377/ [Accessed November 28, 2011].

[19] This comes from an *Atlantic Monthly* editor's introduction to an article by Dunning himself, the last in a series of articles about Reconstruction that the magazine published in 1901. Interestingly, the first one they published was written by one "Professor Woodrow Wilson." William A. Dunning, "The Undoing of Reconstruction," *Atlantic Monthly*, October 2011, 434-36.

[20] Eric Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990), vii.

[21] Woodward, 4.

These leaders sought to transform the so-called "new South" into the Old South. One of the dominant features (if not *the* dominant feature) of the Old South was the slavery of blacks. But the Thirteenth Amendment had banned that old peculiar institution, explicitly formalizing the ideas behind the Emancipation Proclamation. Since the end of the Civil War, Southerners had to deal with constitutional restrictions in the form of three laws that have been called the "Reconstruction Amendments." African American participation in government was one fact of Reconstruction with which the Redeemers took particular umbrage, and so the suffrage of blacks was seen as a pressing political issue.

It was the Fifteenth Amendment that provided the legal framework within which Redemption lawmakers needed to work. Because it explicitly precluded state governments from disenfranchising voters on the basis of their race, lawmakers had to perform a delicate balancing act in restricting the suffrage of blacks. These concerns are easily found in the constitutional conventions of many Southern states. The entirety of the second day of Alabama's 1901 constitutional convention, for instance, was dedicated to suffrage issues. John B. Knox, president of the convention, acknowledged that "the negro" was the central issue facing the state. The delegates present were forthcoming in their motives "to establish white supremacy in [the] State," but were also keenly aware of federal restrictions.[22] A sense of the gravity of the occasion was on the minds of the delegates – one of them described their situation as "a new epoch in Constitution-making, the difficulties of which are great, but which, if solved wisely, may bring rest and peace and happiness."[23]

From this perspective, it was Mississippi that took the first step towards bringing about this "peace." The Mississippi Constitutional Convention in 1890 proved to be the "big bang" of disenfranchisement in the South at the end of the 19th century. In Alabama's aforementioned convention, Knox credited Mississippi as "the pioneer State of this movement" of altering the suffrage restrictions. Its constitution would prove to be massively influential, and many of the other states followed the same blue print. Historians would come to describe the domino-effect of the other Southern states as "the Mississippi Plan," named after a more militant approach from fifteen years prior.[24] Following the adoption of the disenfranchisement-heavy Mississippi Constitution, South Carolina, Louisiana, North Carolina, Alabama, Virginia, Georgia, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Florida, Arkansas and Texas all adopted similar suffrage provisions, in most cases through the Mississippi method of

---

[22] "Official Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Alabama, May 21st, 1901, To September 3rd, 1901," http://www.legislature.state.al.us/misc/history/constitutions/1901/proceedings/1901_proceedings_vol1/day2.html [Accessed 9 November 2011].

[23] "The Constitutional Convention of the State of Alabama."

[24] Woodward, 321.

constitutional convention. Each state would include its own unique "quirks" and add what it saw as improvements to its voting code. These restrictions would grow in number as the years went on.

The model, of course, was always Mississippi, and the roots of all of the disenfranchisement mechanisms can be found in its text. Its article 12 on "The Franchise" reads like a laundry list of the techniques used to suppress the black vote during this period. Sections 242 and 243 mandated a "uniform poll tax" and a literacy test wherein the prospective voter would have to read aloud a portion of the constitution to prove his "understanding."[25] The poll tax and literacy test present here and in subsequent state constitutions has been the subject of much focus from politicians and courts of the day and for later historians, but another provision has often been lost in the shuffle.

As previously stated, laws establishing the disenfranchisement of criminals had been on the books of state governments for some time, and they appeared in most of the Southern states in the early 1860s as they were re-admitted to the Union.[26] Beginning in the late 1880s, however, the states went about radically revising their disenfranchisement laws as part of their express purpose of addressing the "black problem."[27]

Southern lawmakers had found the Fifteenth Amendment to be a relatively easy obstacle to overcome, since it "took away [the state's] power to discriminate against citizens of the United States on account of either race, color or previous condition of servitude, but the power of exclusion upon all other grounds remain[ed] intact."[28] With the restrictions of that amendment being summarily conquered, Southern legislators turned their attention to clauses in another of the Reconstruction Amendments that presented an opportunity for them to suppress African American votes. The Fourteenth Amendment, which dealt with the question of citizenship, allowed for abridgement of voting rights in case of "participation in rebellion, or other crime."[29] Mississippi's constitutional delegates pitted the two Reconstruction Amendments against one another in their attempt to expand the disenfranchisement of African Americans. Section 241 required that a voter had "never been convicted of bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money or goods under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or bigamy."[30]

Mississippi's new suffrage laws, including this criminal provision, came under scrutiny six years later in the state Supreme Court case *Ratliff v. Beale*. In this case, the legality of poll taxing was confronted, manifest in a dispute between a tax collector named W.J. Ratliff and Ambus Beale, a black factory

---

[25] Mississippi Constitution (1890), art. 12.
[26] Behrens, Manza and Uggen, 565-6.
[27] Aline Helg, "Black Men, Racial Stereotyping, and Violence in the U.S. South and Cuba at the Turn of the Century," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42, no. 3 (2000): 585.
[28] "The Constitutional Convention of the State of Alabama."
[29] Fourteenth Amendment, section two.
[30] Mississippi Constitution (1890), art. 12, sec. 241.

worker. Beale, who owned little property and no real estate, declined to pay his 1895 poll tax. Ratliff confiscated Beale's property, planning to auction it off in order to pay for the previous year's poll tax. This apparently was not an uncommon occurrence, and the case was brought to the state Supreme Court in an attempt to determine the constitutionality of poll taxing.[31] The significance of this case to the larger disenfranchisement movement rested in its opinion. While the court upheld the 1890 law, the majority opinion admitted that Article 12 of the Constitution was designed with the purpose of suppressing the African-American vote. The black race was described as including "criminal members given rather to furtive offenses than to the robust crimes of the whites." The court further noted that a voter was not disqualified if convicted of "robbery and murder, and other crimes in which violence was the principal ingredient."[32] By the Mississippi Supreme Court's admission, the suffrage laws were designed to disqualify actions thought to be typical of black criminals (embezzlement, forgery, etc) while allowing crimes thought to be primarily in the domain of whites.

To understand the court's perspective on this racial division between crimes, some context has to be provided. As Edward Ayers writes, the late 19th century was a tumultuous period for crime and punishment in the South.[33] Due in no small part to their generally impoverished situation, the most common crimes committed by blacks were property crimes – the vast majority of which were punished with disenfranchisement by Mississippi's new constitution. While blacks obviously did commit crimes, Southerners were keen to make blacks the scapegoat during this time of change, and as Ayers argued, "were convinced that it was blacks who were dangerous, who bred the violence that hung over the South."[34] Violence, of course, had been a major ingredient in Southern tradition long before emancipation, but to whites this was immaterial. Vagrancy and petty property crimes were cracked down upon during the late 19th century, and this led to a substantial uptick in black crime rates. African Americans, the majority incredibly poor, had been turning to theft to sustain themselves since the 1870s.

The difference between perception and reality of black crime (particularly property crime) in the South has been succinctly analyzed by Mary Ellen Curtin in *Black Prisoners and Their World: Alabama, 1865-1900*. Curtin challenges certain assumptions made by Ayers and others, particularly the simplified claim that blacks stole due to their poverty. According to Curtin, while many poorer blacks indeed turned to theft, that was only one part of the

---

[31] R. Volney Riser, *Defying Disfranchisement: Black Voting Rights Activism in the Jim Crow South, 1980-1908* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2010), 55-56.

[32] *Ratliff v. Beale*, 74 Miss. 247 (1896)

[33] Edward Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 4.

[34] Ayers, *Promise*, 153.

phenomenon.[35] In many cases, blacks convicted of larceny were victims of local and state laws used to "intimidate assertive blacks"; there were disputes over who really "owned" the cotton produced by sharecroppers and renters, for instance.[36] Curtin also delves into the prosecution of blacks participating in informal markets known as "deadfalls." Attempts by African Americans to control their own economic fates and further their stations in life were met by criminal charges.[37]

An important change to the penal system during this period was that of convict leasing: black men were arrested and essentially rented out to employers, who would work them hard without any payment or concern for their well-being. This eventually became a rather lucrative system as the officials who gave the convicts away earned revenue and planters who had had difficulty adjusting to non-slave labor could cheaply "hire" workers who had no choice but to toil. African Americans had become the majority of inhabitants of Southern prisons and whites were loath to have their taxes go toward sustaining them. [38] The convict leasing system would change the penal system from an expense to a source of revenue. When combined with the suffrage restrictions placed upon them by the Mississippi framers, blacks were truly relegated to a form of pseudo-slavery.

Ratliff v. Beale's characterization of the Mississippi suffrage restrictions soon became common political knowledge. The U.S. Supreme Court notably entered into the fray in 1898's *Williams v. Mississippi*. Henry Williams, sentenced to hanging for murder, was a black man convicted by an all-white jury. He cited the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, arguing that the disenfranchisement of blacks under Mississippi's new convention was the reason that blacks were rarely present on juries in the state. Because of this racially homogenized jury system, Williams argued, he had not been subject to a fair trial as was his First Amendment right.[39]

In *Williams v. Mississippi*, the U.S. court upheld the constitutionality of Mississippi's, concurring with the aforementioned decision made by the Mississippi court in *Ratliff v. Beale*. The unanimous decision even went so far as to quote the Mississippi court's remarks upon the racial motivations present at the constitutional convention. However, the opinion of *Williams v. Mississippi* dismissed the relevance of the intentions of Mississippi framers. It claimed that the test was entirely nonracial, and punished "weak and vicious men" without bias.[40] Whatever discrimination may have been present in the crafting of the laws "[could] be prevented by both races by the exertion of that

---

[35] Mary Ellen Curtin, *Black Prisoners and Their World: Alabama, 1865-1900* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 2000), 43-4.
[36] Curtin, 44.
[37] Curtin, 45.
[38] Ayers, *Promise,* 154.
[39] Riser, *Defying Disfranchisement*, 64-6.
[40] Perman, 121-2.

duty which voluntarily pays taxes and refrains from crime."[41] In this case, Mississippi lawmakers found validation in a less likely place: while their own state supreme court openly attempted to reveal its motives, the highest federal court in the country was unwilling to do so.

While the alteration of suffrage laws was the province of each state, the conventions were certainly knowledgeable of the example of their neighbors. Though it is plain that each was dealing with the same issues, it is striking to note how the discussions were so interconnected. Mississippi's disfranchisement law, in fact, would achieve a sort of notoriety among politicians during the era, and it was ever-present in the disenfranchisement discourse. In Alabama's 1901 convention, for instance, both *Ratliff v. Beale* and *Williams v. Mississippi* received attention. By refusing to condemn or even totally acknowledge the racial motives of Mississippi's framers, the U.S. Supreme Court had provided the other states with something of a rubber stamp. In Alabama, John Knox was vindicated by this, and his convention went ahead drafting a constitution after the Mississippi example, "because it is said that the negro is not discriminated against on account of his race, but on account of his intellectual and moral condition."[42] He cast the intellectual and moral conditions of the two races as striking opposites: while whites had been governing themselves in respectable ways since time immemorial ("before the art of reading and writing was known"), blacks were "descended from a race lowest in intelligence and moral precipitations of all the races of men."[43] With full knowledge of the apparently inherent "deficiencies" of the African American people, the Alabama convention followed the Mississippi example, and proceeded in incorporating disenfranchisement laws that would implicitly if not explicitly target them – including the practice of disenfranchising those who committed crimes that people thought were the domain of blacks.

The product of that convention, Alabama's 1901 Constitution, went along with the now-ubiquitous Mississippi plan. The disenfranchisement in that document was yet another step in a process towards criminalizing and weakening the political power of the most ambitious blacks. In 1875, upon the Democrats' return to power, Alabama revised its criminal code to expand the definition of "grand larceny" to include any theft of corn or cotton.[44]

While it restricted suffrage to those who paid a poll tax "and those who can read and write any article of the Constitution of the United States in the English language," Section 182 of Alabama's 1901 Constitution also listed a host of disqualifying crimes. These included the types listed by Mississippi, but widened the scope considerably. Unlike Mississippi, Alabama's list included violent crimes such as murder and rape. If one follows the logic of

---

[41] *Williams v. Mississippi*, 170 U.S. 213 (1898)
[42] "The Constitutional Convention of the State of Alabama."
[43] "The Constitutional Convention of the State of Alabama."
[44] Curtin, 54.

Ratliff v. Beale, these violent crimes would disenfranchise whites to a greater degree than blacks. Some of the other offenses, however, would seem to target blacks. The record of the explicit debates over section 182 is not as thorough as for other portions of the Constitution, but in understanding its peculiar and deliberate selection of crimes, one can look to a delegate named John Fielding Burns.

Burns was an Alabama planter who had more direct experience with blacks than most of his fellow delegates. He made his keep in the state's portion of the Black Belt, and also served as a justice of the peace "where nearly all of his cases involved Negroes." Due to this experience with African American crime, Burns felt he had an understanding of which crimes blacks were more likely to commit, and these included those "furtive offenses" spoken of by the *Ratliff v. Beale* court, as well as vagrancy, rape and incest.[45] Burns also sought to include what today we would call domestic violence, and is reported as having told local newspapers that "the crime of wife-beating alone would disqualify sixty percent of the Negroes."[46] In Alabama's constitution, the ancient white fear of black men preying upon white women sexually was explicit: along with rape and "seduction," also included in the disqualifying crimes is miscegenation, a term which referred to interracial sexual intercourse or marriage. By the time of the Alabama convention, the long-festering white fear of black rape had totally taken shape, even though it was often fabricated.[47] While the constitutions of Mississippi and Alabama differ in that the disenfranchising crimes are different, both are based in white beliefs about black criminality. African Americans were certainly prone to property crime during the Jim Crow era, something that the Mississippi restrictions acknowledged by disenfranchising offenders of these crimes. The other more violent crimes that disqualified one from voting in Alabama were also widely regarded as typical of African Americans, reality notwithstanding.

While the vast majority of Jim Crow voting restrictions was abolished in the mid-twentieth century thanks to the successes of the Civil Rights Movement, remnants of the laws still remain in place. Felon disenfranchisement laws are among these. On a few occasions, challenges to their legality have been brought all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. One of the most significant court cases involving felony disenfranchisement laws was 1974's *Richardson v. Ramirez*.

Richardson v. Ramirez had its origins in *Ramirez v. Brown*, a California Supreme Court case that was a class action by ex-felons against Jerry Brown, the state's Secretary of State. The plaintiffs, three males, had all served the

---

[45] Malcolm Cook McMillan, *Constitutional Development in Alabama, 1798-1901: A Study in Politics, the Negro, and Sectionalism* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), 275.

[46] Jimmie Frank Gross, *Alabama Politics and the Negro, 1874-1901* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1969), 244.

[47] George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1971), 273.

duration of their sentences for committing felonies. Attempting to re-register to vote, these men were denied, and sought to take on the constitutionality of California's felony disenfranchisement laws. They argued that "felon disenfranchisement laws required the same standard of review as other voting restrictions." [48] Typically, voting laws were required to satisfy a compelling state interest, "which is so important that it outweighs individual rights." [49] The California Supreme Court found that the law was unconstitutional, though it was appealed the next year to the highest court in the land.

A major question in *Richardson v. Ramirez* was over Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment. As previously established, the amendment guaranteed the right to vote to males, but did allow for a restriction of suffrage for those known to have "participat[ed] in rebellion, or other crime." [50] The majority opinion, written by William Rehnquist, focused on this section of the Fourteenth Amendment, found that it allowed for felony disenfranchisement, and reversed the California court's decision. Rehnquist and company had consulted the constitutional debates and found that the wording of Section 2 had never changed, therefore concluding that it was almost certainly in the original intent of the framers to allow for disenfranchisement on this basis. [51] The decision of *Richardson v. Ramirez* was not without controversy. There was criticism of the literalist interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment: some had considered the relatively obscure Section Two to be dead letter, as it had not included women. Gabriel Chin, a scholar of constitutional law, has argued that the Fifteenth Amendment had effectively overruled the voting provisions in the Fourteenth, and that the court should not have held the latter as the basis for its decision. [52]

While *Richardson v. Ramirez* has essentially served as a validation for the modern practice of felon disenfranchisement, another U.S. Supreme Court case has addressed the issue from the more historical (and racial) perspective explored in this article. 1985's *Hunter v. Underwood* was a challenge to the racial basis of Alabama's constitution. The racial elements in that 1901 constitution, including the exhaustively selective list of disqualifying crimes, were essentially put on trial in this case. In the late 1970s, Alabama residents Carmen Edwards (black) and Victor Underwood (white) had found themselves excluded from voting in elections. They had lost their suffrage due to check fraud, a crime that Alabama registrars decided fell under the umbrella of "moral turpitude" – one of the disqualifying offenses in Section 182 of the

---

[48] Manza and Uggen, 29-30.
[49] "Law Dictionary for Legal Professionals," FindLaw, http://dictionary.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/results.pl?co=dictionary&topic=61/610d76026e388dc5e6c88e6a8ddcef8d [Accessed December 14, 2011].
[50] U.S. Const. amend. XIV, §2.
[51] *Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24 (1974)
[52] Gabriel J. Chin, "Reconstruction, Felon Disenfranchisement and the Right to Vote: Did the Fifteenth Amendment Repeal Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment?," *Georgetown Law Journal* 92 (2004): 259.

Alabama Constitution. The court had to determine whether or not the crimes included in Section 182 were "intentionally adopted to disenfranchise blacks on account of race**.**"[53] The court found that it was almost impossible to argue that race was not a dominating factor at the constitutional conventions, and sought the advice of numerous historians and scholars in constructing its impression of the motives of that constitution's framers. The sources they consulted were many of the same that have been explored here – the words of John Fielding Burns and John Knox, for example.

The court acknowledged that some of the disqualifying offenses, such as wife-beating and miscegenation, had long been struck down. On this basis, some had argued that the law as it stood in 1984 – which continued to disenfranchise felons and those committing "moral turpitude" – contained plenty of acceptable reasons to deny the franchise. However, in the end, Rehnquist stated that "its original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against blacks on account of race, and the section continues to this day to have that effect. As such, it violates equal protection."[54] To clarify the extent of its decision, however, the court did close by addressing its previous felon disenfranchisement case from a decade earlier:

> The single remaining question is whether § 182 is excepted from the operation of the Equal Protection Clause of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment by the "other crime" provision of section 2 of that Amendment. Without again considering the implicit authorization of section 2 to deny the vote to citizens "for participation in rebellion, or other crime," *see Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U. S. 24 (1974), we are confident that Section 2 was not designed to permit the purposeful racial discrimination attending the enactment and operation of Section 182 which otherwise violates Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment. Nothing in our opinion in *Richardson v. Ramirez*, *supra*, suggests the contrary.[55]

In other words, the court's decision in *Hunter v. Underwood* would not alter the fundamental decision it had made in *Richardson v. Ramirez* – section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment did not appear to have any racial motive, and so felony disenfranchisement would continue in the United States mostly undeterred.

While a host of writers such as Pettus, Behrens, Manza and Uggen are constantly campaigning to abolish felony disenfranchisement laws in America, it is difficult to see a scenario in which that goal will come to fruition.

---

[53] *Hunter v. Underwood*, 471 U.S. 222 (1985)
[54] *Hunter v. Underwood*
[55] *Hunter v. Underwood*

Richardson v. Ramirez was effectively a seal of approval on the practice, and while certain precise wording in state constitutions may be confronted again like in *Hunter v. Underwood*, Section Two of the Fourteenth Amendment seems to be an insurmountable obstacle. The state constitutions' disenfranchisement provisions have been proven to be undoubtedly racially motivated. But as *Richardson v. Ramirez* decided, it is very difficult to make the same pronouncement upon the Fourteenth Amendment. As noted in the introduction, several states are now allowing ex-felons to be re-enfranchised, but only by the government on an individual basis. The fact that this is now the case may be termed progress.

The Jim Crow era is spoken about as the past, and rightfully so. African Americans no longer have to pay poll taxes or take literacy tests to submit a ballot. Blacks are not relegated to sitting in the back of a bus, and everyone is free to drink from whichever fountain they please. And yet it is foolish to suggest that the African American community has achieved anything like equality. The dominant discourse over the last twenty years in terms of race has been "colorblindness," and this concept has done nothing but keep African Americans in a position of inequality through mass incarceration and poverty. The exclusion of felons, largely black, from the political system is one of many vestiges remaining from our nation's troubled racial past.

Joe Louis Pummels Racism In The Face; Loses By Majority Decision

By Pedro Olivarez

The sport of boxing is a peculiar one to say the least. Oftentimes in history, people have considered the sport to be of a barbaric nature. However, this is a common misconception; the sport of boxing is by no means barbaric or savage. Rather, it is a wonderful display of technique, skill, and dedication. It is often said in boxing that the fight is won before the sound of the first bell. The fight is won in the gym; it is won by the person who has trained harder and longer than his opponent. Boxing thus showcases personal achievement and ability more than most other sports. It is a testament to one man's undeniable superiority over another, showcased in the public sphere through sport. Because boxing is not a team sport, the athletes who participate in the sport have a much more individual identity. Each boxer has a very specific background, culturally and nationally. This is perhaps one reason why so much symbolic weight is oftentimes placed on the shoulders of men who might have nothing to do with the issues they come to represent. As historian Jeffrey T. Sammons notes, "Boxing was often an arena in which law, order, and social growth were tested. It was also, at times, the target of Progressive reform initiatives and a scapegoat for antiforeign and racist sentiments."[1]

Boxing, as a sport, serves as a microcosm that reflects the ideas and beliefs of the society within which it exists. In the years preceding World War II, Joe Louis and Max Schmeling would fight each other on two separate occasions. Louis was a black American, and Schmeling was a white German. The fights would be billed as a manifestation of black versus white, and democracy versus fascism.[2] The notion that these two fights carried significant political symbolism has not been understated by historians. David Margolick claims that "no single sporting event…had ever borne such worldwide weight."[3] Patrick Myler regards the fight as "the most politically charged event in boxing history."[4] The prevailing idea is that when confronted with a common enemy, Nazi Germany, black and white Americans were able to temporarily set aside their differences and root in unison for Joe Louis. When choosing between nationalist pride and racism, it is believed that a significant amount of white Americans chose nationalism for the purposes of the second fight. Lewis Erenberg claims that, "in an atmosphere of growing

---

[1] Jeffrey T. Sammons, *Beyond the Ring: The Role of Boxing in American Society* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), xvii.

[2] David Margolick, *Beyond Glory: Joe Louis vs. Max Schmeling, and a World on the Brink* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 12.

[3] Margolick, 13.

[4] Patrick Myler, *Ring of Hate: Joe Louis vs. Max Schmeling: The Fight of the Century* (New York: Arcade Publishing, 2005), 13.

global conflict, Louis became one of the first black heroes that many white Americans saw as a standard-bearer for American national values."[5] The second fight with Schmeling is believed to have catapulted Joe Louis from black hero to national hero.

Prior to the start of Joe Louis's career in the early 1930s, boxing was undergoing critical changes that reflected society as a whole. The sport was slowly beginning to reintegrate African American fighters as well as foreign ones. The only black heavyweight champion to have existed in the sport had relinquished the belt in 1915.[6] That boxer's name was Jack Johnson. He was a highly skilled, and thus cocky, fighter. His mildly abrasive attitude did not bode well with the white public. He was by no means a modest man. While many black citizens of the time looked up to Jack Johnson for his abilities and success, there were also a great deal who resented him for his attitude. They felt that Johnson was not very culturally refined, and that he was a poor spokesperson for the black race.[7] Johnson garnered much resentment as the black champion, and the outcry from the white public echoed the racially charged sentiments of the nation as whole.

As a result, Louis's promoters did whatever they could to separate his public image from that of Johnson's. They wanted the public to be very aware that Louis was not the same type of boxer. They felt this would give him the greatest chance at success. During the early and mid- 1930s, when Louis was beginning to rise as a boxer, the black community was suffering from the oppressive nature of white supremacy, Jim Crow laws, and the economic crisis of the Great Depression.[8] The effects of the Great Depression were magnified for the black community, as they were the least likely to receive job relief and were instead made to be dependent on direct forms of government relief. The disadvantaged black man was personified in the sport of boxing as well. Black fighters were discriminated against and the public did not wish to see them compete for championships.[9] It was only through Louis's unmatched skill and strength, coupled with his easily acceptable demeanor, that he was able to be as successful as he was. Louis also fought, and won, twenty-two boxing matches between 1934 and 1935. This astonishing feat was another reason why he was able to become so popular.

There has been a decent amount of historical work on the fights between Schmeling and Louis. Multiple books have been written detailing the events that led up to the fights and the fights themselves. These books include David Margolick's *Beyond Glory*, Patrick Myer's *Ring of Hate*, and Lewis Erenberg's

---

[5] Lewis A. Erenberg, *The Greatest Fight of Our Generation: Louis vs. Schmeling* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 4.
[6] Sammons, 43.
[7] Sammons, 42.
[8] Margolick, 63.
[9] Sammons, 73.

The Greatest Fight of our Generation. These books tell a historical narrative of the events leading up to the fights, as well as a detailed biography of each fighter. However, little has been done focusing solely on the nature of reporting on the fight. Most historical pieces on the subject are narratives that tell a glamorized story of the two bouts. The general consensus is that through the two fights, Louis was able to temporarily denounce the ideas of racism and unite the nation as a whole against a common German foe.[10] Through his defeat of the German, the United States population became slightly more enlightened and unified on issues regarding race. Erenberg states that "the acceptance of Louis as an American hero was…the first step for whites…to redefining American national identity as ethnically and racially diverse."[11] It is generally believed that the second fight had profound implications of race and nationalism tied to it. Historian Jeffrey Sammons wrote about the second fight saying, "everywhere the fight was being billed as democracy versus fascism, pacifism versus militarism, and ultimately good versus evil. Even the southern press had come to regard it as a symbolic confrontation between Nazi Germany and the United States."[12]

At the time of the second bout, white Americans as well as descendents of immigrants were worried about Hitler's aggressive policies.[13] Jewish people were especially disturbed by Hitler's anti-Semitic policies. When one looks back on the fights between Joe Louis and Max Schmeling, it is easy to see why one would want to exaggerate the significance of the event. It was a most peculiar matchup between a black American and a German. One was an oppressed minority in a country that proclaimed that it was founded on equality and justice. The other was a man who, through his nationality, came to be known as a representative of a Nazi regime that was founded on a concept of racial hierarchy. Because we now know so much about the outcome of World War II and the violent nature of Hitler's racially driven policies, it is very tempting to attach more significance to the fights between Louis and Schmeling. This is why historians such as Lewis A. Erenberg claim that the fights had more of a social impact than they actually did. Speaking on the second fight, Erenberg states that the entire nation "rooted for the African American boxer as a patriotic champion of American democracy."[14] The unity that Erenberg is describing was, in fact, not as strong as scholars have made it seem.

Scholars such as Erenberg proclaim that Louis's second victory over Schmeling transformed him into a symbol of American patriotism and a

---

[10] Margolick, 20.
[11] Erenberg, 161.
[12] Sammons, 115.
[13] Erenberg, 134.
[14] Erenberg, 136.

national hero.[15] Erenberg uses aspects of the media that regarded the fight's social implications to make the claim that America united behind Louis as a national hero. And though one can make the argument that this happened, it is important to remember that the mainstream media only used the fight to invoke a sense of nationalism while never confronting the issue of racism in the United States. It is true that after his enlistment in the Second World War, Joe Louis did become much more of a national hero. The fights with Schmeling also contributed to this sense of heroism. However, the significance of the bouts was not really apparent until much later in Louis's career. Basically, the fights carried much more political weight when one looks back upon them. The black media did attempt to use Louis's successes as a means for unifying the nation; however, the white media neglected to do the same. The success of Louis over Schmeling was only used as a way to advance nationalism while never acknowledging the implications of the bout's outcome on racial ideology in the United States. The Nazi brand of racism was proven erroneous while American racism remained intact.

In fact, after Louis's first loss at the hands of Schmeling, he was denounced by those white media outlets that had previously supported him.[16] The media was interested in selling papers, and thus they catered to their readership. The fights between Louis and Schmeling did not by any means dispel the racial ideology that permeated the United States. Even after Louis's second victory over Schmeling, the white public did not fully embrace him. Racism is grounded in the very social fabric of the United States. It manifested itself there and was nurtured through centuries of social stratification. Racism simply could not be defeated in the United States so easily. Though Louis's achievements would seem to be enough to at least shake the foundation of this racial ideology, as they basically disproved them time and time again, the racist sentiments that existed before Louis remained strong in the face of his accomplishments. The fights, today, serve as a testament to strength and perseverance while also symbolizing the struggle of black Americans. However, the white public tended to acknowledge the accomplishments of Louis while simultaneously disregarding the implications that they had on society as a whole.

Previous historical work on the subject has manifested itself in the form of detailed narratives, which tell a wonderful story of how one man was able to rise above racism in the United States and briefly unify the country under a black national hero.[17] Others have contextualized the boxing matches in terms of the grander implications of the sport for reflecting society.[18] All of these

---

[15] Erenberg, 161.
[16] Erenberg, 101.
[17] Myler, 13.
[18] Erenberg, 155.

tend to presume that a greater sense of national unity as well as better race relations resulted in the aftermath of the second fight. Furthermore, these studies emphasize the type of reporting that was done in Germany regarding the fights, focusing on the United States only when national and racial implications are tied in. This study differs from those by attempting to examine the effects the fights had on public sentiment as it occurred at the time.

This study is also a specific case examination in the city of Chicago and will largely ignore German reporting on the subject. Though the reporting done by Nazi Germany at the time is relevant to the subject, there is already a significant amount of work that has been done on it. Margolick's, Myer's, and Erenberg's books on the subject all dedicate entire chapters to German reporting on the fights. The focus of this study is to examine the change in public attitude as it occurred in the United States, specifically in the city of Chicago. Chicago was chosen due to the fact that both prominent newspapers, *The Chicago Tribune* and *The Chicago Defender*, were relatively accepting of Joe Louis throughout his career. By examining the changes in public opinion, exemplified through the media, that occurred in Chicago as a result of these two fights, I plan to make the case that the white public in Chicago never fully accepted Louis as a national hero. The style of reporting that was done in Chicago offers insight into the thoughts and ideas that many citizens in the nation shared at the time. The truth is that the two fights between Louis and Schmeling were not as significant as they may seem when looking back on them. Though the black press attempted to make the fights of great national and political importance, the white public only embraced the concept of defeating Germany, not the concept of uplifting or unifying with the black community.

During the 1930s, the sport of boxing was beginning to regain its popularity in the United States. During this time, Joe Louis, was making a rapid ascension to the top tier of the boxing world and vying for an opportunity to challenge the heavyweight champion. Louis was a young black man fighting out of Detroit. His strength, speed, and skill in the ring were unmatched by any other boxer of the time despite the fact that Louis was only in his early twenties. However, the public was unwilling to accept the talented, young Louis due to the fact that he was a black man.[19] The previous black boxing champion, Jack Johnson, had not been received well by the public due to his brash personality and poor sportsmanship. Johnson had integrated the sport of boxing, but through his attitude, he had actually set back the ability for black fighters to gain acceptance in the sport.

Louis and his team of promoters made every attempt they could to convince the public that he was not the same type of person as Johnson. Louis was given a list of guidelines to adhere to by his trainer. Among these rules were that Louis was never to have his picture taken alongside a white

---

[19] Sammons, 97-98.

woman. He was not allowed to go into nightclubs by himself. And he was never to taunt a fallen opponent.[20] Louis was always soft spoken in his interviews, he did not "trash-talk" his opponents and he never boasted about victories or knockouts. He was humble, kind, and professional at all times. This type of attitude made him more easily accepted by the white community. In the black community, Louis could do no wrong. He was a race hero. His proficiency as a boxer was a testament to the ability of black people everywhere to be able to compete with their white counterparts. Louis symbolized racial equality to the black community; he disproved racial ideology on a consistent basis with his boxing ability.

During his early career Louis rocketed up through the ranks of boxing by fighting often and going undefeated. As a black man, the black press championed him as a hero and portrayed his success in the ring as symbolic victories for the race.[21] Since sporting was one of the few social realms wherein a black man could compete fairly and evenly with his white counterpart, the black press chose to use sporting as a means to showcase black achievement and ability. Joe Louis was made into a race hero alongside Jesse Owens, as both of these men dominated their sport and proved consistently that black people could not just be as good as white people at something, but could be the best in the world at a task if given the chance. On a regular basis, Louis defeated white society and racial ideology. He did so in the public realm, where everyone could bear witness to it, and he did it in a way that was fair and honorable. He never boasted, bragged, or acted in a way that was unsportsmanlike. Truly, Louis was exactly the type of hero that the African American community needed.

As a result, Louis's fights began to carry more symbolic weight than the average boxing fight would ordinarily have had in the black press. In 1935, his fight with Primo Carnera, an Italian, was portrayed in *The Chicago Defender* as a bout with nationalistic implications. During the time, fascist Italy was threatening to start an aggressive war with Ethiopia. Ethiopia is the oldest autonomous African country and was thus considered to be of great political significance to the black community as a whole, not just in the United States. The aggression on the part of Mussolini and fascist Italy was representative of white aggression toward an innocent black target. So when the African American, Joe Louis, was slated to fight against the Italian, Primo Carnera, *The Chicago Defender* jumped on the opportunity to attach political significance to the fight. It portrayed the fight as a defense against Italian aggression on behalf of Ethiopia. Political cartoons portrayed the young Louis with Ethiopia in his corner facing off against the larger Carnera, who had Italy in his corner.[22]

---

[20] Sammons, 98.
[21] Erenberg, 4.
[22] *The Chicago Defender*, May 25, 1935, sec. 2.

When the two fought in June of 1935, Louis won the fight decisively. His victory was portrayed as a victory against Italian aggression toward Ethiopia. *The Chicago Defender*'s issue, which was published following the fight, stated that Louis had "halt[ed] Italy's favorite son," and that "Ethiopia stretched forth a hand and Italy hit the canvas."[23] The significance of Louis's victory was by no means understated by *The Defender*. It made sure to emphasize the ease with which Louis won as well. The paper stated that Carnera had not landed one single clean punch against Louis. It consistently referred to the fight as a 'killing', 'slaughter', 'assassination', and so forth. Louis was reported to not only have been the clear victor, but to have done so while barely breaking a sweat.[24]

Even during Louis's early career, when the United States was still attempting to cling to an isolationist policy, his fights were reported in the black press as having major social, racial, and, occasionally, national implications. As Louis continued to win, his fame and respect in the black community grew. Truly, he had become one of the black community's greatest heroes, alongside the likes of track star Jesse Owens and political figure Haile Selassie. Selassie was the ruler of Ethiopia, and his prominence in the global community made him a hero to black people in the United States as well. Louis was still in his early twenties and on the fast-track to the heavyweight championship. He defeated three more opponents before 1936, including the former champion, Max Baer. Louis's victories were impressive and his popularity was increasing. He was consistently on the front page of *The Chicago Defender*'s sports section and even headlined the entire newspaper from time to time.[25] He became so popular that he was called the "black Moses," and *The Chicago Defender* even began selling books about his exploits while the young Louis was still in his early twenties.[26]

Still on his meteoric rise through the ranks of boxing, Louis was scheduled to fight the German, Max Schmeling, in June of 1936. Prior to the fight Louis was heavily favored to beat the older Schmeling. As a former champion, Schmeling was on a quest to do what no other boxer had done before him and recapture the title. Back in those days, it was widely accepted in the boxing community that once a boxer loses the championship, he never gets it back. The public considered Schmeling to be an easy target for Louis; it believed him to be washed-up. Louis also took his opponent lightly. *The Chicago Defender* reported that Louis's training camp was very lazy. Whereas before his previous fights, it was often reported that Louis could not find a worthy sparring partner to last in the ring, this time stories were running about how Louis was having

---

[23] *The Chicago Defender*, June 29, 1935, 1.
[24] *The Chicago Defender*, July 6, 1935, 14-15.
[25] See the coverage in *The Chicago Defender* spanning from July 13, 1935 to June 20, 1936.
[26] *The Chicago Defender,* June 13, 1936, sec. 1.

difficulty putting up a good fight against his sparring mates.[27] The Joe Louis who entered the ring against Schmeling for that fight was not the same Joe Louis the public was accustomed to seeing.

