CLIO VOL. 21, 2011

SACRAMENTO
STATE
Leadership begins here.

Clio Staff

CONTENTS

Kevin Gleason

Kevin Gleason is a graduate student in the History program at California State University, Sacramento. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from California State University, Sacramento in History. His current area of interest is ritual and power relationships in ancient literature. After receiving his Master of Arts, he plans to pursue a doctorate degree in Ancient History and hopes to teach at the university level.

Christopher Hoganson

Christopher Hoganson is a graduate student in History at California State University, Sacramento. He received his Bachelor of Arts in the Humanities and Religious Studies from Sac State. Christopher's area of interest is the religions of Antiquity with an emphasis on the transition from Paganism to Christianity. The eternal student, he worries he might not earn his Master's degree before the impending Mayan Apocalypse.

Jessica Jami

Jessica Jami received her Bachelor's in History in 2007 from Sacramento State University. She truly enjoys learning about United States and International history and how major events of the twentieth century have impacted social and cultural norms. Currently, Jessica works as a manager, while also raising her two beautiful children. She hopes to one day attend a Ph. D. program.

Jon Perry

Jonathan Perry is a full-time History and English teacher. He has earned undergraduate and graduate degrees in History and Education. Jon's special areas of research include ancient mystery religions, mythology, and Hermeticism. He lives with his wife and two children in Sacramento.

Shameel Singh

Shameel Singh is currently as second year graduate student in the History program concentrating on Colonialism. She received her Bachelor of Arts in History with a concentration in Ancient History and the Classics from University of California , Davis . She hopes to apply her education towards research and towards potentially teaching History at a Community College.

Scott Spitzer

Scott Spitzer is a graduate student in the History/Humanities program at the California State University, Sacramento. He received his bachelor's degree in Communications at UC San Diego and after a long, circuitous journey, he is currently studying political orthodoxy in early Christianity. He is scheduled to graduate in December 2011, and is in the process of applying to doctorate programs with the goal of teaching at the university level.

Steve Estabrook

Steve Estabrook is a graduate student in the history/humanities program at CSUS with an emphasis on Cold-War era culture in the United States and Western Europe. He received his Bachelors and Masters in Music at CSU Sacramento as well. He has directed and performed with the Village Opera Theater and other local theater groups and currently plays with the band Myler and Starr. After graduation Steve hopes to continue writing and do some teaching as well.

Kevin Gleason

Kevin Gleason is a graduate student in the History program at California State University, Sacramento. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from California State University, Sacramento in History. His current area of interest is ritual and power relationships in ancient literature. After receiving his Master of Arts, he plans to pursue a doctorate degree in Ancient History and hopes to teach at the university level.

Lorraine Dias Herbon

Lorraine Dias Herbon is a graduate student in the History program at California State University, Sacramento. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree in History also from Sacramento State. Her current area of interest is the history of California, specifically Sacramento, during the Progressive Era. The mother of two, Lorraine would like to pursue a doctorate degree in history and work toward expanding the interest of Sacramentans in their rich and colorful history.

Christopher Hoganson

Christopher Hoganson is a graduate student in History at California State University, Sacramento. He received his Bachelor of Arts in the Humanities and Religious Studies from Sac State. Christopher's area of interest is the religions of Antiquity with an emphasis on the transition from Paganism to Christianity. The eternal student, he worries he might not earn his Master's degree before the impending Mayan Apocalypse.

Jessica Jami

Jessica Jami received her Bachelor's in History in 2007 from Sacramento State University. She truly enjoys learning about United States and International history and how major events of the twentieth century have impacted social and cultural norms. Currently, Jessica works as a manager, while also raising her two beautiful children. She hopes to one day attend a Ph. D. program.

Jenn Kistler

Jenn Kistler is a graduate student in the History program at California State University, Sacramento. Her primary area of interest is the history of science during the Middle Ages. She received her bachelor's degree in Journalism and Mass Communications from New Mexico State University and worked as a journalist at various newspapers for several years before embracing the call of the history profession. She plans to teach at the community college level and eventually pursue a doctorate degree.

Annie Snider

Annie Snider is a graduate student in the Master of Arts in History program at California State University, Sacramento. She received her Bachelor of Arts in History from California State University, Sacramento. Annie's areas of interest are nationalism and culture in the fin de siècle Habsburg Empire and ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia. She plans to earn a Ph.D in Eastern Central European History.

Scott Spitzer

Scott Spitzer is a graduate student in the History/Humanities program at the California State University, Sacramento. He received his bachelor's degree in Communications at UC San Diego and after a long, circuitous journey, he is currently studying political orthodoxy in early Christianity. He is scheduled to graduate in December 2011, and is in the process of applying to doctorate programs with the goal of teaching at the university level.

The Truman Doctrine

Jessica Jami

Searching through vast scholarly writings regarding the Truman Doctrine and its origins one is able to gain an understanding of the historical importance of this decisive speech. Since 1947, the Truman Doctrine has been analyzed by historians in terms of how it was created, who influenced its creation, those it affected and how it has impacted American foreign policy. There has been great acclaim attributed to the Truman Doctrine and its significant influence in regards to American foreign policy. Joseph Jones expresses the importance of the events which took place beginning February 21, 1947, "[a]ll who participated in the extraordinary developments of that period were aware that a major turning in American history was taking place."[1] John Lewis Gaddis, in his article, "Was the Truman Doctrine a Real Turning Point?" challenges conventional thinking and argues that the Truman Doctrine was "very much in line with the previously established precedents for dealing with shifts in the European balance of power".[2] Focusing on the literature the Truman Doctrine inspired, it is possible to establish a historical consensus regarding whether or not the Doctrine was a radical change in American foreign policy, or was it as Gaddis claims, "far from representing a revolution."[3] While policies established within the Truman Doctrine are often associated with the end of World War II, the literature represents the address before Congress as a revolutionary step in American foreign policy.

The Truman Doctrine

The Truman Doctrine, as it has come to be recognized, originated as an address given by President Harry S. Truman on March 12, 1947 to a joint session of Congress asking for aid to help Greece and Turkey.[4] The President stressed the importance of aid claiming that, "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by

---

1. Joseph Jones, *The Fifteen Weeks (February 21-June 5, 1947)*, (New York: The Viking Press, 1955), vii.

2. John Lewis Gaddis, "Was the Truman Doctrine a Real Turning Point?," *Foreign Affairs* 52, no. 2 (1974), http://www.jstor.org/stable/20038005 (accessed March 10, 2009), 386.

3. Ibid.

4. Judith S. Jeffery, *Ambiguous Commitments and Uncertain Policies: The Truman Doctrine in Greece, 1947-1952*, (New York: Lexington Books, 2000), 1.

outside pressures."[5] Throughout the address, the President stressed the urgency with which the United States needed to provide support to countries who were enduring disastrous circumstances that might ultimately result in their falling to communism.

In 1941, the Nazi forces invaded Greece. In October of 1944 Greece was liberated from the occupational forces.[6] However, liberation did not bring peace to Greece. G. M. Alexander claims that, "Greece suffered many upheavals in the first half of the twentieth century: dictatorships, civil war, and numerous *coup d'état[s]*."[7] While the situation in Greece is not easy to understand, L. S. Stavrianos emphasizes the uniqueness of Greece's predicament by stating that "Greece is the country where World War II has

> **"While policies established within the Truman Doctrine are often associated with the end of World War II, the literature represents the address before Congress as a revolutionary step in American foreign policy."**

not yet ended."[8] The continuing violence was a result of the division between the resistance movements throughout Greece.   EAM, or the National Liberation Front was founded in 1941.[9] While the other major resistance movement was the British backed EDES, known as the Greek National Democratic League.[10] Despite the fact that they were both in opposition to the occupying forces, EAM and EDES would soon lead Greece into a bloody civil war. In his address to Congress, President Truman described the situation in Greece as such.

> Greece is not a rich country…Since 1940, this industrious and peace-loving country has suffered invasion, 4 years of cruel enemy occupation, and bitter internal strife. When forces of liberation entered Greece they found that the retreating Germans had destroyed virtually all the railways, roads, port facilities, communications, and merchant marine. More than a thousand villages had been burned…Livestock, poultry, and draft animals had almost disappeared. Inflation had wiped out practically all savings.[11]

President Truman argued that instability and political unrest was the result of these tragic conditions. He claimed that "[t]he very existence of the Greek State is today threatened by the terrorist

---

5.   Harry S. Truman, "Recommendation For Assistance To Greece And Turkey" (Address of the President of the United States, Joint session of Congress, Washington, D.C., March 12, 1947) http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/index.php (accessed March 9, 2009).

6.   Jeffery, 4-5.

7.   G.M. Alexander, *The Prelude to the Truman Doctrine: British Policy in Greece 1944-1947*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 1.

8.   L.S. Stavrianos, *Greece: American Dilemma and Opportunity*, (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1952), v.

9.   Ibid., 65.

10.   Ibid., 67.

11.   Truman, "Recommendation For Assistance To Greece And Turkey."

activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists".[12] These armed men Truman spoke of were members of EAM/ELAS, which was gaining support from the Greek Communist Party, KKE.[13] By 1943, it was evident to the State Department that the return of the British-backed monarchy to govern Athens would lead to a left-wing rebellion, possibly resulting in a civil war.[14]

In the early months of 1947, Europe was undergoing drastic leadership changes, which led to the urgency of the speech before Congress on the 12 March 1947. According to Dean Acheson, the winter of 1947 was one like no one could remember. "That awful winter" was difficult to endure even for the most resilient country in Europe: Great Britain.[15] Throughout 1946 Britain was beginning to feel the strain of their international commitments. Not wanting to completely abandon their role throughout Europe, British officials felt they would be able to entice the United States into helping maintain their policies in Greece. In 1946 the United States understood that complete isolation was no longer possible. Hence, while providing assistance to Britain was not entirely opposed, the United States did not want to intervene in Greece and maintain the current British policies. Yet, toward the end of 1946 it became apparent that Britain was going to have to withdraw from Greece, and the fear of leaving Greece subject to Soviet rule was unacceptable.[16] Acheson in his memoir recalls that,

> The situation in Greece, bad at the end of December, deteriorated rapidly during January
> and February 1947. All three of our scouts…sent back increasingly alarming reports
> of imminent collapse due to mounting guerilla activity, supplied and directed from the
> outside…and Greek governmental inability to meet the crisis.[17]

The situation in Greece was grim, although no one foresaw the events that would take place during the first few months of 1947. February 21, 1947 was therefore a historic day at the State Department. Acheson vividly recalls the British Ambassador urgently attempting to deliver "a blue piece of paper" to General Marshall.[18] When Marshall was not available, Acheson was directed to make decisions. "They were shockers," claimed Acheson, "British aid to Greece and Turkey would end in six weeks."[19] Not only could the British no longer manage their international position, they were declaring that they were no longer able to help maintain the status quo.[20] According to Joseph Jones, John D.

---

12.   Ibid.

13.   Howard Jones, *"A New Kind of War": America's Global Strategy and the Truman Doctrine in Greece*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 17.

14.   Lawrence S. Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece, 1943-49,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 13-4.

15.   Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department,* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969), 212.

16.   Wittner, 61-7.

17.   Acheson, 217.

18.   Ibid.

19.   Ibid., 216-7.

20.   Ibid., 217.

Hickerson the Deputy Director of the Office of European Affairs realized at once that "Great Britain had within the hour handed the job of world leadership, with all its burdens and its glory, to the United States."[21] The result of this transformation was unique as Jones recalled that "[r]apidly, in an orderly manner, and with virtually no dissent, the executive branch of the government decided to act."[22] Jones describes the outcomes of these actions:

> This sudden spark set off a dazzling process which within fifteen weeks laid the basis for a complete conversion of American foreign policy and of the attitudes of the American people toward the world…It is a story of American democracy working at its finest…made identifiable contributions to the development of a new American foreign policy, and worked together to accomplish a national acceptance of world responsibility.[23]

On March 12, 1947 President Harry Truman stood before a joint session of Congress and instilled a heightened fear of Communism. In the address President Truman discussed the agency of each country to choose their way of life. There were some, he argued, that chose not to tolerate the freedom allowed in a democratic society. Truman articulated the importance that government manipulations, by authoritarian governments, went against every democratic notion. For these countries, on the verge of collapse to this "second way of life", this meant the will of the minority became forced upon the majority, which created oppression and terror, consequently suppressing personal freedoms.[24] Truman claimed that it was now the responsibility of the United States to protect these nations because without our protection, "the effect will be far reaching to the West as well as to the East."[25] Communist takeovers would be felt worldwide if the United States did not intervene. President Truman connected what was taking place in Europe to the national security of the United States by stating, "[t]he free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter…we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation."[26] The result of the address was encouraging. The Greek-Turkish Aid Act passed the Senate and the House of Representatives and was signed into law by the President on May 22, 1947.

The Literature

Throughout the decades that followed the passing of the Greek-Turkish Aid Act, the Truman Doctrine was being analyzed in regards to its influence on American foreign policy. While a majority of these works were written with different objectives in mind, their commonality was that they all argued

---

21.   Joseph Jones, 5-7.

22.   Ibid., 11.

23.   Ibid., 8-9.

24.   Truman, "Recommendation For Assistance To Greece And Turkey."

25.   Ibid.

26.   Ibid.

that Truman Doctrine was a turning point in American foreign policy.

      With the change of administrations, those who had been a part of the events in 1947 began writing memoirs of the creation and implications of the Truman Doctrine. The most influential and detailed is Joseph Jones' *The Fifteen Weeks (February 21-June 5, 1947)*. Jones argues that, "[t]here was nothing…in anybody's mind to suggest that the most revolutionary advance in United States foreign policy since 1823 would occur within the next fifteen weeks."[27] In his book, Jones details the British withdrawal from Greece and how it had a significant impact upon the United States decision to intervene. While he acknowledges that official policy toward the Soviet Union stiffened in 1946 on specific issues, neither President Truman nor Secretary of State Byrnes, or other governmental leaders, openly recognized or outlined a policy towards the Soviet Union until the Truman Doctrine.[28] Beginning with the Truman Doctrine, Jones claims that President Truman declared a new policy of the United States when he acknowledged that it was the responsibility of the United States "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."[29] Jones emphasizes the enormity of the events which occurred:

> [A] number of other bold policies and actions, beyond aid to Greece and Turkey and the Marshall Plan, had their roots in the national conversation of the Fifteen Weeks: The North Atlantic Alliance, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Military Defense Assistance Program, the Far Eastern programs of Economic Cooperation Administration, the Mutual Security Program, the Point IV Program, the prompt commitment of American power against Communist aggression in Korea, the Manila Pact…And the process of drawing together and strengthening the free world…[30]

      Another important, yet less glorified version of the event can be found in the memoirs of Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson in his book, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department*. Acheson gives a behind the scenes account of how the policies of the United States were affected on a daily basis. In Acheson's description of events he includes a quote from Joseph Jones' *The Fifteen Weeks*, "All…were aware that a major turning point in American history was taking place…" The inclusion of this quote demonstrates that Acheson was aware of the significance of the Truman Doctrine.[31]

      In addition to books written by members of government, there are numerous secondary sources concerning the Truman Doctrine and its impact on American foreign policy. Herbert Druks offers an in depth examination of the forces behind the Truman Doctrine and those who denounced President

---

27.   Joseph Jones, 3.

28.   Ibid., 11.

29.   Ibid., 11-13.

30.   Ibid., 262-3.

31.   Acheson, 220.

Truman and his foreign policies in his chapter "The Truman Doctrine" in *Harry S. Truman and the Russians 1945-1953.* Druks argued that while Truman had always been determined to "keep the free world free" he chose to reverse the traditionally isolationist Monroe Doctrine and put America on the offensive.[32] Through Druks analysis it becomes clear that a reversion by President Truman to traditional foreign policies would have been irresponsible. Druks argues that without President Truman's decisive leadership American foreign policy might have taken a different course.[33] Norman Graebner claims that the Truman Doctrine was a crusade and not a policy in *Cold War Diplomacy 1945-1960.*[34] In his critical examination of postwar policies, Graebner argued that the Doctrine was too vague to be a policy rather, that the American policy of containment began with the Marshall Plan and culminated with the article by George Kennan in July 1947 entitled, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." Richard Challener in his book, *From Isolation to Containment, 1921-1952: Three Decades of American Foreign Policy from Harding to Truman,* claims that the Truman Doctrine was only the beginning of the revolution in foreign policy, but that the Doctrine itself was no more than a committee document.[35] It is evident that those who attempt to fault the Truman Doctrine have a difficult time separating the policies and turn of events, which were a direct result of the address to congress.

L.S. Stavrianos in *Greece: American Dilemma and Opportunity* regards Greece as "a critical testing ground for our foreign policy," continuing by stating that, "We proclaimed the Truman Doctrine with that country primarily in mind."[36] Stavrianos examines the Truman Doctrine and its consequential impact on Greece. He demonstrates the uniqueness of the Truman Doctrine, illustrating America's previous approach to intervention in Greece. Stavrianos describes an incident where Ambassador MacVeagh explained to an EAM emissary that the United States was, in 1944, preoccupied on the Western front and in the Pacific; hence, the decision of the Middle East was left to Great Britain.[37] He stresses the importance of the Truman Doctrine, insisting that it was a defining policy, thrusting the United States into the fight against Communism. He argues that the British abandonment of Greece portrays the escalating crisis throughout the world by focusing on the disintegration of the Big Three.[38] Stephen Xydis, like Stavrianos, writes about the Truman Doctrine with respect to Greece in, *Greece and the Great Powers 1944-1947: Prelude to the "Truman Doctrine".* Xydis argues that with the Truman Doctrine "[a] new era, thus, started not only in Greek-American relations but also in the entire foreign

---

32.   Herbert Druks, *Harry S. Truman and the Russians 1945-1953*, (New York: Robert Speller & Sons Publishers, Inc., 1966), 124, 144.

33.   Ibid., 144-5.

34.   Norman Graebner, *Cold War Diplomacy 1945-1960*, (New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1962), 41-3.

35.   Richard D. Challener, *From Isolation to Containment, 1921-1952: Three Decades of American Foreign Policy from Harding to Truman,* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), 14.

36.   Stavrianos, v.

37.   Ibid., 182-3.

38.   Ibid., 183-185.

policy of the United States."[39] He alludes to the Monroe Doctrine and America's determination to remain solely engulfed in the affairs of the New World while avoiding affairs of the Old World, or Europe.[40] Xydis argues that the Truman Doctrine was not merely the result of Greek-American relations or even that of Soviet-American relations. The United States had become determined to take part in world affairs, not only with its membership in the United Nations but also "by acting as a Power with global capabilities and responsibilities of a very substantial character within the world society of nations."[41]

Historians appeared to agree that the Truman Doctrine significantly impacted American foreign policy. Whether historians agreed or disagreed with the details of the Doctrine, many were able to attribute it to the beginning of the process that changed American foreign policy. That was until 1974, when an article appearing in *Foreign Affairs* by Cold War historian John Lewis Gaddis was published. "Was the Truman Doctrine a Real Turning Point?" breaks the mold of praising the revolutionary consequences of the Truman Doctrine by arguing that the Truman Doctrine was not revolutionary at all.[42] In fact, he argues that the Truman Doctrine was "very much in line with previously established precedents for dealing with shifts in the European balance of power".[43] Gaddis claims that for the United States, concern over the domination of a single hostile state throughout Europe had been prevalent since the turn of the century; hence, the United States attempts to maintain this balance were nothing new. Gaddis clarifies his argument by illustrating how Woodrow Wilson entered into World War I in order to assist the allies, and once again, to help Great Britain evade the totalitarian rise of Hitler after the fall of France in 1940.[44]

Gaddis claims that the Truman Doctrine did not mark a fundamental shift in American foreign policy but that with the Doctrine the objectives of American policy became focused with the Soviet Union.[45] After World War II American policy had been in cooperation with the Soviets, events occurring by 1946 no longer made this possible. Therefore the "actual decision to resist further Soviet expansion came early in 1946, one year before the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine."[46] Gaddis insists that the administration underwent a transformation in regards to its stance on relations with

---

39. Stephen G. Xydis, *Greece and the Great Powers 1944-1947: Prelude to the "Truman Doctrine"*, (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1963), 502.