The fight took place in New York on June 19th, 1936. It lasted twelve grueling rounds in which Joe Louis would be knocked down for the first time in his career. Louis was knocked down early on in the 4th round but continued to push through the fight despite taking continued punishment from Schmeling throughout. Finally, in the 12th round, Schmeling sent Louis crashing to the canvas for good.[28] Schmeling had pulled off boxing's greatest upset at the time. The entire United States was shocked at the result of the fight. The black community could not believe what had happened; it was a tremendous loss for them. One historian noted that, "for many black children, that night marked the first time they had ever seen their parents cry."[29] The white community was also surprised at the outcome, but they did not feel as though their hero had been defeated.

The Chicago Defender took the loss very badly. It had crowned Louis as its personal champion, as a testament to the capabilities of the black race. His loss at the hands of a German fighter stung the black community. The outcome of the fight took away a race hero from *The Chicago Defender*. It had previously used Joe Louis's exploits to showcase the strength and ability of the black race. Louis was a walking antithesis to racism. Thus, his loss to Schmeling took away one of the black community's most prominent and respected role models. *The Chicago Defender* could not simply have Louis tarnish his reputation. It had invested too much in support and adulation of the man. In order to cope with the stunning upset, the newspaper tried to view the event differently so that the outcome would not impede its campaign for racial equality.

It began asserting that Joe Louis was drugged or "doped" and the real reason why he had lost was due to foul play on the part of Schmeling's camp. In fact, in the issues that would follow, *The Chicago Defender* would run numerous stories detailing its investigation into Louis's drugging. In the issue of *The Chicago Defender* that followed Louis's loss to Schmeling, Al Monroe wrote an article that appeared on the front page titled, "Probe Report That Joe Louis Was Doped: Charge Drugs, Not Fists Sent Bomber Down For Count." In the article he stated, "If Louis was doped, a restless and concerned public will not be quieted until an explanation is made."[30] The article was continued on page 11 of the newspaper. Monroe could not believe that Louis had lost the

---

[27] See the coverage in *The Chicago Defender* spanning from June 6 to June 20, 1936.
[28] "Joe Louis vs. Max Schmeling 1" (Youtube) 23 min.; video, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lihT_ewxVko [Accessed February 20, 2012].
[29] Margolick, 163.
[30] Al Monroe, "Probe Report That Joe Louis Was Doped," *The Chicago Defender*, June 27, 1936, 1.

fight in a fair manner, and in his struggle to make sense of it all he consulted a "prominent Chicago toxicologist," who apparently told *The Chicago Defender* that "certain tasteless drugs could be put in a person's food or water that would produce just such a condition as Joe was in when he appeared in the ring and throughout the entire fight."[31] *The Defender* firmly believed, or wanted the public to believe, that Louis had not lost the match on fair terms, but had been cheated. *The Chicago Defender* was adamant in its belief that what happened in New York that June was not in the realm of possibility unless foul play was involved.

The Chicago Defender continued pushing the idea that Louis had been drugged in the subsequent issues as well. In the very next issue, Al Monroe submitted a similar article, which was placed on the front page, titled "Fans May Yet Learn Real Story." Monroe wrote that *The Defender* had "confirmed that…big money interests are backing the investigation into several angles of the recent Louis-Schmeling fight." The article spoke of the possibility of Louis being drugged and stated that *The Chicago Tribune* was also investigating the possibility of foul play in the fight. Monroe also hypothesized that Louis might have had a lackluster performance due to domestic issues with his spouse.[32] The loss to Schmeling on the part of Louis obviously troubled the staff at *The Chicago Defender* deeply. It struggled to repair the damage that had been inflicted on Louis's reputation and public image. The paper had gone through the shock of its loss, and was now in the denial stage of grieving.

When *The Defender* was able to land an interview with Louis about the outcome of the fight, it was puzzled to find that he was not pursuing the drugging allegations. An article was published on page 13 of the same issue with the headline, "Joe Louis Tells His Story; But Fails to Attack Dope Yarn." In an attempt to manipulate Louis's answers to fit its own interpretation of the story, *The Defender* told its readership that it was very strange that Louis should report that, "Everything happened for the best."[33] The paper phrased the quotation as if to say that Louis may have thrown the bout for the betterment of his career. At the time, corruption was not unheard of in boxing, so *The Chicago Defender* disregarded its previous position on Louis's clean and honest manner of conducting business in favor of a farfetched notion that might explain how the unbeatable Joe Louis had lost. The following issue published an article that stated that 'inside sources' close to Louis's family reported that they wanted to continue the investigation about Louis's possible drugging. The article also proclaimed that whether or not Louis was drugged in his fight was a question that "continue[d] to worry

---

[31] Monroe, "Probe Report," 1.

[32] Al Monroe, "Fans May Yet Learn Real Story," *The Chicago Defender*, July 4, 1936, 1.

[33] Unsigned, "Joe Louis Tells His Story; But Fails to Attack Dope Yarn," *The Chicago Defender*, July 4, 1936, 13.

many experts."[34] It was clear to see that *The Chicago Defender* was attempting to make a story out of a circulating rumor. It attempted to validate the legitimacy of the claim by stating that Louis had made suspicious remarks, had behaved unusually throughout the fight, and that his family, as well as other experts and *The Chicago Tribune*, were also considering the possibility of a drugging. In this way it made an effort to raise skepticism amongst its readership that Louis had actually lost a fair fight. If this were not true, if Louis had not lost the fight fairly, then it could still claim that its hero was the best in the world. It could still claim that Louis was a testament to the black race and that his loss was not a case of white superiority, but merely an example of the continued oppression of the black race by immoral and unjust means.

The Chicago Defender had to come up with some way to ameliorate Louis's public image in the wake of his loss to Schmeling. Immediately the paper began speaking of a comeback, reminding the reader that Louis "was really a superman" and that he would once again rise to prominence.[35] It was clear that Louis's loss took away an important aspect of what the paper was trying to argue to the public. *The Chicago Defender* needed Louis to be a symbol of hope for the black community and a testament to the black race as a whole. Following the loss, the paper proclaimed that "Joe's fall takes away [the black] Race's best hope," and stated that the only black hero remaining was Jesse Owens.[36] The paper also spoke of the way in which this fight damaged the battle against racial bigotry both at home and abroad, proclaiming, "what better could produce the requisites for [Hitler] than that the aging Schmeling, boasted representative of Nazism should win…over youthful Joe Louis, America's bronze darling? Or what could better give weight to Hitler's hypothesis of Aryan superiority than a defeat by the Aryan Nazi fossil of this brown boy?"[37] It's important to note the way in which Louis is described by the newspaper. He is not 'America's black darling', nor is he a 'black boy'. He is described as something more easily accepted by the white public. *The Chicago Defender* was trying to push Joe Louis as not just a hero to the black community but as a true American hero.

The Chicago Defender knew that Louis's defeat had profound social implications that transcended boxing. The issue that followed the original coverage of Louis's defeat included an article that examined public reaction

---

[34] Unsigned, "Bomber's Kin Reluctant to Drop Probe; Insiders Say Relatives Feel Situation Needs Investigation," *The Chicago Defender*, July 11, 1936.

[35] Unsigned, "Despite Alleged Plot, Joe Must Mend Ways," *The Chicago Defender*, June 27, 1936, sec. 2.

[36] Unsigned, "Race's Tri-Legged Stool of Hope Now Wobbly, Only 1 Leg Remains," *The Chicago Defender*, June 27, 1936, sec. 2.

[37] Unsigned, "Daily Press Kind to Joe and Marva After Bomber Falls Victim to Schmeling," *The Chicago Defender,* June 27, 1936, sec. 2.

to the outcome of the fight as it was portrayed in Southern newspapers. The article explained that the defeat of Louis finally allowed the racial hatred toward him to be espoused by the white public without criticism. The article examined 124 Southern newspapers; the vast majority of them expressed some type of satisfaction with Louis's loss. Furthermore, the newspapers were directly insulting to the African American race. The author examined the sections of these papers that included letters to the editor. The article said that, "every imaginable type of abuse is heaped upon [African Americans]. The use of 'nigger', 'darkie', 'coon', 'sambo', and many other names appear throughout the letters. Ninety-eight per cent of them were direct insults to the [black] race."[38] Louis's success in the ring had stifled this type of racially charged criticism before, but now that he had demonstrated that he too had his weaknesses, it opened up the opportunity for the public to take jabs at him. Given the opportunity, the nation's white population jumped at the chance to finally knock Joe Louis off his pedestal. They were ecstatic to finally be able to take the young, black boxer down a few pegs and to reaffirm their racial ideology.

The Chicago Tribune reported on Louis and his exploits in a vastly different way. Louis did not find his way into the sporting section of this newspaper unless he was fighting soon or had just finished fighting. However, the newspaper was actually supportive of Joe Louis due to his incredible skill and the fact that Louis had participated in, and won, *The Chicago Tribune's* Golden Gloves competition in 1934 when he was 20.[39] The newspaper's support of Louis would end up garnering criticism from its mainly white readership after Louis's loss to Schmeling. The leading sports columnist on *The Chicago Tribune*, Arch Ward, found himself to be the target of much criticism for his support of the black boxer. Following the fight, Ward published an article that showcased the type of mail he had received after the upset. The article showed how the readers of the *Tribune* had felt about the newspaper's strong support of an African American boxer. One letter to the paper read, "hope you…enjoyed the Louis-Schmeling fight…next time I hope THE TRIBUNE will pick some white man to push along to be champion of the world."[40] Other mail was of a similar nature. This shows that a significant number of people had always felt uneasy fully supporting a black athlete to be their champion.

The article was meant to showcase the ridiculousness of the public outcry over the fight. White citizens jumped at their chance to express openly their racist sentiments following the defeat, while black citizens struggled to come

---

[38] Unsigned, "Louis' Defeat Gives South Chance To Tell How It Felt," *The Chicago Defender*, July 4, 1936, sec. 2.
[39] Margolick, 61.
[40] Arch Ward, "Talking it Over," *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1936, 17.

up with an excuse for why Louis had lost. Perhaps as a result of the articles that had been published by *The Chicago Defender*, many of the letters written to Arch Ward by African Americans pursued the idea that Louis had been drugged. Ward decided to publish these letters in his article as well. One such letter read, "Joe was tricked out of the fight. He was drugged. They put something on Schmeling's gloves to make Joe drunk. If the doctor would examine gloves before the fight I know Joe would win."[41] The article by Ward was meant to show that the public was perhaps overreacting to the outcome of the fight due to the fact that Louis was black and Schmeling was German. White citizens were outraged at *The Tribune* for having supposedly over-hyped a black boxer. Black citizens were devastated and having trouble coming to terms with the loss. All the while, *The Chicago Tribune* retained its general neutrality toward the subject. It was neither devastated nor exuberant about the result of the fight. It was merely surprised; after all, it was one of the biggest upsets in sporting history up to that point.

 The Chicago Tribune generally did not cover boxing as much as *The Chicago Defender* did either. This was most likely due to the fact that the majority of people dominating the boxing world were immigrants, foreigners, or black men. *The Chicago Tribune* was one of the nation's most conservative newspapers and maintained an isolationist policy as war in Europe seemed imminent.[42] The readership of *The Chicago Tribune*, which was predominantly white, was not as interested in boxing because it did not have a young, sensational, white fighter to rally behind. To the readership of the *Tribune*, boxing was not as important as a sport such as baseball, which was not only dominated by white men at the time, but which also had regulations against allowing black men to participate all together.

 The fight between Louis and Schmeling did, however, make its way onto the front page of *The Chicago Tribune* on June 20th, 1936.[43] This was largely due to the fact that the fight had such a surprising result. It was touted as one of the biggest upsets in sporting history. Racial significance was not added to the fight either, although the paper did continuously refer to Louis as the "colored boy."[44] The continuous reference to Joe Louis as merely a "boy," signifies racial bigotry as well as a lack of respect for Louis as a man.

 Despite the prevailing racial ideology of the time manifesting itself in the writing style of *The Chicago Tribune*, the paper generally did not tie racial significance to Louis's fights. The reporting was done from a more neutral standpoint than *The Chicago Defender*. This was due to the fact that *The Chicago Tribune* was not directly invested in the success of either boxer. *The*

---

[41] Ward, "Talking it Over," 17.
[42] Margolick, 61.
[43] Unsigned, "Schmeling Whips Joe Louis," *The Chicago Tribune*, June 20, 1936, 1.
[44] Unsigned, "Schmeling Whips Joe Louis," 1.

Chicago Defender, on the other hand, very much wanted Louis to win so it could use his success in the ring to further its cause for promoting racial equality. *The Tribune* simply reported the fight as it happened and accepted the outcome. This is why *The Tribune* did not run any stories about the possibility of Louis being doped. *The Chicago Tribune* did not need to make sense of the loss since it did not really mind the fact that Louis had been defeated.

The differences in reporting the first fight between these two newspapers stems directly from the fact that *The Chicago Defender* was invested in Louis's success. Thus, *The Defender* intentionally played up the racial and social significance of Louis's fights even prior to his fights with Schmeling. Racial connotation was added to each one of Louis's bouts in order to promote him as a hero of the race. *The Chicago Defender* simply never thought he would lose a bout so it continuously boasted about all of his fights and claimed that they were much more significant than just boxing matches. *The Chicago Tribune* did not engage in this same type of reporting since it had nothing to gain from reporting on boxing matches in a way that was centered on race. If *The Tribune* had done so, then the majority of times Louis fought, it would have had to admit racial defeat at the hands of a black man. Obviously, it did not want to consider such things, so Louis's fights were merely reported as fights, and nothing more.

In the wake of the first fight, Schmeling became a national hero in Germany overnight.[45] The German media embellished on the racial and nationalistic implications. It printed congratulatory letters from other racially stratified countries, such as South Africa. It also edited the fight footage and turned it into a documentary titled, "Max Schmeling's Victory – German Victory."[46] In Germany, the people continuously celebrated the victory as a national one.[47] Louis, on the other hand, lost respect from the white community and had allegedly let down the black community. He subsequently began appearing in *The Chicago Defender* with less frequency. Eventually, however, Louis would return to the ring more determined than before. Once he did, *The Chicago Defender* continued to show support for its hero. His first fight after the loss to Schmeling was against an opponent named Jack Sharkey. Louis defeated Sharkey decisively in the third round. The outcome of the fight landed Louis back on the front page of *The Chicago Defender*, which proclaimed that Louis was, "again headed for [the] top," and that his "victory reinstate[d] him with public."[48] *The Chicago Defender* was eager for its hero to get back in the ring and resume his quest for the championship. Louis continued to fight, and continued to win.

---

[45] Erenberg, 91.
[46] Erenberg, 92-4.
[47] Margolick, 164-75.
[48] *The Chicago Defender*, August 22, 1936, 1.

Although Schmeling had already defeated Louis, he was unable to secure a championship match with James Braddock. The fight with Braddock was instead given to Louis because it was expected that the fight would make more money than a match between Braddock and Schmeling. It was during that fight that Joe Louis was finally able to obtain the heavyweight championship which he had chased for so long. The victory was bittersweet, however, as memories of the painful loss to Schmeling still lingered in Louis's mind. He knew he would not rightly be champion until he settled the score with Schmeling. As Arch Ward noted in an article published after the rematch, "Louis…said he had to whip Schmeling…before he would consider that he merited the championship."[49]

The two were set to fight each other in a rematch in June of 1938. At the time that the match was made, the two fighters were ranked #1 and #2 in the world with Louis as the top ranked fighter.[50] The date was set for June 22nd, 1938 at Yankee Stadium in New York. By this time, citizens of the United States were more aware of the ideology and agenda of the Nazi Party. This resulted in more media hype surrounding the rematch. Nationalistic implications bore heavily on the fight. This caused the nation to more collectively support Louis in his fight against Schmeling. Even President Roosevelt showed his support for Louis by inviting him to the White House a few weeks before the fight and telling him that his strength was needed in the war effort.[51] It is important to note that the support for Joe Louis was primarily nationalistic in nature and focused on decrying Nazi Germany more than on unifying black and white Americans.

Unlike the first fight, Louis had actually prepared quite seriously for his rematch with Schmeling. Again, the stories that ran in the sports section of *The Chicago Defender* talked about the ease with which Louis was defeating his sparring partners.[52] It appeared as though Louis was back to his original form and ready for his rematch with the only man to have ever beaten him. The outcome of this fight was expected to be different from the first one, and Louis was favored 2 to 1 going into the fight.[53]

The stage was set and the two men squared off against one another in front of a packed stadium in New York. At the very beginning of the fight, the announcer blatantly stated that the fight was of "great international political importance."[54] He said that the first bout was interpreted by Hitler as an example of Aryan racial supremacy and that a victory by Louis could debunk

---

[49] Arch Ward, *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1938, 21.
[50] *The Chicago Defender*, December 25, 1937, 19.
[51] Myler, 120.
[52] *The Chicago Defender*, June 4, 1938, 9.
[53] *The Chicago Defender*, June 18, 1938, 9.
[54] "Louis vs. Schmeling 2 boxing" (Youtube) 4 min.; video, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GusM4IgmLe8 [Accessed February 20, 2012].

that myth. Before the announcer could even finish his statement, Louis bombarded Schmeling with a flurry of punches. Louis seemed calmer and more focused in this fight, slowly stalking down Schmeling before backing him into the ropes and barraging him with a series of hard punches. The referee broke up the action for only a moment but as soon as he allowed Louis to continue, a hard, overhand right from Louis caused Schmeling to collapse on the floor. Within three minutes Louis would send Schmeling to the floor a number of times. Each time Schmeling got up, it was only for a moment before Louis came crashing down on his temple with hard right hands. The fight was not even close to competitive and Louis won decisively.[55]

Schmeling's decisive defeat by a member of an 'inferior' racial group shook German society.[56] Louis demonstrated to the entire world that he was not inferior to Schmeling in any way. Louis had restored his honor and made up for his embarrassing defeat at the hands of Schmeling two years earlier. He was once again a testament to the abilities of the black community and a walking contradiction to racial bigotry. Louis's victory had signified that ideas of racial hierarchy were either unfounded, or backwards.

Again, *The Chicago Defender* was quick to point out how a victory for Louis meant more to the United States than any other boxing match ever could. The issue that followed Louis's victory had its entire front page dedicated to details about the fight.[57] An article in the issue talked about how Louis had saved the championship from Hitler. It also claimed that "every Jew in New York was solidly behind Joe Louis. They believed this was one of the ways by which they could prove that Hitler could rule Germany, but not America."[58] Later in the issue the paper highlighted a story about Joe Louis in a Jewish newspaper and discussed how the story was a tribute to Louis. The paper also stated that support of Louis was universal among the Jewish population of New York, which denounced the Nazi German.[59] The purpose here was to convince the reader that Louis had done something much more significant than winning a boxing match. These stories were meant to convince the reader that Louis's victory over Schmeling was a victory over injustice, a victory over Germany for the United States, and a defense of the Jewish people. By attaching that type of significance to Louis's defeat of Schmeling, *The Chicago Defender* attempted to transform Joe Louis from a black hero to a national one.

The Chicago Tribune also reported on the rematch between Louis and Schmeling. Prior to the fight, *The Tribune* placed a large amount of racial and national emphasis on Schmeling. An article that ran about a week prior to the fight discussed the significance of the fight for Schmeling. It read, "he is an

---

[55] "Louis vs. Schmeling 2 boxing" (Youtube).
[56] Erenberg, 150-1.
[57] *The Chicago Defender*, June 25, 1938, 1.
[58] *The Chicago Defender*, June 25, 1938, 2.
[59] *The Chicago Defender*, June 25, 1938, 6.

idol in his home land, but he must win again …or he loses his value to a government which teaches the physical and intellectual supremacy of the Nordic." The article then goes on to try and explain Louis's support from the black community. The author wrote, "The hero worship of Louis by members of his own race" was due to the fact that, "to a people generally economically dependent, Louis' meteoric career was as stimulating as a parade of Brown Shirts along Unter Den Linden [was] to the Germans."[60] This statement simultaneously insults Germans and African Americans while undermining Louis's status as a representative of the black community. It also demonstrates how the white community never fully embraced Louis as its hero.

By claiming that the reason for Louis's popularity in the black community was his successful career and not the fact that he was a symbol of racial empowerment or a testament to perseverance and dedication, *The Tribune* belittled the racial struggle that was occurring in the United States. The stance was again one of neutrality. *The Chicago Tribune* made it clear that it did not consider Louis to be one of its own. Louis was one of the 'others', as was Schmeling. Though Louis was preferable to the man who had come to be associated with Nazism, he was still not considered to be completely American. *The Tribune* made it abundantly clear through its writing that Louis was still a member of a marginalized group and that his racial identity was still a hindrance to his full acceptance as an American hero. While he was not as bad as the German, he was still not as good as a white hero would have been.

After the fight had taken place, *The Chicago Tribune* also emphasized the ties between Schmeling and Hitler. An article in the paper told of how Schmeling had received a message from Hitler. The message read, "To the coming world's champion. Wishing you every success. Adolph Hitler."[61] The purpose of informing the public about this was to remind them that Schmeling was affiliated with Nazi Germany. This made Schmeling a more marketable 'villain'. Once again, the black community was not immune to attacks by *The Tribune* either. The same issue ran an article titled, "Colored Folks Chant 'Ah Told You So'." The article detailed the celebrations that followed Louis's victory by various parts of the black community. The manner in which the article was written emphasized the rambunctiousness of the crowds that night and detailed the damage that was caused by it, including the accidental shooting of a 39-year-old woman in Gary, Indiana.[62] It was very clear that *The Chicago Tribune* did not abandon race prejudices and embrace the black community simply because Louis had beaten the

---

[60] *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1938, 19.
[61] Arch Ward, "Louis Stops Schmeling in First Round," *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1938, 21.
[62] Unsigned, "Colored Folks Chant, 'Ah Told You So,'" *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1938, 21.

German Schmeling. It was supportive of Louis while remaining grounded in the traditional racial ideology of the time.

Instead of accepting Louis and embracing him as an American, *The Tribune* simply portrayed him as the lesser of two evils. Louis was still being referred to in the paper as a "boy." The racial element of the fight was very apparent in the rematch. From the style of writing that one observes in *The Chicago Tribune*, it is clear to see that Schmeling is portrayed as the enemy, but Louis is not made out to be the hero that he is in *The Chicago Defender*. The mainstream press simply did not accept him fully due to his race. The white public just could not fully endorse a black man as its national hero. Still, it wanted him to beat the German, whom they associated with Nazism. The fight was described in *The Tribune* as having "bitter racial feeling, international rivalry, and personal grudges."[63] The racial feeling being described existed between Louis and Schmeling, thus it was between black and German, not black and white. The majority of the public was white, but it did not identify with the German. However, it did not identify with the black man either. To the majority of the public the race battle was insignificant; it watched it as a neutral faction. The national implications, however, were shared by almost all American citizens. It was of no doubt that Louis was from the United States, even if he was black. That was what the public could easily support, while still holding on to its racial ideology.

The outcome of the fight made the front page of *The Chicago Tribune* with a headline that read, "Louis whips Max: 1 Round."[64] On the front page of the sports section there was a picture of a large group of black citizens celebrating Louis's victory in the street. The caption above the photo read, "Whooping It Up as Their Boy Makes Good Again."[65] The small article next to the photo explains how the people celebrated and how excited they were. The writer states that Louis is 'their boy', in reference to the people in the photo. The writer is informing the reader that the American fighter who beat Schmeling is different from the readership of the paper. He belongs to the black community. The paper explained that the people in the photo are Joe Louis's brethren. Once again it is apparent that while *The Chicago Tribune* did wish for Louis to win, it did not fully embrace him as one of its own. There still existed a divide between the black and white communities in the United States that did not allow the majority of the public to fully accept Louis as a national hero.

The Chicago Defender consistently attached racial significance to Joe Louis's fights because of his great skill and talent. It did so very early on in his career. It believed that through his dominance of the sport of boxing, it could

---

[63] *The Chicago Tribune*, June 22, 1938, sec. 1.
[64] *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1938, 1.
[65] *The Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1938, 19.

show the nation that the black race was in no way inferior to the white race. This caused it to put more racial emphasis on the first fight between Louis and Schmeling than most other news outlets. After the upset, *The Chicago Defender* was devastated by the loss because it had invested so much of its time in Louis's success. As a result, it actually put less racial emphasis on the rematch since it did not want to suffer such a devastating loss again. This is unique because most other news outlets followed the opposite pattern, wherein the first fight only garnered media attention since it was such an upset. Most of that racial significance in the first fight was added by the German media and resulted in an increased interest in the rematch.

 The Chicago Tribune, however, reported the fights more similarly to the rest of the nation. The first fight was reported in a more neutral manner and the emphasis on the fight was placed on the fact that the outcome was very surprising. The political significance of the second fight resulted due to the growing tension between the United States and Germany. The German reporting on Schmeling's win being a testament to Aryan racial ideology also added more symbolic weight to the rematch.[66] The reporting done by *The Chicago Tribune* simultaneously denounced Nazi Germany while never fully embracing Louis and the black community. It recognized the political elements of the fight but ignored the significance that the results carried. The pattern of reporting was more consistent with the rest of the nation for *The Tribune*, as far as the white media was concerned. However, it had supported Louis as a boxer even prior to his rise to stardom. It remained consistent in its coverage of the fights and eventually did add more political implications to the rematch. But, *The Tribune* tried its best to remain impartial and being a conservative paper, never wanted to play upon the notion of a showdown between the United States and Germany.

 It is in this way that the Chicago case is unique to the rest of the nation. The two media outlets that dominated Chicago at the time were politically polarized. *The Chicago Defender* was overly enthusiastic about Louis's fights and their racial implications, more so than other black newspapers. As historian David Margolick noted, Al Monroe, sports columnist for *The Defender*, "tripl[ed] as a reporter, spy, and cheerleader for Louis."[67] *The Defender* was perhaps one of Louis's most adamant supporters, and as a result it was hesitant to emphasize the significance of the rematch due to the devastation it suffered from Louis's first loss. *The Tribune,* on the other hand, never fully succumbed to the fervor and hysteria that gripped other media outlets, remaining steadfast in its conservative ways.

---

[66] Sammons, 109-17.
[67] Margolick, 267.

When one looks at the fights between Louis and Schmeling, it is tempting to believe that some level of enlightenment must have been achieved as a result. Surely the nation could not have cheered in unison for a black champion without disregarding some of its racial ideology. But racism was undefeated in the United States. It trumped everything. Even in the face of an oncoming global conflict, racism proved stronger than nationalism. Any type of unison between blacks and whites during the second fight was short-lived. It is clear to see from the nature of the reporting and the language in the white press that blacks were never accepted at the time; they were just preferable to Nazis. Joe Louis was a great man, and he deserved to be a national hero. But he was not. He was, however, about as close as a black man could get to being a national hero in his time – if that counts for anything.

Pinch Hitting: How Women Changed Gender Roles by Filling the Shoes of Professional Baseball Players

By Rebecca Kijek

No women's professional baseball league exists in the world, but from 1943-1954 in the United States the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League (AAGPBL) flourished as an organization that provided women the opportunity to play ball. Through that league, women broke traditional gender roles and followed their dreams rather than society's expectations. This small group of individuals served as pioneers in an arena made for men, and paved the way for female athletes in future generations. Pat Brown, former AAGPBL pitcher, explained, "the opportunity to participate in sports and play for the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League made a difference for me; I was fortunate to have some help along the way. One of my fondest wishes is that no woman will ever again hear the words, 'You can't do that because you're a girl.'"[1] From their early years in sports to the end of their professional careers and beyond, these players strove to redefine womanhood by moving into a waged labor force formerly reserved for men: professional sports. The U.S. entry into World War II provided that opportunity.

With the outbreak of World War II American women faced a new set of responsibilities – filling the positions of men while they were away at war. Some of these positions were in the workforce while others were in the home, such as responsibility for home repairs. This came with a shift in beliefs as traditional gender roles were temporarily suspended in order to allow women to help support the war effort by working in male dominated jobs. Consequently, the women of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League not only effectively filled the positions of some men, but also continued to counter traditional myths surrounding womanhood when their time in the League had ended. From the League's start in 1943 to its end in 1954, Philip K. Wrigley, owner of the Chicago Cubs and Wrigley's chewing gum, created a place for women to put their athletic skills and personalities on display, while filling the shoes of their male counterparts.[2] Yet in spite of their player functions, the League promoted femininity through the style of uniforms and requiring players to attend charm school in the early years. They were expected to remain feminine and not assume male identities, but rather simply play as women in a male sport. Put on public display by male League owners, the women showed they could compete with the same athletic ability and success

---

[1] Patricia L. Brown, *A League of My Own: Memoir of a Pitcher for the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League* (London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2003), 131.

[2] Gia Ingham Berlage, *Women in Baseball: The Forgotten History* (Westport: Praeger, 1994), 133.

as men, and most importantly, that baseball was not just a sport for men.[3] That outcome surprised owners and, to some extent, the players themselves.

Throughout the years of the League, the All-Americans overcame traditional gender norms for their time period and although the League eventually came to an end, these women knew they were capable of so much more than falling back into their place as "women." In a study of women's struggles in changing gender norms, sociologists note these women had grown up as "obedient and cautious children in a world that emphasized conformity and cultural norms," showing that not only were they going against societal expectations, but also traditions instilled in them since childhood.[4] Women were expected to go back to their homes when soldiers returned from war, but the women of the AAGPBL pursued educations and careers that did not center on the household and family. In a social sense, their activism was primarily focused on continuing to play sports past puberty, especially softball and baseball – games they loved that were considered the domain of men. Ultimately, the AAGPBL provided women with the chance to achieve higher social and gender status by allowing them to demonstrate their athletic abilities and personal strengths in a public arena.

Historians studying women in the workplace during World War II and the postwar years have looked at women's reasons for joining the workplace, their jobs, the temporary shift in gender roles, and the transitions they needed to make after the war.[5] During the war, "women performed jobs that were viewed by the public as necessary and valuable, and that were often physically challenging," consequently giving them the confidence and a new self-image about their abilities and roles in society.[6] It is a common misconception that all of these women returned to being housewives at the end of the war; as these scholars show, a large number of women continued their careers or educations to better themselves and continue their newly adopted role. These women are responsible for permanently shifting gender norms, as well as inspiring future generations to follow in their footsteps. As William Chafe points out in *The Paradox of Change*, in order for women to maintain their newly achieved status

---

[3] More information on the AAGPBL can be found in the following: Jean Hastings Ardell, *Breaking Into Baseball: Women and the National Pastime* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005); Berlage, *Women in Baseball*; Marilyn Cohen, *No Girls in the Clubhouse: The Exclusion of American Women in the 20th Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[4] Mary Fielder Belenky, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck Tarule, *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1986), 68.

[5] For information on women in the workplace following WWII, see for example, Belenky et al., *Women's Ways of Knowing*; William Chafe, *The Paradox of Change: American Women in the 20th Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Sherna Berger Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited: Women, The War, and Social Change* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987); Alice Kessler Harris, *Women Have Always Worked: A Historical Overview* (New York: The Feminist Press, 1981).

[6] Gluck, xii.

they "required a continued redefinition of sexual roles, a more profound shift in public attitudes, a substantial improvement in the treatment afforded workers, and a new ideological assault on traditional values and sex stereotypes."[7] A case study of the AAGPBL provides an unusual, but pivotal setting to assess the factors laid out by Chafe, showing the redefinitions and shifts played out on the ball field as well as in the players' homes.

This article focuses on the combination of women's work, leisure, and life paths during and after World War II, through the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League. Understanding the role of sport in relation to women's lives in the mid-twentieth century is important for this analysis. Women involved in sports were part of a community filled with like-minded individuals, all working together for a greater cause. Historian Beth Hensley found that "sport provided a goal-oriented context within which the women athletes formed close ties and a sense of connectedness…these factors promoted the group empowerment of the women and prepared them for being able to advance to a societal level."[8] The act of being involved in sport, regardless of the sport, provides participants with benefits that are rarely found in any other environment. The women of the AAGPBL demonstrate the effects sports had on their lives with the unique experiences they had because of the League.

This analysis relies on memoirs and personal testimonies of the players to understand the impact the League had on their lives. League publications, League yearbooks, and newspapers show the business perspective and how the League and media represented these women. In order to best understand the impact the League had on these women, it is necessary to set up a chronological representation of their time before, during, and after the League. In doing this, readers will gain a stronger grasp on the societal expectations during this time, the impact they had on women, and the way the ballplayers combated them.

Starting as Tomboys

The pursuit for gender equality among League players did not start as such a clear-cut goal for them. Most of the players grew up as the "tomboys" in their neighborhoods, searched for ballparks and pick-up baseball games to join, and tagged along with older brothers in hopes they would be picked to play on one of the teams. From an early age, these women, "were recognized and accepted as androgynous tomboys who crossed gender boundaries, preferring baseball to girl's games, who excelled at the game and enjoyed the

---

[7]   Chafe, 134.

[8]   Beth H. Hensley, "Older Women's Life Choices and Development After Playing Professional Baseball," PhD Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1995, 34.

support of family members, particularly fathers."[9] Although they were accepted on the field, gender roles enforced by society resulted in female ballplayers constantly being told they were girls and to not play sports with the boys. This represents some of the internal struggles women faced due to societal restrictions. The differences in norms for the two genders were apparent from a young age, for "unlike the advantaged adolescent male who has had years of practice in exploring and testing social limits, the adolescent female from a similar background has frequently been rewarded for her quiet predictability, her competent though perhaps unimaginative work, and her obedience and conformity."[10]

The experiences these women faced as children trying to get involved in athletics allowed a whole-hearted passion to grow within them, pushing them to get involved in as many sports as possible and excelling to their best abilities, but few athletic options existed after high school. This made it clear that as they got older there was no place for them in sports, leaving them with one option – finding a husband and starting a family. Pat Brown's memoir highlights the dilemma:

> I had two dreams. One was to play baseball, and the other was to go to college. Both dreams presented problems. First of all, women did not play baseball in my part of the country, and secondly neither my family nor I had the financial means to pay for college. I called these two hopes my impossible dream.[11]

Although such revelations were devastating, women were very aware of their responsibilities and seeing as they had no other options, accepted their gender-denoted roles.

Expanding Options: A League for Women

The outbreak of World War II forced a temporary shift in women's responsibilities, and opened the door to women playing professional baseball. P.K. Wrigley introduced a women's professional softball league, later becoming the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League. Wrigley wanted to continue the nation's pastime to maintain a sense of normalcy while men were away at war and turned to female players. Soon tryouts were open to women interested in playing and athletes across the nation were given a chance to follow their dreams and pursue professional baseball.