40. Ibid., 502-3.

41. Ibid., 503.

42. Gaddis, "Was the Truman Doctrine a Real Turning Point?," 386.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid., 387.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid.

the Soviet Union as a result of the unpublished analysis of George Kennan (later to be published with the title, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct"), which described the increasingly hostile behavior of the Soviet Union. In the fall of 1946, Presidential aid Clark Clifford submitted a report to President Truman advocating, "a global policy of containing the Soviet Union through the use of propaganda, economic aid, and even military force".[47] Gaddis indicates that American policy began to change in 1946 with a firmer position taken toward the Soviet Union from the Truman Administration. It was then that Truman vehemently supported Winston Churchill's speech at Fulton, along with blatant opposition to Soviet demands in Iran and Turkey. These events, combined with negotiating tactics of then, Secretary of State Byrnes, Gaddis argues, clearly demonstrates the change in direction of American foreign policy.[48] Gaddis asserts that the decision to intervene in Greece was nothing more than an attempt to maintain the balance of power throughout Europe. The withdrawal of the British threatened the stability of Greece; therefore, the stability of the Mediterranean was in question. According to Gaddis, the United States had previously demonstrated that they would step in and participate in European affairs once it became a question of maintaining the balance of powers.[49]

Gaddis maintains that "the real commitment to contain communism everywhere originated in the events surrounding the Korean War, not the crisis in Greece and Turkey."[50] Gaddis argues that the original goal of the Truman Doctrine was to contain the Soviet Union and that the sweeping language utilized throughout the Doctrine was misleading. Gaddis cited George Kennan and General Marshall as having reservations in regards to the language of the Doctrine.[51] Gaddis states that Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson claimed that the Truman Doctrine was not destined by the Administration to be a precedent of aid to all countries threatened by communism; all other requests were to be reviewed on a case by case basis.[52] Therefore, Gaddis argues that the Doctrine was not a real turning point because it was not viewed as a universal policy by the administration. Gaddis explains the case of China in effort to display the limited nature of the Truman Doctrine. The United States, Gaddis claims, did not foresee any long-term ramifications of China becoming a Communist country; hence, the Administration felt there was no need to intervene with every country at risk of a Communist takeover.[53]

Aside from the language used and the implications of the Truman Doctrine, Gaddis claims that American foreign policy shifted with the initiation of the Korean War and the events in April of 1950. Throughout the article Gaddis describes American intervention as primarily influenced by political and economic forces, but by 1949, the United States had begun to implement military assistance as a result

---

47.   Ibid., 389.

48.   Ibid., 383-89.

49.   Ibid., 387-90.

50.   Ibid., 386.

51.   Ibid., 390.

52.   Ibid., 390-392; can also be found in John Lewis Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*, (New York: Oxford Press, 1972), 351.

53.   Gaddis, "Was the Truman Doctrine a Real Turning Point?", 395.

of the Soviet development of atomic weapons. This increase in military assistance caused the State Department to increase defense spending, resulting in the nation's first formal statement of national security, NSC-68.[54] In the end, John Lewis Gaddis claims that the actual policies of the United States varied greatly from the Doctrine. There was not one clear policy to the problems arising in Europe. Each situation was evaluated individually, and "distinctions were made, sometimes ruthlessly, between peripheral and vital interests."[55]

Overall, Gaddis does not grant the Truman Doctrine the respect deserved for changing American foreign policy. "Was the Truman Doctrine a Real Turning Point?" is only one article in the vast body of work presented by Gaddis discussing United States foreign policy and participation in the Cold War. In *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War 1941-1947*, Gaddis argues that the Truman Doctrine was a last-ditch effort by the government to convince Congress that America needed to accept responsibility of world leadership. The world leadership position, Gaddis argues had been in place since its "get tough with Russia" policies implemented in 1946.[56] In addition, Gaddis pays particular attention to the dissention within the administration regarding the perception of the Truman Doctrine and its implications on the whole of American foreign policy. Gaddis argues that while Kennan was in support of aid to Greece and Turkey "he objected to placing it 'in the framework of a universal policy'".[57] The question of the "universal" language of containment is discussed in various Cold War histories written by Gaddis. These works include: *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy, The Long Peace: Inquiries Into the History of the Cold War, The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsiderations, Provocations*, and finally, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History.*[58] Gaddis often attributes the Truman Doctrine with little significance; instead, he credited the Marshall Plan with being much more influential in transforming American foreign policy. In *We Now Know*, Gaddis claims that the policy of Containment originated from the Marshall Plan, not the Truman Doctrine, or as he claims the "stopgap military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey".[59]

A majority of analysis of the Truman Doctrine disagrees with the historical position of John Lewis Gaddis. *Anglo-American Relations with Greece: The Coming of the Cold War, 1942-1947* by Robert Frazier directly challenges Gaddis. He agrees that the question of Communism had been raised

---

54.   Ibid., 396.

55.   Ibid., 402.

56.   John Lewis Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), 351.

57.   Ibid., 350.

58.   John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); *The Long Peace: Inquires Into the History of the Cold War,* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); *The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsideration, Provocations*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

59.   Gaddis, *We Now Know*, 38.

before, but that it was not until the Truman Doctrine that the foreign policy of the United States became directed toward an ideological movement rather than being opposed to Soviet expansionism.[60] Frazier acknowledges Gaddis's article throughout his discussion on the Truman Doctrine, yet offers this insight:

> One can accept Gaddis's view that there was a turning point in early 1946 in American attitudes, but this does not vitiate the proposition that the Truman Doctrine *was also* a turning point; one of far greater importance in the development of American foreign relations. It marked the first implementation of a policy designed to oppose the expansion of Communism backed with Congressional approval and the appropriation of funds. It was also the first decision to provide military aid to another country in peacetime…it must rank at least equally with the decision to use military force in peacetime…the distinguishing feature of the Korean War.[61]

Frazier is confident in his conclusion that it is possible to have more than one transformation in postwar foreign policies. By addressing the article by Gaddis, Frazier acknowledges that there have been those who doubt the changing policies, yet he clearly claims that beginning with the British notes in February 1947, American foreign policy was to transform.[62]

In addition to Robert Frazier, Denise Bostdorff is the most current author who refutes the case made by Gaddis by asserting that the Truman Doctrine was an important turning point in American history. In *Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War Call to Arms*, Bostdorff argues that while Korea may have marked a turning point in the application of American foreign policy, the Truman Doctrine was the symbolic turning point, which made the full transition possible.[63] Bostdorff agrees with Gaddis that the Korean War jumpstarted the Cold War arms race. However, Bostdorff argues that without the Truman Doctrine intervention in Korea never would have been possible.[64] *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy* by Andrew Bacevich is another contemporary book that alludes to the connection of current American foreign policies with those created throughout the Truman Administration and enforced through the Truman Doctrine. Citing the Truman Doctrine as "a blank check for intervention," Bacevich claims that it "provided political and moral cover for actions overt and covert, wise and foolish, successful and unsuccessful…"[65] Essentially, Bacevich and Bostdorff are claiming that without the Truman Doctrine, the foreign policies of the United States would inevitably

---

60. Robert Frazier, *Anglo-American Relations with Greece: The Coming of the Cold War, 1942-47* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 159.

61. Ibid., 164.

62. Ibid.

63. Denise M. Bostdorff, *Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: A Cold War Call to Arms,* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008), 146.

64. Ibid.

65. Andrew J. Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002), 228.

have been vastly different.

While some authors attempt to separate them, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan should be discussed as part of the same transformation in policy. Gaddis argues that the Marshall Plan was "an ambitious attempt to reconstitute a political balance in Europe by economic means."[66] Like Gaddis, Wilson Miscamble, author of *From Roosevelt to Truman: Potsdam, Hiroshima and the Cold War,* argues that the Truman administration never purposely embarked on a path to change American foreign policy. Miscamble argues that neither the Truman Doctrine nor the article by Kennan clearly outlined a policy for dealing with the Soviet Union and its actions. He then contends that the Marshall

"The Truman Doctrine was the first official stance for a policy of openness."

Plan "was the decisive step in establishing a political balance in postwar Europe."[67] *U.S. Diplomacy Since 1900*, by Robert Schulzinger, refers to the Truman Doctrine as "only one part of the concentrated strategy".[68] The association between the Truman

Doctrine and the Marshall Plan is evident when Bostdorff quotes President Truman as stating that the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan "were two halves of the same walnut."[69] Examining the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan separately can be equated to only learning a fragment of the story. The Marshall Plan was the economic partner to the military aid lent from the Truman Doctrine; this essential component cannot be viewed separately if one hopes to gain a full understanding of the transformation of United States foreign policy. *The Fifteen Weeks* by Joseph Jones demonstrates the relation between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan by encompassing the period from February 21, 1947, the British announcement of retreat, to June 5, 1947 and the speech by George Marshall to launch the Marshall Plan.[70]

Since 1974 not all of the scholarship on the Truman Doctrine has been a direct rebuttal of the work presented by John Lewis Gaddis. Cecil Crabb, author of *The Doctrines of American Foreign Policy: Their Meaning, Role, and Future*, argues that the Truman Doctrine expressed America's "internationalist" or "interventionist" approach to foreign relations. Like Gaddis, Crabb argues that the Doctrine set out to readdress the balance of power.[71] Throughout Crabb's analysis he claims that the Truman Doctrine was "the culmination of trends that had begun as early as 1945" therefore representing

---

66.   Gaddis, *The Long Peace*, 56.

67.   Wilson D. Miscamble, *From Roosevelt to Truman: Potsdam, Hiroshima, and the Cold War*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 310-11.

68.   Robert D. Schulzinger, *U.S. Diplomacy Since 1900*, 5th edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 209.

69.   Bostdorff, 143.

70.   Joseph Jones.

71.   Cecil Crabb, *The Doctrine in American Foreign Policy: Their Meaning, Role, and Future*, (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 111-13.

"no abrupt departure in U.S. policy."[72] Although, by the end of Crabb's analysis he argues that, "[n]o postwar American foreign policy principle…outranks the Truman Doctrine in terms of its impact upon the diplomacy of the United States."[73] There appears to be a discrepancy in his analysis. One could argue that although the Truman Doctrine may have roots in events beginning in 1945, it was the declaration to Congress that essentially impacted the future of the policies of the United States. In the sixteenth edition of *American Foreign Policy Since World War II*, John Spanier and Stephen Hook argue that the Truman Doctrine, while initiating a policy of containment, was "activated by its desire to prevent a major nation from achieving dominance in Europe, an occurrence that twice in the twentieth century has led the United States to war."[74]

The Vision of Anglo-America: The US-UK Alliance and the Emerging Cold War 1943-1946 by Henry Butterfield Ryan illustrates the emergence of the United States on the international forum. In referring to the Truman Doctrine, he claims that, "[t]his declaration, with its extremely vague and general terms but its clear intent to confront communist expansion…remains basic to American foreign affairs."[75] Butterfield Ryan, unlike Gaddis, is able to accept the vagueness of the Doctrine while recognizing the impacts that were made on American foreign policy. Another author that acknowledges the vagueness of the Truman Doctrine while accepting its impacts is Howard Jones. Jones, in his article, "A Reassessment of the Truman Doctrine and Its Impact on Greece and U.S. Foreign Policy," argues that the Truman Doctrine "marked the beginning of a global foreign policy that was flexible, restrained, and not necessarily military in nature."[76] Jones attributes the Truman Administration with crafting a foreign policy that was capable of transforming and shifting to meet its needs. A foreign policy that is constantly able to shift allowing for adjustments as threats change.[77]

The Truman Doctrine, as depicted by historians, played a significant role in the transformation of American foreign policy. There are some historians, like John Lewis Gaddis, that argue that the policies set forth in the Truman Doctrine had begun forming with the end of World War II, and that they did not culminate into universal policy until the Korean War in 1950. While, these were important steps throughout the transformation, the evidence in the literature is clear. The Truman Doctrine was the first official stance for a policy of openness. Policies began forming when World War II ended, but it was not until President Truman stood before the joint session of Congress and delivered the general statement

---

72. Ibid., 121.

73. Ibid., 138.

74. Stephen W. Hook and John Spanier, *American Foreign Policy Since World War II*, 16th edition, (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2004), 47-9.

75. Henry Butterfield Ryan, *The Vision of Anglo-America: The US-UK Alliance and the Emerging Cold War 1943-1946*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 169.

76. Howard Jones, "A Reassessment of the Truman Doctrine and Its Impact on Greece and American Foreign Policy," in *The Truman Doctrine of Aid to Greece: A Fifty Year Retrospective*, ed. Eugene T. Rossides, 24-41 (New York: The Academy of Political Science; Washington, D.C.: American Hellenic Institute Foundation, 1998), 27.

77. Howard Jones, 27-8.

of principle, which would drive U.S. foreign policy.[78] The speech is significant in that it enabled the United States the ability to embrace a new, official foreign policy. The literature on the topic has been extensive, deriving from every facet the Truman Doctrine influenced. Since 1947, the scholarship on the topic has swayed from one extreme to another. Those writing on the Doctrine in its infancy glorified the event, while authors like John Lewis Gaddis attempted to debunk the significance attributed to the Congressional address. While it is possible to examine authors directly opposed to the Truman Doctrine and its significance, it has become overwhelmingly more common to find authors who argue that while the Truman Doctrine did not alone change American foreign policy, it was an influential first step toward a more open foreign policy then America had ever experienced.

---

78.   Alonzo L. Hamby, "Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the Truman Doctrine," in *The Truman Doctrine of Aid to Greece: A Fifty Year Retrospective*, ed. Eugene T. Rossides, 12-23 (New York: The Academy of Political Science; Washington, D.C.: American Hellenic Institute Foundation, 1998), 12.

From Imposed Classification to Self-Identification: Tracing the Definitions of Race and Ethnicity in American Historiography

Jenn Kistler

One ever feels the two-ness, – an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.

W.E.B. Du Bois[1]

Racial categorization is not completely determined by one's language, skin color, or shape of the head.[2] Although such characteristics play a role in exaggerating differences, racial definitions are political, social, and historical constructions. Ethnic and racial groupings are what Benedict Anderson calls "imagined communities" in constant state of flux.[3] Understanding racial and ethnic definitions requires an understanding of power.[4] In the American past, racial definitions were often tools utilized by Anglo-Europeans to establish their dominance over other groups. They defined their "whiteness" by imposing definitions on non-white groups. This is evident in U.S. Census records. For example, in the 1790 U.S. Census residents in the districts of the United States were categorized in one of five groups: free white males older than 16, free white males younger than 16, free white females, all other free persons, or slaves.[5] Whiteness was defined by its opposites—"others" and "slaves." However, whiteness is not an invariable category.[6] By 1940, the U.S. Census Bureau noted three major race classifications: White, Negro, and other races. This time, however, the definition of whiteness expanded

---

1. W.E.B. Du Bois, "Of Our Spiritual Strivings," in *The Souls of Black Folk*, ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. and Terri Hume Oliver (New York: W.W. Norton & Company), 11.

2. See Linda Joyce Brown, *The Literature of Immigration and Racial Formation: Becoming White, Becoming Other, Becoming American in the Late Progressive Era* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 18-21.

3. For information about imagined communities, see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* Rev. ed. (New York: Verso, 2006).

4. Ibid., 26.

5. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *First Census of the United States, 1790* (Philadelphia: J. Phillips, George-Yard, Lombard-Street, 1793).

6. Brown, xvi. "At the heart of this study lies the assumption that whiteness is not a stable, unified category of human classification. Instead, whiteness, like other racial-defined groupings, is an ever-shifting terrain…"

to include Mexicans.[7] In 2000 the categorizations changed once more. The government declared that "race" and "Hispanic origin" were separate concepts. Participants were first asked to answer "yes" or "no" to being of Hispanic origin. Then, the person could proceed to choose any number of races, such as White; Black, African American or Negro; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian Indian; or Native Hawaiian. People also had the option of writing in a race of their choice, allowing people to define their racial identity on their own terms.[8]

American historiography follows a similar path, on which racial definitions are constantly forming and reforming along with the evolution of historical schools of thought. However, a noticeable path emerges, from a time when racial distinctions were imposed upon groups by those outside of the group—dominated by a hegemonic system that defined "whiteness" against the inferior "others"—to the late twentieth and early twenty-first century when race became a means of self-identification.[9] This transformation of American historiography does not simply give agency to those "other" races; instead the "others" take control of their own agency.

Before one can understand the historiography of race and ethnicity, one must understand the differences between the two categorical terms. They are not easy to define. According to Nancy Foner and George Fredrickson, "race" is a "socially, culturally, and historically constructed" concept. It is often associated with the idea that physical differences between people are "innate and unchangeable," and in a multi-group setting often causes one group to establish dominance over another based on physical differences.[10] Linda Joyce Brown adds that although racial categorizations are "biological misnomers," such definitions retain cultural significance.[11] Ethnicity, on the other hand, refers to a group of people who share similar cultural origins, such as nationality, ancestry, or shared history.[12] Foner argues that "race" is an imposed construct—where one group defines another—while "ethnicity" is a consciousness or a self-identification.[13] However, these distinctions become increasingly confusing with the acceptance of multiple ethnicities, causing many historians to define racial and ethnic categorizations on their own

---

7.   U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940* (Washington, D.C.; GPO 1943). The introduction explains that although those of Mexican ancestry were designated as Mexican in 1930, by 1940 they were included with the white population.

8.   U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Twenty-Second Census of the United States, 2000* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 2002).

9.   Nancy Foner and George M. Fredrickson, "Introduction: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States: Social Constructions and Social Relations in Historical and Contemporary Perspective," in *Not Just Black and White: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States*, ed. Nancy Foner and George M. Fredrickson (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004), 3. Foner states that the identification as "white" was initiated in the seventeenth century when American colonists distinguished themselves from Indians and blacks.

10.   Ibid., 2.

11.   Brown, 3.

12.   Foner, "Introduction," 3-4.

13.   Ibid., 4.

terms.[14] These complexities follow the progression from race and ethnicity as an imposed classification to a form of self-identification. In the early twentieth century, historians either ignored non-Anglo groups or treated them as inferior obstacles. Later, historians depicted groups such as African Americans and Native Americans as objectified "others" that were exploited by the superior whites. With the rise of social history, historians in the 1970s began to give agency to non-white groups and by the late twentieth century those groups took agency for themselves.[15]

In The Frontier in American History, published in 1921, historian Fredrick Jackson Turner depicts Native Americans as "savage lords of the boundless prairies," a group that served as a hostile barrier between the civilized East and the frontier West.[16] As historian Sucheng Chan notes in her introduction to Peoples of Color in the American West, Turner asserted that the American national character was developed as civilized European Americans were forced to confront "savages" as they moved West.[17] Black slaves also were defined as a mere buffer zone. Their presence marked "a clear line of division between the Old Northwest and the South."[18] Turner references a few specific Native American groups: Sioux, Iroquois, and Algonquin. Yet, he generally refers to them as the collective "Indian" or "savage," while the offspring of Puritan settlers and Indians are classified as "half-breeds."[19] According to historian Mario T. Garcia, Turner's thesis that the environment caused "Americanization" focused only on the assimilation of racial groups rather than "ethnic pluralism."[20]

Many scholars who addressed race and ethnicity in America at the turn of the twentieth century focused on opposing forces, often defining a supposed superior race by its opposition to an inferior race. Like Turner, John Commons was concerned with the ideas of assimilation and acculturation, but often on the inability of non-Anglo groups to succeed on either front. His 1907 work, Races and Immigrants in America, constantly characterizes Native Americans, Africans, and Asians by their inferiority to Anglo culture. For example, he states:

---

14.   Mario T. Garcia, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 2. In the footnote, Garcia explains: "Mexican refers to a person of Mexican descent who is either a U.S. citizen or a Mexican national; Mexican American refers specifically to a U.S. citizen of Mexican descent; *mexicano* refers to a Mexican national residing in the United States, and Anglo refers to a U.S. citizen of European descent."

15.   Sucheng Chan, et al., "Preface," in *Peoples of Color in the American West*, ed. Sucheng Chan, et. al. (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1994), v.

16.   Fredrick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921; Project Gutenberg, 2007), 144. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22994/22994-h/22994-h.htm. "A period of almost constant Indian hostility followed, for the savage lords of the boundless prairies instinctively felt the significance of the entrance of the farmer into their empire."

17.   Sucheng Chan, "Introduction: Western American Historiography and Peoples of Color," in *Peoples of Color in the American West*, ed. Sucheng Chan, et. al. (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1994), 1.

18.   Turner, 242.

19.   Ibid., 44-45.

20.   Garcia, 9.

> The Chinaman comes from a mediæval [sic] civilization—he shows little of those qualities which are the product of Western civilization, and with his imitativeness, routine, and traditions, he has earned the reputation of being entirely non-assimilable [sic].[21]

He combines the political, social, and economic issues associated with racial definitions by studying industry, labor, crime, poverty, and politics. He categorizes races into five basic divisions: "white, yellow, black, red, and brown races of the earth."[22] He blatantly supports white superiority, suggesting the importance of testing immigrants before they are allowed to enter the country in an effort to root out undesirables.[23] Commons also declares that Christian ideals, particularly the Christian God's "impartiality toward races," allowed the United States to avoid the caste system and create less-defined social classes.[24] Yet, he devotes his entire work to drawing those sociopolitical racial lines.