As scouts searched the Midwest for athletes, women across the country laced up their cleats, hopped on trains, and prepared for the ultimate test of their athletic ability to see if baseball was in their future. Tryouts were mostly

---

[9] Cohen, 50.

[10] Belenky et al., 65.

[11] Brown, 5.

held in the Midwest because that is where the leagues were located, but there were also small-scale tryouts provided for women on the East and West Coasts. Tryouts lasted two to three days with cuts at the end of each. Steep competition for a small number of openings created a stressful atmosphere and recruiters often asked women to play positions they had no experience in. This ended up working out for Pat Brown, who pitched during her tryout and secured a spot despite no experience on the mound.[12] After women won a coveted spot on a team, they moved onto Spring Training and then eventually to a baseball season packed with challenging match-ups.

From the start of the League in 1943 to its end in 1954 the owner held one thing constant – the notion that these players maintain the image of being "ladies" rather than athletes. Wrigley made it his utmost responsibility to present his players as feminine and implemented strict rules and protocols for the players to protect their femininity. He knew fans expected seeing a man, or even a masculine woman play sports well, but the real spectacle was seeing feminine women excel in a traditionally male dominated sport. Historian Susan Cahn argues,

> Critics ranged from physicians and physical educators to sportswriters, male athletic officials, and casual observers. In their view, strenuous athletic pursuits endangered women and threatened the stability of society. They maintained that women athletes would become manlike, adopting masculine dress, talk, and mannerisms.[13]

Wrigley avoided this negative view by making girls attend charm school during the first two years of the League, wear skirted uniforms, and have chaperones who enforced the strict rules.

A Guide for All-American Girls: How to Look Better, Feel Better, Be More Popular, was published by the League, distributed to each player, and served as the perfect guide to maintaining womanhood. This guide laid out all responsibilities for an All-American Girl. From "After Game Procedures" to how to act in public, the guide showed players how to represent the League. It states,

> You have certain responsibilities because you too, are the limelight. Your actions and appearance both on and off the field reflect on the whole profession. It is not only your duty to do your best to hold up the standard of this profession but to do your level best to keep others in line.[14]

---

[12] Brown, 29.

[13] Susan K. Cahn, "From the 'Muscle Moll' to the 'Butch' Ballplayer: Mannishness, Lesbianism, and Homophobia in U.S. Women's Sports," *Feminist Studies* 19, no. 2 (1993): 343-368, 345.

[14] Ester Sherman, *A Guide for All-American Girls: How to Look Better, Feel Better, Be More Popular* (Chicago: Major League Baseball, 1943), 1.

League players commonly knew these requirements, along with many others, including the curfews and dress codes. Required to wear skirted uniforms, as a way to continue their feminine appearance on the field, players dealt with the impracticality and discomfort. In an interview conducted by Frank Boring as part of a Veterans History Project at Grand Valley State University, 1948 Player of the Year Audrey Daniels remembered when asked about the uniforms, "It didn't matter what kind of uniform they would have given us, we would have put it on. We were playing baseball and we were so thrilled to be there."[15] Mastering these two gender specific roles shows their versatility and desire to play. Historian Marilyn Cohen explains these two pivotal roles as women being "both subjects and objects, attempting to negotiate the confines of an extremely controlled construction of femininity and their subjective experiences as competent women athletes."[16] Players managed to perform at high levels of athleticism, while still maintaining a feminine image, rarely breaking out of it in the heat of the game.

The majority of the time the All-Americans upheld their "lady" image, but in a few instances they fell out of their League mandated role. Each player can remember a moment in which the circumstance arose for her to break from the normative feminine behavior and disobey rules. In the heat of the game some base runners chose to spike other players and pitchers would intentionally hit batters with their pitch.[17] While there were no punishments for spiking or intentional hits, players could be fined for cursing on the field and displaying unladylike behavior such as raising their voices, staying out past curfew, and drinking. In a 1997 questionnaire sent out by the National Baseball Hall of Fame (NBHF), ex-All-American Mary Lou Caden recalled being fined $10 for yelling at an umpire as her least favorite memory of the League.[18] Since cursing and raising their voices were direct violations of the League, as stated in *A Guide for All-American Girls,* players were fined according to the degree of their outburst.[19]

---

[15] Audrey Daniels, "Oral History Interview," 12, interviewed by Frank Boring, Grand Valley State University Veterans History Project [hereafter, GVSUVHP], August 5, 2010, Detroit, Michigan at the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League reunion, transcribed by Joan Raymer, November 16, 2010, at http://gvsu.cdmhost.com/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/p15068coll11&CISOPTR=30&CISOBOX=1&REC=9 [Accessed November 3, 2011].

[16] Cohen, 68.

[17] The term "spike" refers to when a base runner slides into a base and intentionally hits the fielder with the sharp points on the bottom of their cleats.

[18] Mary Lou Caden, "AAGPLB Questionnaire" distributed by the National Baseball Hall of Fame [hereafter, NBHF] (Cooperstown, 1997), 3.

[19] Sherman, 8.

Each player fundamentally abhorred the belief that most sports were masculine; however, they accepted the rules in order to play the game they loved. The League would never have endured during and after the war if Wrigley had not established it to project the highest social image for the players, which emphasized their femininity and was therefore acceptable to the conservative businessmen in league cities who sponsored and supported the teams. Thus the skirted uniforms, the charm school training, the femininity publicity, and the strict behavioral rules came into the picture. Still, if the individual players had not defied social mores to continue playing physical games they loved despite their masculine image, there never would have been an AAGPBL.

In attempts to continue expanding the role of women as athletes, the League faced many changes throughout the years. When Wrigley started the League it was considered a professional women's softball league, but that quickly changed when he saw the athletic ability of the women. In describing the differences between softball and baseball, the Racine Belles' Yearbook from 1946 states, "Girls baseball is a new and entirely exclusive game to the AAGPBL…all phases of the game require the utmost of skills, whether it be pitching, batting, fielding, base-running or sliding. It's a great game!"[20] Each year the League saw changes in the length between bases and the size of the ball, and in each of the Racine Belles' yearbooks, fans were informed about what to expect in the coming season.

As suggested above, from the beginning of the League in 1943 to its end in 1954, the game shifted from a form of softball to full-scale baseball. In 1943 the ball diameter was 12 inches (the same diameter as a softball today), the distance from the pitcher's mound to home base was 40 feet, the base paths were 65 feet, and pitchers used an underhand style. The women enjoyed playing this, but their athletic ability clearly surpassed the required skill needed for these rules. In order to attract more fans and continue to challenge the players, the regulations of the game were changed. The regulations in the 1954 season show the evolution of the game. This season used balls with a 9¼-inch diameter, a pitcher's mound-home base distance of 60 feet, base paths at 85 feet, and overhand pitching. The shift from softball to baseball shows that these women were playing a traditionally male sport, which is what makes these women stand out in history. When ex-player Marilyn Jones was asked if she thought women played baseball differently than men, she answered,

---

[20] Racine Belles 1946 Yearbook, 23, Wisconsin Historical Society; online facsimile at http://www.wisconsinhistory.org/turningpoints/search.asp?id=1141 [Accessed October 28, 2011].

> Different? No. We played as hard, ran as hard, and slid as
> hard. We hit as good and threw as good and thought better!
> No, I think we didn't play any different than what they played.
> Except we got a hell of a lot less money.[21]

Marilyn explains that the All-Americans played at the same level as their male
counterparts, and were even accepted because of their skill, but were still paid
at a lower rate.

Despite the gender inequity in baseball, League players earned more than
other workingwomen. One of the highest paying jobs for women during WWII
was factory work, bringing in $37 a week.[22] At the beginning of the 1943
season, players could make anywhere from $40 to $85 a week with all
expenses paid.[23] Over the years players saw increases in pay, making about
$330 a week with all expenses paid during the 1953 season, and only seeing a
decrease in pay during the League's last season, due to budget cuts.[24] As the
rules changed and players were challenged at a higher degree, it was necessary
for the League to pay the athletes more. Along with this, large fan turnout
created more revenue for the League, allowing it to pay the women players
more for their great performance on and off the field. Although this was more
than the average woman was making, the All-Americans were paid more for
playing the game they loved. The extra money they made allowed them to
support themselves and save for life after the League, as well as send money
home to their families to help support them. Ex-All-American Madeline
English recalled, "my experiences in the League not only helped me pay for
college, but also gave me more confidence in myself."[25] Due to the amount of
money they were making the women shifted from traditional gender roles of
being dependent to being completely independent, with others relying on them
for help. This alone is a significant part of what the League did for these
women. It showed them they could take care of themselves and gave an
alternative to what patriarchal society had planed for them. Financial
independence was not the only thing the All-Americans gained.

Fans kept the League going throughout the years. In 1946, the Racine
Belles Yearbook reported that a total of 419,950 people attended regular season
games, and an additional 25,144 fans attended off-season games.[26] This

---

[21] Marilyn Jones, Interviewed by Susan Johnson, in Susan E. Johnson, *When Women Played Hardball*,
(Seattle: Seal Press, 1994) 15.

[22] Chafe, 129.

[23] Merrie A. Fidler, *The Origins and History of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League*
(London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2006), 199.

[24] Fidler, 199.

[25] Madeline English, interviewed by Patricia Brown in *A League of My Own*, 167.

[26] Racine Belles 1946 Yearbook, 29.

overwhelming number of fans increased throughout the years as the sport gained more popularity, but the players were what kept the fans coming. Furthermore, while players were displaying high levels of athleticism, the spectators were influenced by what they saw.

Spectators were made up of all types of baseball fans, but young female fans comprised the largest group. These girls also represent the fans most influenced by seeing women become professional players. As Cohen argues, the fact "that the League players were eagerly watched and supported by many female fans is a significant phenomenon…the athletic skills displayed by women players confirmed not only their own possibilities as professional athletes but expanded horizons for those women watching them as fans."[27] Women in the League were given an opportunity to change their lives, which in turn provided young girls with the inspiration to change their own. The players turned themselves into the role models they never had, something that they continued to do the rest of their lives.

Susan E. Johnson grew up as a fan of the Rockford Peaches. The Peaches inspired her to follow her dreams, regardless of gender stereotypes. They also inspired her to write a book about the women in the League, in which she describes how they influenced girls like her. She explains,

> The All-Americans were heroes for all their fans, but especially for their little-girl fans. They showed us women doing something difficult and dangerous, something that took physical courage, intelligence and a fighting spirit. Moreover, the ballplayers were doing this as a team, working hard with other women to achieve something worthwhile, a game well played, and – if dedication, hard work, luck and umpires cooperated – victory. And they did all this with a lightheartedness that told me, struggle, even combat, could be fun.[28]

These larger-than-life figures projected "the qualities of courage and resourcefulness and strength" that girls needed women to show them as they grew up.[29] Popular media also noticed the new found role models.

Having fans acknowledge the importance of the players was necessary to their existence, but media representations were vital in helping secure their redefinition of womanhood. In the early years of the League some reporters only focused on the appearance of the players, but as they continued to prove they were athletes, there was a huge shift in the way they

---

[27] Cohen, 54.

[28] Johnson, xiii.

[29] Johnson, xii.

were seen. In an article from 1950, reporter Morris Markey addressed the
female ballplayers by stating,

> Women make the game possible. Housewives and cooks,
> clerks and secretaries, and salesgirls find delight which they
> make no effort to conceal in watching members of their own
> sex play a game just as well as their brothers can play it. The
> spectacle feeds their pride and goes a long way toward
> dispelling the myth of inferiority, the myth of the weaker sex.[30]

Media representation, along with reactions from fans and the overall
performance of the All-Americans, helped secure a new view of the roles of
women. The players set the example for themselves, as well as for spectators,
of what women could accomplish. Once this was achieved, the media
represented these women by showing their athletic ability and spreading the
word of their success across the country, allowing more women to be exposed
to their story.

Advantages of Playing in the League

Former player Mary Moore fondly remembered,

> The things we learned from playing baseball in the League will
> stick with all of us for the rest of our life. I just can't say
> enough about the experiences we had in the traveling and
> learning to get along with people, working as a team, learning
> responsibility, and just everything I think helped almost every
> one of us in our life and in our time after the League. Playing
> in the League was one of the greatest experiences in my life,
> and I wouldn't trade anything in the world for the time we
> played baseball."[31]

In this way, she explains the set of life skills and newly acquired confidence
that would completely reshape the identities of the All-American players and
guide them throughout their education and career paths.

The educational and career paths women chose when the League ended in
1954 show their experience in the public arena gave them the confidence that
they could take care of themselves. They learned to get along with other
people from all over the U.S., Canada, and a few from Cuba. They had the
opportunity to travel extensively to the South and Southeast, to the Northeast,
some to Cuba, some to Central and South America, and, of course, all to the

---

[30] Morris Markey, "Hey Ma You're Out," All-American Girls Professional Baseball League Scrapbook,
Chicago Colleens versus Springfield Sallies, 1950, A. Bartlett Giamatti Research Center at the NBHF,
in Cohen, *No Girls in the Club House*, 55.

[31] Mary Moore, interviewed by Patricia Brown in *A League of My Own*, 182.

Midwestern states in which the League operated.[32] All of this traveling required them to take care of themselves for four to five months at a time and allowed them to develop relationships with a vast variety of women. In regard to the extensive traveling, Sue Kidd acknowledged, "It made a big impact on my life. I got to travel and meet people from all over the country and from other countries even. It helped me grow up. It taught me to be independent."[33] The player questionnaire sent out by the NBHF shows that this was a common sentiment amongst the players. A large majority of them stated traveling and gaining independence as one of their favorite memories of the League. Along with meeting new people in the locations they traveled to, "AAGPBL teams became mini-melting pots of society and afforded players with an opportunity to rub shoulders with diverse opinions and viewpoints from all over the country that couldn't help but broaden their perspective of the world."[34] These new opinions were something the players might have never experienced if they stayed in their hometowns with the family and friends they grew up with. The personal relationships the women were exposed to in the League served as an on-hands sociological learning experience, resulting in a more cultured group of women.

Being a part of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League came with a set of responsibilities that the players upheld during the League, but also took with them after it ended. Each team expected its players to engage in civic and community events in order to promote the League. In doing this, the Racine Belles created a junior baseball organization for boys and girls and according to the 1948 Belles Yearbook, "it was one of the mot popular and successful youth recreation programs ever undertaken by any community in America."[35] The goal of this organization was to provide quality recreation and develop athletic skills. The junior players participated in full-scale baseball, not softball, and were coached by the women in the League. The Junior Belles were a mark of League sponsored community service, but also served as a way for the players to share their expertise and get involved with giving girls a chance to play baseball. For these women, this was their first chance outside of a household to pass on their knowledge, and the favorable reactions from the young players did nothing but boost their confidence – but confidence could only get them so far during the League.

League Endings

Unfortunately the 1954 season was the last the AAGPBL would see. The League folded following that season because of a decrease in attendance and

---

[32] Fidler, 111.

[33] Fidler, 192.

[34] Fidler, 192.

[35] Racine Belles 1948 Yearbook, 30.

budget cuts. Even though the players had given years to the League, it was time for them to pack up their bats and balls and, as society expected, head back to their families. When soldiers reclaimed their jobs at home, women were expected to return to being housewives. Female workers were seen as a temporary fix to wartime needs. As Cohen explains, "after a stint of playing professional baseball, the women players [were expected to] assume heterosexual lives in supportive, dependent, reproductive roles for which they were 'naturally' suited."[36] Societal expectations proclaimed,

> Women went to work out of "necessity." If a woman had declared that she sought employment in order to gratify a personal desire or prove her equality with men, she would immediately have come into conflict with the social norm that a woman should be happy to stay in the home.[37]

When the League ended, it expected players to remember the fond memories of the League and take their roles as women, but the majority of players took a different path. Susan Johnson explains in the following how the League inspired these women to follow their careers of choice:

> The feeling of being left out was one all the girls had to struggle with. It was the nature of these youngsters who would grow up to be All-Americans to want to do things uncharacteristic of their sex, to be more active and risk-taking and free. As a result, they were left out, unwilling to join with other girls in girl-type activities, and sometimes unwelcome in their attempts to do boy-type things, they were also isolated because they performed at a level of skill unnatural for either sex. Not until professional baseball became available to them did they find others who could match their skill, determination, courage, and competitive spirit.[38]

These players were accustomed to being overlooked and left out of male jobs, but being in the League exposed them to other women with similar experiences. They took this with them knowing they could accomplish their desires, regardless of society seeing them as outsiders.

While cultural expectations and gender stereotypes provided challenges for the women, they show the context in which women worked to achieve their goals. The All-Americans needed to follow their desires and career choices in order to further challenge the expectations of women. This task would not be

---

[36] Cohen, 47.

[37] Chafe, 169.

[38] Johnson, 43.

easy, but as Pat Brown remembered, "I learned at a very young age that, as a girl, and later a women, wanting to make something of myself in a so-called 'man's world' I had to learn more, try harder, and train better in order to succeed. This lesson stayed with me the rest of my life."[39] Although this was a harsh reality for the women of the AAGPBL, they had already proven to themselves, as well as to the nation, that they were capable of achieving the same as men and it was now time to achieve just as much in a different field.

The women of the AAGPBL continued to work towards maintaining and enhancing their own rights, as well as women's rights, by pursuing education and careers after the League ended in 1954. Their non-conformity to society's expectations for them to return to their homes resulted in their pursuit of gender equality. Jacqueline Baumgart reflected on what kept her pushing on after the League: "We're not just what someone else thinks we are. We have to learn to live out from within instead of having to fulfill somebody else's ideas of what we are."[40] During and after the League, some AAGPBLers did marry and raise families; however, many of them chose to go to college and become professionals. They were able to do so with the money they earned playing ball, some only being able to do so because of those earnings.[41] Many of them also continued to participate in sports after the League's demise even if they were married or engaged in a professional occupation, and some of them became softball and Little League Baseball coaches.[42] While playing baseball, the League served as a primary support system to help them grow. As it ended, the confidence and personal relationships they made encouraged them in their career pursuits.

Those players who continued onto college, professional careers, and coaching, constantly thought about their time in the League. While attending college many found their universities had athletic teams for men, but none for women. In her story, Pat Brown explains, "attending college was everything I had dreamed about and hoped for, except for one major disappointment. Much to my chagrin, I discovered that Suffolk University had no gym, no women's physical education program, and no sports at all for women."[43] Pat, like many of the other women in the League, took this issue into her own hands. She offered to start, play in, and coach a women's basketball team at the university,

---

[39] Brown, 7.

[40] Jacqueline Baumgart, "Oral History Interview," 17, interviewed by Frank Boring, GVSUVHP, August 5, 2010, Detroit, Michigan at the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League reunion, transcribed by Joan Raymer, February 20, 2010, at http://gvsu.cdmhost.com/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/p15068coll11&CISOPTR=23&CISOBOX=1&REC=3 [Accessed November 3, 2011].

[41] Fidler, 229.

[42] Fidler, 229.

[43] Brown, 80.

while working a part-time job and being a full-time student.[44] While Pat coached the basketball team, many of her fellow All-Americans pursued careers in physical education and coached local sports teams. Of course this was due in part to the women's experience and love for sports, but also because they wanted to provide young women with the same opportunities they had been given. In following these careers, as well as others, "women have raised their voices to challenge the femininity myth by declaring that females who worked for pay and valued their work were real women and were not deviant and defective."[45] Thus, after the League had ended, they continued to redefine womanhood and embrace their identities.

Bringing the AAGPBL to the Next Generation

League players rarely talked about their experiences for fear people would not believe them or understand what they accomplished.[46] The instructions in the *Guide for All-American Girls* had emphasized to players that "there is nothing more vulgar than bragging about personal possessions, accomplishment or achievements."[47] The All-Americans kept their stories to themselves until the 1970s when women's studies courses blossomed because of the feminist movement.[48] Researchers, historians, and sociologists began searching for and discovering information about women who had vast accomplishments, despite social and gender norms that tried to direct their lives. Soon, the story of the AAGPBL began to unfold.

Although their story was being researched and studied by college students, it was relatively unknown by the public until 1988 when the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League was inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York.[49] Not only were these women part of the only women's professional baseball league in history, but they were also being recognized for their great accomplishments. Pat Brown remembered, "to be included in the National Baseball Hall of Fame was a tremendous honor. If I had dreamed of being in the Hall of Fame as a goal, along with my goals of playing baseball and going to college, people would have laughed at me."[50] President Ronald Reagan shared the excitement and congratulated the All-Americans in a letter to the AAGPBL Players Association stating,

---

[44] Brown, 81.

[45] Hensley, 12.

[46] Jean Cione, "Oral History Interview," 14, interviewed by Gordon Olson, GVSUVHP, September 27, 2009, Milwaukee, Wisconsin at the Alumni Reunion of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League, transcribed by Joan Raymer, March 4, 2010, at http://gvsu.cdmhost.com/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/p15068coll11&CISOPTR=18&CISOBOX=1&REC=7 [Accessed November 3, 2011].

[47] Sherman, 8.

[48] Fidler, 230.

[49] Fidler, 258.

[50] Brown, 113.

> As professionals in our national pastime, you were pioneers
> among women in the world of professional sports. Your
> achievements on the diamond come through exceptional
> dedication and discipline, and I know you agree it was surely
> worth the effort. Baseball is always a memorable and enriching
> experience, and you can reflect and rejoice that the example
> you and others set is now depicted at Cooperstown to inspire
> and inform your fellow Americans and visitors from abroad for
> years to come.[51]

Following the induction into the Hall of Fame, actor and director Penny Marshall started researching the players and the League in order to create a movie about them. With the help of the Hall of Fame, the players and the Player's Association, the movie, *A League of Their Own,* was completed in October of 1991.[52] Marshall hired some of the players, and in the beginning and end of the movie, the original All-Americans can be seen getting ready to attend the opening of the Hall of Fame exhibit dedicated to them. While being amused that they were paid for their appearances in the film, they were also pleased with how it turned out. When asked about the movie Marilyn Jenkins, former Grand Rapids Chick said, "It was wonderful and it's going to be a movie that's going to be around forever I'm sure. …It strengthened the association, gave the association a purpose…to perpetuate the League."[53] The movie was a blockbuster, but did so much more than bring in money. It helped share the story of the League. The players found themselves "being looked at as role models for girls and women who wanted freedom to participate in more sporting activities," and it was fulfilling that "girls' fathers, mothers, and quite often, even brothers were also becoming more supportive of their daughters' and sisters' struggle to participate in sports which were previously unavailable to women."[54] It showed new generations of girls the forgotten history of women who played professional baseball and the reactions from the public reinforced the All-Americans' desire to spread their story.

Just as *A Guide for All-American Girls* told women to avoid bragging about themselves, it also encouraged them to be leaders, which was the role they took. As the League promoted, "The development of leadership, initiative, and self-confidence in the girls who are to have the tremendously

---

[51] Ronald Reagan, letter to the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League Player's Association, January 10, 1989, in Patricia Brown, *A League of My Own,* 115.
[52] Fidler, 282.
[53] Marilyn Jenkins, "Oral History Interview," 15-16, interviewed by Frank Boring, GVSUVHP, transcribed by Joan Raymer, August 15, 2008, at http://gvsu.cdmhost.com/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/p15068coll11&CISOPTR=19&CISOBOX=1&REC=13 [Accessed November 3, 2011].
[54] Brown, 118.

increased responsibilities that women must carry in another generation is surely
of vast importance. If they can be encouraged to think, judge, and act on their
own responsibility they gain an asset that should prove of great future value."[55]
Leadership, initiative and self-confidence were what got the All-Americans,
through the League, education, careers, and inspiring future generations, to
push aside gender roles and become their own person. The movie, Hall of
Fame, and personal stories of the players continue to inspire women to this day.

Today, the Player's Association preserves the history of the League and
encourages women to play sports. On its website, visitors can find the stories
of the players and history of the League, as well as links to the Baseball Hall of
Fame's website, and information about getting involved in local sports.[56]
Former All-Americans travel to conventions, such as the Major League
Baseball All-Star Weekend, each year, and make an appearance at "Fan Fest,"
part of the weekend's activities. At such conventions they talk about their
experience in the League and the purpose of the Association, and meet with
fans. Along with this, there is a group of re-enactors called the World War II
Girls Baseball Living History League, which travels around to various
historical reenactments in the Midwest.[57] In a recent visit to Wisconsin, former
player and grandmother of one of the re-enactors, Joyce Hill Westerman,
reflected on the reenactment: "It brings back memories. I think it's great these
girls want to do this. I never thought this would happen 60 years later."[58] All
of these women are working together to share and preserve the story of the All-
Americans' accomplishments. According to Audrey Daniels, "we
accomplished more than playing baseball, we showed that we were as equal as
boys," and that this was achieved by going beyond what was conventional and
disobeying social customs.[59]

The legacy of the League now rests in those the All-Americans inspired,
those who continue to challenge social norms. Just as the women in the League
tried, and are still trying to tell their stories, their fans in younger generations
need to continue talking about what these women did. In continuing to retell
the history of the AAGPBL, this study must mention a very important, yet
overlooked accomplishment of these women. When baseball fans are asked
about the first night game ever played on Wrigley Field most of them would
answer with a game in the late 1980s, because "the Cubs list 1988 as the first

---

[55] Sherman, 11.
[56] All-American Girls Professional Baseball League Player's Association, "The Official Site of the
AAGPBL,"
http://gvsu.cdmhost.com/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/p15068coll11&CISOPTR=19&CISOB
OX=1&REC=13.
[57] World War II Girls Professional Baseball Living History League, "WWII Girls Baseball Living
History League," http://www.ww2girlsbaseball.com/.
[58] Meg Jones, "Re-enacting A League of Their Own," *The Journal Sentinel*, September 18, 2011, at
http://www.jsonline.com/news/wisconsin/130096398.html [Accessed October 3, 2011].
[59] Daniels, "Oral History Interview," 19.

historical game under the lights, and completely ignore the AAGPBL's night
game under the portable lights."[60] The first night game played on Wrigley
Field was actually on July 1, 1943, and the players were women from the
AAGPBL.[61] Although the movie and the induction in the National Baseball
Hall of Fame have helped share their story, it is the responsibility of the
remaining players and their fans to continuing sharing their great achievements,
because what they did "as professional baseball players was important to the
history of baseball as well as the history of women in sports."[62]

The shift from young tomboys, to feminine ballplayers, to confident,
independent women, displays the substantial transformation these women went
through because of their experience in the All-American Girls Professional
Baseball League. Despite being challenged by traditional gender roles and
societal expectations, these women embraced their athletic abilities and
personal desires to better themselves, redefine womanhood, and inspire future
generations to follow in their footsteps. Whether it was to play sports or get an
education, the players of the AAGPBL shared their story in order to show girls
they could accomplish anything their male counterparts could. Pat Brown
explains the importance of their story saying, "not every woman wants to play
baseball, but all women struggle against any society that holds them back…"[63]
from achieving "success in their professional careers, not only in sports, but as
lawyers, executives, doctors, police women, firefighters, and in all fields which
were once opened only to men."[64]

The women of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League strove
for success at a time when they had no role models to show them how to get
there. The League, although focused on keeping them feminine, opened doors
so they could become each others' role models, as well as the role models of
future generations. The challenge of ignoring stereotypes and defining their
own lives is one of the few struggles these women faced and overcame. The
women know the pains of not being able to play the sport they loved because
they were girls and the struggle to overcome gender roles. They also, as Pat
Brown tells,

> [k]now the joy of being accepted by the first and only women's
> professional baseball league in the United States, the All-
> American Girls Professional Baseball League. We know,
> firsthand, what women can achieve in sports, and we know how
> participating in sports can help women gain self-esteem and

---

[60] English, in Brown, *A League of My Own*, 167.
[61] Fidler, 95.
[62] Brown, 127.
[63] Brown, 104.
[64] Brown, 3.

confidence in themselves. We know from our own experiences that this confidence helps women to forge ahead from sports to successful careers in whatever occupation they choose. And we know that individuals and groups who support the growth of women in sports can make a difference.[65]

It is easy to see what the women of the All-American Girls Professional Baseball League have achieved as well as inspired. They have made their imprint on American and Women's history, and they will continue to make an impact on future generations as long as their story is told.

---

[65] Brown, 190.

WILPF and the Fight Against the Arms Race and Chemical Warfare:
Women's Peace Activists after World War I, 1915–1930

Lyndsey M. Eagle

In 1914, the world as anyone knew it ceased to exist. With the beginning of World War I, an entirely new world was born. Men left their countries in droves, pulled into an unavoidable European conflict based on a series of treaties that had long kept Europe out of war. Women lost their sons, brothers, and husbands, as they knew them, to the fronts. When, or if, they returned, they failed to return to normalcy. Shell-shocked, dismembered, and disillusioned men came home to those women who waited patiently and in fear. Millions of sons, brothers, and husbands never came back. The horrors and atrocities of the "war to end all wars" deeply and profoundly impacted the lives of women around the world. During this pivotal moment in history, some women found solace in searching for peace. Perhaps some started in search of peace of mind or of heart. Others, especially those involved in the progressive social reforms during this time, searched for permanent world peace; in a time of unprecedented violence and destruction, an international group of women came together, envisioning a world free of war and oppression.

Historians have discussed the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) in terms of its attempts to educate the public, its rhetorical strategies of mixing Victorian idealism and modernist language, its internationalism, its pacifism, and its nonresistance. From its emergence during World War I, WILPF aimed to achieve a peaceful world, international cooperation, and public realization of the importance of women's work and roles in society. As scholar Harriet Alonso argues, the women involved in the direct predecessor of WILPF, the Woman's Peace Party, established the first feminist peace organization in United States history during this time.[1] This article will focus on correspondence and publications by WILPF members in the 1920s, looking to the immediate aftermath of the Great War and the ways in which its destruction and horrors became the impetus for the women of WILPF to begin their work.[2] During the 1920s, America withdrew from internationalism with the rise and fear of socialism. This heightened awareness

---

[1] The Women's Peace Party was organized in 1914 and lasted until divisions between members caused a split into numerous organizations, including WILPF. Harriet Hyman Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue: A History of the U.S. Movement for World Peace and Women's Rights* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1993), 59.

[2] Works on WILPF include the following: Harriet Hyman Alonso, "Gender and Peace Politics in the First World War United States: The People's Council of America," *The International History Review* 19, no. 1 (1997): 83-102; Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, *Pioneers for Peace and Freedom: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1965* (Oxford: Alden Press, 1980); Wendy B. Sharer, *Vote and Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915-1930* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004); and Barbara J. Steinson, *American Women's Activism in World War I* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982).

affected the ways that citizens viewed war and preparedness, impacting WILPF's effectiveness and making it a political target.

Traditionally, historians of the Progressive Era have studied women's roles in social reform movements like settlement houses, issues of labor and child-care, and the rights of women to participate in the public sphere, both economically and politically. Historians have considered peace movements and organizations such as WILPF as part of this larger social reform movement, justifying women's involvement as a natural extension of their domestic role as caregivers and educators.

When studying WILPF, historians Harriet Hyman Alonso, Carrie Fisher, and Linda Schott have often cited the domestic role of women as a major reason for their dedication to work toward peace and establishing an organization for women only.[3] However, women also made clear their aims of gaining greater political independence and freedom. Thus, historians have also argued that WILPF grew out of the suffrage movement; not only were the women working to take care of and protect humanity, "their life's work," but they were also attempting to move into the public sphere, achieve a public voice, and gain access to political participation with the vote.[4] Many of the women involved in WILPF were upper- or middle-class, college-educated women who had experience in areas of social work. During this time, social work and reform were common areas for educated white women to assert their professional selves, while trying to establish their public and political voice. These women had the means, time, and knowledge to pursue their endeavors toward equality, suffrage, and peace.

More than just a pacifist organization, WILPF was also a feminist organization, fundamentally rooted in seeking to promote women's activism, equality between the sexes, and the right to vote. At the time of the outbreak of the European war, women were trying to find their political voice by way of suffrage across the globe. The First World War interfered with their progress, and women took the opportunity to officially organize in response to it. This first organized feminist response to the war was created with the Women's Peace Party, established in 1914, which became, as Alonso says, "the suffrage wing of the peace movement and the pacifist wing of the

---

[3]   See Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*; Carrie A. Foster, *The Women and the Warriors: The U.S. Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1946* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995); and Linda K. Schott, *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Before World War II* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).

[4]   Linda K. Schott argues that women's involvement in the peace movement, especially in WILPF, was rooted in the belief that women had a responsibility to work toward peace, as well as to protect and care for human life. They were therefore, purportedly, more sensitive to its loss through violence and war. Jane Addams, Schott claims, believed that when women opposed war and worked toward peace, they were also "opposing the wanton destruction of their life's work." Schott, 43.

suffrage movement."[5] In fact, the women took to the streets and organized a parade less than a month after the war began. Some 1,500 women in New York, dressed in mourning garb, marched in silence to protest the war with a banner featuring a dove and an olive branch – traditional symbols of peace. The parade, with its roots in feminism, demonstrated their stance on war and the ways in which the atrocities affected them, both emotionally and financially.[6] Also, it allowed them to advance their anti-war position from the private sphere to the public realm.

At the International Congress of Women at The Hague in 1915, prominent upper-class women publically gathered from around the world to share their thoughts on the First World War, seek ways to find permanent peace, and demonstrate the ways that women were integral to the international peace effort. The opening sentiments of the Congress described a feeling of sadness at the devastating loss of life. Dr. Aletta Jacobs, the President of the Dutch Executive Committee, addressed the Congress, saying,

> With mourning hearts we stand united here. We grieve for many brave young men who have lost their lives on the battlefield before attaining their full manhood; we mourn the poor mothers bereft of their sons; with the thousands of young widows and fatherless children, and we feel that we can no longer endure in this twentieth century of civilization that governments should tolerate brute force as the only solution to international disputes.[7]

Her speech on the first evening of the Congress demonstrated the reason it was vital these women organize and the ways that women became victims as much as the young men. The barbaric war caused the women distress, destroyed human life, and was not fit for a country that believed in civilization or religion. These sentiments were repeated throughout the existence of WILPF. With their role as mothers, women expressed their concern for men in wartime and explained why they had a different position than them.

While WILPF used motherhood as an argument for woman's involvement in peace movements, it additionally promoted itself as an organization working toward equality for women. Many of the early leaders of WILPF were suffragists or daughters of suffragists. Beneath its exterior as a pacifist organization, it was also a feminist organization. WILPF emerged from the feminist movement and many of its tactics originated there as well. Women

---

5   Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 56.
6   Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 57.
7   Emily Greene Balch, "Journey and Impressions," in Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, and Alice Hamilton, *Women at The Hague: The International Congress of Women and its Results* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 7.

such as Jane Addams and Carrie Chapman Catt had traveled widely for the international suffrage campaign.[8] Naturally, the same methods for seeking women's suffrage could be seen as working for the peace movement. These women took what they learned from their experience working toward the vote: organizational skills, international ties, and a constituency. WILPF's combination of feminist activism allowed easy access for other issues of importance to women, in this case war and peace. Catt wrote to the *New York Times* in 1915, stating, "When war murders the husbands and sons of women, destroys their homes, desolates their country and makes them refugees and paupers, it becomes the undeniable business of women."[9] Catt was making war a women's issue in order to gain suffrage and political equality with men.

During their three-day Congress, the women drafted a series of resolutions. These twenty resolutions identified the Congress' objectives for obtaining world peace and how women were important in procuring it. Demonstrating ties to women and the war, as well as the importance of including the feminine opinion, the first two resolutions read:

1. We women, in international congress assembled, protest against the madness and the horror of war, involving as it does a reckless sacrifice of human life and the destruction of so much that humanity has labored through centuries to build up.