At the turn of the twentieth century, there were political and academic battles between writers who supported Chinese immigration into the United States and those "whose sensationalist accounts kindled anxieties about a potential Yellow Peril invasion."[25] Similar issues followed Japanese immigration, causing pro-Japanese scholars such as Yamato Ichihashi of Stanford University to assert that Japanese people were effectively assimilating into American society.[26] However, Ichihashi's assertion contradicted popular opinion. From the turn of the twentieth century to the end of the 1960s, "the Asian presence in the United States was almost invariably framed as a 'problem.' Because Asian Americans allegedly failed to assimilate, they were considered deficient or deviant."[27]

During this period of historiography obsessed with the idea of assimilation, and by association exclusion, a non-Anglo voice emerges to offer a different view on race and ethnicity in America. In The Souls of Black Folk, published in 1903, W.E.B. Du Bois' definition of race contains some of the elements that historians at the end of the twentieth century will define as ethnicity.

> [Race] is a vast family of human beings, generally of common blood and language, always of common history, traditions and impulses, who are both voluntarily and involuntarily striving together for the accomplishment of certain more or less vividly conceived ideals

---

21. John R. Commons, *Races and Immigrants in America* (1907; Project Gutenberg, 2010), 211. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/34028/34028-h/34028-h.htm.

22. Ibid., 17.

23. Ibid., 231.

24. Ibid., 9.

25. Sucheng Chan, "Asian American Historiography," *Pacific Historical Review* 65:3 (Aug., 1996): 364. Chan mentions pro-Chinese missionaries William Speer and Otis Gibson, diplomat George F. Seward, and sociologist Mary Roberts Coolidge, as well as anti-Chinese writers M.B. Starr, Pierton W. Dooner, and Robert Woltor.

26. Ibid., 364-365.

27. Ibid., 369.

of life.[28]

Yet, Du Bois still maintains that there are biological differences among races, a "common blood" that links people within a group, but separates them from those outside the group. He divides people into eight racial categories, including the English of Great Britain and America, the Negroes of Africa and America, and the Mongolians of Eastern Asia. American Indians, however, are a minor racial group.[29] However, for Du Bois color, hair texture, and head shapes are not definitive distinctions between races. Instead, he declares that racial characteristics are "spiritual, psychical, differences" that transcend physical differences.[30] Du Bois also discusses the idea of "double-consciousness," the dichotomy between being American and Negro, questioning whether identifying as a member of both groups is possible.[31]

Most early twentieth century historical works demonstrated "Anglo-Saxon superiority over other racial and ethnic groups."[32] Herbert Eugene Bolton's history of the Borderlands progresses beyond the traditional Anglo-European agency, writing American history from the perspective of Spanish explorers.[33] Although a breakthrough in historical interpretation, this perspective automatically gives Spanish conquistadors dominance over other ethnicities in the Borderlands. Like Turner, Bolton asserts that Native Americans were merely "buffers against European rivals." However, he also defines non-European ethnic groups as the objectified "others" who were killed, subdued, exploited, and married off to aggressive European explorers.[34]

Reviewers Victoria and Light Cummins express their trepidation about relying on Bolton's work in a journal article published in Latin American Research Review:

> Despite the work's status as a classic, readers should evaluate it carefully. The Spanish Borderlands remains an appropriate starting point for students interested in the subject. But its implicit and explicit assumptions about race, ethnicity, gender, and social history raise troubling questions for contemporary readers.[35]

---

28.   W.E.B. Du Bois, "The Conservation of Races," in *The Souls of Black Folk*, ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. and Terri Hume Oliver (New York: W.W. Norton & Company), 177-178.

29.   Ibid., 177-178. "The history of the world is the history, not of individuals, but of groups, not of nations, but of races…"

30.   Ibid., 178.

31.   Du Bois, "Of Our Spiritual Strivings," 11; Du Bois, "The Conservation of Races," 180-181.

32.   Victoria H. and Light T. Cummins, "Review: Building on Bolton: The Spanish Borderlands Seventy-Five Years Later," *Latin American Research Review* 35:2 (2000): 232.

33.   Herbert E. Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), vii. According to Bolton, the Borderlands includes "regions between Florida and California, now belonging to the United States, over which Spain held sway for centuries."

34.   Herbert E. Bolton, "The Epic of Greater America," *The American Historical Review* 38:3 (Apr., 1933): 452.

35.   Cummins, 231.

Nowhere in Bolton's history of the Borderlands are Native Americans active agents in the cultural system or economy. The theory that Native Americans were weaklings against powerful European forces supports the idea of "American exceptionalism," where indigenous people enjoy inter-tribal peace until European explorers exploit and enslave them.[36] Like Commons, Bolton refers to those of mixed ethnicity as "half breeds."[37] Although writing from the Spanish European perspective, he maintains ideals of Anglo superiority, using phrases such as "standard-bearer of the white race."[38]

However, Bolton does recognize the need for a synthesis of American history and the importance of studying "the effects of the Indian on European cultures."[39] Although this gives more agency to Native Americans, it still places them as the inferior group in comparison to a superior group. Charles McLean Andrews views history in a similar way, as a war "between the privileged and the unprivileged, the satisfied and the dissatisfied, the "haves" and the "have nots" of political, economic, and social groups."[40] Not until James F. Brooks' seminal work, Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands, does an historian give complete agency to two non-Anglo, non-European groups—Native Americans and Borderlands settlers far removed from imperial Spain.

Winthrop Jordan's White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1150-1812 essentially takes Bolton's charge to study the effects of one group on another, writing a history about African Americans from the perspective of Anglo Americans. Jordan explains that, "This is not a book about Negroes except as they were objects of white men's attitudes."[41] For Jordan, white American attitudes toward blacks reveal the intellectual history of whites. In essence, Anglo Americans established their racial identity and superiority by imposing racial definitions on those they deemed to be their opposites—the African Americans.[42] Although African Americans are given more agency in Jordan's work, it is, ultimately, a history of white Americans.[43] Reviewer David Brion Davis summarizes:

---

36. James F. Brooks, *Captives & Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 365.

37. Bolton, "The Epic of Greater America," 452.

38. Cummins, 232.

39. Bolton, "The Epic of Greater America," 474.

40. Charles McLean Andrews, "On the Writing of Colonial History," *The William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series 1:1 (Jan., 1944): 30.

41. Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550-1812* (Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1969), viii.

42. Ibid., 134. "In retrospect it is easy to see that their presence constituted an invitation to development of a new rationale which would tell white men who they were and where they stood in the community—the rationale of racial superiority."

43. James Campbell and James Oakes, "Review: The Invention of Race: Rereading White Over Black," *Reviews in American History* 21:1 (Mar., 1993): 182.

> Still, the most valuable message of the book is that for Americans racial slavery was a good deal more than a system of economic exploitation. It was a system of psychological exploitation, of cultural parasitism, which allowed the whites to achieve a sense of communal solidarity and purpose through the systematic debasement of Negroes.[44]

Jordan's definition of race also focuses on biological differences. In his "Note on the Concept of Race," Jordan discusses recent scientific discoveries about genetic differences between racial groups, declaring that "one of the most important recent breakthroughs has been the conception of race as a group of individuals sharing a common gene pool."[45] He also mentions scientific debates about the differences between white and black physiology, anatomy, and mental abilities. He emphasizes that race is in a constant state of change, but this also refers to biological differences.[46] Toward the end of the twentieth century, racial categories will shift from focusing on biological distinctions to understanding the fluctuations of social and historical constructs.

Carl Degler's 1971 work Neither Black Nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States, maintains biological distinctions between races, but also shows that racial definitions are dependent on politics and geography. "To perceive physical distinction is the first step toward making social distinctions."[47] To accomplish this, Degler offers a comparative analysis of race relations in Brazil and the United States. He also focuses on studying the mixed race, not as "half breeds," but as a distinct group of mulattos.[48] Of course, this distinction is dependent on social constructions of the region. For example, Degler asserts that in the United States, any hint of black ancestry categorized a person as Negro, whereas in Brazil there were various levels of blackness.[49] Reviewer Rayford Logan argues against Degler's main thesis, stating that the United States has more than a basic black-and-white distinction.[50] Ultimately, Degler's Pulitzer Prize-winning book was written to produce a discourse.[51] He declares it was written to encourage the general public to discuss the question of biracial respect.[52] He concludes with a call to action: "We have to recognize that the price of equality in pluralism, like the price of liberty, is

---

44.   David Brion Davis, "Review: [untitled]," The William and Mary Quarterly 26:1 (Jan., 1969): 112.

45.   Jordan, 584.

46.   Ibid., 584-585.

47.   Carl N. Degler, Neither Black Nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), 209.

48.   Ibid., xii. In Brazil the mulatto is a distinction separate from "negro", whereas in the United State mulattos are considered black.

49.   Ibid., 101-103.

50.   Rayford W. Logan, "Review: [untitled]," The Journal of American History 60:1 (Jun., 1973): 131.

51.   For more information on discourses, see Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality: Volume I: An Introduction (1978; New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 11.

52.   Degler, xi.

eternal vigilance."[53]

During the 1970s there was a noticeable shift in the categorical terms used by historians. Degler used the term "Negro" in his work that was published in 1971. In the same year, George Fredrickson published The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914. His use of term "Afro-American" displays a shift from defining racial concepts by biological differences to acknowledging origins. Fredrickson's book studies the intellectual history of racism by surveying "the racial views of few hundred prominent white Americans, almost all of whom were male."[54] Like Jordan, Fredrickson's work is not about African Americans. It focuses on Anglo American racist ideas about African Americans.[55] For Fredrickson, however, it was not biological racial characteristics that are in a constant state of flux—as Jordan notes—but a "fluid pattern of belief" that was "affected in significant and diverse ways by the same social, intellectual, and political currents influencing other basic aspects of American thought and experience."[56]

The rise of social history ignited a desire for historians to focus on what E.P Thompson called class-consciousness, or "the consciousness of an identity of interests as between all these diverse groups of working people and as against the interests of other classes."[57] Lawrence W. Levine's Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought From Slavery to Freedom focused on the consciousness of African Americans in U.S. history. Rather than sourcing historical documents that frequently depict slaves "either as docile, accepting beings or as alienated prisoners on the edge of rebellion," he used oral sources to give African Americans a voice and agency in their own history.[58] Levine shows African Americans not as inarticulate, empty shells without culture or control of their situation, but as "actors in their own right who not only responded to their situation but often affected it in crucial ways."[59] He argues that despite "racial, social, and economic exploitation black Americans forged and nurtured a culture."[60] He utilizes oral traditions, such as slave songs, folktales, and jokes from the antebellum era to the end of the 1940s, which were previously thought to be flawed sources by historians, to show that African slaves were not stripped of their traditional African culture,

---

53.   Ibid., 292.

54.   Mia Bay, "Review: Remembering Racism: Rereading the Black Image in the White Mind," *Reviews in American History* 27:4 (Dec., 1999): 648.

55.   Ibid., 649.

56.   George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), 320.

57.   E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London, 1965), 194. Thompson here was discussing the formation of the English working class between 1790 and 1830; however, the idea of class or group consciousness persisted into other studies within the historical profession, such as race and ethnicity. See Chan, "Asian American Historiography," 375-376.

58.   Lawrence W. Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom*, 30th anniversary ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xx and 114.

59.   Ibid., xxv.

60.   Ibid., xxv.

emerging "from bondage in an almost culture-less state" and forced to adopt white culture.[61] In fact, the improvisational and expressive nature of African American oral culture is rooted in African traditions.[62] Levine's work essentially dismisses the long-held notion that African American slaves and freed people desired acculturation and assimilation into Anglo American society and introduces readers to the idea of dual ethnic identities.[63] He revisits Du Bois' notion of "double consciousness" and proves that blacks can be both African and American. Levine does not merely give agency to African Americans; he uses their oral expressions of culture to prove that they already had agency, a voice, and power.

In Telling the Truth About History, Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob assert that the democratization of education initiated dramatic changes to the craft of "doing history." More women, racial minorities, and those with immigrant backgrounds earned Ph.Ds in history during the twentieth century and began producing dissertation topics that related to their personal histories.[64] The democratization of education, Appleby argues, is what initiated "the rewriting of American history from a variety of cultural perspectives, and the dethroning of science as the source and model for what may be deemed true."[65] This is certainly true in writing about race and ethnicity in American history, as historians move from definitions based on biological differences to those examining social and cultural constructs. It also rids the history profession of imposed hegemony by the authors and proves that agency does not need to be given to Native Americans, Mexican Americans, or African Americans. These "others" are now taking charge of their own agency.

In 1972, Rodolfo Acuña, a Chicano teaching in the Chicano Studies department at California State University, Northridge, wrote an introductory textbook about Chicano history in America. Reviewer J. Joseph Huthmacher describes Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle toward Liberation as "an excellent introductory survey of the history of a particular minority group that conveys not only scholarship and information, but sincerity, concern, and commitment as well."[66] It offers a narrative of American history from the perspective of Chicanos, written by a Chicano. Similarly, Mario T. Garcia's monograph Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960 is "a study of ethnic leadership" in the United States during the Mexican-American Generation.[67] Reviewer Juan R. Garcia summarizes that Mexican Americans during this period "strongly espoused the concepts of cultural pluralism, Pan-Americanism, integration, and education as key components in promoting equality and

---

61.   Ibid., 442.

62.   Ibid., 6.

63.   Ibid., 444.

64.   Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth About History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995), 146-147.

65.   Ibid., 5.

66.   J. Joseph Huthmacher, "Review: [untitled]," *The American Historical Review*, 80:2 (Apr., 1975): 480; Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle toward Liberation* (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972).

67.   Garcia, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960,* 1.

social advancement for Mexican Americans."[68] Mario T. Garcia defines Mexican Americans as "mostly a people of color—mestizos."[69] This dramatically contradicts the 1940 U.S. Census, which fused Mexicans into the white racial category.[70] To tell the history from a Mexican American perspective, Garcia uses oral interviews, newspapers and periodicals from the period, and archival sources.[71] There also is an attempt by the author to integrate Mexican American women's stories into the history.[72]

Shirley Ann Wilson Moore's To Place Our Deeds: The African American Community in Richmond, California, 1910-1963 also focuses on a specific period of African American history. However, she zooms in closer than Garcia by studying African Americans in a specific region of California. Moore also uses a variety of sources that historians in the early twentieth century often ignored, including newspapers and periodicals, shipyard recruitment sheets, letters, pamphlets, and more than 100 hours of oral interviews to reconstruct everyday life from the perspective of African Americans living in Richmond from 1910-1963.[73] In Moore's history, women are not merely integrated into the history of men; women's voices shine through, particularly as workers in shipyards and owners of blues clubs.[74]

With the recognition of a multiplicity of ethnic groups, American historiography has in the last twenty years experienced an age of anthologies. Asian American studies professor Sucheng Chan collaborated with Douglas Henry Daniels, Mario T. Garcia, and Terry P. Wilson to bring together a collection of essays in 1994 focusing on the relationship between various ethnic groups—Native Americans, Mexican Americans, African Americans, and Asian Americans—not just relationships between peoples of color and Anglo Americans.[75] Chan explains that early works in American history of the West ignored peoples of color or saw them as obstacles while newer works depict them as victims. Peoples of Color in the American West, however, is an "attempt to transcend the perspectives of both the 'old' and the 'new' western American history.[76] Essays include "American Indians' Ideas About Themselves," "Chicana Feminist Discourse, 1970s," "African Americans in the Cattle Industry, 1860s-1880s," and "Korean Americans and the Model Minority Myth, 1970s-Present." Chan admits that

---

68. Juan R. Garcia, "Review: [untitled]," *The American Historical Review* 96:2 (Apr., 1991): 631.

69. Garcia, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960*, 8.

70. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940* (Washington, D.C.; GPO 1943).

71. Garcia, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960,* 303-307.

72. Ibid., 2-3. Although Garcia admits that he found limited sources about Mexican American women, he states that he decided to "integrate the material on women…within rather than apart from the other material."

73. Shirley Ann Wilson Moore, *To Place Our Deeds: The African American Community in Richmond California, 1910-1963* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2000), 5 and 203-218.

74. Ibid., 57-58 and 135-137.

75. Chan, "Introduction," 10. See also Chan, vii-viii: The editors represent each ethnic group: Asian American, African American, Mexican American, and Native American.

76. Chan, "Preface," v.

there are significant gaps in historical knowledge that prevent a synthesized history about peoples of color. However, she views the anthology as a building block which other historians can use to create a master ethnic narrative.[77]

Nancy Foner and George Fredrickson also compiled an anthology of historical essays discussing the multiplicity of ethnic identities in America, including those who identify as people of mixed ethnicities, in Not Just Black and White: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States. Eric Foner's The New American History incorporates essays and historiographies about race and ethnicity within a broader collection of works about American history from "the experience of previously neglected groups."[78]

One of the major attempts at synthesis, although not on a country-wide scale, was successfully achieved by James Brooks in Captives & Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands. Writing from the perspective of local actors in Borderlands history—Native American tribes and Spanish colonists—Brooks blurs the line differentiating the cultures. He shows that involuntary servitude, the necessity for intermarriage, and the integration of captives demanded the blending of races and led to the dismantling of former racial definitions. Reviewer Theda Perdue writes that Captives & Cousins rescues "Indian history from the 'tenaciously sunny romanticism' that not only placed Native people in a precontact Eden but also exempted them from active participation in Euro-American expansion."[79] In Brooks' history of the Southwest Borderlands, Native Americans fuel the economic slave system through "capture, adoption, intermarriage, and occasional sacrifice."[80] By giving agency to Native American tribes in the Southwest, Brooks razes Bolton's idea of "the heroic and romantic contributions of Spanish conquistadores to North American history" and the stereotypical view of Native Americans living in a primordial Utopian society.[81] Even Brooks' use of the term "Native Americans" in contrast to Bolton's use of "Indians" breaks some of those preconceived notions and shows the evolution of scholarship.

Historians are also working to reveal more voices from ethnically diverse groups of women. Quintard Taylor and Shirley Ann Wilson Moore's anthology African American Women Confront the West: 1600-2000, gives agency to black women who "confronted myriad wests, from the seventeenth-century frontier of New Spain to Oakland of the 1960s."[82] In 2009, Cynthia Orozco authored No

---

77.   Ibid., v.

78.   Eric Foner, ed., *The New American History: Revised and Expanded* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), x.

79.   Theda Perdue, "Review: Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Border lands by James F. Brooks," *The American Historical Review* 108:1 (Feb., 2003): 183.

80.   Brooks, 33.

81.   Ibid., 36 and 365-366.

82.   Gayle Gullett, "Review: [untitled]," *The Journal of American History* 91:3 (Dec., 2004): 985; Quintard Taylor and Shirley Ann Wilson Moore, ed., *African American Women Confront the West: 1600-2000* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003).

Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed: The Rise of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement, incorporating women into the discussion of the Mexican American civil rights movement and, by default, includes their experiences and self-identity into the definition of what it means to be a Mexican American.[83]

> Some historians were concerned that social history would eventually cause fragmentation and "overspecialization" within the profession.[84] However, Eric Foner explained in a lecture given in 1997, I think there is an excessive fragmentation and overspecialization in much of the writing of American history, and a history of our society is more than simply the sum of the parts of discreet groups that make up American life. On the other hand, the New History… with its increased attention to the experience of previously neglected groups has tremendously enhanced our understanding of American history.[85]

Although the incorporation of a variety of ethnic identities has expanded an understanding of the American past, a synthesized narrative about ethnic diversity in American history is needed. There are anthologies that incorporate individual studies about various ethnic groups, monographs that feature a specific group, and comparative studies between two merging groups. Alan Taylor successfully told the story of American colonization from the perspective of the once excluded: non-English European empires, Native Americans, Africans, and women.[86] Yet, a synthetic narrative about race, ethnicity, and cultural pluralism has yet to be authored. As ethnicities in twenty-first century American society continue to merge—in addition to the growing ease of globe-trekking and starting families with people of different national origins—there will be a greater demand to study how people of mixed races are treated in history.