2. This International Congress of Women opposes the assumption that women can be protected under the conditions of modern warfare. It protests vehemently against the odious wrongs of which women are the victims in time of war, and especially against the horrible violation of women which attends all war.[10]

The women who attended the Congress at The Hague came together to establish WILPF. They believed that peace could only come from, among other things, equal rights, and this included equality between men and women. In an era when the fight for equal rights and suffrage was intensifying, these reformers "pushed the envelope," using an international forum to actively

---

[8] Carrie Chapman Catt was not a member of WILPF. However, she was a peace activist and suffragist. As a member of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, she dedicated herself to working towards gaining the vote for woman. To Catt, suffrage was more important than pacifism until the right to vote had been earned. Once the Nineteenth Amendment passed, however, Catt turned her attention to the war and the fight for peace.

[9] Carrie Chapman Catt, in Letter to the *New York Times*, February 6, 1915, cited in Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 61.

[10] These are the two introductory resolutions on women and war established by the International Congress of Women at The Hague on May 1, 1915, less than a year after the outbreak of the First World War. This document incorporates all of the women's aims for the Congress, demonstrating their opinions on war, their actions for peace, and how to attain a permanent international peace. International Congress of Women, "Resolutions Adopted by the International Congress of Women at The Hague, May 1, 1915," *Women at the Hague*, Appendix 3, 72.

pursue equality; with it, they forged a new peace activism and established peace as a women's issue. In the United States, WILPF members drew upon their feminist and suffragist convictions to challenge war as a solution to international disputes, to rid the world of ammunitions, and to eliminate the use of chemical warfare. The U.S. activists, however, were met with hostility and deemed "un-American" and "socialist" by some of their friends, family, colleagues, and fellow citizens. In the midst of the Red Scare, the women of the United States Section of WILPF struggled to obtain their objectives, but nevertheless avidly pursued their end goals.[11]

Founding the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Women who joined the Women's Peace Party, which would later become the U.S. Section of WILPF, felt that women had a unique position on the European War and on peace efforts, particularly in their roles as wives and mothers. Rooted in Victorian ideology, women were seen as the kinder, gentler sex, more sensitive to these sorts of moral issues. Also, women had been "charged with the future of childhood and with the care of the helpless and unfortunate."[12] Preserving and producing the human race was women's work; war and its destruction of human life affected their sensibilities and their biological role as the "mother half" of the human race. Women were victims of war because it undermined their social responsibility, livelihoods, life's mission, and their work. The *1915 Report*, a newsletter of the International Congress of Women, featured a letter from the Abraham Lincoln Centre in Chicago's religion class to urge lawmakers to take a stance against war and protect women from becoming its casualties. It stated, "in the name of home and childhood, of motherhood and human advancement, we demand that the violation of women be condemned as the most uncivilized relic of barbarous warfare and unworthy of the soldier of any nation calling itself either civilized or Christian."[13] Jane Addams cited the unique role of motherhood for women's "peculiar revulsion" to war, as women who brought men into the world and raised them were horrified when the men were "cut down in war."[14] Women, then, rightfully challenged war and sought peace because they were repulsed by the loss of the sons they had borne.

The women at the Congress also drew upon their concurrent goal of enfranchisement and equality between the sexes and brought forth resolutions directly related to women at the 1915 Congress. Their resolutions advocated for women's involvement in nearly all respects, political and otherwise, and

---

[11] The Red Scare was a time in American history when heightened tensions and xenophobia caused America to withdraw from internationalism and instead become isolationist due to the perceived rising communist threat in Europe.

[12] Foster, 12.

[13] Harriet Hyman Alonso, "Introduction," *Women at The Hague,* xxiv.

[14] Alonso, "Introduction," *Women at The Hague,* xxx.

were the fundamental basis for their work towards disarmament and world peace. Some of these resolutions included the demands that government gain the consent of men and *women* in seizing territory, that women would be among men in framing the end of the war, that women should have a meeting at the same time and place for the peace settlement, and that women should be envoys to the governments of neutral and belligerent nations to seek permanent peace.[15] However, the most important of these resolutions explicitly demanded the enfranchisement of women. This resolution on enfranchisement, Resolution Nine, reads: "Since the combined influence of the women of all countries is one of the strongest forces for the prevention of war, and since women can only have full responsibility and effective influence when they have equal political rights with men, this International Congress of Women demands their political enfranchisement."[16] Gaining suffrage was nearly as important to WILPF as gaining permanent international peace.

The suffrage issue, however, was not without its own problems. When the United States entered World War I, reformers like WILPF members became upset and were angered by the moral and political effects the war would have on them; they had worked to advance their idea of peace, and, instead, President Woodrow Wilson led them into war. But women had not yet gained the right to vote. Some members were wary of isolating themselves from the suffrage movement, worrying that the backlash for "unpatriotic" peace work would diminish their gains toward the vote. This caused a split among the women. Carrie Chapman Catt, who was herself an activist for peace, turned her efforts towards the vote in war time, claiming, "we are working so hard to get the vote that we have no time to consider peace or war."[17] Others remained steadfast in their pacific beliefs, maintaining their conviction of peace on earth and good will toward humanity.

After the war ended in 1918, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom officially emerged; the Woman's Peace Party became the official United States section. Some divisions still existed between pacifists and suffragists, but with the passing of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, the mission of the organization shifted from suffrage to peace. During the interwar years, WILPF avidly worked for permanent peace. It started on a hopeful note. As their national chair, Anna Garlin Spencer, said,

> This group of women came together to protest in the name of
> Womanhood against the cruelty and waste of war, and to give
> united help toward translating the mother-instinct of life-saving

---

[15] International Congress of Women, "Resolutions," *Women at The Hague*, Appendix 3, 72-77.
[16] International Congress of Women, "Resolutions," Appendix 3, 74.
[17] Carrie Chapman Catt to Anna Garlin Spencer, Correspondence, February 17, 1917, cited in Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 75.

> into social terms of the common good…. The inner bond of a
> common devotion to securing permanent peace, and to make
> good women's share in that devotion has held firm all the while;
> and now the end of war allows us to become wholly reunited,
> not only in ultimate convictions, but in every-day service.[18]

In the immediate years after the armistice, WILPF began to make efforts to avoid another destructive world war. It challenged the public and government on the ways that war destroyed human life and women's lives, targeting chemical warfare and the arms race. It also worked towards total global disarmament as a way to reach permanent peace. However, its members found themselves criticized, demeaned, and ostracized in the midst of rampant xenophobia. The Red Scare, in particular, marred their efforts. Enemies of the WILPF suggested that peace was unpatriotic and a danger to the United States when Soviet Russia lurked so closely. Nevertheless, WILPF continued its efforts.

Shifting back to the wartime era in which WILPF was founded, upon their return from the 1915 Congress, members of the newly formed organization worked to alter public opinion regarding the war. They urged women to use their natural resistance to acknowledge the horrors young men faced at the fronts and upon returning from the fronts. Mostly, these women condemned the tactics used to fight the war, citing the harmful, disastrous, and monstrous effects of machinery and chemical warfare.

In condemning war, many of WILPF's key leaders went to the warring capitals in hopes of speaking with leaders to gain peace.[19] Jane Addams noted that all belligerent countries thought the war was in defense of their nation; whether it was Germany or France, the notion of self- and national defense was declared. On the contrary, Addams suggested that soldiers "considered the older men responsible for [the war], that enthusiasm for the war was not universal among the young men."[20] These young soldiers did not believe it was a just war in self-defense. As she travelled, Addams discussed the mental conflict of soldiers. The young men she encountered were torn between duty to their nation and their repulsion over the act of killing someone. For Addams, war was tragic, not only in its destruction, but in the Greek, dramatic sense of the word; she cited "the conflict between one good and another, between two kinds of

---

[18] "Statement Recommended by the Board of Officers of the Women's Peace Party to the Annual Meeting, November 3d [sic] and 4th, 1919," cited in Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 84.

[19] These women, including the WILPF President Jane Addams, Alice Hamilton, and others, traveled to warring nations such as England, Germany, France, Russia and Italy. They also travelled to "neutral" countries like Denmark and Switzerland to persuade their leaders to mediate a peace between nations. Addams recorded some of her experiences in "The Revolt against the War" and "Factors in Continuing the War," *Women at the Hague*, 27-46.

[20] Addams, "The Revolt against the War," *Women at The Hague*, 29.

good, so that the mind of the victim is torn as to which he ought to follow."[21] In demonstrating the moral and mental conflict of the soldier, Addams and the women of WILPF aimed to touch the heartstrings of the leaders and citizens who would read their published accounts. Stories of mothers suffering when their sons are shipped off to war touched women; stories of their sons' lives on the frontlines illuminated hidden horrors. One mother lamented, "it was hard to see my boy go because he did not believe in war; he did not belong to a generation that believes in war."[22] These accounts came from all over the world as leaders of WILPF travelled throughout Europe. But the efforts to obtain peace by talking with the rulers of belligerent nations failed. This, however, did not stop the women of WILPF in their pursuit of peace.

International WILPF Secretary Emily Greene Balch wrote that the time to make peace was upon them, but that the militarists and nations would not come to terms until the enemy had been absolutely defeated. The leaders of countries believed that negotiation was a sign of national weakness; they wanted peace on their own terms. Peace based on annexation, military advantage, and settled by outsiders could not be a lasting peace. Instead, Balch and WILPF believed in making concessions to form a lasting peace. The war was deadly to any nation carrying it on, she wrote.[23] The longer the Great War continued, the more unlikely permanent peace seemed. She warned of bankruptcy, industrial revolt, and humiliation if peace was not found. WILPF members advocated for compromise and concessions between belligerent nations. However, these efforts failed to accomplish much. Not until 1918 would the fighting come to an end; but the women did not stop trying. As Balch, Addams, and others travelled through Europe to meet with leaders, members in the United States pushed toward total disarmament.

Moving Toward Disarmament

As part of the resolutions of the International Congress, WILPF advocated for the general disarmament of all nations. As noted in Resolution Twelve,

> the International Congress of Women, advocating universal disarmament and realizing that it can only be secured by international agreement, urges, as a step to this end, that all countries should, by such an international agreement, take over the manufacture of arms and munitions of war and should control all international traffic in the same. It sees in the private profits accruing from the great armament factories a powerful hindrance to the abolition of war.[24]

---

[21] Addams, "The Revolt against the War," 30.
[22] Addams, "The Revolt against the War," *32*.
[23] Emily Balch, "The Time for Making Peace," *Women at The Hague*, 58.
[24] International Congress of Women, "Resolutions," *Women at The Hague*, Appendix 3, 75.

WILPF members recognized the private interests of men who make money from the sale of munitions and sought governments' help in controlling and regulating the sale of arms. This was the first necessary step towards peace.

The 1919 Treaty of Versailles limited Germany's production of arms, but not that of the Allied nations. After all, Germany was forced into accepting blame for the war, and thus, in the opinions of many of the time, deserved to be punished. But the women of WILPF thought the arms limitations did not go far enough. In 1921, they published the "Manifesto on Disarmament" after their third organizational meeting, calling attention to the arms race that had begun since the end of the war. This document publicized war expenditures at the beginning of the war and at the current time. In 1913-14, it reported, the United States had spent $316,000,000 on war; by 1920-21, that figure had risen to $911,000,000. WILPF could not believe that increasing war spending would maintain peace. The document noted President Warren Harding's warning that "the enormous disbursement of rivalries of armament manifestly constitutes a greater part of encumbrance upon enterprise and national prosperity, and avoidable or extravagant expense of this nature is not only without economic justification, but is a constant menace to the peace of the world rather than an assurance of its preservation."[25] WILPF invoked these numbers, arguing peace could not be maintained if there was a continuous arms race between nations.

But WILPF also acknowledged the various nations' anxieties about disarmament. Catherine A. Marshall, WILPF vice-president, wrote in a 1921 letter to International President Jane Addams, "in talking with members of Governments, I find that their minds always turn to the dangers and anxieties of disarming their own countries, rather than the safety and relief of having their neighbors disarmed…particularly in the cases of countries which have four or five armed neighbors on their frontiers and live in a state of perpetual fear."[26] WILPF wanted total international disarmament. In order to accomplish this, its leaders realized that these anxieties must be faced. Still, WILPF worked to convince citizens through its literature, bulletins, and publications that an arms

---

[25] Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, "Manifesto on Disarmament" 1921. Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Jane Addams Papers, Series 1 (Jane Addams Papers Microfilm, reel 14, #243-244, #125), in Anissa Harper LoCasto and Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Pacifism vs. Patriotism in Women's Organizations in the 1920s: How Was the Debate Shaped by the Expansion of the American Military?* (Binghamton: State University of New York Press, 1998), on the site Kathryn Kish Sklar and Thomas Dublin, eds., *Women and Social Movements in the United States, 1600-2000*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000678 562 [Accessed October 16, 2011]. Hereafter, the Swarthmore College Peace Collection will be abbreviated as SCPC, the Jane Addams Papers as JAP, and sources from *Women and Social Movements, 1600-2000* as *WASM.*

[26] Catherine E. Marshall to Jane Addams, 5 October 1921, SCPC, JAP, Series 1 (JAP Microfilm, reel 14, #243-244, #125), *Pacifism vs. Patriotism*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000682 137 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

race would only make matters worse; if nations continued to increase the sizes of their navies and armies, permanent peace could not be had.

At this same time, the 1921-22 Washington Conference urged a limitation on armaments, which resulted in the five largest nations agreeing to a treaty. These nations included the United States, Britain, Japan, France, and Italy.[27] In 1923, Senator William Borah (R-ID) proposed a resolution in Congress that would outlaw war, while women of WILPF testified to the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations about the funding of the United States Army. Harriet Connor Brown spoke on behalf of WILPF, and expressed disdain for the "immense sum of money" appropriated to the army when funding was needed for "agriculture and commerce and education and public welfare and the things that mean so much to us women."[28] Some $2.5 billion dollars had been appropriated to build 71 ships, 25 cruisers, 32 submarines, 9 destroyers, and 5 airplane carriers. WILPF was "appalled" at the bill, realizing that the armaments industry would profit from this. The members of WILPF sought to lobby against this bill; however, these attempts failed miserably.[29] No one in Congress saw Borah's resolution as a feasible option, and Borah himself failed to push the issue. By 1927, no progress had been made to outlaw war or toward disarmament. The great powers came together at the League of Nations and the Washington Naval Conference, but made little progress.[30]

Not all women believed in limiting America's armaments. The Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) quickly attacked WILPF's disarmament efforts. Like many people, the DAR felt that disarmament would make the nation weaker in the eyes of other nations. The only way to keep America safe, in its view, was to continue to build up a strong army and navy. The DAR wrote to Jane Addams in July 1924 expressing its concerns, as follows:

> We are absolutely opposed to the disarmament of the United States until such time as all class A nations will disarm. We are fully aware of the insidious forces now at work within our borders attempting to undermine our Government; therefore,

---

[27] According to the Washington Naval Treaty, also referred to as the Five Powers Treaty, the number of naval arms was limited by tonnage. Foster, 46.

[28] "Statements by Members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom on Reduction of the Army," in *War Department Appropriation Bill, 1923: Extract from Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, United States Senate* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922). The Records of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. Section, 1919-1959, SCPC (Microfilm, reel 33, #662-663), by Harriet Connor Brown, in Allison Sobek, *How Did the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Campaign Against Chemical Warfare, 1915-1930?* (Binghamton, NY: State University of New York at Binghamton, 2001), at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000676193 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

[29] Foster, 80.

[30] Foster, 77.

> regardless of the possibility of attack from other nations, we
> believe that this condition necessitates an adequate national
> defense. We are therefore in favor of doing all possible to
> further complete understanding and cooperation between all
> nations of the world, that the causes of war may be eliminated.[31]

Emily Greene Balch responded to the DAR's accusations and falsehoods, writing that there is "an honest difference of opinion between pacifists and militarists" on national defense, but that "preparedness does more to create ill-will and distrust than it can do to protect against the dangers of war."[32] But Balch's attempts to calm the attacks on the peace organization failed. The DAR continued to attack WILPF and other peace organizations, failing to note the differences between the moderate ones (like WILPF) and more radical organizations. In fact, the DAR launched its own national defense campaign, which encouraged the "right kind of peace" and called on women to discuss their place in militarism.[33]

WILPF's pursuit of disarmament came on the heels of the appointment of Secretary of War John Weeks in the War Department. Weeks began a public campaign to increase the visibility of the army to demonstrate its importance to the nation. The peace movement and organizations like WILPF were scrutinized by Weeks and the War Department; Weeks called them "silly pacifists" and claimed they had "insidious propaganda" that hurt national defense policies.[34] In 1923, WILPF was singled out as a target of the War Department. Brigadier General Amos Fries, of the Chemical Warfare Service (CWS), led the charge.[35]

Challenging Chemical Warfare

In World War I, Germany successfully used chemical poison gas for the first time at Ypres on April 21, 1915. With its greenish-yellow cloud, it killed

---

[31] Daughters of the American Revolution to Jane Addams, ca. July 1924, JAP, Correspondence, SCPC (JAP Microfilm, reel 16, #958) in *Pacifism vs. Patriotism*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000677 593 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

[32] Emily Greene Balch to the Kaskia Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 10 July 1924, JAP, Correspondence, SCPC (JAP Microfilm, reel 16, #956-957), *Pacifism vs. Patriotism*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000688 367 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

[33] Grace H. Brosseau, "Opening Speech to the Third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, January 1-3, 1928," reprinted by Elisabeth Ellicott Poe, "Patriotic Women Take Stand for Adequate National Defense," *DAR Magazine* (March 1928), 145-150, *Pacifism vs. Patriotism*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000690 620 [Accessed October 16, 2011].

[34] Foster, 47.

[35] Foster, 48.

5,000 men and injured twice that many.[36] According to an article in the *New York Tribune* on April 27, 1915, the Germans even used poison explosives to defeat their enemies.[37] Chemical warfare, however, had been made illegal by the signing of The Hague Convention of 1899, where Germany had agreed not to use asphyxiating gases in war. In 1918, the CWS was formed in the United States, headed by Amos Fries, who throughout the 1920s advocated the use of this new, powerful warfare. Fries wrote,

> Additionally, Chemical Warfare is an agency that must not only be reckoned with by every civilized nation in the future, but is one which civilized nations should not hesitate to use. When properly safe-guarded with masks and other safety devices, it gives to the most scientific and most ingenious people a great advantage over the less scientific and less ingenious. Then why should the United States or any other highly civilized country consider giving up chemical warfare?[38]

After the war, Congress appropriated $40 million to establish a chemical weapons arsenal and industry.[39] Naturally, the members of WILPF challenged this growing military endeavor.

At the 1921-22 Washington Naval Conference, WILPF issued a "special condemnation of Chemical Warfare, in the belief that to so publicize its peculiar horrors might arouse opinion against all war."[40] The United States Section was aware of the public opinion on chemical warfare that had proliferated toward the end of the war, despite the military's and Amos Fries' attempts to promote it. Historian Allison Sobek suggests that WILPF used this abhorrence of chemical warfare to "enlist support for disarmament."[41] In her testimony to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, both in 1921 and 1922, Harriet Connor Brown stated, "we are dead against that item of $500,000 for chemical warfare. In fact, I do not see how any Member of the Senate can

---

36   Allison Sobek, "Introduction," *How Did the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Campaign Against Chemical Warfare, 1915-1930?*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000682 890 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

37   Will Irwin, "Germans Use Blinding Gas to Aid Poison Fumes," *New York Tribune* (27 April 1915), 1, *How Did the Women's International League…?*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000684 54 [Accessed November 13, 2011].

38   Amos A. Fries and Clarence J. West, "The Future of Chemical Warfare," *Chemical Warfare* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1921), 435-39, *How Did the Women's International League...?*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000673 849 [Accessed November 13, 2011].

39   Sobek, "Introduction," *How Did the Women's International League…?*

40   Bussey and Tims, 47-48.

41   Sobek, "Introduction," *How Did the Women's International League …?*

defend that item, any Member of the Senate who voted for that treaty which condemned asphyxiating gases."[42] In 1921, she testified,

> Especially one thing we wish to cut out entirely, the Chemical Warfare Service. We do not want one cent given to that service. We women will not willingly endure for one minute a service which aims to perfect poison gases and poison germs destructive of innocent noncombatants, as well as fighting armies. The second thing is for you to use your influence to secure an international conference on disarmament here in Washington this spring.[43]

Mr. Hull, the senator with whom she was speaking, doubted her knowledge of the Chemical Warfare Service, believing her to be ignorant of what it actually did. The members of WILPF actively sought to abolish the Chemical Warfare Service, and this included educating themselves on the practices. Despite having public opinion on their side, their efforts in the 1920s once again failed.

Dorothy Detzer, executive secretary of WILPF from 1922 to 1946, even attempted to persuade the National Chemical Society to abandon the development of "inhuman methods of warfare," urging it to think of humanity "for whom a new war with the modern scientific arms would mean complete annihilation."[44] For the sake of humanity, WILPF believed wholeheartedly that just as total disarmament was possible with international cooperation, poison gas could also be outlawed. Without removing a horrific chemical weapon, more and more men, women, and children would become inadvertent casualties if another war broke out. WILPF suggested that failing to outlaw poison gas would be in favor of wars, a "moral disaster," and a "heavy blow to the peace movement throughout the world."[45]

---

[42] "Statements by Members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom on Reduction of the Army"

[43] "Statement of Mrs. Harriet Connor Brown, Representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom," in *World Disarmament: Extract from Hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, January 11, 1921* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921). The Records of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. Section, 1919-1959, SCPC (Microfilm, reel 33, #649-57), *How Did the Women's International League …?*, at *WASM*:
http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000671881 [Accessed November 13, 2011].

[44] Dorothy Detzer to Charles Parsons, 19 March 1925, The Records of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. Section, 1919-1959, SCPC (Microfilm, reel 47, #78), *How Did the Women's International League…?*, at *WASM*:
http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000681903 [Accessed November 13, 2011].

[45] *Can We Outlaw Poison Gas?* (Washington, D.C.: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1927). The Records of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. Section, 1919-1959, SCPC (Microfilm, reel 33, #281-284), *How Did the Women's International*

"What hope then is there?" WILPF wrote in 1927. In response, it proposed a treaty to prohibit the use of poison gases in war, citing the Washington Conference and treaty ratified in March 1922. WILPF even implored Germany, Austria, and Hungary not to use poison gas or import and manufacture it. Challenging the notion that chemical warfare might be used in self-defense, WILPF stated that gas is only needed for wars of aggression; thus, "the United States would lose nothing so far as the power of self-defense."[46] These women, knowledgeable of public opinion, tried to sway citizens and lawmakers alike to outlaw poison gas. When *Can We Outlaw Poison Gas?* was written in 1927, the treaty signed at Geneva in 1925 to outlaw poison gas was before the Senate for ratification. This literature aimed to push the senators closer to ratifying the proposal and outlawing poison gas for good.

Damaging Red Scare Accusations

The senators, however, were not as swayed by WILPF's attempts to outlaw war, poison gas, and chemical weapons. Some of their hesitance may have stemmed from allegations against WILPF as a socialist organization. During the 1920s, when America withdrew from internationalism, a rising xenophobic fear of socialism and communism proliferated through the country and elevated tensions. WILPF members became caught in the frenzy of government suppression of anti-war speech and citizens' civil liberties. In the time known as the Red Scare, WILPF struggled to spread its message amid the hostilities.

Ardent believers in nonviolence, WILPF never used violence to advance their positions. But that did not stop conservative patriots from vilifying, condemning, and ostracizing women involved in the organization – so much so that some women left it.[47] WILPF came to be seen as a socialist organization, unpatriotic and corrupt. This was exacerbated by Jane Addams' attempts to suggest that the 1917 Russian Revolution, the first successful communist revolution, represented the soldier's "instinct" to till the soil rather than continue war.[48] Patriotic Americans viewed pacifists in a negative light, having been persuaded that pacifism was "subversive, un-American, and allied with Russian Bolshevism."[49] In 1919, Archibald Stevenson, a New York lawyer employed by the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, produced before the Senate a list of 62 names of people he deemed to be

---

League…?, at *WASM*:
http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000679974 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

[46] *Can We Outlaw Poison Gas?*
[47] Foster, 24.
[48] Foster, 27.
[49] Foster, 36.

"dangerous, destructive, and anarchistic."[50] Jane Addams and Emily Green Balch appeared on this list; peace activism was purportedly their subversive attempt to spread their socialist views. These attacks continued well into the 1920s and inhibited WILPF's attempts to find permanent peace.

The attacks on WILPF during the Red Scare were more numerous than for other organizations. Membership in WILPF meant nearly complete ridicule in society, although Harriet Alonso notes that all feminist peace activists dealt with the Red Scare on some level.[51] The War Department, however, placed WILPF under ruthless surveillance. Its Washington office, directly across the street from the War Department, was a regular target for raids and break-ins. Files were disrupted and stolen, ink was thrown on documents, and confusion spread throughout the office.[52] In 1923, R.M. Whitney, the author of a pamphlet critical of WILPF, deemed it "probably the most subversive, certainly the most insidiously and clevery [sic] camouflaged thoroughly anti-American and un-American" organization.[53] But these attacks were not viewed as significantly damaging as the infamous "Spider Web Chart" that appeared in Henry Ford's newspaper, *The Dearborn Independent*, in 1924.

The Spider Web Chart originated with the Chemical Warfare Bureau of the War Department. This document linked numerous women's organizations and their members to communist and socialist doctrines, garnering lots of negative attention from those who read it. Carrie Chapman Catt reportedly expressed her "outrage" in numerous articles in *The Woman Citizen*, defending the accused and exposing the origins of the chart.[54] While John W. Weeks of the War Department sent his apologies for the leaking of the Spider Web Chart, the damage had been done. The Daughters of the American Revolution took up the argument, deeming WILPF "guilty until proven innocent."[55]

Despite its efforts to dispel the rumors, WILPF struggled to overcome the damage. Over the next couple of years, women's "patriotic" societies, notably the DAR, took up the offensive against WILPF. Carrie A. Foster notes that in the early months of 1927, the DAR successfully disseminated two "colorfully written pamphlets." These pamphlets were "The Common Enemy" and a

---

[50] Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 83.

[51] Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 106.

[52] Alonso notes that this was a common occurrence on weekends when the War Department would raid the office. However, she does not mention what, if anything, happened because of these raids.

[53] Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 110.

[54] Kathryn Kish Sklar and Helen Baker, "Introduction," *How Did Women Peace Activists Respond to 'Red Scare' Attacks during the 1920s?* (Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton, 1998), at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000684 832 [Accessed September 23, 2011]. These authors also note that the public did not know at the time the extent to which the government was involved.

[55] Foster, 49.

reprint of thirty-six pages of the Congressional Record in July 1926.[56] These pamphlets continued to attack WILPF and other American organizations for alleged Bolshevism and communist doctrines, practices, and policies.

While WILPF as a whole was targeted as a socialist organization, its leaders faced a more personal attack. Wellesley College economist Emily Greene Balch lost her faculty position after 1918. Despite several appeals, the Board of Trustees, upset over Balch's affiliation and admission of her socialist ideology, refused to reappoint her.[57] Her personal career took a disastrous blow. At the age of fifty-two, Balch was unemployed. The Board's concerns were not entirely unfounded. In 1906, Balch had publically admitted to being a socialist when she accepted reappointment at Wellesley.[58] Twelve years later, Balch attempted to counter the attacks against her, claiming that she could not be tied to Communist Russia. Communism was deeply rooted in military rhetoric and sanctioned violent revolution, two concepts Balch disagreed with as a peace activist; it was "moonshine" she said about her connections to Soviet Russia.[59]

At the same time, these organizations targeted Jane Addams for her "socialist" reform efforts. Conservatives particularly disliked her for her attempts at reform, and her work with WILPF earned her the labels "slacker" and "traitor." In an undated (although presumably 1927) "dossier," the DAR wrote a virtual who's who of communism and socialism. The "DAR Dossier on Jane Addams" connects the aged reformer with every known or suspected "Red" of the era, including the "Workers (Communist) Party," the National Child Labor Committee, the Student's Anti-Military League, the "notorious" American Civil Liberties Union, the Public Ownership League of America, the National Council for the Prevention of War, the National Peace Federation, and WILPF.[60] According to the DAR, Addams was guilty by association. Not only did the document fail to give substantial facts that Addams was a socialist, but it also claimed that she willingly subverted American security by her support for disarmament.

Carrie Chapman Catt, who was not as vilified by the DAR as her contemporaries, ardently defended Jane Addams. Even though Catt believed WILPF to be more radical than other pacifist organizations, she wrote letters

---

[56] Foster, 116.

[57] Harriet Hyman Alonso, "Nobel Peace Laureates, Jane Addams and Emily Greene Balch: Two Women of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom," *Journal of Women's History* 7, no. 2 (1995): 14.

[58] Alonso, "Nobel Peace Laureates," 8.

[59] Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue,* 112.

[60] Daughters of the American Revolution, "Dossier on Jane Addams," SCPC, JAP, Series 1 (JAP Microfilm, reel 18, #1307-1315, #1317-1318), *Pacifism vs. Patriotism*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000680770 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

to newspapers, the DAR, and other sources pointing out the DAR's lies and untruths. In 1927, she wrote it was "truly shocking to note how untrue, how misleading, how contemptible are the charges made against this body. Call it radical if you wish, but cease charging it with conduct little short of treason."[61] In a 1927 letter published in *Woman Patriot*, Catt challenged the DAR on its publication "The Common Enemy," which called various groups "dupes" of the world revolutionary movement; one of these groups was WILPF. Catt, who was not a member of WILPF at this time, noted the following five charges against it:

> organizational operation in a world revolutionary movement; or its members are dupes of the world revolutionary movement; a factor in a movement to destroy civilization and Christianity; aiming at…Communist objectives; aiming to destroy the government of the United States.

Catt also challenged the innuendos against Jane Addams as a Bolshevik seeking to destroy civilization.[62]

Catt tried to reveal the truth that the DAR withheld: "Miss Addams is not a Bolshevik. She is not a Communist. She is not a Revolutionist. She is not a red. She is not even a Socialist. She is not favorable to the six aims of the Communists, or any one of them."[63] Catt even attempted to use President Coolidge's praise and faith in Addams to dispel the rumors, quoting from his letter: "her work at Hull House during the last twenty-five years of benevolence and charity has been a great contribution to the public welfare."[64] However, Catt's efforts to clear Addams' name were thwarted when the next year the DAR continued to blacklist her and eighty-six other women for their socialist ties. Jane Addams was the only name without an explanation, Foster writes, because of her apparently obvious qualifications.[65] In addition, the DAR blacklisted Emily Greene Balch, Dorothy Detzer, Alice Hamilton, Hannah Clothier Hull, Lucia Mead Ames, Anna Garlin Spencer, and even prominent women reformers like Carrie Chapman Catt and Margaret Sanger of

---

[61] Catt to DAR, 1927, cited in Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 112.
[62] Carrie Chapman Catt, "An Open Letter to the DAR," *The Woman Citizen* (July 1927), 10-12, 41-42, *Pacifism vs. Patriotism*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000670 868 [Accessed September 23, 2011].
[63] Catt, "An Open Letter to the DAR"
[64] Catt, "An Open Letter to the DAR"
[65] Foster, 118.

the Birth Control Movement.[66] The Daughters of the American Revolution had an agenda and would not be deterred. The attacks would continue into the early 1930s, and grow fainter only as the Second World War hovered ominously over the heads of the pacifists and "patriots" alike.

Conclusion

As the 1920s came to a close, peace organizations started to become less successful – even more so into the early 1930s. The last major victory for the peace activists came in 1928 with the Kellogg-Briand Pact.[67] A year earlier, French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand suggested that France and the United States sign a treaty renouncing war. Public opinion, with the help of WILPF, forced the government to consider the offer. The first of its two major clauses renounced war as an instrument of policy and pledged that disputes should be settled by pacific means. In the summer of 1928, WILPF members campaigned to make the Kellogg-Briand Pact a reality, pressuring the public and government for a World Disarmament Conference and thrusting the organization into the 1930s.[68]

However, historians note that the Kellogg-Briand Pact failed to mention two serious causes of war: defense and aggression. In addition, the Pact has been seen as a morally binding agreement rather than a legally binding one. Alonso mentions that there were no provisions for peace talks in case a nation defended itself against invasion, and some organizations thought it was useless unless governments outlawed war in their legislatures.[69] Nevertheless, WILPF and other pacifist organizations believed the Pact to be an impetus for change and the beginning of total world disarmament. However, the hope and spirit brought about by the signing of the Kellogg-Briand Pact came to an abrupt end as Europe and America teetered on the edge of World War II, and the mood of the 1930s shifted toward militarism and fascism. The war itself brought heartbreak to pacifists who had struggled throughout the interwar period to find permanent world peace. Still, Alonso notes that it also elicited a "renewed commitment" to peace activism in WILPF and other organizations that would continue until the present day.[70]

From 1915 on, a generation of middle- and upper-class white women came together to protest the loss of life and sheer destruction of the "war to

---

[66] DAR, "Doubtful Speakers," 1927. The Records of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. Section. SCPC (Scholarly Resources Microfilm, reel 42, #824-828), *How Did Women Peace Activists Respond…?*, at *WASM*: http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.proxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.object.details.aspx?dorpid=1000677 040 [Accessed September 23, 2011].

[67] Bussey and Tims, 83.

[68] The Kellogg-Briand Pact for the Renunciation of War was signed in Paris on August 27, 1928 by 15 nations. All other nations were invited to sign the agreement at that time as well.

[69] Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 117.

[70] Alonso, *Peace as a Women's Issue*, 124.

end all wars." Fearing for the lives of husbands, brothers, and sons, these women urged the complete, total abandonment of warfare. As women, the pacifists sought to use their political voice, at a time when that voice was contested, to protect their families, their livelihoods, and their country. WILPF brought together women who shared the pain and suffering caused by the war and used their feminine sentiments to advocate for the end of all warfare. The unique appeal of WILPF as a women's organization with suffragist roots drew members aiming to reform the country and gain stature as female citizens. While this article has focused on the late 1910s and 1920s, the organization remains active today. After World War II, renewed efforts were made toward disarmament and total peace. The Cold War era drew interest from younger women. In addition, the rise of second wave feminism provided WILPF with even more active members, combating feminist concerns such as violence against women, economic degradation, political and legal discrimination, and other issues. While WILPF's efforts toward complete disarmament and the outlawing of war in the interwar period were failures, the hope and efforts continue.

An organization that proselytizes peace on earth and good will towards humanity, WILPF remains true to its goals today. With recent news of chemical weapons attacks in Syria, WILPF continues to vehemently denounce the use of these weapons and military intervention. Instead, it advocates international peace through diplomatic and pacific means. In a recent statement found on its international website, WILPF asserts its early attempts for peace from the "first reports" of the usage of chemical weapons, stating that their recent use "is a serious violation of international law." The organization hopes this chemical weapons crisis "shall not be used as a pretext for military intervention. Other options are available and must be pursued." Still ardent enthusiasts for international peace and disarmament, WILPF's recent statement suggests other options, including United Nations inspections and a Security Council resolution for the handover of any weapons of mass destruction, referral to the Office of the Prosecutor at the International Criminal Court,[71] and peace talks.[72] Once again, WILPF is calling for peace rather than military solutions. Perhaps at last WILPF's feminist, pacifist efforts – nearly one hundred years in the making – will lead toward total disarmament and the abolition of chemical weapons to prevent tragedies like those of World War I, Syria, and countless others from happening in the future.