Studying race and ethnicity in American historiography is exciting in many ways, especially writing as an historian in the twenty-first century. This is an age when a plethora of source material is accepted within the profession to add depth to the history. Many historians, including Levine, Brooks, and Moore, injected their histories with cultural literature and personal interviews.[87] It is a valuable tool that adds narrative flow, draws readers into the history, and creates intimacy with the actors. Historians

---

83. Cynthia E. Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed: The Rise of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009), 11. "Class, citizenship, and gender have had their effects as well on identity…"

84. Thomas Bender, "Strategies of Narrative Synthesis in American History," *The American Historical Review* 107:1 (Feb., 2002): 131.

85. Eric Foner, "Who is an American?," (1997) Alternative Radio website, MP3 recording, 7:01, http://www.alternativeradio.org/programs/FONE001.shtml (accessed Dec. 13, 2010).

86. Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2001), x-xiii.

87. See Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness*; Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*; and Shirley Ann Wilson Moore, *To Place Our Deeds*.

must follow their predecessors and utilize more than traditional source material. For instance, A. Gabriel Meléndez and M. Jane Young of the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque compiled an anthology of poems, personal essays, and historical studies written by people with ethnic ties to the Southwest. The book also was published in the southwestern region by the University of Arizona Press in Tucson.[88] Such perspectives are vital to understanding ethnic diversity in the United States. Fashion, artwork, depictions of ethnic groups on stage and in film, as well as the adoption of pop culture phrases, music and dance styles by various ethnic groups also contribute to the constantly changing definitions of race and ethnicity in American history.

Racial and ethnic categorizations are not fixed. Definitions shift as a result of politics, economy, social structures, and the rise of self-awareness. Within the last century, the definition of race shifted from a classification imposed upon groups to a self-defining characterization of one's personal history, culture, and identity. Perhaps W.E.B. Du Bois' idea of "double consciousness," the feeling of "two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings" of being both African and American will never be resolved. Yet, a resolution is not necessary, or even desired. The history of the United States is not a story of multiple races fusing to form one homogenized ethnicity. As Frank Shuffelton notes, "America was ethnic from the beginning," and it will continue to be ethnic in the future.[89] A historical synthesis about race and ethnicity in America will surely guide Americans to a greater acceptance of ethnic diversity. For we are all similar in our differences.

---

88.   A. Gabriel Meléndez, M. Jane Young, and Patricia Moore, and Patrick Pynes, ed., A *Multicultural Southwest: A Reader* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001).

89.   Frank Shuffelton, ed., *A Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 7.

Beats and Punks: Conformity and Counterculture in Cold War America

Steve Estabrook

Introduction

As the Cold War developed out of the aftermath of World War II, some organizations within the United States government deemed it necessary to project specific cultural ideals both domestically, and to the world at large. This resulted in some rather interesting bedfellows as the CIA became a de facto ministry of culture in the late 1940s and early 1950s.[1] The CIA and the U.S. State Department supported film projects, art exhibits and concerts designed both to project a favorable image of America abroad and to depict capitalism in a positive light.[2] With the encouragement of politicians and intellectuals like Nelson Rockefeller and Arthur Schlesinger, the government provided support to certain types of art that one might not associate with the conservative elements prominent in the federal government at that time, such as Abstract-Expressionism and modern jazz.

Closer to home, political and business factions promoted a lifestyle based on consumerism, patriotism and capitalism.[3] The dissemination of these ideals in advertising, movies, and political pronouncements resulted in a perceived cultural conformity against which groups whom we now identify as "the counterculture" rebelled.[4] Countercultural factions such as the Beats in the late 1940s and on into 1960s, gave voice to and acted out, a repudiation of what they saw as a bankrupt system of values. The rejected the requisite middle-class, nuclear-family suburban lifestyle, which was in turn supported and was supported by the increasingly consumer- based economy.[5]

Columnist Herb Caen jokingly named this group of countercultural advocates the Beatniks as a play on Russian terminology akin to "Sputnik."[6] The Beatniks grew out of the immediate post-war urban

1. Kammen, Michael. "Culture and the State in America," The Journal of American History 83, no. 3 (December 1996): 798.

2. Saunders, Francis Stonor. *Who Paid the Piper: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War.* London: Granta Books. 1999, 1.

3. Fried, Richard M. *The Russians are Coming, the Russians are Coming!: Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold War America.* New York: Oxford University Press. 1998, 20-22.

4. Jamison, Andrew and Ron Eyerman. *Seeds of the Sixties.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994,

5. Johnston, Allan. "Consumption, Addiction, Vision, Energy: Political Economies and Utopian Visions in the Writings of the Beat Generation." *College Literature* Vol. 32 No. 2 (Spring, 2005): 107.

6. John Arthur Maynard, *Venice West: The Beat Generation in Southern California* (New Brunswick:

landscape and formed enclaves in places such as Greenwich Village, Venice Beach, and San Francisco. They produced literature that on one hand hearkened back to the Romantic poets of the nineteenth-century like Walt Whitman, and on the other reflected the rhythms and sensibilities of modern jazz: bop and bebop.[7] The Beats included socialists, drug users, practitioners of alternative religions and homosexuals. Almost all were in some way on the fringes of the societal mainstream and thus popular media often ridiculed or marginalized the movement. One example is in the television show *The Many Loves of Dobie Gillis* which aired from 1959-1963. Bob Denver (aka Gilligan) portrayed Beatnik character Maynard G. Krebs as a lovable, ineffectual, unthreatening "rebel" with the requisite Beat goatee. This depiction effectively neutralized any potentially ominous aspect of such a character and helped to relegate the Beats' social criticisms to the realm of satire and comedy. [8]

Much as the Beats reacted to the political and social environment of the 1950s, the punk rock scene developed from the mid-1970s to the early 1980s in part as a response to the post-Fordist economic challenges of the late 1960s and early 1970s. The United States was shifting from a labor intensive, manufacturing-based economy, into a white collar, service oriented economy. This ultimately resulted in a loss of relatively well paid union jobs, and an increase in lower paid, pension-less and often temporary service jobs. A phenomenon known as "stagflation" – a combination of high unemployment, high inflation and sluggish growth – became the byword for the economic troubles of the decade.[9]

While the origins of musical developments are notoriously difficult to pin down, some cultural and social historians consider punk rock to have begun in New York City circa 1975.[10] The Punks symbolized a reaction against the perceived failure of the cultural, political, and economic ideals of American society. The social and economic gains that workers and their families realized throughout the 1950s and 1960s were collapsing, as was the nuclear family. Frustration with this state of affairs (in the U.S. and in Britain) and with both the mainstream ideals of society at large and the mainstream artistic–primarily musical–cultural situation at the time were all major factors in the development of the punk movement.[11]

Both Punks and Beats saw themselves as torch bearers of an artistic integrity that countered the growing commercialization of an increasingly consumer-driven popular culture. Some believe these views represent unsupportable and unrealistic generalizations about the motivations of the participants, and to an even greater extent, the realities of the relationship between counterculture and consumer

Rutgers University Press, 1991), 100.

7.   Maynard, 48.

8.   Maynard, 2-3.

9.   Bailey, Beth L and Dave Farber, Ed. *America in the Seventies*. University Press of Kansas, 2004, 59.

10.   Moore, Ryan. *Sells Like Teen Spirit: Music, Youth Culture, and Social Crisis*. New York: New York University Press, 2010, 1.

11.   Moore, Ryan. *Sells Like Teen Spirit: Music, Youth Culture, and Social Crisis*. New York: New York University Press, 2010, 6-9.

culture. Others, however, believe they don't go far enough in crediting the Beats and Punks for their roles at the beginning and end of a cultural movement that effectively questioned the very concept of mainstream culture.

In the book *Nation of Rebels,* Joseph Heath and Andre Potter take issue with the distinction between the counterculture and the consumer society it purports to rebel against. They insist that countercultural ideals will always be absorbed into society and become part of the mainstream. In this way they not only emphasize that the counterculture cannot be considered distinct from consumer culture, but also that those who focus on such a distinction do more harm than good to progressive ideals like civil rights and socio-economic equality. By rejecting or discounting the political and social realities and processes by which such positive progressive change is made, these "rebels" do damage to these causes and by extension, to the underclass and working classes.[12] Additionally, such critiques of consumerism can often ring hollow to those in the working class who due to political/economic legislation and frankly, due to the benefits of capitalism, have gained easier access to consumer goods.[13] Manuel Luis Martinez supports this assertion in *Countering the Counterculture,* and takes the argument a step further when he states that concurrent with McCarthyism, the Beat movement was in part a reaction to the civil rights movement and other progressive movements that were gaining ground in the 1950s. He views it as a predominantly white male isolationist association that showed little support for the needs of minorities, women and the working class.[14]

Greil Marcus, author of *Lipstick Traces,* affirms some of these charges as they relate specifically to the punk movement. Using the Sex Pistols as an example, Marcus identifies a sensibility that does, in fact, ignore the "language of protest" by which musicians and other artists had historically called for change.[15] Instead, in songs such as "Anarchy in the U.K." and "God Save the Queen" the Sex Pistols observed the state of society in the aftermath of the 1960s protest era and called into question the very structure of the social order, the legitimacy of its "rulers" and thus the ultimate ineffectuality of traditional protest methods.[16] Further, sociologist Ryan Moore notes that part of the genius of the punk movement lay in its deconstruction of the very ideals and icons of consumer society such as safety pins, Vaseline, pornography, the British and American flags, all recycled and re-presented to society in

12.   Heath, Joseph and Andrew Potter. *Nation of Rebels: Why Counterculture Became Consumer Culture.* New York: Harperbusiness. 2004, 8-9.

13.   Ibid, 32.

14.   Martinez, Manuel Luiz. *Countering the Counterculture: Rereading Postwar American Dissent from Jack Kerouac to Tomas Rivera.* Winconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. 2003, 15-16.

15.   Marcus, Greil. *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth-Century.* Harvard University Press, 1991 13.

16.   Ibid, 12.

17.   Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 313.

undisguised mockery.[17]

This paper will analyze different views of the countercultural movements that bookended the Cold War. It will show that while some of the charges against the Beats may hold true, the primary impetus for the movement was artistic and not political. What politics were of concern were related to personal civil liberties especially those peculiar to artists. One can criticize them more for self-absorption than conscious reactionary tendencies (with the exception of Jack Kerouac). Likewise, in contrast to Heath and Potter's assertions, I will identify works by some in the beat and punk movement that while no longer universally shocking, have still not ingratiated into the mainstream, even today. I will also demonstrate that while Martinez and Heath and Potter have valid criticisms of certain countercultural elements, there were artists who managed to remain decidedly outside the mainstream and yet were eloquent activists for progressive change in society. Finally, this study will propose that it is far from axiomatic that the mainstream ultimately absorbs and negates all radical art. In fact, the legacy of both the Beat and Punk movements is a model of artistic freedom independent of conventional, commercial culture.