---

[71] The ICC is the first permanent, treaty-based international criminal court and was created in July 1998. See http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4b87da3c6.html [Accessed October 3, 2013]

[72] WILPF International, "Syria, Chemical Weapons, and Avoiding Military Intervention," Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, http://www.wilpfinternational.org/syria-chemical-weapons-and-avoiding-military-intervention/ [Accessed October 3, 2013].

Russian Perspectives on Cuba during the Khrushchev Years
in Thought and Writing

By William E. O'Farrell

This research project started with a question: why did the Soviet Union under Khrushchev help the Cuban people and their leaders? It is a subtle difference from the question most often addressed about the events that surrounded Cuba, the Soviet Union, and the United States about the time period from 1959 to 1964. The normative question is: why did the Cuban Missile Crisis happen? Admittedly, it is a reasonable hyper-focus on a dramatic event in human history, but it leaves a valuable part of the narrative missing. The Soviet leadership did not help the Cubans solely for exploitive purposes, and nor were the Cubans its puppet state. The Soviet Union's leaders helped the Cubans because they saw them as like them and viewed the Cuban struggle as a microcosm for their struggle: a communist society attempting to survive in a world controlled ever increasingly by capitalism and its markets. The Soviet Union's involvement was not singularly focused on an attempt to strengthen its position in the world or to force the United States into concessions in Berlin or elsewhere in the world. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union's relationship with and views on Cuba cannot be studied in a vacuum. Thus, the United States and the Cold War in general must be observed for context.

In 1959, the Cuban people were victorious in a popular uprising against their government, and secured autonomy from the Batista regime and its allies in the American State Department. Almost immediately there was a wave of changes in Cuba that resembled socialist reforms. These reforms drew the ire of Washington D.C. and they began a wave of escalations with Washington that resulted in an embargo of Cuba by the United States. The Cubans needed resources, especially oil and corn. Moreover, they needed people to buy their chief export, sugar, which the United States was no longer importing from Cuba. The Soviet Union was a willing trade partner to replace the United States and an alliance of convenience was brought about for the Cubans.

What about the Soviet Union? What did it stand to gain by helping such a small country so far from Europe and Asia? If the Soviet leadership's goal was to simply use Cuba as a base for its military and missiles, as a pawn in its global chess game with the United States, why did it not simply do only that? Why buy its sugar and help its people? Why the flattery of the Cubans and the high praise of them in the Soviet press, even before they declared themselves communists?

Historians of the United States and the Soviet Union usually communicate about the subject from the climactic events of October 1962, when the world held its breath and hinged on the edge of a nuclear cataclysm. Historians of Cuba address Cuba's relations with the Soviet Union extensively, but little can be seen about the Soviet Union's reasoning and motivations. Nevertheless, the

Cuban historian's perspective offers valuable insight into the perception of the Soviet Union from a divergent historical standpoint.

American and Soviet historians have written extensively about the Soviet Union's involvement in the Caribbean during the early parts of the 1960s. However, they more or less tend to view this through the lens of the Cuban Missile Crisis, or the Caribbean Crisis as Khrushchev referred to it (as shall this article).[1] As such, the historiography of the Soviet people's and government's perceptions of Cuba is rather thin and lacks extensive scholarship. Regardless, a great deal stands to be learned from historians about why the Soviet regime was helping the Cubans in the Khrushchev era.

The works of Martin McCauley and William Taubman illuminate the Khrushchev years in general. McCauley's book, *The Khrushchev Era: 1953-1964*, is largely a work that explains politics during the Khrushchev years and immediately before Khrushchev's ascension to power. McCauley provides an excellent overview of the political environment of Moscow during the Khrushchev years, and presents a possible agenda for the Soviet leadership. Specific to Cuba, he makes note that the Russians felt as though they were riding "on top of the world."[2] Additionally, McCauley provides a brief interpretation of the events surrounding Khrushchev's rationalizations for entering into the Cuban Missile Crisis and his reservations about revolutionary Cuba's chances for survival so close to the United States. Missing from McCauley's work, though, is a view of the ideological and social motivations for assisting Cuba.

William Taubman explores the entire life of Khrushchev and his role as leader of the Soviet Union. His biography of Khrushchev, like McCauley's book, notes that Khrushchev was a failure, but a remarkable one. Taubman describes a country that was grateful to Khrushchev for exposing Stalin, but that was also ashamed that such a man was in charge of Russia.[3] However, Taubman does make note of Khrushchev's, and other high ranking Soviet officials', sincere admiration for Cuba, its people, and Fidel Castro. Taubman describes briefly a Soviet Union that was in love with the Cuban Revolution and the hopes it held for Latin America as a whole. Furthermore, for the Soviet Union and Cuba, relations between these two countries were mutually warm and respectful leading up to the events of October 1962. Taubman also explores how Khrushchev set about making the decision to aid Cuba, and the process by which Khrushchev convinced himself of this course of action, by referencing multiple meeting minutes of the Soviet leadership. In effect,

---

[1] Nikita Khrushchev, *Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, Volume 3: Statesman, 1953-1964,* ed. Sergei Khrushchev, trans. George Shriver (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), 315.

[2] Martin McCauley, *The Khrushchev Era 1953-1964* (New York: Longman Publishing, 1995), 69.

[3] William Taubman, *Khrushchev: The Man and His Era* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2003), xi–xii.

Taubman attempts to explain the reasoning for aid to Cuba beyond simple political advantage over the United States.[4] Admittedly however, the decision to put missiles in Cuba had as much to do with the United States as it did with Cuba. Furthermore, Taubman did not explore Soviet public reactions.

Jonathan Haslam, in his book *Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall*, takes the more traditional route of explaining Cuba from the Soviet perspective almost entirely based on the advantages military involvement would bring the Soviet Union.[5] Haslam does offer more on the overall progression of the Cold War from Russia's perspective. However, he thoroughly criticizes the Soviet Union for its involvement in Cuba on the international stage, making a case that it was a mistake to apply pressure in Cuba against the United States. While he is arguing against the effectiveness of the Soviet Union's military operations in the area, and the wisdom behind them, he does not explore the deeper context of the Soviet-Cuban relationship.

Philip Brenner and James G. Blight are historians of Cuba. Their collaborative work, *Sad and Luminous Days: Cuba's Struggle with the Superpowers after the Missile Crisis,* is an in-depth look at the effects of the Caribbean Crisis on the country of Cuba. The book draws its title from Che Guevara's words when he spoke about the crisis. While the rest of the world viewed what happened in the Caribbean as a harrowing, sobering experience (one where recent research has shown the world really did hang by a thread, and the leaders of the three countries involved all knew that), why would Che Guevara have noted the end of the crisis as sad and luminous days?[6] This is the essential question the book asked. In a secret speech Castro gave in 1968, dealing largely with the Caribbean Crisis, Castro stated that the Cuban people could not trust the Soviet Union because of its actions in 1962. Despite a common view held by political scientists at the time, Cuba was not in fact a pawn of the Soviet leadership's will. Castro's secret speech made this rather clear. The authors make the point that the days were sad for Cuba because the deal between the United States and the Soviet Union had left it vulnerable and betrayed by its allies. The days were luminous because the Cubans were ready to fight arm-and-arm with Soviet supporters and die to the last man on the cause of standing for principle. The work is relevant to how the Soviet side viewed the Cuban one and how Cubans reacted to both superpowers in the aftermath. By looking at the Cuban perspective it offers a mirror to the Soviet perspective portrayed by Khrushchev in his memoirs, and the official Soviet line in Soviet newspapers.

---

[4] Taubman, 534.
[5] Jonathan Haslam, *Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).
[6] James G. Blight and Philip Brenner, *Sad and Luminous Days: Cuba's Struggle with the Superpowers after the Missile Crisis* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2002), xvi.

Additionally, Louis Perez has studied the Cuban historical standpoint and provides much of the background for the situation in Cuba that was being relayed to the Soviet Union. His work, *Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution,* addresses internal and external concerns within Cuba, the troubled history between Cuba and the United States, and the impact of the Soviet Union.[7] The last of these provides critical information for understanding what was guiding the Soviet leadership's decision-making.

Cuba and Khrushchev

Nikita Khrushchev was the central figure in the Soviet Union's support of Cuba. Khrushchev was reluctant to aid Cuba in 1959 when Havana was taken by Che Guevara and Castro. However, within a year, large trade and relief efforts were started by the Soviet Union under the direction of Nikita Khrushchev, and these agreements included Warsaw Pact weapons. An island in the Caribbean appears to have been an ever-growing concern for Khrushchev as time went on. The more facts about Cuba that were returned to Khrushchev in the Soviet Union, the more his interest grew. Castro and Khrushchev appeared to genuinely like one another at their first meeting in New York in 1960 during a United Nations summit.[8] Indeed, much of the Soviet Union's relationship with Cuba would appear to have started at the very top with Nikita Khrushchev's interest.

To understand why the Soviet Union was providing aid to Cuban requires an understanding of Khrushchev's motivations. Khrushchev may have had several different motivations, for example, geopolitical pressure in Berlin and the growing global military imbalances that clearly favored the United States. In Khrushchev's mind, it is even possible that Cuba was seen as a means to address multiple problems all at once.[9] However, did Berlin and the balance of power (discussion of which often focuses only on the Caribbean Crisis in October 1962) have anything to do with the initial decision to become involved in Cuba officially in 1960? Yes, both were involved from the beginning, long before any plots to put missiles in Cuba, but Berlin and the balance of power were not the primary driving forces behind the bold and sometimes rash Khrushchev. Importantly, it was Khrushchev's interest in protecting Cuba and Castro from the increasing number of incidents that involved American aggression that initiated his willingness to enter the Caribbean. However, the complete answer lies more in Soviet, and Khrushchev's, self-identification with Cubans.

---

[7] Louis A. Perez, *Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution, 4th ed.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[8] Bettman, "Fidel Castro Hugging Nikita Khrushchev," photograph, 1960. See CorbisImages.com, http://www.corbisimages.com/stock-photo/rights-managed/BE024391/fidel-castro-hugging-nikita-khrushchev [Accessed February 20, 2013].

[9] Taubman, 532.

Historians of the Cold War all acknowledge that Berlin had a role in the Soviet Union's involvement with Cuba, and they only vary in their judgments of how large that role was. The NATO[10] powers and the Soviet Union had failed multiple times to resolve the question of German reunification. Indeed, in 1956 there was still no formalized peace treaty that officially ended the Second World War. West Germany had joined NATO in 1956 and was pursuing rearmament. In addition, West Germany was looking to procure nuclear weapons of its own. Khrushchev had no intention of allowing East Germany to go to the Western powers as well, but the question remained about West Berlin. Berlin was situated deep in East German territory, and the city, like the nation, was divided in half. Leading up to 1960, there were multiple disputes over Berlin between NATO and the Soviet Union, and all of them resulted in stalemates.

The Soviet Union had already signed over effective control of East Berlin and East Germany to direct GDR[11] authority and formally recognized the country in 1955. However, to Khrushchev this still meant there was an armed camp, an "unhealthy tumor" (West Berlin), in the middle of a sovereign socialist country. Additionally, Khrushchev was convinced (correctly) that the issue of Berlin had the possibility to erupt into a direct confrontation with NATO.[12] Kennedy and Khrushchev both agreed that for the time being, the "status quo" was acceptable.[13] That status quo was locked in for decades after Khrushchev's decision to erect the Berlin Wall in 1961.[14]

Concerning Berlin, it is possible that the decision to build the Berlin Wall had effectively put the matter of Berlin on hold for the Soviet Union. Oleg Troyanovsky, a foreign policy advisor to both Stalin and Khrushchev, recalled that the matter of Berlin was closed for the Soviet Union when the wall went up. Troyanovsky claimed that while there was continued saber rattling and drum beating over Berlin, it was all for show, and that the decision to help Cuba was certainly not involved with Berlin. More so, he claims, the movement of missiles to Cuba also had nothing to do with Berlin.[15] There is evidence to support Troyanovsky's claim. Firstly, Khrushchev had withdrawn his ultimatum (that the Western powers effectively withdraw from Berlin) from the Vienna conference on October 17, 1961. Secondly, in January 1962, U.S. negotiators were taken aback by the lack of urgency of their Soviet counterparts. The Soviet negotiators seemingly had no interest in moving the talks forward, but rather just repeating the same demands that Berlin be released. Troyanovsky concluded by recalling a post-Caribbean Crisis incident

---

[10] This is the acronym for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
[11] This is the acronym for the German Democratic Republic, or East Germany.
[12] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 320.
[13] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 319.
[14] Haslam, 189.
[15] Taubman, 539.

in which Khrushchev became angry at the idea of enflaming the situation with the Americans again when an advisor suggested a blockade of Berlin to counter the United States' blockade of Cuba.[16]

Conversely, Khrushchev mentioned Berlin in his memoirs while talking about Cuba, in particular, while introducing his reasoning for being involved in Cuba. He did not say directly that Cuba was an attempt to gain influence in Berlin; however, it can be implied, perhaps, that there was a connection there. Still, while it does seem that to Khrushchev there was a connection to Berlin when he was thinking about Cuba, it is impossible to know exactly what happened inside his mind. It is clear though, from his memoirs, that Khrushchev was bitter about West Berlin not being "free" and remaining a "tumor" in the GDR.[17]

As much as Berlin is considered the reason why the Soviet Union aided Cuba (to use it as leverage), so too is the arms race and the balance of power. Similar to Berlin, these topics are often approached from the context of the Cold War. The question of the Soviet Union's involvement in Cuba is not approached from the actual starting point in 1959-1960 of official relations; rather, the focus is always on the Caribbean Crisis of October 1962.

First, to understand the Soviet Union's position in Cuba requires an exploration of the balance of power and the realities of the Soviet Union's capabilities. Khrushchev was certainly concerned with what he often referred to as the imperialists attempting to take over the world. Specifically, in a conference in 1959 with American businessmen in San Francisco, the business captains pointed out that Khrushchev had a fear that the United States wanted to take over the world. Khrushchev replied "not just wants – striving!"[18] The businessmen then hurled back at him that the United States saw the Soviet Union in the same way. However, earlier in this conversation, and following this exchange, Khrushchev pointed out the vast inequities between the two superpowers. Khrushchev said "America has now surrounded us with military bases, alliances such as NATO and SEATO, and by these means the United States wants to obtain world domination. In the United Nations we are always outvoted."[19] Khrushchev raised his voice several times (he even came to his feet at one time during this conference) to these captains of industry to express that the encroachment on all sides by the United States had not gone unnoticed. Khrushchev further leveled a charge that the capitalist countries (specifically, he named the United States, England, and France) exploited other countries for profit in Africa and Asia (which, given what is known about the globalization process since 1959, is true.)

---

[16] Taubman, 537-538.
[17] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 319-320.
[18] Nikita Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Speaks: Selected Speeches, Articles, and Press Conferences 1949-1961,* ed. Thomas P. Whitney (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963), 337.
[19] Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Speaks,* 336. SEATO is the acronym for the South Asia Treaty Organization.

Khrushchev further digressed into discussing the ruble versus the dollar in respect to the large value advantage the dollar had over the ruble. Khrushchev believed that while the United States and its businesses were exploiting other countries, the Soviet Union only engaged in fair trade.[20]

There was also the issue of the Soviet leadership's game of deceiving the United States in the arms race. For much of the 1950s, the Soviet Union was bluffing about the size of its nuclear and bomber forces. The United States had no means to verify it one way or another, but had sided with caution to assume the Soviet leadership's claims as true.[21] When Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) were developed in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Soviet leadership continued this sham. The missile gap, as it was referred too, had kept the world at peace, or so Khrushchev believed, and Khrushchev based a majority of his foreign policy on this bluff of Soviet missile superiority.[22]

However, the truth in the balance of power was a very sobering reality for Khrushchev. Khrushchev knew full well that the United States had a large advantage in both ICBMs and bombers that were able to reach the Soviet Union.[23] To digress for a moment, the issue of the ICBMs was rather grim for the Soviet Union. Soviet missiles of the day were based on liquid fuel and were prone to explosions; as such, the missiles had to be kept unfueled. In the event the missiles needed to be launched, it would have taken more than an hour to fuel them. Furthermore, there was the very real possibility that in a hurried fueling in the event of an attack, the unstable fuel itself might destroy the missiles (that is if they were not destroyed by U.S. missiles first.) In fact, the United States used solid fuel missiles by this time. Not only were these missiles safer and more stable, but also they could be launched within minutes. This is in addition to the fact the United States had many more missiles, and many more bombers able to reach the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet bomber force able to reach the United States at this time was a bluff as well.[24]

Khrushchev knew of the military imbalance, and it certainly did bother him. In his memoirs he wrote bitterly, "They [the United States] had surrounded us with military bases and kept our country under constant threat of possible nuclear attack. But now the Americans themselves would experience what such a situation feels like. As for us, we had already grown used to it. During the preceding half century [the Soviet Union] had fought three wars on its territory… The United States had taken part in many wars and had grown rich from them, shedding the blood of only a minimal number of its own people while accumulating billions and robbing the whole world."[25] Additionally,

---

[20]   Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Speaks,* 336-337.
[21]   Haslam, 179-180.
[22]   Haslam, 180.
[23]   Haslam, 180.
[24]   Taubman, 537.
[25]   Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 326.

Khrushchev felt he had a duty to protect Cuba. Khrushchev was already affectionate for Cuba from 1960, but it is also clear that the military aspect did play some role in his decision-making process.[26]

In either case, the Berlin situation and the balance of power do not fully explain Khrushchev's decision to become involved in Cuba to the extent to which he had committed the Soviet Union. Certainly Khrushchev was looking for a chance to put a base near the United States; he alludes to as much in his own speeches before the Cuban relationship had even started.[27] The most important role in Khrushchev's decision-making process involving Cuba was his desire to see Cuba thrive, and for the Soviet people to have something to be proud of far from the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev was influenced by the romantic idea of these far-off rebellious fighters who had ousted the imperialist puppet Batista from power. And it was important to Khrushchev that the Soviet Union be well perceived in Cuba. The Soviet leadership had dispatched Sergei Kudryavtsev as its ambassador, and a KGB agent posing as a TASS press reporter by the name of Aleksandr Alekseyev.[28] Castro immediately recognized Alekseyev as an intelligence officer and grew close to him. The official Soviet ambassador was less well received. Kudryavtsev had demanded that armed guards protect him in Cuba, and the Cubans were extremely annoyed by this, conveying to Moscow that none of them walked around with armed guards. Kudryavtsev was shortly thereafter recalled and Alekseyev named the official ambassador. Khrushchev had realized that Kudryavtsev was not the right man for revolutionary Cuba.[29] The removal of this Soviet ambassador concerned the matter of Cuban impressions of the Soviet Union, and Khrushchev did not want Cuba to see Soviet citizens as cowards, but rather to welcome them.

However, what purpose did Khrushchev see in Cuba in 1960? It would appear that the only thing he wanted was for the Cubans to continue down the path of communism. Materially, the Cubans needed just about everything. Castro had nationalized the U.S. corporations that were operating in Cuba and seized all of their property. In response, Washington D.C. had cut off imports and exports with the island. Khrushchev responded not only by sending materials to Cuba, but committed the Soviet Union to a massive effort to aid Cuba. For example, the Soviet Union did not have much of an oil tanker fleet and Cuba needed a new importer of oil. So, not content with just sending what oil they could, the Soviet Union built new oil tankers to ensure they could send a full supply.[30]

---

[26] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 315-315.
[27] Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Speaks,* 338.
[28] TASS is an acronym for the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union, a news service.
[29] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 317.
[30] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 316.

Additionally, the Soviet Union was committed to seeing the Cuban economy survive. Cuba had traditionally grown sugar and was one of the world's largest producers of sugar cane. The sugar cane crop had a long history of exploitation by foreigners on Cuban soil going back to the Spanish Empire, and this exploitation continued into the 20th century under the effective control of corporations operating from the United States such as the United Fruit Company. The Cuban farmers needed to keep growing this sugar cane, and the Cubans needed money. Thus, the Soviet Union stepped in and bought the entire sugar crop produced by Cuba until the collapse of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, in January of 1962, the Soviet Union created a complete trade network with the Cubans to ensure the survival of their economy. The Soviet Union exported to Cuba (in addition to oil) metals, fertilizers, chemical products, lumber materials, cellulose, paper, cotton, wheat, flour, animal and vegetable fats, various machines, equipment, and instruments. These were not just gifts to Cuba. In return, the Cubans were able to sell to the Soviet Union (in addition to sugar) alcohol, nickel ore, tobacco products, rum, canned fresh fruit, and juices.[31]

What is more, Khrushchev believed that if revolutionary Cuba survived, it could be "a beacon of hope, a great light shining for all the insulted and injured, all those who had been plundered and deprived among the peoples of Latin America."[32] This statement again plays into Khrushchev's belief that the United States was a great exploiter, and that Cuba needed to be protected if Marxism-Leninism was to spread. Khrushchev cited the United States' interventions in Panama and the Dominican Republic as having been the suppression of progressive reform.[33] Furthermore, if Cuba fell, Khrushchev believed it would discourage any future rebellions against the United States in the region.

Khrushchev did not have a plan or a scheme really beyond the protection of Cuba from invasion by the United States, and the crisis of 1962 was largely because Khrushchev misjudged how the Americans would respond. He had no plan other than to frighten the United States into not invading the island.[34] Through the remaining years of his time in power, Khrushchev had a particular fondness for Cuba. Castro recalled, "of course it is true, Nikita loved Cuba very much. He especially cherished Cuba. He had a weakness for Cuba you might say – emotionally and so on."[35]

---

[31] Unsigned, "Cuba – U.S.S.R.: Economic Ties Grow Stronger," *Pravda*, January 11, 1962, 3. This and the other articles from Soviet newspapers hereafter cited have been gleaned from *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, a publication that reproduced excerpts from Soviet newspapers, scholarly journals and popular magazines in translation from Russian into English.

[32] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 322.

[33] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 323.

[34] Taubman, 531-532.

[35] Taubman, 545.

Cuba from the Soviet Perspective

Soviet newspapers reflected Khrushchev's warm feelings about the small island nation of Cuba. Beginning in 1960, they reported on a wide variety of topics that dealt with this country. It is possible to infer from these papers, given that they would have been the average citizen's link to the outside world, that like their leader, the Soviet people saw Cuba in many of the same ways that they saw themselves.

This was visually reflected in the 1964 film *Ia Kuba/Soy Cuba* (*I am Cuba*), a cinematic masterpiece that offers the Soviet perspective on the Cuban people and the nature of their Revolution.[36] *Ia Kuba* was produced by the Soviet company Mosfilm, partly to fill the void for Cuban filmgoers left by the halt in imports of Hollywood movies into Cuba.[37] Directed by Mikhail Kalatozov, this film was an expression of love and solidarity sent from afar in Russia to the island of Cuba. Despite the propaganda woven into it, *Ia Kuba* rouses empathy for the Cuban struggle against the United States. This is done, for example, through hypnotizing cinematography that focuses on making a connection with the audience through imagery rather than dialogue, effectively bringing viewers down from the skies of Cuba to the Earth and the Cuban people. Meanwhile, the storyline presents the Soviet perspective of Cubans as idealistic fighters, determined to overthrow the corruption of their current rulers and to remove the decay that foreigners (chiefly American businessmen) had brought upon them and their cities. American arrogance is shown, for instance, in a scene depicting American sailors on shore leave loudly singing about how "America is the greatest nation on Earth." Furthermore, throughout the film, Kalatozov parallels the Cuban struggle with the October Revolution in Russia. For example, he romanticizes Cubans, young, old, and poor, in true socialist realist form, overcoming and freeing themselves from wealthy autocratic masters and foreign overlords.

Of course years before *Ia Kuba* appeared, as evident in Khrushchev's memoirs, the Soviet leadership did not know in 1959 what path Castro would lead Cuba down. Rather, Moscow, much like the rest of the world, was captured by surprise when rebels occupied Havana. The Soviet leadership knew that some of the people in Castro's revolution were communists (including his brother), but there were also many communists who were not fighting with the rebels. Khrushchev even joked about the situation, as the following account reveals:

---

[36] *Soy Cuba/Ia Kuba* was a Soviet-Cuban co-production directed by Mikhail Kalatozov that appeared in 1964.

[37] Richard Gott, "From Russia with love," *The Guardian*, November 11, 2005, http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2005/nov/12/cuba [Accessed April 29, 2013].

> The [leaders of the] Cuban revolutionary government ended up
> in heaven. Saint Peter came out and ordered them to line up.
> Then he said: 'All Communists, take three steps forward!'
> Guevara stepped forward, Raul stepped forward, and someone
> else did, too, but the rest remained where they were. Then
> Saint Peter shouted to Fidel: 'Hey you, the tall one, what's the
> matter? Aren't you listening?' The point is: they thought
> Fidel was a Communist, but even in heaven he still didn't think
> of himself as a Communist and assumed that the order given by
> Saint Peter didn't apply to him. That was a typical reflection of
> the situation in Cuba at the time.[38]

Despite all of this, the official Soviet press was hailing Cuba to the
Russian public. From the outset of 1960, the Cubans were touted as heroes.
It is possible that this was solely because they had defeated the American-
backed Batista regime, but it is more likely that this was part of a larger
narrative at work in the public consciousness. Cuba was presented as a
microcosm of the Soviet Union's own struggles in the world, specifically its
being surrounded by a hostile world.

The Soviet Union was encircled by its enemies, and in the Khrushchev
years, it was still on the road to recovery from the devastation of the Second
World War. Its population, especially the young male population, had died by
the millions. The damage still scarred the land. Furthermore, the Soviet people
had not forgotten how the United States, Great Britain, France, Japan and other
countries had sent troops to aid the White Guards in the Russian Civil War that
followed the October Revolution. These troops were intended to defeat
communism in Russia by causing the failure of the communist state in its
infancy.[39] Indeed to the Russian people, this corresponded to American
interference in Cuba.

In 1960, the United States broke official diplomatic relations with the
Cuban government. In effect, the United States withdrew its recognition of
Cuba's leaders as the lawful government of the nation. This was similar to the
situation that the Soviet Union found itself facing when it attempted to
reestablish ties with Western powers following the October Revolution. Soviet
newspapers thus made various observations about American politics vis-à-vis
Cuba. *Pravda*, for example, noted in January 1961 that the Eisenhower
administration was seemingly intentionally making matters concerning Cuba
difficult by not consulting about them with the incoming President Kennedy.
The *Pravda* commentator nevertheless hoped that the incoming Democratic

---

[38] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 316.
[39] Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Speaks,* 328-329.

Party would be less war-hawkish than the out-going Eisenhower administration.[40] Of course the Kennedy administration would end up backing the attempted overthrow of the Cuban government. But at the Bay of Pigs, Castro managed to personally rebuff the Cuban exiles armed and sent by the United States. Not only did this bring more fame to Castro, but also it solidified the conviction of the Soviet Union to send more assistance to Cuba.

One aspect of this was economic, and such ties with Cuba were often hailed in the Soviet press. Namely, trade between the two countries was presented as essential for Cuba's survival. More so, Cuban-Soviet trade was important in the wake of the United States cutting off trade with the island. Economic articles were thus full of descriptions of Cuba's economic situation and what Americans were giving up in terms of all that Cuba had to offer the world.[41] They further touted the new direction and agrarian reforms that the Cuban government embarked upon in distributing land to cooperatives and collective farms, and adapting toward Communism in the wake of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Condemnation of United States actions in Cuban affairs was fairly common throughout 1962. It is perhaps possible that this increase in reporting on this matter in Soviet newspapers was due to direction by the Soviet leadership to step-up propaganda as the shipment of arms, which would lead to the Caribbean Crisis, was carried out. Newspapers often related the accusations that the United States made against Cuba to the ones they leveled against the Soviet Union. For example, the United States was often portrayed as accusing the Cuban government of not allowing its people to be free. *Pravda* pointed out the irony of such statements when it noted that the Cuban uprising was a populist movement that removed a U.S.-sanctioned dictator from power. *Pravda* argued that the Cubans had already undergone self-determination, and that the United States should respect their decision. The paper continued by condemning American aggression toward Cuba based on economic grounds, rhetorically asking, "By what right and by what law does the U.S.A. organize and direct aggression against another country while accusing it [Cuba] of establishing a different social system, a different type of state, from the type the United States had wanted to see?"[42] This article then described at length the Soviet Union's commitment to defend Cuba's revolution from outside interference. Solidarity with Cuba in the Soviet press thus turned into official statements of support.

In August 1962, there were shelling incidents in Havana harbor by several small crafts that launched from and returned to the United States. Soviet

---

[40] Commentator, "Peace-Loving Peoples Are With Cuba! – Provocateurs Receive Rebuff," *Pravda,* January 6, 1961, 4.

[41] M. Kremnev, "Two Years of Cuban Revolution," *Ekonomicheskaya gazeta,* December 31, 1960, 4.

[42] Unsigned, "Soviet Government Statement," *Pravda,* February 8, 1962, 1.

newspapers were quick to call the incidents acts of piracy, projecting a particular interest in the weak response by the United States in stopping these attacks. For instance, *Izvestiia* was quick to come to the defense of Cuba and denounce the unwillingness of the United States to stop these pirates.[43] *Pravda* did the same, but also condemned American newspapers for having hailed the invaders as heroes and patriots. This Soviet publication also called on the United States to protect Cuba from the Floridian thugs and gangsters.[44]

Additionally, the Soviet press collectively called attention to the growing cooperation between the Soviet Union and Cuba. Specifically, news stories welcomed the arrival of Cubans in the Soviet Union to learn different farming techniques for growing foods other than sugar. Of interest as well was Che Guevara's visit to Moscow to ask for more aid and armaments, and these were conventional ones that the Soviet leadership was happy to supply. What the press does not mention however, is that this was the same visit by Che Guevara in which Khrushchev informed Guevara that he wanted him to go back to Cuba and convince Castro to allow nuclear weapons to be put in Cuba.

In September of 1962, a TASS statement showed the Soviet Union categorically denying that it had any intention of sending offensive or nuclear weapons to Cuba. TASS stated that the United States had plans to invade "little heroic Cuba" and that the Soviet Union was committed to defending it.[45] Directly comparing the Soviet Union and Cuba to highlight their solidarity, the report stated, "The Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, has stretched forth the hand of aid to the Cuban people because we understand Cuba's situation particularly well. After the October Revolution, when the young Soviet state was in capitalist encirclement and the people of our country suffered tremendous difficulties caused by the postwar devastation, the United States, instead of giving assistance, undertook armed intervention against the Soviet Republic."[46] Indeed over time, the Soviet press portrayed the feelings of connection and solidarity between the Soviet Union and Cuba more strongly, thereby suggesting that the Soviet people themselves were becoming more enamored with Cuba's struggles.

During the Caribbean Crisis and afterwards, Soviet newspapers continued to praise Cuba and the Soviet Union. Throughout the crisis, they made frequent mention of the Americans being in an overactive military frenzy. Interestingly, they also noted the resolution of the crisis as "Reason Triumphs."[47] Furthermore, the Soviet press gave a great deal of credit not only

---

[43] S. Kondrashov, "Pirates Again – Provocational [sic] Firing on Havana Is Washington's Handiwork," *Izvestiia,* August 28, 1962, 1.

[44] S. Vishnevsky, "Pirates on the Rampage In Florida," *Pravda,* August 28, 1962, 3.

[45] Unsigned, "TASS Statement: Put an End to the Policy of Provocations," *Pravda* and *Izvestiia,* September 12, 1962, 1-2.

[46] Unsigned, "TASS Statement," 1-2.

[47] Editorial, "Reason Triumphs," *Izvestiia,* October 31, 1962, 1.

to Khrushchev, but also to Kennedy, apparently not shy about giving both leaders praise for backing down from the standoff.[48] Castro was missing from the Soviet press for the most part during the resolution of the crisis, and this is likely due to him having been very angered by having been cut out of the negotiations between Washington D.C. and Moscow.[49]

Conclusion

As asserted, the Soviet leadership did not help Cuba solely for exploitive purposes, nor was Cuba its puppet state. The Soviet Union's leaders helped the Cubans because they saw them as like them; they viewed the Cuban struggle as a microcosm of their struggle. This exploration of Khrushchev's motivations, of Soviet-Cuban solidarity as presented in the Soviet press, and the love of the Soviet people for Cuba as conveyed in *Ia Kuba*, suggests both official and popular awe of and commitment to the small island of Cuba. But even so, in the years that followed Khrushchev's removal from power in 1964, it can be, and has been, argued that the economic influence of the Soviet Union was as crushing to Cuba as that of the United States. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Cuba pursued its own goals in the world as well. Cuba hardly acted as a puppet to the Soviet Union, but rather related to the Soviet Union more like Israel relates to the United States.[50] Cuba would pursue its own objectives in Africa, and it would take leadership around the world in anti-colonialist struggles, by providing aid and troops.[51] Furthermore, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Cuba found the means to survive without its assistance in a world in which the United States remained its enemy. However, for the Khrushchev years, the Russian were depicted as thinking, "*Ia Kuba!*"

---

[48] N. Polyanovo, "Not a Test of Strength but Negotiations," *Izvestiia,* November 1, 1962, 2.
[49] Khrushchev, *Memoirs,* 344 – 345.
[50] Blight and Brenner, 147-182.
[51] Blight and Brenner, 182.

The Formation of Economic Policy in Post-Colonial India:
The Economic Policies of Gandhi and Nehru

By Sidney Comstock

In the *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi stated that "formerly, men were made slaves under physical compulsion. Now they are enslaved by temptation of money and of the luxuries that money can buy."[1] In this pointed critique of Western civilization, Gandhi clearly highlighted the debilitating effect that Western economics had on the population of India and, more generally, humanity. As India began to transition from a colonized state into an independent nation, its leaders had to create an economic policy to combat the ill effects of British colonial rule. Many different economic theories and models existed in 1947 and Gandhi's plan was one of many competing economic policies. These policies ranged from models of Soviet Marxism to Western, Liberal economic theories. Gandhi, however, presented a radically different economic plan based on his own non-violent and religious ideals. Unlike most Western economic models, he presented an economic ideology that did not focus on the accumulation of material wealth as its core tenet. In his vision, mankind worked not to mindlessly create additional wealth, but to sustain the body enough to devote the mind to the religious understanding of God. Gandhi presented an alternative model for economic organization that stressed values different from the Western world and refocused the pursuit of the individual towards religious goals, not economic ones. However, while Gandhi did provide an alternative economic vision for the future, his economic plan failed to adequately address major problems stemming from colonial rule, namely extreme poverty, and the desire for an industrial economy in post-colonial India.

This article examines the economic conditions at the time of Indian independence in 1947 to understand the economic problems that plagued independent India. Furthermore it analyzes the role of Gandhi and Nehru in constructing post-colonial economic policy by considering their competing economic visions for independent India. Gandhi, the architect of independence, favored a return to pre-colonial rule, whereas Nehru, the first Prime Minister, desired a strong, industrial India. They both favored socialism, but, unlike Gandhi, Nehru wanted to create an industrial, modern economy. Both policies represented a large turning point in the economic development of India, and Gandhi offered a course that could even serve as a model for humanity. Although Nehru's vision was ultimately followed, was Gandhi's plan, which was a much larger deviation from Western economic thought, a viable plan to follow? By understanding how these varying

---

[1] Rudrangshu Mukherjee, *The Penguin Gandhi Reader (*New York City: Penguin Books, 1993), 17.

policies attempted to redress the failures of colonial rule, it becomes evident that Nehru's policies, adopted by independent India, more acutely responded to the problems facing independent India.

Colonial rule in India was plagued with many different economic problems. The most pressing of these problems were extreme poverty and the drain of wealth to Great Britain, India's colonial ruler. Both of these problems had become evident by the end of the nineteenth century. Dadabhai Naoroji, the first Indian Member of British Parliament, wrote a significant critique of British economic policies in his book *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Naoroji outlined exactly how British rule worked towards creating these problems, citing an international trade system that left India as a perpetual net exporter to Britain and a policy of extreme taxation of the agricultural sector.

There were several competing policies aimed at combating these severe economic problems being debated at the time of independence. In his writings, Gandhi developed an economic plan that was categorically different than the path prescribed by traditional Western economic theory. He described his main critique of Western economics in his work, *The Hind Swaraj*. In his vision, he placed an emphasis on religion and duty instead of profit and materialism. He called for a highly decentralized economy, in terms of both power and production, through village republics and reliance on the individual to fulfill his or her economic role in society.

Jawaharlal Nehru offered a different, competing economic plan for the future. In his work, *The Discovery of India,* Nehru discussed how his economic policies differed from Gandhi's. His approach called for the government to take on a centralized role in economic planning and the creation of socialism. Instead of relying on the individual to effect change, the government would take the leading position in achieving economic goals via state socialism. Nehru, however, took a pragmatic approach in implementing his plan, which included socialist elements, acknowledging its limitations in a political sense. Nehru placed a heavier emphasis on finding a way to blend Western ideas and practices into a new policy that would create a better future. Unlike Gandhi, who mostly rejected Western economic thought, Nehru attempted to use Western style socialism to rectify the profit motive instead of relying on individual duty. Nehru's plan emphasized an increase in economic growth and material quality of life, while Gandhi's emphasized different values and even laid a premium on material non-possession and a frugal lifestyle. However, both men recognized the moral corruption inherent in the profit-motive of capitalism.

Historiography

Few topics have elicited as much historical analysis as the Indian nationalist movement headed by Gandhi. Gandhi himself has been the focus of countless books and papers, and his economic policies are embedded in

analyses of the nationalist period. When looking at the way Gandhian economics have been portrayed within the nationalist movement, it is crucial to also understand the historical context in which these authors write.

Initially, historians mostly attempted to categorize and understand the ideological policies of Nehru and Gandhi alongside those of the Indian economists of the nineteenth century. Historian V.B. Singh, in his work *From Naoroji to Nehru*, described in detail the framework for these varying nationalist leaders and economists. Singh summarized the key elements of Gandhian economic thought in three concepts: "*Varna Dharma* [the duty to follow one's division of labor in society]*,* Trusteeship, and Decentralization."[2] He further discussed the evolution of socialist thought in India in important speeches by Nehru on the implementation of socialism in independent India. R.C. Dutt further expanded on the role of Nehru in creating socialism within an independent India. In his book, *Socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru,* he explained how different pieces of Nehru's life molded his views on socialism. Dutt portrayed Nehru as a leader whose vision was continuously shaped and redefined according to his personal experiences. For example, Nehru's philosophy deviated from many key Marxist beliefs, like that about violent revolution, and incorporated some Gandhian beliefs, such as social change through non-violence. It even allowed for continued private ownership, which ideally does not belong in a socialist state.[3]

The liberalization of Indian economic policy seemed to inspire a renewed interest in the economic history of the nationalist era. Beginning in the 1990s, the economic aspects of the nationalist struggle began to be further analyzed. Historians Tirthankar Roy, Bipan Chandra, and Aditya Mukherjee represent this trend. In *The Economic History of India: 1857-1947*, Tirthankar Roy presented a concise history of economics during British rule. Writing in an age that is further removed from the colonial context, he took a more nuanced view of the British colonial system, recognizing the positive along with the negative results. For instance, he recognized that "the railways, communications, ports, power, universities and not least, the bureaucracy – all erected in colonial times – were critical resources for Nehru's India in the pursuit of an independent path of development."[4] This view would have been much more controversial in the immediate post-colonial context.

2   V. B. Singh, *From Naoroji to Nehru: Six Essays in Indian Economic Thought* (New Delhi: The Macmillan Company of India Limited, 1975), 123.
3   Rabindra Chandra Dutt, *Socialism of Jawharlal Nehru* (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1981).
4   Tirthankar Roy, *The Economic History of India: 1857-1947* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2011), 316.

Bipan Chandra wrote about economic conditions during the nationalist phase of Indian history, focusing on the nationalist and industrial leaders' economic desires. He tied capitalism and industrialism together with the nationalist movement. In his article, "Economic Nationalism," Chandra described the economic tone of the nationalist movement. He discussed the importance of the economic critique of the British as a unifying theme for moderates and extremists alike. Furthermore, he pointed out that "the economic outlook of the Indian national leadership was basically capitalist" because it felt capitalism held the highest prospect to achieve the rapid industrial growth it desired. [5] He conveyed the importance of understanding the economic rationales of the nationalist leaders in order to more fully understand the political system that arose in response to the economic conditions.

The Economic Problems Created During Colonial Rule

The British East India Company's victory in the Battle of Plassey in 1757[6] dramatically transformed its role in India. The Company changed from a coastal trading company into the political ruler over the *Nawabs* of Bengal. Prior to the arrival of the British, rights governing the land were a complex division of power between the right to collect taxes, the right to work the land, and the right to grant taxation rights to others.[7] After the Battle of Buxar in 1764[8], the British were granted the rights of taxation that they then used to fundamentally alter this complex relationship. Aiming to expand the tax base and break up the power of the old military elite, the East India Company reformed the tax system by assigning property rights to the land and then directly taxing the landowner. In Bengal, this was done through the creation of the Permanent Settlement system in 1793, and in mostly South and West India, through the *Ryotwari*[9] system.[10]

The Permanent Settlement system greatly upset the traditional balance that had been created in the years prior to British rule. First of all, the rate of taxation was initially very high, rendering it nearly impossible for the earliest *zamindars* (landlords) to pay the tax. If unable to pay, they lost their land and no provisions were made for bad harvests due to natural events like drought.

---

[5] Bipan Chandra, "Economic Nationalism," in *Nationalist Movement in India: A Reader*, ed. Sekhar Bandyopadhyay (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009), 23.

[6] The Battle of Plassey was between the British East India Company and the Nawab of Bengal and his French allies. The resolution of the battle established the rule of the East India Company over the rulers of Bengal (the Nawabs) and dramatically reduced the French presence in Bengal.

[7] Roy, 27.

[8] The Battle of Buxar was between the British East India Company and a combined army of Mir Qasim, the Nawab of Bengal, the Nawab of Awadh, and the Mughal King Shah Alam II. The British won *Diwani* rights for the company to collect taxes on land in Eastern India.

[9] A system to collect taxes directly from the *ryots* or those working the land.

[10] Roy, 37.

Furthermore, since the rate of taxation was so high, the *zamindars* tried to pass the tax burden onto the peasant-cultivators who, if pushed too hard, might outright flee from their land.[11] However, the switch to a property rights system created by British rule opened the way for commercial agriculture to begin taking hold. Landowners began switching production to cash crops and became increasingly market oriented. The cash crops of indigo, opium, cotton, and sugar were grown in order to pay the high taxes on the land, creating a system that only worked so long as international trade stayed favorable. Although there is some historical controversy over how much freedom the debt-laden cultivators had in choosing their crops, they generally became more responsive to market conditions. Peasant resistance to this new system did occur, especially in times when international trade was unfavorable for the cash crops being grown, such as in the 1850s, when rice prices were rising higher than indigo. In this case, the peasants led what was known as the "Blue Mutiny."[12]

One of the more lasting effects of British rule in India was what many term the "de-industrialization" of the economy. This generally refers to "the progressive agrarian orientation of the workforce, or de-industrialization of an entire workforce." [13] In the case of India it specifically referred to the decline of the indigenous cotton textile industry in India. This was partly due to the importation of cheap British cloth that drove many domestic producers out of business when they were unable to compete with British prices. Industry was further stifled when European demand for cloth shrunk at the same time that the newly impoverished Indian aristocracy's demand fell. Production for most domestic industries declined along with cloth during this period, with the exception of limited shipbuilding.[14]

This combination of economic forces, international trade, and an agrarian-oriented economy plagued by taxation ultimately resulted in poor economic conditions in the late colonial period. *Zamindars* were expected to behave similarly to landlords in England during the enclosure movement and usher in a new age of agrarian prosperity. However, high taxation prevented the accumulation of capital needed to pay for expensive investments in highly productive agricultural technology. The international trade situation whereby India became an agrarian supplier to the industrial machine of Great Britain left India with the lower paying economic activity of agriculture, while still paying for the burden of maintaining the empire through a high rate of taxation. These

---

[11] Roy, 39.
[12] Roy, 48. The Blue Mutiny resulted because debt agreements caused peasants to grow indigo in order to satisfy the debt covenants, but left them continuously impoverished. When they saw that the price of rice was higher than indigo in the 1850s, they fought for the right to grow what they choose and sought the federal government as an arbiter.
[13] Roy, 59.
[14] Roy, 59-61.

conditions led to extreme poverty within India, especially for the rural peasants who worked the land and lived in a vicious cycle of debt and poverty. This also paved the way for a new wave of internal critiques by nationalists based on the economic condition of India. According to Bipan Chandra, "the evidence of India's dismal poverty began to overshadow their entire economic outlook."[15] Early on, the nationalists believed that the British system could develop the domestic economy, but as time wore on and poverty failed to diminish, they became more skeptical of British rule. Perhaps the most poignant skeptic of British rule was Dadabhai Naoroji.

Dadabhai Naoroji, known as The Grand Old Man of India, was one of the most influential Indian economic and political figures of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As the first Indian to serve as a British Member of Parliament, he believed in British rule of law, although he was very critical of its implementation in India. Working as a moderate leader of the Indian National Congress, he hoped that if he brought to light the problems of British rule in India, Parliament would reform the misapplication of its laws in India. He approached his criticism of British rule in a way that was fact-based and, unlike later nationalist leaders, reliant upon the idea that British rule in and of itself was not corrupt.

At the same time, Naoroji harshly criticized the economic conditions created by British rule in India. His primary criticism revolved around a theory he called "The Drain of Wealth," which he outlined in his book *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Essentially, British rule had followed a long-term trend towards impoverishing Indians through international trade. He argued that a continuous imbalance of trade with Great Britain, in which India was always a net exporter to Great Britain, resulted in draining much of the material and capital wealth of India to the benefit of the British. Instead of other foreign rulers, like the Mughals, who had ruled over India and spent the wealth accumulated in India, the British took the wealth from Indian rule back to England, in part through this trade imbalance.[16] Further exacerbating the problem of trade issues, excessive taxation of Indians, especially the peasants, supported the British Empire at the expense of the Indian people. He noted that while the average income of an Indian was 40s per head, this amount was below subsistence and thus was "as 'crushing' to any people as it can possibly be"; moreover, Indians had to pay tax upon this low income.[17] The harsh taxes further weakened the country when the British left India, for these remained in British hands rather than directly serving the betterment of India.

---

[15] Chandra, 16.

[16] Dadabhai Naoroji, *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd., 1901), 30-31, 34.

[17] Naoroji, 52-53.

Indians also paid a higher percentage of their income in taxes compared to their counterparts elsewhere in the world, making taxation harsher than the nominal amount of tax *per capita* would indicate. [18]

Historian R.P. Masani noted that Naoroji proposed industrialization on a mass-scale as the solution to India's problems. However, in order to achieve industrialization, India was missing one key component, capital. Due to the drain of its wealth to England, India was woefully deficient in capital, without which industry could never develop. Therefore, the solution was for England to allow India to borrow credit on favorable terms. Masani paid particular attention to how the argument was structured. Naoroji did not argue in overly nationalist tones, but in fact argued in such a way that made it incredibly easy for the British to follow and understand. For example, when he explained the drain to the English people, he "held up before the audience the picture of England herself when she was a tributary to the Pope."[19]

Naoroji's criticism of British rule would set the stage for later nationalist leaders. The Drain of Wealth theory was an idea that people could rally around since it could be labeled as a direct cause of their impoverishment under British rule. Both Gandhi and Nehru, among others, would directly and indirectly apply parts of Naoroji's Drain of Wealth theory in constructing their economic policies.

Gandhi directly understood and implemented into political action the Drain of Wealth theory. The *swadeshi* movement and the production of *khadi* were, at least in part, created as a reaction to the British textile industry draining Indian wealth through what nationalist leaders saw as a corrupt trade cycle. This corrupt trade cycle resulted in India exporting her cotton to Britain for use in the cotton mills in Lancashire and Manchester. Then this cotton was sold back to India as imported cloth at steep prices. Gandhi hoped to stop this unfavorable trade relationship and at least help alleviate poverty by employing scores of rural workers in building a mass-cloth industry by producing *khadi*, or home-spun cloth. Furthermore, looking at the nature of the Salt March in 1930 and the later boycott of British textiles, Gandhi clearly understood from Naoroji's writings the source of British economic power in India. Taxes and imported textiles formed the backbone of British economic power and Gandhi targeted them both.

Naoroji's theories would also help to formulate Nehru's economic policies. Nehruvian economic policy was highly focused on India promoting industrial growth to produce, internally, all the goods and services necessary for its own people. British trade policies had left India bereft of industry due to the Drain of Wealth. International trade would have a diminished role in

---

[18] Naoroji, 52-53.
[19] R.P. Masani, *Dadabhai Naoroji* (Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers, 1968), 74.

the socialist policies of Nehru. Historian Sunil Khilnani noted, in *The Idea of India,* that this policy choice was caused by a belief that with unfettered international trade, India could find herself paying homage to international capital in lieu of British capital. This potential future had to be avoided at all costs. So the Drain of Wealth theory still held sway, but this time it was used to create proactive policy to prevent another such situation from arising. According to Khilnani, Naoroji's theory "engrained a fear about the fragility of Indian economic interests in an open, international economy."[20] The Drain of Wealth certainly influenced the policy choice of Nehru with regards to international trade.

However, the most important aspect of Naoroji's critique of British rule was its focus on economic terms. This meant that initial nationalist sentiments would be aroused to combat unfair economic policies and the poverty created by British rule. When the nationalist rhetoric was centered upon poverty and economic quality of life, it helped to create a mindset that material quality of life should be improved by the government after British rule. Bipan Chandra pointed out that the early nationalist leaders "made the people of India conscious of the bond of common economic interests" and "inculcated among the people the desire to increase the economic wealth of the country."[21] Therefore, it would follow that the economic policy that should be adopted after British rule would be one that addressed the issue of low material quality of life. While both Gandhi and Nehru would offer policies aimed at improving the quality of life for rural peasants, the narrative of industrial socialism imbedded in the policies of Nehru appeared to be more acceptable for increasing material prosperity. Gandhi's policies did not adequately promise a higher material quality of life and instead stressed religious fulfillment and moral duty. Upon achieving independence, India chose to follow Nehru's vision, which was primarily built upon a desire for a higher economic quality of life, fueled by Naoroji's critiques.

The Gandhian Economic System

Gandhi responded to the problems created during British rule by essentially rejecting the key tenets of Western economic thought and civilization. Gandhi constructed the bulk of his critique of Western ideals in the *Hind Swaraj* where he described in detail the essential problems of Western civilization. His economic theories rejected many key elements of Western economic thought, including the idea that self-interest and materialism are the primary guiding forces in human motivation. For example, Gandhi noted that the "[s]ocialism and communism of the West are based on certain conceptions which are fundamentally different from ours. One such conception is their

---

[20] Sunil Khilnani, *The Idea of India* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1999), 69.
[21] Chandra, 25.

belief in the essential selfishness of human nature. I do not subscribe to it."[22]
Gandhi laid out an alternative pathway to socialism in lieu of the materialism
and violent conflict that Marxist ideology envisioned. Gandhi instead
advocated for a renewed emphasis on the laborer as the heart of the economy, a
decentralized economic and political model through the village republic, an
emphasis on the individual to effect change instead of the state, and the duty to
replace materialism as the driving force in mankind's economic actions.
Surrounding Gandhi's economic policies were the two key concepts of
morality and non-violence. Both of these were essential to Gandhi's policies.

One of Gandhi's primary critiques of Western civilization was the
elevation of machine production to dominate over the dignity of labor. In the
Hind Swaraj, Gandhi stated that Indians of the past chose not to invent
machines. They made this decision not due to their inability to create such
devices, but because "our forefathers knew that, if we set our hearts after such
things, we would become slaves and lose our moral fiber."[23] Therefore the
transformation of society into an industrial society lowers the role of man and
especially labor. He also described factory workers as "enslaved by the
temptation of money and of the luxuries that money can buy."[24] Clearly,
machine production was seen as a negative route for mankind to take since it
was the main mechanism that enslaved mankind to material desires.

Gandhi's argument that machinery could not solve the complex
economic problems that plagued India was evident in his views on mass
production. Traditional Western economics dictates that economic
efficiency is achieved when a single worker produces goods at a rate with the
highest output possible. Gandhi, however, contended that mass production
would fail to raise the standard of living for the people of India. He claimed
that mass production in the Western sense, which involves either a single or
very few factories producing goods on a large-scale, eventually fails due to
the lack of simultaneous distribution on an equally mass scale.[25] Essentially,
once the saturation point is reached for a factory's good, the crisis of
unemployment will ensue as the factory begins to lay off the now
unnecessary workers. This problem can only be solved when production is
equal to consumption, or as Gandhi called it, simultaneous distribution.
Mass production thus concurrently wields two of the great evils of Western
civilization, an emphasis on machine production and the concentration of
economic power into a single institution or factory.

---

[22] Mukherjee, 239.
[23] Mukherjee, 35.
[24] Mukherjee, 19.
[25] Raghavan Iyer, *The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. 3* (New York and Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989), 525.

Gandhi was particularly critical of the concentration of economic power. Gandhi envisioned his ideal society as being run not by an all-powerful central government but by a network of village republics. According to Gandhi,

> Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose center will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units.[26]

This would result in the decentralization of power among as many people as possible. Furthermore, these village republics would be based upon agricultural economies and labor, not machine-guided industrial farming. Gandhi stated that "in this there is no room for machines that would displace human labor and that would concentrate power in a few hands."[27] Ultimately, for a truly just economic system to occur, it needed "an automatic balance between production, distribution, and consumption; where political or economic power was spread out and not concentrated." The only real solution to agrarian poverty was simple, easily manufactured hand tools that each and every individual citizen could have access to. Any solution that was distributed unequally, such as factory production, would not be able to create economic equality. Inevitably, the concentration of economic power was tied with machine production in the capitalist age, and Gandhi's rejection of machinery was one way to protest economic centralization.

Gandhi greatly believed in the power of the individual as an outlet of human potential. Any attempt to reduce this creativity would result in disastrous consequences for the progress of civilization. Gandhi stated, "I look upon an increase of the power of the State with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress."[28] With this in mind, the best way to create an economic system that truly had socialist economic justice as its core value would be to change the minds of individuals through reason and intellect and rely upon individuals to carry out this mission.

Furthermore, every policy of Gandhi was rooted in non-violence. Gandhi would not adopt any policy that did not revolve around this key point. Traditional state socialism requires the state to nationalize many economic

---

[26] Mukherjee, 84.
[27] Mukherjee, 84.
[28] Mukherjee, 243.

resources that were once held by individuals throughout the society. The act of nationalizing resources goes against non-violence because the state is forcibly taking these assets. Alternatively, if people were to willingly give up these resources for the state to look after on behalf of the good of all, and socialism arose because of it, then that would be acceptable. Gandhi stated that "if communism came without any violence, it would be welcome. For then no property would be held by anybody except on behalf of the people and for the people."[29] The only way this could be accomplished was through state sponsored trusteeship.

To reconcile these two ideas, non-violence and individuality, with the socialist belief that everyone only consumes that which he or she needs, Gandhi put forth the idea of trusteeship. Trusteeship would allow landowners and capitalists to keep their resources, but then use them responsibly and for the good of the people, not just for themselves. Since they would know that continued exploitation would result in class warfare, they would have to "[m]ake their choice between class war and voluntarily converting themselves into trustees of their wealth."[30] To avoid this fate, owners of wealth would thus use their property for the good of mankind instead of selfishly attending to only their own needs. According to Gandhi, "under my plan, the state will be there to carry out the will of the people, not to dictate to them or force them to do its will." [31] Any attempt at economic reform must be done from the bottom up to become a lasting and stable part of society. If the state tries to impose economic equality or socialism, it will be met with more resistance than if the state is the one purely acting for the will of the people.

Historian V.B. Singh pointed out that trusteeship is a difficult proposition in a society that is based on exploitation of one class over another. While admittedly "no sane person would deny the desirability of mutual confidence among individuals and sections of society," he pointed out that trusteeship in an exploitative society amounts to a personal appeal to the exploiting class.[32] He further noted that a philosophy based on appealing to the personal characteristics of the exploiting class fails to recognize the social relationship of exploitation and instead categorizes it as a personality trait. Therefore, to make it into a more rational philosophy, Gandhi had to accept the idea that if individuals failed to abide by trusteeship, then dispossession of property was the next step.[33] Ultimately, the exploitative nature of the Indian economy at

---

[29] Mukherjee, 246.
[30] Mukherjee, 250.
[31] Mukherjee, 250.
[32] Singh, 126.
[33] Singh, 127.

the time of independence may have made trusteeship a very difficult alternative even though some industrial families, like the Birlas, may have been able to achieve this ideal.

The final major piece of Gandhian economic policy was the reorganization of economic society on the basis of duty, according to *Varna Dharma*. *Varna Dharma* is the economic system wherein each person performs his or her specific role in society. However, it would, in theory, deviate from the caste system as it was currently practiced in India and go back to its more fluid ancient roots. People could move between the *varnas* and their *varna* was not protected if they did not fulfill their duty to perform its essential functions. According to Gandhi,

> Of all the animal creation of God, man is the only animal who has been created in order that he may know his Maker. Man's aim in life is not therefore to add from day to day to his material prospects and to his material possessions but his predominant calling is from day to day to come nearer his own Maker, and from this definition it was that the *rishis* [religious leaders who wrote the *Vedas*] of old discovered this law of our being. You will realize that if all of us follow this law of *varna* we would limit our material ambition and our energy would be set free for exploring those vast fields whereby and wherethrough we can know God.[34]

Therefore, *varna* was essential in curbing material ambition and effecting the new economic order. *Varna* was the specific mechanism that would perpetuate equality among all in society and refocus mankind's energy on duty and religious pursuits. It is through self-restraint and commitment to duty and the community that unhealthy material appetites can be curbed.

Furthermore, Gandhi believed that through true *varna*, equality could be realized. According to him, "All *varnas* are equal, for the community depends no less on one than on the other."[35] Furthermore, "the emoluments of all crafts and professions should be equal and amount to a living wage."[36] Therefore, he explicitly recognized that through *varna* everyone should be considered economically and spiritually equal. *Varna* is the specific medium that makes trusteeship possible. In the social relationships promulgated by capitalism it may be very difficult to reform each individual capitalist to act according to his or her responsibility to society. Acting according to his or her *varna* would stress the duty to maintain a trusteeship relationship between

---

[34] Mukherjee, 210.
[35] Mukherjee, 218.
[36] Mukherjee, 232.

wealth holder and society. Gandhian socialism achieves equality through *varna* by giving all members of society an equal living wage when they perform their duty. Wealth, therefore, would be held for the benefit of all and the profits of the use of that wealth would be equally distributed amongst both business owners and workers.

One critique of Gandhi's economic policy is that he may have in fact been too enmeshed in the ideas of anti-colonialism and thus over-emphasized pre-colonial society as a solution to the evils of Western civilization and colonial rule. By over-emphasizing an old historical epoch Gandhi failed to recognize viable solutions outside a narrowly constructed view of pre-colonial society. Living in the confines of colonial India, Gandhi may have idolized pre-British rule and over-emphasized it as the solution instead of recognizing its faults. For example, with regards to agriculture, Gandhi may have failed to completely grasp the true extent of the forces harming the agricultural sector. While colonial policies did have a disastrous impact on agriculture, especially through high taxation, this sector managed to continue to grow throughout the nineteenth century. This growth, argued Tirthankar Roy, was mostly fueled by an "expansion in area cropped, developments in long-distance trade networks, and improved infrastructure."[37] Therefore, the stagnation of the early twentieth century was more due to the effect of land scarcity since growth had not been fueled by an increase in agricultural productivity. Therefore, when Gandhi idolized the past in the *Hind Swaraj* by stating "we have managed with the same kind of plough as existed thousands of years ago" he failed to recognize that the problem with agriculture may have needed to be solved with increased productivity in the face of land scarcity.[38] By over-emphasizing pre-colonial society, Gandhi may have missed one of the best solutions to the poverty of the countryside, productivity improvements.

How should Gandhi's economic policies be interpreted in light of their radical break with traditional Western thought? Any scholar of Gandhi must keep in mind the historical circumstances under which his policies were created. While Gandhi encompassed viewpoints that were in some ways a mixture of his experiences in both India and Great Britain, as a nationalist leader he was enmeshed in the colonial system. This colonial system, as Naoroji pointed out, was complicit in creating the vast rural poverty seen in Gandhi's lifetime. With this in mind, it seems perfectly natural that a pre-colonial society would be held as an ideal to return to. Furthermore, Gandhi, Nehru, and other nationalist leaders and economic theorists had already identified many of the flaws that existed in the capitalist production system. Therefore, a rejection of the British Liberal tenets on which capitalism

---

[37] Roy, 144.
[38] Mukherjee, 35.

functioned is not as radical a response at it may initially seem. However, the main problem in the radical rejection of Western economic theory is that at the time of independence, India had a growing history of westernized education that had propagated Western economic thought. This may have resulted in a situation where, similar to Naoroji's, the prevailing belief was that the problems of poverty lay not in the system itself *per se* but in the application of the system by the specific colonial rulers.

The Nehruvian Economic Response

Nehru approached the goal of economic development with a radically different set of policies than Gandhi prescribed. Nehru, upon becoming India's first Prime Minister, followed an economic policy centered upon development and the elimination of poverty. These lofty goals were going to be accomplished by creating a centralized socialist state run by a planned economy, with critical sectors of the economy becoming public industries. Furthermore, industry was a top priority in order for India to become self-sufficient. It was developed primarily through public funding, but also indirectly through high tariffs on foreign manufactured goods. Ideally the high tariffs would protect the key heavy and capital goods industries while they developed into full-fledged domestic industries.[39] This set of development goals was in stark contrast to Gandhi's aims, which did not advocate industrialization as a response to poverty and instead emphasized the agricultural sector.

Nehru's outlook stood in stark contrast to the philosophy of ascetic life that Gandhi propounded. In a letter to Gandhi in 1928, Nehru stated, "I neither think that the so-called Ram Raj[40] was very good in the past, nor do I want it back. I think the Western or rather industrial civilization is bound to conquer India."[41] Nehru believed in the ability of industrial society to eliminate poverty as it had done in the West. Moreover, he believed that Gandhi focused too heavily on the problems of industrial society and not enough on its merits. Nehru stated, "these defects are not due to industrialism as such but to the capitalist system which is based on exploitation of others."[42] Gandhi replied by saying,

> I see quite clearly that you must carry on open warfare against me and my views. For, if I am wrong I am evidently doing irreparable harm to the country and it is your duty after having

---

[39] This summary of the development plan of Nehru was gleaned from a lecture on the development of India after independence, delivered by Dr. Sudipa Topdar.

[40] This means "rule by Ram," the Hindu god. It holds Ram as the ideal trustee for society as a model and guide. Ram Raj is the term used for the utopian village republic of pre-modern times.

[41] Dutt, 46.

[42] Dutt, 47.

> known it to rise in revolt against me. Or, if you have any doubt
> as to the correctness of your conclusion, I shall gladly discuss
> them [sic] with you personally. The differences between you
> and me appear to be so vast and radical that there seems to be
> no meeting ground between us.[43]

Although public warfare on economic policy never developed between the two leaders it was quite clear that they held diametrically opposed views on the issue of industrialization.

Gandhi's philosophy on the problems of modern civilization, as outlined in the *Hind Swaraj,* did not concur with Nehru's ideological beliefs. Nehru summarized Gandhi's belief on progress and civilization as consisting

> not in the multiplication of wants, of higher standards of living,
> 'but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants, which
> promotes real happiness and contentment, and increases the
> capacity for service'… Personally I dislike the praise of
> poverty and suffering. I do not think they are at all desirable,
> and they ought to be abolished.[44]

Nehru's economic objectives can thus be seen as centering on industrial growth in order to eliminate poverty. Machinery only became evil when used within the capitalist production system and was not itself evil.

Nehru saw the stunting of industrial growth in India as a direct consequence of British colonial policies. In *The Discovery of India,* Nehru pointed out that as a historical legacy the Congress provincial governors had tried to encourage domestic industry at every opportunity, citing the instance of government aid to save the Tata steel industries in the 1920s. However, the British government purposely stunted Indian industry whenever a conflict arose between Indian and British economic interests. As a particularly salient example, the British government stifled the growth of Indian shipping industries even though there was significant domestic talent, capital, and technical expertise in the industry.[45] British policy, in Nehru's eyes, clearly worked against, and not in tandem with, Indian industrial development. Therefore, his policies were shaped around promoting industrial production.

While Nehru developed an ideologically sound framework for socialism, practical matters hampered its implementation. According to V.B. Singh, "on the *practical* plane he could not achieve success as he could not devise a

---

[43] Mahatma Gandhi, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. 41* (New Delhi: Publications Division of India, 1999), 121, electronic book at http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/VOL041.PDF.
[44] Jawaharlal Nehru, *An Autobiography* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1980), 510.
[45] Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1985), 228-229.

functional strategy and tactics for the Indian socialist transformation."[46] While the Congress accepted what he said, it lacked the political will to implement the program fully. Changing the nature of property relations in the agricultural sector would have caused upheaval in order to displace the entrenched *zamindars,* the landowners created by the British during the colonial period. In the end, the economic system developed by Nehru was akin to a mixed economy. He wanted the public sector to command the heights of the economy, but in reality it was the private sector that dominated the economy. Nehru believed that a mixed economy was "inevitable in a democracy."[47]

Thus, the socialism that Nehru followed was in actuality a mix of competing philosophies. While Nehru himself was an ardent socialist, he did not follow true Marxist doctrine and instead incorporated Gandhian philosophy. Given the nature of the nationalist movement, it is unsurprising that Nehru's philosophy was a mix of several viewpoints. Most nationalist leaders had a Western education, including Gandhi, and were exposed to both Western and Indian ideas. Furthermore, the close contact between Gandhi and other members of the Congress Party insured that ideas passed between the two leaders. Thus, even while they may have had opposing views on key aspects of economic policy, such as industrialization, they agreed on many other issues such as non-violence as a political force. In this sense, Nehru rejected the idea of continuous revolution in favor of a non-violent interpretation of socialist thought.

Conclusion

Gandhi and Nehru both presented vastly different economic plans for the future of India. Ultimately, only one set of policies could be followed and thus Nehru's vision was implemented when he became the first Prime Minister of independent India. However, both nationalist leaders presented ideologically coherent and sound arguments for their own economic policies. Could Gandhian policy have been an alternative to the industrial program of Nehru?

It is unlikely that Gandhi's policies would have been followed in an independent India. Gandhi failed to adequately address a specific circumstance that a legacy of colonialism created and that was the desire for a modern economy. His radical rejection of Western ideas failed to fully incorporate the early critique of economic nationalists, centered upon the issue of stunted agricultural and industrial growth. While Gandhi recognized the legacy of colonialism, he tried to refocus the dialogue toward rejecting remedying this as an economic goal. While he held the desire to increase the quality of life for

---

[46] Singh, 164.
[47] Dutt, 258.

the peasant, he did not incorporate the philosophy of wealth generation into his carefully constructed ideology.

Nehru's program of planned industrialization fit much better within the context of immediate post-colonial India. It rejected the British and Western economics that many nationalists spoke out against. Furthermore, it targeted key aspects of the nationalist critique and put forth a planned effort to deal with them. It specifically targeted industrial growth, rejected foreign manufactured goods, and focused the wealth of the state on domestic economic improvements. All of these satisfied the drain of wealth critique developed by Naoroji. The main points of contention between Gandhi and Nehru were the role of the state in independent India and the creation of a modern, industrial economy based upon mass consumption.

Additionally, Nehru's economic policy was much less radical in nature than Gandhi's. While it is true that both policies were radical in the sense that they were large deviations from the capitalist model of the British, Gandhi's economic model broke with Western tradition completely. Socialism was generally considered, by at least some Western scholars, the next progression of capitalism, whereas Gandhi's philosophy seemed to be taking a step backwards (although Gandhi would probably have called his vision a step forward towards a better society). In the end, Gandhi's policies failed to capture the spirit of industrial reform and presented an entirely new conceptual framework for the functioning of society. It is much more difficult to convince a nation to follow such a radical new conception of society than to follow what could have been considered a reform of the current system. The birth of independent India presented a choice between two different conceptual frameworks for society. Even though Gandhi presented a coherent plan for a new type of society to unfold, it was not as attractive an option for nationalist leaders as the industrial program offered by Nehru.

Debunking Moscow in the Midway: Robert Maynard Hutchins' Protection of Academic Freedom at the University of Chicago

By Caleb Rowe

The McCarthy era is remembered as one of the most repressive times in recent American History. Senator Joseph McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee's (HUAC) cleansing of the communist threat, which had gripped a fearful American society, led to the criminalization of liberal thinking. By monitoring nearly every aspect of American society, McCarthy and the HUAC assured the public that it would be protected from the threat of a communist invasion. Justified as protecting American morality and ideals, McCarthy's war on communism quickly transformed into the persecution of liberal, left-leaning institutions and individuals. Blacklisting became the method by which those considered to be subversive were removed from America's social institutions. Most of the accusations made by McCarthy and the HUAC were unconfirmed and not punishable by the law, so blacklisting acted as a means through which accused subversives could be punished. Blacklisting, in turn, ruined countless lives and careers by forcing the dismissal of many Americans from their professions. In most cases, blacklisted individuals would never again hold a career in the same field that they were dismissed from.

 Blacklisting was much more than just a termination from a position; in many ways it was a termination from society. In order to truly grasp the impact of McCarthyism, one must not only have a general knowledge of Cold War popular culture in America, but also an in depth understanding of the destruction of personal liberties that many faced during this era. Very few occupations felt the impact of blacklisting like professors did during the Cold War era. McCarthy and anti-communist organizations across the nation felt threatened by the liberal professors who were educating America's youth. Concerned that students were being indoctrinated with communist teachings in the classroom, such organizations kept a very close watch on universities and colleges. At the height of the Cold War, it took very little for a professor to be labeled a communist and dismissed from his or her position. For the American professor, the threat of being blacklisted was only one "wrong" step away.

There is no exact figure regarding the number of professors dismissed from their positions during the McCarthy era since the blacklist was unofficial and many times undocumented. Be this as it may, the number of firsthand accounts of blacklisted professors has continued to grow since the end of McCarthy's attack on higher education, allowing researchers to gain a greater scope of the magnitude of professors blacklisted within academia.

McCarthyism is a widely studied and researched topic. Yet, while it affected virtually every aspect of American culture and society, its impact on American popular culture, especially Hollywood and journalism, has

dominated most recent research.[1] Studying such topics is undoubtedly crucial to understanding the era as they provide unique glimpses into the repressive, paranoid, and conformist society that America became. However, the study of American popular culture and media often overshadows McCarthyism's attack on higher education, which arguably had a greater impact on American society. The study of blacklisting in higher education provides a better understanding of how deeply rooted McCarthyism became in Cold War America.

Numerous universities and colleges were investigated for subversive behavior during the Cold War (roughly spanning 1945-1991). The majority of them lost administration and faculty due to suspicions of communist activities, affiliation with "communist front organizations" or for simply not cooperating with investigators.[2] With jobs and reputations on the line, educators and administrators were expected to "ferret-out"[3] their colleagues or face the possibility of blacklisting themselves. Scholars such as Mark E. Engberg, Phillip Deery, and Ellen W. Schrecker have portrayed the manner in which these investigations were held, as well as their outcomes and the long terms effects on those involved.[4] These works have concentrated on instances in which McCarthy, the HUAC and countless other anti-communist organizations were successful in infiltrating various universities. This article, however, will examine what I believe to be an anomaly for the era: the University of Chicago.

The University of Chicago was a deviation from the norm because it successfully fought against multiple investigations of supposed communist activities both on campus and in the personal lives of professors and students

---

[1] Paul Buhle and Dave Wagner, *Hide in Plain Sight: The Hollywood Blacklistees in Film and Television, 1950-2002* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Ronald Radosh and Allis Radosh, *Red Star Over Hollywood: The Film Colony's Long Romance with the Left* (New York: Encounter Books, 2006); and Victor S. Navasky, *Naming Names* (New York: Penguin Books, 1991).

[2] A communist front organization was a group or organization believed to be a front for communist and subversive meetings and activities, allegedly run either by the Communist Party or other communist organizations.

[3] A term commonly used during the Cold War era to describe the act of informing anti-communist organizations of subversives, communists, or communist sympathizers.

[4] Mark Engberg examined the removal of two professors and the censoring of a third at the University of Michigan. Phillip Deery investigated how Edwin Berry Burgum's academic career as a professor and literary theorist was destroyed as a result of his American Communist Party membership. He did so by exploring the relationship between New York University, where Burgum was employed, and the House Un-American Activities Committee. Deery not only examined how McCarthyism impacted liberal and communist professors, but also how the HUAC was able to get liberal-minded institutions like New York University to cooperate with its agenda. Ellen Schrecker identified McCarthyism's impact on American colleges and universities, exploring the witch hunt that plagued academic institutions and the number of professors and faculty members forced to "name names" or accept dismissal. Through interviews and other research, Schrecker demonstrated the impact of the unofficial blacklist on the lives and job status of many professors, one that lasted well into the 1960s. See, respectively, Mark E. Engberg, "McCarthyism and the Academic Profession: Power, Politics, and Faculty Purges at the University of Michigan," *American Educational History Journal* 29 (March 2002): 53-62; Phillip Deery, "'Running with the Hounds': Academic McCarthyism and New York University, 1952-53," *Cold War History* 10, no. 4 (November 2010): 469-492; and Ellen W. Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York: Oxford Press, 1986).

alike. It did so through the efforts of Robert Maynard Hutchins, who was president of the university from 1929 to 1945 and its chancellor from 1945 to 1951. Throughout his career at the University of Chicago, Hutchins was determined to defend the civil liberties of both his students and faculty, despite constant pressure from government organizations, trustees and conservative members of academic society to provide information on left leaning liberal students and faculty members. Hutchins put his reputation, career and personal life in jeopardy in order to protect the academic institution in which he strongly believed. Because of Hutchins, the University of Chicago was able to prevent the blacklisting of its faculty and staff.

The strong stance that Hutchins and the University of Chicago took against anti-communist organizations differs greatly from what occurred at most universities subjected to investigation. Other universities resisted anti-communist investigations, but their efforts were rarely successful. University administrators were often swayed to cooperate with investigators due to threats made by government officials. Such threats included, but were not limited to, the loss of government funding and the removal of tax exemption. Although the University of Chicago was in fact a private university, it was not immune to such threats since it had tax exempt status. But, because of its stalwart resistance to McCarthyism, Chicago was an exception to the usual pattern.

The investigation of the University of Chicago for subversive and communist activities dates back to as early as 1912, well before the start of the actual Cold War.[5] Under Hutchins, whose career at the university spanned from 1929 to 1951, the university faced two major investigations, the first in 1935 and the second in 1949. While this article will focus on these two separate instances, it should be understood that Hutchins and the University of Chicago faced constant government watch beginning with the first investigation and continuing well into the 1950s and 1960s.

In 1935, drugstore magnate Charles Walgreen incited an investigation of the University of Chicago that would become Hutchins' and the university faculty's first triumph over anti-communist organizations. Walgreen came to believe that his niece, Lucille Norton, who had begun attending the university in the fall of 1935, was being indoctrinated into communism. Based on many conversations with his niece about the content of her courses, Walgreen determined that there were radical professors at the university who were trying to force their views of free love and communism on the young, malleable minds of their students.[6] Walgreen, who was paying for Norton's education, described his niece in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* as an innocent girl who had

---

[5] Unsigned, "U. of C. 'Red Peril' Cited 23 Yrs. Ago by Prof. Shorey: Warning Repeated in '32 by Famed Scholar," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 15, 1935, 3.

[6] Free love is the practice of casual sex, not restrained by marriage or any other form of long-term or intimate relationship. Free love was believed to go hand in hand with communism and its destruction of American morals.

"expressed no decided views of social, economic, or governmental questions, [but] after attending the University of Chicago for a time her thoughts, as disclosed by her conversations, centered on communism and its tenets."[7] Disturbed by this, Walgreen withdrew his niece from her classes and sent President Hutchins a letter that claimed that the university was a hotbed for radical teachings and subversive propaganda. The letter also requested an open meeting with Hutchins, other administrators and the university board of trustees. Hutchins denied Walgreen's request, claiming to the *Tribune*,

> The University of Chicago for 43 years [has held] a clear record of public service and educational leadership... in view of that record it feels no necessity of holding a public hearing when vague and unsupported charges are made against it. The university will ignore your criticism until it receives the evidence it has asked for. If you will supply this evidence the board of trustees will give careful consideration to it.[8]

Hutchins' decision to deny an open meeting with Walgreen was not fully supported by his fellow administrators, alumni or the board of trustees. Many felt that not meeting with Walgreen, a very wealthy and respected individual, would be damaging to the university. Despite pressure to accept a meeting with Walgreen, however, Hutchins continued to deny his request. While many criticized Hutchins for "ducking out" of the confrontation, he gained the support of three prominent members of the university faculty: Fredric Woodward, Charles E. Merrian and Arthur H. Compton.[9] News of Hutchins' dismissal of Walgreen's request spread quickly throughout the state and nation. By April 15, 1935, it was assumed that the dismissal would lead to a senatorial investigation. Illinois State Senator Charles Baker (R), who backed Walgreen's request, stated that because Hutchins had avoided the open meeting, Walgreen would push for a legislative investigation of "red propaganda in colleges and schools of Illinois."[10] By this point Lucille Norton had publicly stated that she had "perceived no undercurrent of propaganda in the lectures on economic and political subjects." But her uncle continued to

---

7   Unsigned, "Clash at U. of C. Red Quiz Over Walgreen Data: Senators Hear Both Sides in Dispute," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* May 14, 1935, 1.
8   "Clash at U. of C.," 1.
9   Fredric Woodward was a Professor of Law at the University of Chicago and Vice President of the institution, Charles E. Merrian was Chair of the Department of Political Science, and Arthur H. Compton was a Professor of Physics, distinguished for his research on 'cosmic rays'. Unsigned, "Senator Speeds Move For State School Red Quiz: Hutchins Ducks Walgreen Issue, Says Baker," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 15, 1935, 1.
10   "Senator Speeds Move for State School Red Quiz," 1.

back a legislative investigation of the University of Chicago, Northwestern, and other Illinois universities.[11]

During the investigation, Walgreen presented what he believed to be evidence of the indoctrination of students at the University of Chicago. The majority of his evidence was based on conversations with his niece. Walgreen essentially criticized the content of the courses at the university for being unacceptable and sympathetic to communism. Walgreen testified that Fredrick L. Schuman, of the Political Science Department, was sympathetic to free love and other communist ideologies. Along with this, he also contended that this department required the reading and analysis of *The Communist Manifesto.* Walgreen also attacked the English Department for requiring students to read works by the "radical" author Stuart Chase, as well as *New Russia's Primer*, a standard textbook in Soviet schools that was designed to explain scientific socialism to adolescents. Walgreen told the Illinois Senate committee that he was "persuaded that the methods used in the social sciences and English courses...evidence a subtle and insidious design to impress by indirection, communist views on the student mind."[12] The *Tribune* described Walgreen and his lawyer's efforts to present evidence against the university as futile. Despite his best efforts, Walgreen lacked any hard evidence to support his accusations.

On June 26, 1935, the four members of the Illinois Senate committee that were investigating Walgreen's allegations submitted their majority report, which generally cleared the University of Chicago of all charges. The report stated that Walgreen's oral testimony against the institution was unpersuasive.[13] Fredrick L. Schuman was cleared of all accusations regarding his support of "free love" and communist ideologies. Another instructor, however, Professor Robert Morss Lovett, was found to be hostile to the investigation and not a loyal American. The report stated that he had participated in and spoken at communist meetings. These meetings were anti-war meetings that the committee deemed to be anti-American. The main evidence against Lovett was a letter that he had written, stating, "I was anxious to have the book published as a human story, not caring in the least whether it reflects the Russian government or the United States government or any other, all in my opinion, being rotten."[14] Investigators assumed that Lovett's age, mixed with the stress of work over the years, had impaired his judgment. They requested that he retire from the university.

In 1936, Lovett did retire from his position at the University of Chicago, but would continue to lecture and give courses at other universities, including

---

[11] Unsigned, "U. of C. Refuses Public Hearing on Radicalism: Asks Walgreen for Facts in Private," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* April 14, 1939, 1.

[12] "Clash at U. of C.," 1.

[13] Unsigned, "U. of C. Cleared; Hot Rebuke for One Professor: State Senator Issues 'Red' Report," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* June 27, 1939, 1.

[14] "U. of C. Cleared," 1.

the University of Puerto Rico. Since Lovett was near the end of his career when the investigation took place, it is hard to determine whether his retirement was due to personal choice or the investigation. In 1939, Lovett was appointed to the position of Secretary to the Government of the Virgin Islands where he held political office for four years before he was forced to resign after being attacked by the HUAC for communist subversion.[15]

During these investigations, Hutchins stood firmly behind his faculty, stressing the importance of academic freedom within universities. With the help of Professor Charles E. Merriam, Mrs. Edith Foster Flint (Lucile Norton's English professor), and Harold Swift (president of the board of trustees), Hutchins defended the reputation of the university and the professors under investigation. He did so through the use of carefully selected statements subtly wrapped in satire and irony. News reports commented that Hutchins appeared to be bored throughout much of the hearings, but when he did speak, his time was well spent. Hutchins understood the seriousness of the state investigation, but he clearly felt such accusations were not worth his and the university's time, as indicated by his mannerisms during the hearing. To him, the allegations brought against the University of Chicago were a mockery of the academic freedoms that he had and would defend his entire career. Hutchins argued that the university would not allow for the indoctrination of its students, but he added, as is the case with most professions, "...the professor is not disfranchised when he takes an academic post. He may join any church, club, or party; he may think, live, worship, and vote as he pleases."[16] While this was an important point to make about academic freedom, Hutchins understood how such a statement could possibly excite the accusers. In order to prevent the investigative committee from concluding that the university condoned professors associating with communist organizations, he continued his statement by stressing that "the university [could not]... have a professor who commits illegal acts. Under the laws of Illinois it is illegal to advocate the overthrow of the government by violence. The university would... dismiss any professor who...was proved to have advocated the overthrow of the government by violence."[17] With statements like this, he appealed to conservative sentiments while subtly mocking the fears of Walgreen and the committee.

After the University of Chicago was cleared of the allegations against it, in June 1935, Hutchins told 1,200 alumni at an assembly in Mandel Hall on campus that he believed the legislative investigation had helped the university rather than harmed it. According to the *Tribune*, he went on to say that the investigation proved that the University of Chicago was not an institution run

---

[15] "Guide to the Robert Morss Lovett Papers 1876-1950," University of Chicago Library, 2001, at http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/scrc/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.LOVETT [Accessed November 15, 2011].

[16] "Clash at U. of C.," 1.

[17] "Clash at U. of C.," 1.

rampant with radicals, but rather a "fine place, with stimulating courses of study, able teachers, upstanding students, and an active and intelligent board of trustees."[18] He also told the alumni in attendance that Walgreen's lawyer, Joseph Fleming, had only proven that one of the professors under investigation, Fredrick L. Schuman, was a liberal and not a radical nor a communist.[19] Jokingly, Hutchins concluded that Fleming proved that Schuman was indiscriminate, as he would attend any banquet that did not require a fee for entry and allowed him to sit in the back and consume a meal. Hutchins and the University of Chicago survived the 1935 investigation with relative ease, but the 1949 investigation would prove to be much more of a challenge.

The University's second investigation would come at the height of the Cold War. By 1949, communist investigations of the American education system were on the rise. The fear of subversive influences in the universities had grown, causing greater attention to be focused on the activities of faculty and students. Such scrutiny had begun to limit the academic freedom that had come to define the American education system in the previous decades. Not even prominent and prestigious institutions were spared the ever-watching eyes of anti-communist activities committees. Some, like the University of Michigan, tried to fight against the investigations and the accusations made against their faculty members, but had little success. Others cooperated with investigators to insure the well-being and tax exempt status of their institutions. Despite the failures of other universities, Hutchins and the University of Chicago would again hold strong and overcome the 1949 investigation.

The University of Chicago's second major investigation came as a surprise to many. It ensued less than 24 hours after approximately 150 students from the University of Chicago, Roosevelt College and other schools appeared on March 1, 1949 at the Illinois State legislature in Springfield to lobby against a series of anti-communist bills. The bills that the students were lobbying against were introduced by the Seditious Activities Group and designed to curb communist activity in Illinois.[20] Members of the legislature were appalled by the student demonstration, which was described as loud, rude, and disrespectful by those who witnessed it. Representative G. William Horsley (R, Springfield), who had recommended the investigation of the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College, described the event to the *Tribune* as "one of the most unsightly things [he had] seen in many a year." He went on to explain that he could tell just by looking at the demonstrators that "the communistic

---

[18] Unsigned, "Red Inquiry a Help to U. of C., Hutchins Tells 1,200 Alumni," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 9, 1935, 1.

[19] "Red Inquiry a Help to U. of C.," 1.

[20] The Broyles' Bills, introduced by Paul Broyles, "made any person in the State of Illinois, who was a member of the Communist Party ineligible for public office or for any position as 'a teacher, instructor or professor in any school, college or university' in Illinois." Jonathan R. Cole, *The Great American University* (New York: Public Affairs, 2010), 366.

doctrine [had] so infiltrated them [that it had] become a religion...they do not have the clean cut youth look my boys and girls and your boys and girls have."[21] Following the demonstration, University of Chicago and Roosevelt College were both informed of the possibility of an investigation. Both institutions were warned that if communist indoctrination was discovered on their campuses, they would, at the very least, lose their tax exempt statuses. According to news reports, both President Ernest Cadman Cowell of the University of Chicago and President Edward J. Sparling of Roosevelt College welcomed the idea of a legislative investigation with the confidence that it would not produce any evidence against either of their institutions.[22]

By March 16, 1949, with the support of the Illinois State Senator and Chairman of the Seditious Activities Investigation Commission, Paul Broyles (R, Mt. Vernon), the Illinois State House and Senate approved the proposed investigation and necessary funding for it.[23] The majority of the representatives voting on the emergency appropriation of $2,500 for the investigation were still reeling from the conduct of the students during their demonstration. Many felt that the students' behavior reflected the moral deprivation and communist indoctrination that had come to consume both institutions in question. Representative Clinton Seale (R, Rock Island) told news reporters that when he attended the University of Chicago it was a fine place to study, but he would not "send his pets there now."[24] The Representatives felt concern over what they had witnessed. They recognized that the students and their teachers had the right to freedom of speech, but argued, "Freedom of speech should not give teachers at tax exempt institutions the right to preach treasonable doctrines in the classroom." Representative Charles Clabaugh (R, Waukegan) went on to tell news reporters that we should not "forget that the Nazi storm troopers of the 1930s were also just a bunch of misguided kids who were being directed by smart and ruthless cheer leaders."[25] With the investigation underway, the Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission (also known as the Broyles Commission) acquired the help of Joseph Brown Matthews – a former research investigator for the HUAC and champion of the University of Washington hearings – as the chief investigator for the Illinois Commission. On April 15, 1949, Broyles reported that

---

[21] Johnson Kanady, "Vote State Inquiry into U. of C. Reds: Cite Roosevelt College Also," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* March 3, 1949, 1.

[22] Kanady, "Vote State Inquiry into U. of C. Reds," 1.

[23] Prior to March 16th, the Illinois House and Senate had already adopted a resolution empowering the Seditious Activities Commission to investigate the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College, but it lacked the appropriate funding to accomplish the job. On March 16, 1949, the Commission received the necessary two-thirds vote by the house to receive $2,500 in funding to carry out the investigation. George Tagge, "House Votes $2,500 for U. of C. Quiz: Senate Amends Anti-Red Bill," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* March 17, 1949, 1.

[24] "Vote State Inquiry into U. of C. Reds," 1.

[25] Tagge, "House Votes $2,500 for U. of C. Quiz," 1.

subpoenas had been served to both Chancellor Hutchins and Dean John B. Thompson. The subpoenas requested their appearance before the Commission at the opening of the hearings on April 21, 1949, to determine whether communism was being taught at the University of Chicago.[26]

Chancellor Hutchins served as the first witness before the Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission in Springfield. He testified before 13 of the 15 members of the committee who were present at the hearing.[27] In his opening statement, Hutchins told the Commission that he "[could] not testify concerning subversive activities at the University of Chicago because there [were] none."[28] Numerous times during the questioning, Hutchins explained that the University of Chicago did not believe in the doctrine of guilt by association. He told the Commission,

> The fact that some Communists belong to, believe in, or even dominate some of the organizations to which some of [University of Chicago's] professors belong does not show that those professors are engaged in subversive activities. All such facts would show would be that these professors believed in some objectives of the organizations.[29]

News reports described Hutchins as being calm and in control despite being on the receiving end of the interrogation. The *New York Times* noted that Hutchins frequently asked for "clearer definitions of terms and assumptions, or raised questions concerning them, and several times [he] drew laughs from a gallery of 400 observers."[30] Hutchins, a lawyer himself, was careful not to get caught up in the word play of Matthews, who was in charge of the interrogation. Many of Matthews' questions were worded with the intention of trapping Hutchins into admitting the guilt of the students and faculty of the university. The majority of the questions that Hutchins faced concerned the membership and activities of a student-run communist club that had been allowed by the University of Chicago, as well as his knowledge of professors' activities and alliances off campus. The Chancellor carefully stated that while some of the students and faculty may be associated with groups that the Commission would categorize as "communist front"

---

[26] Unsigned, "Broyles Group Serves Subpena on Hutchins in State Red Probe," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 16, 1949, 9. The Broyles Commission was made up of five members from the Illinois State Senate, five members from the Illinois State House of Representatives, and five nonpartisan citizens.

[27] George Eckel, "Illinois Inquiry Hears Dr. Hutchins Deny Subversion at U. of Chicago: Chancellor Asserts School does not Believe 'in Doctrine of Guilt by Association' – 1st Witness in Legislative Study," *The New York Times*, April 22, 1949, 19.

[28] J.B. Matthews, "Investigation of University of Chicago and Roosevelt College," State of Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission, April 21, 22, 23, 1949-May 19, 1949 (State of Illinois, 1949).

[29] "Illinois Inquiry Hears Dr. Hutchins," 19.

[30] "Illinois Inquiry Hears Dr. Hutchins," 19.

organizations, their membership was not incriminating, nor did it define their
political beliefs. Hutchins informed the Commission that the communist club
had an average of ten members, and that as far as he knew only two or three
members considered themselves communists. The remaining members were
merely interested in the study of communism. Hutchins argued that a dozen
or so communist sympathizers on campus were not a real danger to the state
or the university. The real danger, Hutchins insisted, comes when you
"mistakenly repress the free spirit upon which... institutions are built. …The
policy of repression of ideas cannot work and never has worked."[31] After an
hour and a half of questioning, with a 15-minute recess, Hutchins was excused
from the hearing. The hearing carried on for another three days before the
Commission reached a decision.[32]

On May 20, 1949, the Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation
Commission met and wrote its report in a two-hour session. The report, which
is a transcript of more than 300,000 words of testimony, provided no
recommendations regarding its findings in the hearing. According to the
Tribune, committee members stated that the decision to "avoid
recommendations to the general assembly was a unanimous one."[33] While
Hutchins and the University of Chicago were seemingly victorious at the
hearing, the Chancellor became increasingly more outspoken against anti-
communist organizations, while the investigation of the University of Chicago
and Roosevelt College carried on. In an interview less than nine days after the
Commission had released its decision, Hutchins stated his opposition to
mandatory loyalty oaths and laws preventing professors from joining
"subversive" groups. He told reporters that a professor's political beliefs
should not affect his or her qualifications. A professor's competence is for the
university and his fellow faculty to determine. Hutchins asserted that
"subversive groups are generally not subjected to legal safe-guards or
determinations. Since virtually any organization can be termed 'subversive' by
its opponents, teachers may be subjected to penalty without adequate safe-
guards or recourse."[34] The university remained unscathed by the Commission
until it met again in June 1949.

On June 14, 1949, the Seditious Activities Investigation Commission met
to determine the appropriate measures to follow based upon its investigation of
the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College. Eleven of the thirteen active
members condemned much of what the investigation had unveiled. The state-

---

[31] "Illinois Inquiry Hears Dr. Hutchins," 19.

[32] The hearing was held on April 21, 22, 23 and on May 19, 1949, during which seven University of
Chicago professors denied the charges brought against them. Johnson Kanady, "U. of C. Probers End
Hearings, Write Report," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 21, 1949, 3.

[33] "U. of C. Probers End Hearings," 3.

[34] Benjamin Fine, "Educators Insist on Ouster of Reds: Professors Would Drop Party Members, Saying
Academic Freedom has Limits," *The New York Times,* May 30, 1949, 1.

wide investigation concluded that outside of the University of Chicago, there were 30,000 adherents of communism in the Chicago area and 6,500 card-carrying communists in Illinois.[35] The Commission stated that "never in recent history of the state has there been encountered by a Commission such an extensive and highly coordinated effort to challenge its authority and stop its...activities."[36] The Commission felt that Hutchins and the liberal media were advocating a smear campaign against the process of the investigation, but concluded, "if this investigation produces a salutary effect on [the subversive] activities of professors, as we believe it will, it will have been very much worthwhile."[37] They encouraged the denial of the university's tax exempt status because it had refused to rid itself of "communist front professors, organizations, and activities."[38]

The Commission believed that Hutchins' defense against the doctrine of guilt by association was invalid and they criticized the evasive answers given by other witnesses from the University of Chicago. The *Tribune* reported that the Commission was disturbed and appalled "to find that some of the faculty members refused to accept the right of the Justice Department and other governmental agencies to list certain organizations as 'subversive', 'communist', or 'communist front' organizations."[39] It was the majority's opinion that any individual associated with communism, in any manner, was "undesirable" to teach in the American school system. The Commission issued a series of recommendations in response to the investigation's findings that, if followed, would be detrimental to the university and its students and staff.[40] Of the thirteen members of the Commission, there were only two dissenters, Charles J. Jenkins (R, Chicago) and Senator Norman Barry (D, Chicago). According to the *Tribune*, Barry stated that "it [was] 'both unwise and Un-American' to dictate to the trustees of the University of

---

[35] Johnson Kanady, "Schools Found a Fertile Field for Red Growth: Seeds Easily Planted, Report Says," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* June 22, 1949, 7.

[36] Johnson Kanady, "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* June 15, 1949, 1.

[37] "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," 1.

[38] "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," 1.

[39] "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," 1.

[40] The Recommendations of the Majority were as follows: "1. Expulsion from any tax exempt or tax supported school of any student who refuses to say whether he is a communist and whether he will fight on the side of the United States in a war with Russia. The same applies to those who acknowledge communism. 2. A private investigation by the officials of the U. of C. and Roosevelt College and all other educational institutions, concerning student activities, communist clubs, faculty affiliations, etc. 3. Prohibition of sale, on campuses, of communist propaganda, refusal to allow campus bulletin boards or publications to carry advertisements of communist meetings, and denial of campus facilities for such meetings. 4. Survey of textbooks and required reading material to eliminate material which advocates theories and doctrines of communism or 'other subversive doctrine.' 5. Dismissal of professors who refuse to resign from known communist or communist front groups. 6. Investigation of new campus organizations to ascertain whether they are made up of persons who have been members of 'questionable' organizations. 7. Denial of tax exemption to any school which allows communist front professors to teach, or which allows communist front groups to flourish under faculty sponsorship." "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," 1.

Chicago how to do their job." The university released the following nine-word statement regarding the recommendations: "We heartily agree with the statement of Sen. Barry."[41]

Two days after the Commission announced its recommendations, Hutchins spoke in front of 466 students at the University of Chicago's commencement exercise. During the ceremony, Hutchins kept his strong and unwavering stance against anti-communist organizations that had been berating his university because of the reports of communist and subversive activities described by the investigation. Furious over the accusations brought against the university and the American education system as a whole, Hutchins told those in attendance that "the 'cloak and stiletto work' that is going on will frighten independent thinkers into silence and stupidity and injustice will go unchallenged."[42] Without mentioning the Seditious Activities Investigation Commission specifically, Hutchins criticized anti-communist organizations for accomplishing exactly the opposite of their goal. He argued that these organizations were not protecting Americanism, but rather making many of the same demands as *The Communist Manifesto*, albeit in a peaceful manner.[43] According to the *Tribune*, Hutchins told the audience the following:

> It has never been shown that there are so many spies or traitors in this country, or that the external danger is so great and imminent that we have to divert the entire attention of our people into one great repressive preoccupation, into one great counter-revolution, in which freedoms of our citizens must be thrown overboard as too burdensome for the floundering ship of state to carry.... We ought to be afraid of being stupid and unjust, we are told we must be afraid of Russia, yet we are busily engaged in adopting the most stupid and unjust of the ideas prevalent in Russia, and are doing so in the name of Americanism. The worst Russian ideas are the police state, the abolition of freedom of speech, thought and associations, and the notion that the individual exists for the state.[44]

With public addresses like this, Hutchins not only defended the integrity of the University of Chicago, but also denounced the credibility of anti-communist organizations. Because recommendations had been made and the investigation had gained national attention, Hutchins had no other option but to continue insisting that the university did not allow the indoctrination of its students and that the actions of the Seditious Activities Investigation

---

[41] "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," 1.

[42] Unsigned, "Legion Post Awards Presented: Loyalty Oaths Stupid, Unjust, Hutchins Says," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* June 23, 1949, 10.

[43] "Red Schools Face Loss of Tax Freedom," 1.

[44] "Legion Post Awards Presented," 10.

Commission were unconstitutional and un-American. Hutchins, by appealing to logic and remaining level-headed, was able to outwit the Commission in what would turn into a battle of emotions. The end of June would mark the slow downfall of the Commission's attack on the University of Chicago.

On June 23, 1949, Representative and Commission member Horsley issued his remarks in a 23-page booklet that summed up the evidence gathered by the investigation. Rather than appealing to logic, Horsley turned to emotion. He claimed that the moral conditions at the University of Chicago were "ample proof of that fact that communism, lawlessness, and disrespect for religion and family life go hand in hand."[45] He described the conditions of the university as shocking and cited 27 cases of sex crimes, felonies, and general police trouble involving University of Chicago students.[46] In his analysis, he cited instances of sex orgies in university buildings and stated that the university had been aware of and unresponsive to such sexual acts. He also attacked Hutchins, claiming that he had remained indifferent throughout the investigation and had given silent approval for the "subversive" activities that occurred on campus. The *Tribune* reported that Horsley planned to ask for legislative action on a resolution embracing his recommendations, which were similar to the Commission's June 14th majority report.[47]

Immediately following the release of Horsley's booklet, Hutchins indicated to the *Tribune* that the University of Chicago was contemplating "possible legal action against the legislator on the strength of the booklet."[48] Hutchins told reporters that "Horsley's accusations [were] vicious and untrue."[49] The Chancellor was appalled at the slanderous manner Horsley had written his reports. In a telephone conversation with reporters, Hutchins stated that Horsley had the chance to produce his evidence of immorality during the Broyles hearings, but did not have the courage to do so, as he knew they would not withstand a cross-examination. He went on to say that all of Horsley's accusations had been investigated by university officials and dismissed as gossip. Hutchins ended his conversation by informing reporters, "the university intends promptly to get legal advice as to whether Horsley, merely because he is a member of the legislature, has immunity for this libelous and irresponsible charge."[50]

Horsley's booklet appears to have decisively discredited the Commission's investigation of the University of Chicago. His slanderous accusations were obviously too biased and libelous for the legislature and public to believe.

---

[45] Johnson Kanady, "Charges U. of C. Chief Follows Red Front Line; Censure of 2 Prexies Urged by Horsley." *Chicago Daily Tribune,* June 24, 1949, 3.

[46] "Charges U. of C. Chief Follows Red Front Line," 3.

[47] "Charges U. of C. Chief Follows Red Front Line," 3.

[48] Unsigned, "Horsley Charge Draws Denial from Hutchins," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 24, 1949, 3.

[49] "Horsley Charge Draws Denial from Hutchins," 3.

[50] "Horsley Charge Draws Denial from Hutchins," 3.

Whether Horsley wrote his booklet in reaction to the attacks Hutchins had
made against the Commission, or as a last desperate effort to prove the
presence of un-American activities at the University of Chicago and put forth
the recommendations of the Commission, is up for debate. Either way this
decision was damaging to the Commission. After June 24, 1949, the day after
Horsley had released his booklet and the university had threatened legal action,
newspaper coverage of the investigation ended. Thereafter, the conflict
between Horsley and the University of Chicago appears to have slowly fizzled
out. The Seditious Activities Investigation Commission was defeated and the
Broyles' Bills, which were at the root of the entire investigation, were also later
defeated in the legislature.[51] With the self-destruction of Horsley's
investigation, the University of Chicago, for the second time, was able to walk
away from a major investigation relatively unscathed.

Many parallels can be drawn between the 1935 and 1949 investigations of
the University of Chicago. Both investigations examined the degree to which
professors and students could exercise their First Amendment rights, while
remaining within the parameters set by the United States government during a
period of fear and paranoia brought on by hostile relations between the United
States and the Soviet Union. However, these parameters would continue to
contract as the relationship between these two world powers soured. By 1945,
it had become clear to the American public that there was no grey area – you
were either democratic or communist, an American or a subversive. The
majority of the American population supported McCarthy's witch hunt, which
targeted intellectuals, minority groups, and those with liberal leanings, all in the
name of freedom. With its intentions pointing in one direction and its actions
pointing in another, McCarthy and the HUAC, with the support of the
American people, engendered a society that favored restriction and repression
over expression and tolerance.

The rhetoric used to fight the "communist threat" evolved as the American
government, along with the population, became more and more obsessed.
Frightening American society with anti-communist and "pinko" propaganda,
McCarthy and anti-communist organizations were able to grow in power and
stature. This enabled these organizations to convince the population that the
battle they were embroiled in was no longer just about democracy verses
communism, but about right versus wrong, good versus evil. It is through this
lens that we can identify the differences between the two investigations that
occurred at the University of Chicago.

The 1949 investigation occurred at the height of the Cold War, an era in
which the investigation and blacklisting of assumed communists in academia
had become a common occurrence. Hutchins, through his undeterred defense

---

[51] Cole, 366.

of academic freedom, stood strong as a hero of American academia. Jonathon R. Cole states in his book, *The Great American Universities,* that Hutchins' "forceful counter-attack on the 'red-hunters' has led scholars of the Cold War period to speculate that some of the damage of McCarthyism might have been mitigated had more academic leaders had [Hutchins'] courage to defend the idea of the University."[52] During the two investigations this article has analyzed, Robert Maynard Hutchins did not succumb to the pressures and threats of government agencies like so many university leaders did during the Cold War. Hutchins did not tolerate fear mongering nor allow slanderous and damaging accusations to force him or the University of Chicago into submission. Rather than look out for his own personal well-being, he chose to protect and defend his institution and the academic rights of all. Because of his stance against repression and the slow destruction of academic freedom, Hutchins is one of the unsung heroes of Cold War America.

---

[52] Cole, 366.

Myth or Reality?
Christopher Columbus as Portrayed in Textbooks and Public Monuments

By Valerie Gabaldo

For most of history, since that fateful day in October 1492, Americans have celebrated Christopher Columbus as a hero. Every school-aged child in the United States learns that he "discovered" America and proved to everyone in Europe that the earth was round, not flat. The myth created around Christopher Columbus leaves out much of the true story about his explorations, life, and treatment of those he met. Since the 1970s, the heroism of Columbus has been tarnished as historians have studied the facts of the Columbus story.[1] However, textbooks and public monuments often portray Columbus as the hero and grandfather of the United States and the American continents.[2] Almost every textbook on American history has a section on their discovery and there are at least 237 monuments in the United States dedicated to Christopher Columbus.[3] To understand why Columbus is portrayed as a hero or a villain, it is necessary to look at the context in which a given textbook was published, or a monument built.[4] Understanding the period in which a book or monument appeared gives insight into what societal need the portrayal of Columbus filled. Columbus's story has also raised many questions about how he should be taught in schools and whether he should be presented as a hero, a villain, or some combination of the two.

Christopher Columbus, as the "discoverer" of a new continent, has been a very popular subject for historians and biographers. For the first several hundred years after his "discovery" of the Americas, Columbus was portrayed as the quintessential hero. However in the 1970s, this began to change on a large scale. Whereas before he was seen as beginning the modern age, and as a Renaissance man who made his own destiny and had the values of dignity and individualism, Columbus became the worst villain in history.[5] This change from hero to villain emerged from a controversy between supporters and opponents of the Columbus story. Much of the controversy centered on the accuracy of the myth, and whether his "discovery" was a triumph of progress or a catastrophe for Native Americans and the environment.[6]

---

[1] Richard Gambino, "Revisions of the Christopher Columbus Myth: Is He An Historical Hero?" *Columbus: Meeting of Cultures*, ed. Mario B. Mignone (Stony Brook: Forum Italicum, 1993), 44.

[2] Foster Provost, "Columbus as a Comic Hero," *Columbus: Meeting of Cultures*, ed. Mario B. Mignone (Stony Brook: Forum Italicum, 1993), 64.

[3] Peter van der Krogt, "Columbus Monuments Pages," *Columbus Monuments Pages*, at http://vanderkrogt.net/columbus.index.php [Accessed April 21, 2012].

[4] James W. Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007), 333.

[5] Mario B. Mignone, "Introduction," *Columbus: Meeting of Cultures*, ed. Mario B. Mignone (Stony Brook: Forum Italicum, 1993), ix.

[6] Richard Gambino, "The Question of Columbus's Historical Significance," *Columbus: Meeting of Cultures*, ed. Mario B. Mignone (Stony Brook: Forum Italicum, 1993), 38.

Myth or Reality?
Christopher Columbus as Portrayed in Textbooks and Public Monuments

While many historians have argued about the accuracy of the Columbus myth regarding his childhood, explorations, and origins, others have looked at his portrayal in different time periods. Historian Marvin Lunenfeld has stated that the views of Columbus changed over time in accordance with the concerns of a given society. In the post Civil War years, he was an icon for the renewed entrepreneurial nation, while in the 1940s, when the United States needed a naval hero after the attacks on Pearl Harbor, it found one in Columbus. By the 1990s, with the shift away from heroes and the embrace of multiculturalism, attacks on Columbus became part of the social climate.[7]

The portrayal of Columbus has also been examined by historians studying textbook revision. In her 1979 book *America Revised*, Frances FitzGerald looked at textbooks used in the United States from 1900 to the 1970s. For example, she noticed that since the 1930s, textbooks focused more on institutions and social forces than on heroes. Still another shift occurred in the 1960s, as the nation turned toward societal problems and students began to question content.[8] Columbus had become a minor character in history as his story was displaced by the study of Native American cultures or other explorers. Through their 200-year history, American textbooks have undergone several complete revisions, with many events being adjusted to suit the temperament of their times.[9]

The choice of public monuments also changed over time. Albert Boime, in his 1998 book *The Unveiling of the National Icons*, looked at how national icons such as the American flag and the Statue of Liberty were created and later manipulated for patriotic purposes. The same has occurred with Christopher Columbus, as he and other icons have acted as shrines to American national ideas and to preserve historical, religious, and biographical memory.[10] Public monuments have become part of a "civil religion" helping to hold society together with a shared heritage.[11] These monuments can be found everywhere on the American landscape, in courthouses, historic homes and sites, and on roadsides. Like textbooks, they usually focus only on the "positives" of a specific event or person's life.[12] This is true with Columbus, as most monuments dedicated to him celebrate his "discovery" of the Americas, without a word to the rest of the story.

---

[7]   Marvin Lunenfeld, "Columbus-Bashing: Culture Wars over the Construction of an Anti-Hero," *Columbus: Meeting of Cultures*, ed. Mario B. Mignone (Stony Brook: Forum Italicum, 1993), 1-4.

[8]   Frances FitzGerald, *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979), 54, 10-11.

[9]   FitzGerald, 8, 48.

[10] Albert Boime, *The Unveiling of the National Icons: A Plea for Patriotic Iconoclasm* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 2-7.

[11] James W. Loewen, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong* (New York: The New Press, 1999), 26.

[12] Loewen, *Lies Across America*, 15.

As suggested, the story of Columbus has been the subject of American school textbooks since the United States was formed, as well as of monuments, even as perceptions of the explorer changed. Such shifts raise several questions about how the story of Columbus should be taught in schools. Should he be portrayed as a hero or a villain? Should young children be shown the horrors he began for the native populations? Should previous views of Columbus be used to teach his story and if so, how?

Columbus's Story

Historians, using legal documents, letters, journals, and other sources of the period have pieced together the "real" story of Christopher Columbus. His story starts with the Age of Exploration. Beginning in the early 15th century, Europeans explored the world by sea in search of new trade partners, trade routes and goods, as well as to simply learn about the world. Scholars had known for over 1,500 years that Earth was large and round, but did not know about land past Europe, parts of Africa and Asia. In the 3rd century B.C.E., Eratosthenes, a Greek scholar, had calculated the circumference of the earth to within one percent error. Eratosthenes' figure of 25,000 miles was much more correct than Columbus's later calculations of 18,000 miles, and most scholars in the Middle Ages accepted the larger circumference figure as correct.[13] There were many reasons for explorers to set their sights on the seas as Europe developed, and these also allowed for the overall acceptance of new discoveries. As countries advanced in terms of military technology, they created larger territories. Religion provided justification for conquests and a motivation to gain wealth and power, as these were seen as positive for esteem on earth and for salvation in heaven. Social technological advances, such as the printing press, as well as increases in literacy, allowed the news of discoveries to spread more quickly than in the past; the successes of imperial domination thus became well known. In many cases, the conquest of island societies was also aided by the spread of diseases from Europe such as influenza and smallpox. The Americas did not have diseases similar to Europe and as such, their natives did not have immune systems to defend against them; this led to mass death.[14]

The Portuguese were at the forefront of sea exploration during the early 15th century, and Columbus learned quite a bit from Portuguese sailors. Under their prince, Henry the Navigator, the Portuguese began the first systematic exploration of the African coast and Atlantic Ocean in 1434.[15] By 1452, they had begun profiting from the slave trade, though they continued looking for a route to the Indian Ocean around the continent. In 1469, they discovered the

---

[13] Charles C. Mann, *1493: Uncovering the New World Columbus Created* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011), 15-16.

[14] Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me,* 35-37.

[15] Ernie Bradford, *Christopher Columbus* (New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1973), 28.

Ivory, Slave, and Gold Coasts, and in 1488, they reached the southern tip of Africa.[16] In addition to their discoveries, the Portuguese experimented with ideas of longitude and latitude, drawing the Meridian through St. Vincent Cape, the south westernmost tip of Europe in southwest Portugal.[17]

It was in this Age of Exploration that Christopher Columbus grew up. He was born in Genoa, Italy in 1451 to Susanna and Domenico Colombo. Cristoforo, as he was born, had two brothers, and a sister who died at a young age.[18] His father was a weaver and worked in the wool trade.[19] Columbus had little formal education, though he learned to read and write, and he studied some cosmographers' works.[20] He first went to sea around the age of 13.[21] In 1476, at the age of 25, Columbus joined a ship's crew. During the trip, the ship sank off the coast of Lagos, Portugal and Columbus made his way to Lisbon. Here he stayed for eight years, working as a mapmaker, bookseller, and sailor.[22] In 1477, Columbus sailed to Iceland, England, and Ireland, working on a ship in the triangle trade in the area. On this trip he heard stories of land to the west, which led him to think about sailing west to find a route to India.[23] At the age of 28, Columbus married Felipa Moniz Pecestrello, whose father was an explorer and governor of an island in the Madieras, which he had helped to find. They had a son, named Diego. Columbus's mother-in-law gave him her husband's journals and maps when she learned how interested he was in exploration.[24] Having heard more stories about land in the west and having studied other explorers' journals and maps, Columbus became convinced that a route to India by sailing west was possible. He approached King John of Portugal with the idea in 1484 and it was determined by a commission that his calculations on the circumference of Earth were wrong.[25]

In 1485, with his wife Felipa having died and King John of Portugal having refused to serve as his benefactor, Columbus moved to Spain, hoping to interest King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella in his idea to find a new route to India.[26] Through connections with wealthy friends, Columbus met the monarchs in 1486 and then followed their traveling court for six years. To investigate his idea, Isabella and Ferdinand set up a commission, which in its 1490 report, again found his calculations on circumference to be wrong and his

---

[16] Zvi Dor-Ner and William G. Scheller, *Columbus and the Age of Discovery* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1991), 55-61.
[17] Dor-Ner and Scheller, 64.
[18] Bradford, 11, 17.
[19] Bradford, 17; Gianni Granzotto, *Christopher Columbus*, trans. Stephen Sartarelli (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1985), 25.
[20] Granzotto, 24.
[21] Bradford, 22.
[22] Bradford, 27, 47.
[23] Bradford, 35-39.
[24] Bradford, 48-51.
[25] Bradford, 49; Granzotto, 58.
[26] Bradford, 60-61.

route west unfeasible.[27] While waiting for a reply from the Spanish monarchs, Cristobal Colon, as Columbus was known, had another son, Ferdinand, by his Córdoba mistress.[28] The close of 1491 had Columbus ready to move to France or England to garner support for his idea there, when the Reconquista ended and Isabella and Ferdinand were ready to further discuss his western route. The Spanish monarchs had been fighting to rid their country of the Moors for hundreds of years, and in January 1492, finally succeeded. By April of that year, Columbus had signed a contract to sail west in search of a route to India.[29] By the time of his death in May 1506, at the age of 55, Columbus had sailed to the "new world" four times.[30]

Columbus's first and most famous voyage west with three ships – the Niña, the Pinta, and the Santa María – began on August 3, 1492 and ended in March 1493. These 36 weeks marked the end of the "old world," as it was known, as a "new world" was "found." On October 12, 1492, land was sighted from the three small ships.[31] On this trip, Columbus and his crew discovered many Caribbean islands, including the Bahamas, Cuba, and Hispaniola.[32] On Hispaniola, Navidad, a settlement of about forty men, was created after the Santa María sank on Christmas day. As was expected of them on each island they found, members of the crew were to explore in search of gold.[33] The Niña and Pinta thus returned to Spain with evidence of the "new world"; news quickly spread and the Indies were known around Europe within the year.[34]

Columbus was quickly given permission for another voyage to the "new world." This one was much bigger, with seventeen ships, 12,000 men, and resources for permanent settlements.[35] This voyage left Spain in September 1493 and returned in June 1496. During that time, it landed on several different Caribbean islands and a new settlement, Isabella, was created after Navidad was found deserted. Isabella was a rough settlement for the men who explored inland for gold and many got sick from disease and a poor diet.[36] Columbus left the settlement in order to further explore the Indies, traveling along the south coast of Cuba, Jamaica, and southern Hispaniola.[37] In spring 1495, Columbus led a punitive expedition inland and captured hundreds of natives, sending 500 of them back to Spain as slaves. He also instituted a tribute system, requiring the natives to meet gold or cotton quotas every three

---

[27] Granzotto, 80; Bradford, 65-72.
[28] Bradford, 63.
[29] Bradford, 76-77.
[30] Granzotto, 267.
[31] Bradford, 15, 82.
[32] Bradford, 116-131.
[33] Bradford, 140-143.
[34] Dor-Ner and Scheller, 197.
[35] Granzotto, 198.
[36] Granzotto, 204-210.
[37] Granzotto, 212.

months or else be severely punished.[38] Before returning to Spain, a hurricane hit the island, causing the capital to be moved to Santo Domingo.[39]

   In May 1498, Columbus was again allowed to sail back to the "new world" and returned in October 1500. For this trip, Columbus had three ships for exploration, while another three headed straight to Santo Domingo.[40] Columbus landed much farther south this time, finding the continent of South America. He first landed on Trinidad before exploring the Paria Peninsula of northern Venezuela, later returning to Santo Domingo.[41] He returned to find many problems in Santo Domingo, with men dying, rebellion, gold scarcity, and issues with the tribute system and continued slave raids.[42] Unknown to Columbus, the Spanish monarchs heard of these problems and appointed Francisco de Bobadilla as the authority of the Indies. Once Bobadilla arrived in Santo Domingo, Columbus and his brothers were arrested and sent back to Spain in chains, though they were later pardoned for their mismanagement of the colony.[43]

   Columbus sailed once more to the Indies in May 1502, after promising to not return to Santo Domingo. With four ships, Columbus set off, landing on Martinique before going to Santo Domingo, ignoring his orders. Here he stayed to weather a hurricane before sailing west to search for the straight he was sure existed. After failing to find the straight along the coasts of Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama, he switched his sights to gold. Columbus did find some gold, though greatly angered the natives and was forced to leave.[44] Problems began shortly afterward as the ships suffered from shipworms and encountered several storms. They became stranded on Jamaica, where they stayed for 13 months before being rescued, and later returned to Spain in November 1504.[45]

   Much about Columbus's voyages is left out of the mythology, particularly the mistreatment of natives. The misidentification of the natives as Indians is minor compared to their many other grievances. From the very first contact with natives in 1492, Columbus removed men from their homes to act as guides for his exploration.[46] This forced removal did not end, and quickly came to encompass work as well, as Columbus never saw the relationship of Europeans and natives reaching beyond that of master-servant.[47] During his second voyage in 1494, Columbus began using the natives as slaves, selling

---

38 Granzotto, 222; Bradford, 222.
39 Bradford, 227.
40 Bradford, 235.
41 Bradford, 238-244.
42 Bradford, 247-248; Granzotto, 239.
43 Bradford, 250-256.
44 Granzotto, 251- 255.
45 Granzotto, 261-265; Bradford, 265.
46 Bradford, 120.
47 Granzotto, 207.

them to help pay for the colony. In 1495, as previously mentioned, he sent 500 natives to Spain, thus beginning the trans-Atlantic slave trade; the natives on Hispaniola were soon subjected to slavery as well. Overall, Columbus directed slave-catching raids of villages, the occupation of land, and the imposition of the tribute system.[48] In the early 16th century, Africans were brought to the islands to replace the depleted native population as slaves for the sugar crop.[49]

    In addition to being subjected to forced removal and labor, the natives were taken advantage of in various ways. The Europeans in the settlements did not have much food and soon began to abuse the natives' generosity in providing them with this and other goods. The settlers began to raid and plunder villages for food, as well as gold and any other valuable items they could find. As they found more villages and islands, the Europeans constantly pressed the natives for the location of gold, harassing them for answers. The women of the villages were in constant danger of being raped, as it was considered a reward for the all-male settlers to have a woman.[50] The natives also faced punishments for not cooperating with the European settlers. The settlers used intimidation, show of force and violence to discourage rebellion and frighten the natives into working for them. They used large dogs, showed their weapons, and even cut off an ear or the nose of a native to intimidate.[51]

    The movement of goods, people, ideas, plants, animals and diseases across the Atlantic Ocean, between the "old world" and the "new world," is known as the Columbian Exchange. This worldwide exchange, which still occurs today, has had large-scale consequences. Almost half of all of today's major crops originated in the Americas, and the gold and silver trade of the Americas was so great it undermined Islamic power in the 15th century.[52] When Columbus first returned to Spain in 1493, he took back with him parrots, vegetation, gold, unknown spices and natives; this exchange quickly accelerated with his second voyage. In preparation for permanent settlement in the "new world," the supplies loaded onto ships included wine, horses, cattle, sheep and pigs. Earthworms, rats, honeybees, mosquitoes, dandelions, and diseases like swine flu and smallpox were also unknowingly taken on board.[53] When men from the second voyage returned to Spain, they brought with them many items as well, including the hammock, gold, spices, wood, tobacco, maize, sweet potatoes, chili peppers and cotton, in addition to slaves.[54]

---

[48] Dor-Ner and Scheller, 213-215.
[49] Dor-Ner and Scheller, 280.
[50] Bradford, 189, 218; Granzotto, 207.
[51] Bradford, 204-208.
[52] Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, 61-63.
[53] Bradford, 164, 176-180; Mann, 9-11.
[54] Bradford, 196; Warwick Bray, "Crop Plants and Cannibals: Early European Impressions of the New World," *The Meeting of Two Worlds: Europe and the Americas, 1492- 1650*, ed. Warwick Bray (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 291.

Societal Changes, Education, and Columbus

The "true" story that has been pieced together by historians about Columbus's childhood and later life, his voyages, his treatment of the natives, and the Columbian Exchange, is not always what is shown in textbooks. Several historians have looked at textbook revision in general, some focusing on specific events and figures, including Columbus. In *Guardians of Tradition*, Ruth Miller Elson stated that histories were not required until after the Civil War, but became important because they helped identify what information was worthy of being part of American tradition.[55] In the late 19th century, Columbus was very important because he was a model for desirable qualities, with his religious, individualistic and scientific leanings.[56] While Elson looked at textbooks from the nineteenth century, James Loewen focused on textbooks published between 1974 and 2007. He found that when publishers were faced with unpleasant truths about the hero, they blamed others for any faults.[57] With Columbus, Loewen found that textbooks gave "cut and dried" answers despite the fact that uncertainty existed regarding such issues as Columbus's class background, where he thought he had landed, and the weather during his voyages.[58] Many textbooks also did not provide the whole story, leaving out the other voyages, the Columbian Exchange, and the violence of the tribute system and slavery, as well as racism.[59]

In my research on Columbus in textbooks, I have looked at seven textbooks from the second half of the twentieth century. Two of the textbooks are from the 1960s, two are from the early 1970s, and three are from the 1990s. There are several interesting trends in the textbooks, ranging from the amount of space given to Columbus to the content provided. While one textbook published in 1964, *History of Our United States*, spends five pages on Columbus, the other one from the 1960s and those from the 1970s only give Columbus a passing mention of two to five sentences.[60] The textbooks from the 1990s give Columbus an average of two pages. The content provided in the textbooks on Columbus and the Age of Exploration is also wide-ranging. Only half of the books afford detailed attention to previous discoveries of the American continent and the Age of Exploration. The violence perpetrated by Columbus toward the natives is only mentioned in one book. Only one textbook specifically provides information on the Columbian Exchange, though both textbooks from the 1960s mention a change in trade routes and the items he returned with. While the majority of the textbooks mention his other

---

[55] Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 4-5.
[56] Elson, 190.
[57] Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, 17.
[58] Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, 47-48.
[59] Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me,* 53-63.
[60] Harold H. Eibling et al., *History of Our United States* (River Forest: Laidlaw Brothers Publishers, 1964), 45-49.

voyages, only two provide maps and only one goes into detail, though only briefly. The explanation for the varied treatment of Columbus lies in the preoccupations and orientation of the times in which the textbooks appeared.

The 1960s were a period of turmoil and political activism, while the 1970s were a retreat from this activism and a period of redirection for the United States.[61] Starting with a newly elected Catholic president, John F. Kennedy, and ending with an overwhelming presidential win by Republican Richard Nixon, the 1960s were full of political protests and crises. Internationally, the Cold War led to the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba, which failed horribly, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the steady and rapid escalation of the Vietnam War. Domestically, crisis continued with the assassination of President Kennedy in November 1963, and the assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy in 1968. Political activism flourished as well during the 1960s, with the Civil Rights Movement spreading from blacks to women, youth, Native Americans, Mexicans, and other minority groups. Anti-war demonstrations also became commonplace, especially on college campuses. By 1968, American society seemed to be falling apart, as the youth culture of rock music and drugs pulled teenagers farther away from the older generations, and political divisions became apparent.[62] In the midst of the chaos of the 1960s, President Lyndon B. Johnson passed domestic reforms that affected schools and aimed to better American society.

Johnson became president after Kennedy's assassination in 1963, and began domestic reforms to create his "Great Society," an America with improved education, equality, a protected environment, and no poverty. Johnson passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, and several other laws in his "War on Poverty."[63] The Civil Rights Act put in place fiscal penalties for continued segregation in schools, leading to a great push for desegregation in the late 1960s.[64] The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest federal education law passed, set aside a large amount of money to help deprived students and schools.[65] The Bilingual Education Act stated that children whose first language was not English could be given instruction in their first language and English so that their achievement did not suffer.[66] While these reforms were passed in the 1960s, school curriculum had already been affected by the National Defense Education Act, which was passed in 1958 in response to

---

[61] Wayne J. Urban and Jennings L. Wagoner, *American Education: A History* (New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 2009), 355.
[62] Urban, 356-358.
[63] Urban, 357.
[64] Urban, 366.
[65] Urban, 373.
[66] Urban, 361.

the 1957 Soviet launch of *Sputnik*, the first artificial space satellite. This act emphasized math and science in American schools.[67]

As the 1960s ended and the 1970s began, math and science remained important areas of curriculum achievement. Schools continued to battle segregation as well, as magnet schools gained popularity and busing became a heated issue. As whites moved *en masse* from urban centers to suburbs, districts again became segregated with blacks staying in the inner-city schools while whites attended suburban schools. To maintain desegregation, the busing of students from suburbs to cities, and vice versa, was introduced, but quickly became controversial.[68] Magnet schools gained popularity, and became a way for desegregation to continue, as students chose to attend a school developed around a specific topic or interest area.[69] Handicapped children were also included in the school reforms with the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975. With this reform, many more handicapped students were placed in regular classrooms and given Individualized Education Plans.[70]

While reforms continued in American schools during the 1970s, society in general moved in a conservative direction. President Richard Nixon wound down the Vietnam War, appointed conservatives to the Supreme Court, and supported the anti-busing movement. The 1970s also witnessed tumultuous events. Nixon resigned from the presidency in 1974, after the Watergate affair, though he was pardoned by his successor Gerald Ford. When Jimmy Carter was elected president in 1976, the world faced an international energy crisis, which caused inflation to soar. Overall, American society in the 1970s retreated from its societal activism of the 1960s.

Regarding Columbus, textbooks of the 1960s and 1970s reflected what was occurring in American society at the time. In the 1960s, they situated Columbus's voyage in the wider context of the Crusades, Renaissance and Reformation, to explain the motives behind exploration. The upheaval that preceded the Age of Exploration appeared to parallel the changes that were occurring in 1960s American society with the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War. The textbooks suggested that the fighting and the changing standards in science and religion of the 1400s ended with a positive outcome in the "discovery" of a "new world." American society in the 1960s and 1970s, also undergoing great changes, was hoping for an end to turmoil as well.

Alongside the aforementioned, both textbooks of the 1960s noted the Columbian Exchange, though they did not use that term. They mentioned the change in trade routes and goods traded, as well as the inspiration for exploration by Columbus. One of these textbooks, *History of Our United*

---

[67] Urban, 336-339.
[68] *School: The Story of American Public Education*, DVD, directed by Sarah Mondale and Sarah Patton (New York: Films for the Humanities and Sciences, 2002).
[69] Urban, 369.
[70] Urban, 365.

States, gave a brief outline of Columbus's childhood and each of his voyages, while the other did not note either topic.[71]

In the 1970s textbooks, Columbus appeared even less. In *A People and a Nation*, published in 1971, he was only mentioned in one sentence that noted that the American continent was not a reality to Europeans until his "discovery" in 1492. Other than stating that the Spanish founded settlements on Hispaniola, this is all that was said of Columbus's time in the "new world."[72] In the other 1970s textbook, *Episodes in American History: An Inquiry Approach*, published in 1973, Columbus's voyage was only mentioned in relation to his brother Bartholomew failing to broker a deal with King Henry VII of England in 1488, a circumstance that led to Columbus sailing for Spain.[73] All of the textbooks focused much more on international trade, the developing world, and economics, showing the importance of increasing globalization at the time they were published. That they emphasized the English roots of the United States, meanwhile, was indicative of conservative trends at the time. Notably, none of the textbooks from either the 1960s or the 1970s connected Columbus to the atrocities that befell the natives and later, African slaves.

By the 1990s, many aspects of the Columbus story that were not included in the 1960s and 1970s textbooks began to appear. The Democrat Bill Clinton had been elected president in 1992. However, in 1994, Republicans controlled both the House of Representatives and the Senate, continuing the conservative policies of the last two decades.[74] The decade was full of turmoil as well, with violence, sex scandals and the United States "policing" the world. The United States sent troops to Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Somalia, and participated in the Gulf War. At home, urban riots occurred, bombings took place in two important buildings in Oklahoma City and New York, and school shootings became a major issue, with fourteen occurring between 1996 and 1999. The United States Navy and Marine Corps became involved in the Tailhook sex scandal, and the decade ended with a scandal involving President Clinton.[75] The year 1992 also marked the 500th anniversary of Columbus's "discovery" of America. While some celebrated this day, others protested it for the destruction of lives and of the ecosystem that it represented.

In American schools, many conservative policies stayed in effect. The "back to basics" trend that occurred during the 1980s, after the "A Nation At

---

[71] Eibling, 45-49.

[72] Clarence L. Ver Steeg and Richard Hofstader, *A People and a Nation* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971), 6.

[73] Robert E. Burns et al., *Episodes in American History: An Inquiry Approach* (Lexington: Ginn and Company, 1973), 89a.

[74] Urban, 390.

[75] Peggy Whitley et al., "1990-1999," *American Cultural History*, at http://www.kclibrary.lonestar.edu/decade90.html [Accessed April 20, 2012].

Risk" report stated that test scores were dropping, continued.[76] In much of the nation, there was a push for restructuring at the state level, as states demanded successes from local districts. Measurable standards were created for academic subjects, the school year was lengthened, and schools were held accountable for students' test scores.[77] In addition to the growth in popularity of home schooling, charter schools and magnet schools, multiculturalism gained a foothold in schools. Teachers were prompted to respect and teach many cultural backgrounds as their students came from diverse ethnicities.[78]

 The textbooks of the 1990s devoted much more space to Columbus than those of the 1960-1970s. Two of the books established the context of the Renaissance, and one addressed the spread of the Muslim Empire. The Age of Exploration was covered in two of the books as well, mentioning innovations in sailing technology. While only one of the textbooks noted Columbus's childhood in any detail, all three described his later three voyages and two provided maps. All three textbooks also mentioned the hardships that Columbus encountered on his voyages, including trouble with the natives. Only one of the textbooks connected the violence and enslavement of natives to Columbus, stating that he was "a brutal enslaver of Indians," while the other two only mentioned "trouble" in passing.[79] Only one of the textbooks focused on the Columbian Exchange, devoting an entire page to explaining the definition and citing goods that were part of the movement.

 The information included in the textbooks of the 1990s reveal that globalization had taken a greater hold in the world and that multiculturalism was evident in schools. By addressing the Columbus story in more depth, teachers could cover more cultural backgrounds from different parts of Europe and the Americas. That Columbus was now connected, even on a small scale, to violence against the natives, shows that the protests of Columbus Day had been heard and were being answered in schools as well. Though Columbus himself was not painted as a villain, the textbooks did say that the natives were treated badly, which is more than was admitted before. The changing portrayal of Columbus in textbooks reflected the times and what was going on in society as a whole, but textbooks are not the only place where Columbus has been portrayed.

Portrayals in Monuments
 Just as textbooks have been studied for changes in content and how historical figures have been portrayed, public monuments have also been studied for changing depictions of historical figures. In his 1999 book, *Lies*

---

[76] *School: the Story of American Public Education.*
[77] Urban, 418.
[78] *School: the Story of American Public Education*; Urban, 433.
[79] Anthony Esler, *The Human Venture: A World History from Prehistory to the Present* (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1996), 344.

Across America, James Loewen looked at historic sites across America to see if the information they presented was correct and how events and people were portrayed. The only monument he looked at in regards to Columbus was in Sacramento, California. The 1883 statue of Columbus speaking with Queen Isabella of Spain is in the California State Capitol building's rotunda, though Columbus never made it anywhere near California.[80] The fact that the monument was created in the nineteenth century is significant though, as Columbus's popularity grew and many stories were written about him, both true and false.[81]

The Italian-American community has sponsored many Columbus monuments, invoking progress and ethnic pride. Due to their persistence in creating monuments, Columbus now has more statues, plaques and tributes across the United States than any other individual in American history. Other than George Washington, he also has the most cities, counties, and geographic features named after him.[82] While looking at the information given at historic sites, Loewen advised on the importance of considering the time when they were created, for a monument tells two stories. One of these is of the actual event or person being portrayed, while the other is of the attitudes and ideas of the society in which it was created.[83]

In my study of Columbus monuments, I have examined two statues from among many statues, monuments, plaques, busts and paintings. The chosen statues were interesting for their similarities. Both were created around the time of the anniversary of Columbus's "discovery" of the Americas. The first was created for the 1893 Chicago World's Fair, which marked the 400th anniversary of Columbus's first voyage; the second was created in 1993, in connection with its 500th anniversary. Both statues were cast of bronze and now sit on a granite base. This is where the similarities end though, for the time periods in which these statues were created are quite different.

Dedicated to Columbus, the 1893 Chicago World's fair was called the Columbus Exposition, and many of its exhibits examined how the world changed with his "discovery" of the "new world." Columbus continued to be very popular as all Americans could identify with him as the grandfather of the country. His story had become a myth centuries before and was embellished in the nineteenth century as new documents surfaced.[84] To discuss these, new books about Columbus were published and clubs were organized to read them. Much of the emerging literature focused on such matters as Columbus's

---

[80] Photograph available at "Columbus Monuments Pages"
[81] Loewen, *Lies Across America,* 57-59.
[82] Loewen, *Lies Across America,* 59-60.
[83] Loewen, *Lies Across America,* 36.
[84] John Noble Wilford, "Discovering Columbus," *New York Times*, August 11, 1991, http://search.proquest.com/docview/108712106?accountid=11578 [Accessed April 22, 2012].

"discovery" and his bravery. The times, featuring a World's Fair expressly dedicated to him, made Columbus a hero to be revered.[85]

Many Columbus monuments were created in the few years surrounding the 400th anniversary of his first voyage, and in Chicago, a large number were created for display at the World's Fair. The nine-foot bronze Columbus that now sits in Arrigo Park in Chicago was one of them. This statue was cast in Rome, Italy by the American sculptor Moses Jacob Ezekiel and was blessed by Pope Leo XIII before being sent to Chicago.[86] The statue was mounted above the doorway of the Columbus Memorial Building before the fair and stayed there until the building was knocked down in 1959.[87] The statue sat in a lumberyard in storage for six years while a city board tried to decide what to do with it. Many agreed it was "too good looking to be lying where he is lying," and were determined to find the statue a new home where it could once again honor Columbus.[88] Then, in 1965, the Italian-American community again stepped in to support its famous countryman. It decided to dedicate a new plaza in Vernon Park (Arrigo Park) to Columbus and place the statue in a prominent spot in the new Columbus Plaza, where it now stands in the Little Italy neighborhood.[89]

Statues and monuments of Columbus continued to be built and honored, though as the 500th anniversary of his "discovery" neared, society became more critical of the "discoverer." In the twentieth century, historians began to point out the shortcomings of the myth, including those surrounding the questions of where he had landed, where his money had come from, and how his crew had behaved towards natives. It was also made clear that Columbus had some less than stellar attributes, for example, that he was inept as a colonial administrator, brutal to the natives, and pivotal in beginning the trans-Atlantic slave trade. These truths still were not as widely or loudly shared, as was his role in the "discovery" of the "new world" as the anniversary drew nearer. Nevertheless, as large celebrations were arranged to commemorate October 12, 1992, more people did begin to question the myths and speak out against the reverence given to Columbus.[90] One of the largest groups to speak out against him was Native American. Native groups in cities across the country arranged protests on and around Columbus Day celebrations to bring awareness to their

---

[85] Mary P. Abbott, "Wrote of Columbus: Pens have Been Busy in Honoring the Great Navigator," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* October 30, 1892, http://search.proquest.com/docview/174727163?accountid=11578 [Accessed April 22, 2012].

[86] Photograph available at "Columbus Monuments Pages"

[87] "Columbus Monuments Pages"

[88] Sheila Wolfe, "Seek a Home for a Statue of Columbus," *Chicago Tribune*, February 14, 1965, http://search.proquest.com/docview/179837515?accountid=11578 [Accessed April 22, 2012].

[89] Sheila Wolfe, "Columbus Statue Has High Hope of Finding a 'Home' in Italian Community on West Side," *Chicago Tribune,* October 3, 1965, http://search.proquest.com/docview/176451113?accountid=11578 [Accessed April 22, 2012].

[90] Wilford, "Discovering Columbus."

fight for equal treatment and the destruction that occurred to their cultures and homeland after the "discovery." In Washington D.C., the Columbus statue outside of Union Station was covered with blood and signs that read "500 years of slavery." The next day, a similar fate befell the Columbus statue standing in Columbus Circle in New York City.[91]

Even in this hostile environment, statues of Columbus continued to be built and displayed. To most of the world, Columbus was seen as the "discoverer" of the "new world," and as such, worthy of being celebrated for the change that he brought to the world. Not only did the "new world" open new opportunities for economic trade and prosperity, it opened a new area to colonize for a Europe that seemed to be getting smaller. In 1993, the Italian-American Club, Knights of Columbus, and Order Sons of Italy banded together to donate a bronze statue and granite base for the lawn of the town hall of Mahopac, New York.[92] The statue was designed by Anthony Padovano and dedicated on October 10, 1993.[93] The creation of this and other monuments shows that even though the true story of Columbus was beginning to take hold in society in the 1990s and people were speaking out, he was still honored and considered an important part of American culture.

Conclusions

Stories about Christopher Columbus have been produced and published since the early sixteenth century. Typically, they portrayed a man who overcame many obstacles, was very religious, determined to prove his theory of a western route to India, and ultimately, can be credited with discovering a "new world" for Europe to exploit. These stories did not include his previous education in sailing and navigation or his incompetence in running the colony. They also ignored his brutality toward natives and his use of slavery to finance the "new world." Stories, textbooks, and public monuments generally continue to portray Christopher Columbus as a hero, even though his flaws have been discovered and made widely known.

At the same time, textbooks are continually being revised, and whether they focus on heroes of the past or on current issues depends on what is occurring in society at the time they are published. In the four textbooks examined for the 1960s and the 1970s, Columbus was briefly mentioned as the "discoverer" of the "new world." These books then discussed the continued economic impact that the Americas had on the world, from the plants and animals it contributed, to the labor systems of slavery and developing countries it engendered. Columbus fell to the background in these decades as society

---

[91] "Topics of the Times," *New York Times*, October 20, 1991, http://search.proquest.com/docview/108566685?accountid=11578 [Accessed April 22, 2012].

[92] Mahopac Central School District, "Our Community," *Mahopac Central School District*, at http://mahopac.k12.ny.us/ [Accessed April 22, 2012]. Photograph available at "Columbus Monuments Pages"

[93] "Columbus Monuments Pages"

focused on contemporary issues of war, equality and political activism. Change in American society can be seen in the textbooks of the 1990s in which Columbus took on a more important role in history. The three books from this decade cover Columbus and the Age of Exploration much more widely. In these textbooks, the "discovery" of the "new world" is laid out with all four of Columbus' trips to the Americas and a brief look into the realities of travel and life in a "new land." The 1990s saw the 500th anniversary of the "discovery" of America, as well as the embrace of multiculturalism in schools. Thus, while Columbus was celebrated in the textbooks of this decade, teachers were afforded more opportunities to discuss ethnic histories with their students.

While textbooks generally reflect the society that produced them, public monuments act as a reminder of the society that built them. Public monuments make a statement about what a community sees as important in its cultural heritage, or commemorate a person for his or her deeds. That there are over 600 monuments dedicated to Christopher Columbus in the world shows that many people have viewed him, and continue to view him, as an important historical figure.[94] Telling of their times, the two monuments I looked at were built on the occasion of major anniversaries of the "discovery" of the "new world." One of these was for the 1893 Chicago World's Fair, which itself was dedicated to Columbus; this statue, which now stands in Chicago's Arrigo Park, has been rededicated by the Italian-American community in Chicago to honor its countryman. The other was the monument dedicated to Columbus in Mahopac in 1993, which marked the 500th anniversary of Columbus's "discovery." Though many still celebrated Columbus as a hero, 1992 had witnessed some rebellion as groups spoke out against his brutality towards the natives and showed awareness of multiculturalism.

Monuments and textbooks typically show one side of a hero's story, but is there more to them? As a teacher, the question becomes how to provide students with accurate information, while at the same time getting them to think critically about what they have been taught in the past and why certain things have been emphasized. Debunking the myth they grew up with of Columbus as the great discoverer can be upsetting to students; teachers thus have to be prepared to address the story differently. Some students may not want to believe that their previous teachers did not tell them the whole truth of a story, making it more difficult to convince them that they were not shown the full information. Another issue teachers must address is how they want to portray Columbus. Should they show him as a discoverer who found

---

[94] "Columbus Monuments Pages"

a great new world that led to new nations being born? Should they show him as a man consumed by greed and brutality, who destroyed the lives of millions of native people?

Teachers must choose how they want to teach the topic of Columbus. One solution would be to give students a variety of sources, showing different sides of Columbus, and have them make their own decision about him after reading through the documents. Students could also look at the number of monuments to Columbus and decide if building them to honor the man they are analyzing was a positive thing to do. This would allow students to analyze primary and secondary documents, think critically about what they have read, come to their own conclusions, and then back up their reasoning with evidence from the sources they analyzed. This way, teachers could present Columbus as both hero and villain, while still allowing students to develop critical thinking skills and to see how varying portrayals can provide two or more completely different interpretations of one event or person in history.

In the meantime, teachers will continue to teach Christopher Columbus in a variety of ways. Furthermore, the information they provide will continue to change depending on what is occurring in society. It is therefore always important to remember the influence that society has on topics being taught in schools, and how textbooks and monuments portray events and people.