Chapter 1

During the early years of the Cold War the United States advanced its attempts at cultural propaganda even beyond the level it utilized during World War II. Through a clever use of local and national pageantry, and through new and old types of media, an American mythology was codified that promoted the ideals of democracy and freedom, indelibly linked with a capitalist, consumer-based economy. From national events such as the Freedom Train - a travelling museum of American historical documents - and holidays like I Am an American Day, to local staged events such as mock communist takeovers sponsored by the American Legion,[18] a pointed comparison was made between the American and Soviet ways of life. Thus encouraged, authors like Mickey Spillane created best-selling novels involving duplicitous communists,[19] [20] and groups such as the Catechetical Guild Educational Society of St. Paul Minnesota published comic books like *This is Tomorrow: America Under Communism* which depicted the American congress and media under communist control with those who resisted either enslaved or dead.[21] Using such broad strokes, all of the above demonstrate the fears extant about the encroachment of communism.

---

18.   Fried, 16, 67, 75.

19.   Barson, Michael. *Better Dead than Red***:** *a nostalgic look at the golden years of Russiaphobia, red-baiting, and other commie madness.* New York: Hyperion, 1992, 79.

20.   Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States.* New York: Harper Perennial, 2003, 436.

21.   Barson, 50.

Television was a different story. This new medium was used in more subtle ways that did not always directly confront communism or the U.S.S.R., but worked hand in hand with the promotion of the American consumer-based culture and economy. One example was the General Electric (GE) TV Theater show which ran from 1954 to 1962, hosted by Ronald Reagan. As hosts, Reagan and his wife Nancy provided a picture of an ideal middle-class lifestyle. This lifestyle embodied a confidence in technological progress (as in the all-electric kitchen) and the betterment of home life through the acquisition of the latest consumer goods.[22] Thus the vision of America projected through these media was one of a freedom-loving, democratic, middle-class existence where one's basic needs were satisfied via the maintenance of an essentially conformist consumer culture.

This is ultimately, however, an incomplete view of American culture during the early Cold War era. While there were corporate and political interests that had as their goal the creation of a commercialized and multi-level consumer culture operating in education and the arts, as well as the general marketplace,[23] there were examples in literature, film, music and television of reactions to this tendency. Andrew Jamison and Ron Eyerman in *The Seeds of the Sixties,* and Lay May in *Recasting America,* note that the economic difficulties of the Great Depression of the 1930s led to a certain amount of political and artistic unity, and show that this in turn resulted in real progressive change. However, the relatively affluent fifties were often characterized by "fragmentation and anxiety" [24] epitomized by the popularity of books like *Catcher in the Rye*, plays like *Death of a Salesman,* the advent of film noir, rock and roll and the political and social ambiguities reflected in television shows such as *The Twilight Zone.* All point to the fact that the supposed consensus about America's actions, and where it was headed as a society was neither deep nor universal.[25]

Likewise, at the level of the State Department and the CIA there were movements afoot that, while strongly maintaining an anti-communist stance, as well as an interest in domestic conformity, exhibited an occasional artistic progressiveness to the rest of the world in order to promote a view of America that embodied the virtues of freedom of thought and expression.[26] Conservative intellectual art critic Clement Greenberg, and allies of the Non-Communist Left (NCL) Joseph Schlesinger and Nicholas Nabokov were but a few of the supporters of such action.[27] There were others who had been associated with communism in the 1920s and 1930s but who became disillusioned with the same following Stalin's

---

22. Raphael, Tim. "The Body Electric: GE, TV, and the Reagan Brand," *TDR (1988-)* 53, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 127.

23. Jamison, 12-13.

24. Jamison, 10-11.

25. May, Lary. Ed. *Recasting America: culture and politics in the age of cold war.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1989. 8..

26. Saunders, Francis Stonor. *Who Paid the Piper: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War.* London: Granta Books. 1999, 2.

27. Saunders, 63, 58.

purges and censures.[28] They supported the CIA-run covert campaign called the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF).[29] This was a program whose purpose was decidedly counter-communist, but at the same time maintained a relatively progressive cultural bent.[30] The CCF, which had a presence in thirty-five countries, published journals, held art exhibits, concerts and awarded prizes. In June of its inaugural year it adopted a declaration called the *Freedom Manifesto* which outlined its support of intellectual and artistic freedom, and its toleration of diverse opinion in opposition to totalitarian (communist) states.[31]

One of the CCF's methods in fighting the cultural Cold War was to showcase particular elements of the American avant-garde in order to counter the notion of the United States as a cultural follower, and show that a free society allowed an artistic liberty that the communist world and its push for Socialist Realism could not match.[32] An example of the CIA/CCF's technique was the support of the New York Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), especially the exhibition of Abstract-Expressionists.[33] They accomplished this with the aid of Nelson Rockefeller, who was president of MoMA in the 1940s and 1950s[34] and who had long been a supporter of government funding for the arts.[35] The State department also made use of jazz music, especially that of black musicians whom they sent out on tour both to make an artistic statement and to counter the charges of racism that the Soviets made against the United States.[36]

The situation in the United States at the beginning of the Cold War reflected an encroaching consumer culture supported by a growing middle-class, and bolstered by rapid technological development. In combination with an ideological enemy in the USSR and its communist allies, this state of affairs resulted in a certain amount of conformity both of purpose and of expression. However, an equally strong (if not equally perceived) reaction was a condition of anxiety that revealed itself in the art and media of the time. Some of this art the government deemed useful in waging the cultural Cold War and was supported domestically and exported abroad. Other art, such as that created by the Beats, both the government and the society at large viewed with suspicion, and as such it represented a decidedly countercultural trend.

---

28.   Ibid, 1.

29.   Ibid, 268, 270.

30.   Ibid, 268

31.   Ibid, 1, 83

32.   Ibid, 254.

33.   Saunders, 255-256

34.   Ibid.

35.   Howard, Brian David. "Between Avant-Garde and Kitsch: Pragmatic Liberalism, Public Arts Funding, and the Cold War in the United States." *Canadian Review of American   Studies* 34. no. 3 (2004), 293.

36.   Wagnleitner, Reinhold and Elaine Tyler May, ed. *Here, There and Everywhere: The Foreign Politics of American Popular Culture.* Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 2000, 7.

Chapter 2

The original Beat movement began in New York City. The Beat writers, influenced as much by modern jazz musicians like Charlie Parker as by current literary figures, created a style that often reflected improvisatory gestures as opposed more highly structured works. While the stereotype of the Beat poet reciting to bongos and a string bass was prevalent at this time, the improvisations of jazz musicians actually did inform the styles of many Beat poets. The freer improvisatory nature of bebop, as compared to swing and big band jazz, was inspirational to prominent Beat figures like Allen Ginsberg and Jack Kerouac, Larry Lipton and Stuart Perkoff.[37] The jazz of Charlie Parker and Dizzy Gillespie, and later John Coltrane and Miles Davis, often involved long instrumental excursions that wrung and milked given themes and scales in an attempt to squeeze out their very essence. It was a far cry from the more structured and orchestrated swing style of the 1930s and 1940s. Poems such as Ginsberg's "Howl" and Michael McClure's "Ode to the Rose," with their spontaneous nature and the reiteration and development of their initial lyrical patterns, carried with them an improvisatory feel completely akin to the modern trends in jazz.

Often, but not always, the Beats' work carried with it radical political and sociological overtones implying dissatisfaction with the mores and structures of the current American government and society. An example is Michael McClure's "Mad Sonnet 13," written for Allen Ginsberg in 1964:

<blockquote>
ON COLD SATURDAY I WALKED IN THE EMPTY VALLEY

OF WALL STREET

I dreamed with the hanging concrete eagles

And I spoke with the black-bronze foot of Washington.

I strode in the vibrations

of money-strength

in the narrow, cold, lovely CHASM.[38]
</blockquote>

McClure wrote this poem in the early days of the Unites States' involvement in the Vietnam War, and in it he links the politics of the federal government and the business interests of Wall Street.

Other poems like Ginsberg's *Howl* portray relatively explicit sexual themes and imagery in addition to radical political and sociological motifs.

<blockquote>
Moloch! Solitude! Filth! Ugliness! Ashcans and unobtainable

Dollars! Children screaming under the stairways! Boys

Sobbing in armies! Old men weeping in the parks!
</blockquote>

---

37. Douglas Malcom, "Jazz America: Jazz and African American Culture in Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*," *Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring, 1999): 85.

38. Michael McClure, *Huge Dreams: San Francisco and Beat Poems* (New York: Penguin Books, 1999), 75.

Moloch! Moloch! Robot apartments! invisible suburbs! skeleton
        treasuries! blind capitals! demonic industries! spectral
        nations! invincible madhouses! granite cocks! monstrous bombs!

Dreams! adorations! illuminations! religions the whole boatload
        of sensitive bullshit! [39]

As the subject of an obscenity charge lodged against San Francisco's City Lights bookstore owner Lawrence Furlinghetti, Ginsberg's *Howl* provided an important touchstone for American civil liberties. It premiered at the Six Gallery on October 7th, 1955. Furlinghetti, who published the work, was arrested shortly thereafter for disseminating obscene material.[40] The court ultimately acquitted him of all charges, as witnesses including poet and ostensible leader of the San Francisco Beats Kenneth Rexroth, testified to the artistic/literary nature of the work. Rexroth and others gave evidence to the fact that none of the supposed obscenity – and by extension the poem as a whole – had as its purpose arousal of sexual desires in those whom the work was likely to reach.[41] This case became the precedent that courts have used ever since in defining obscenity from a legal standpoint. It was not enough merely to reflect offensive words or ideas, it had to be proven to appeal to and encourage the prurient natures of both the intended audience and those who were likely to access the work.[42]

In addition to the group representing San Francisco's North Beach area, Southern California's Venice Beach was also home to a contingent of Beats who coalesced around poet/author Larry Lipton. Chicago-born Lipton and his wife, known professionally as Craig Rice, had success writing detective novels together, but Lipton wanted the literary world to take him seriously as a poet.[43] Venice Beach had the bohemian charm (as well as a bit of the seamy side) he wanted, and in 1948 he moved into a flat and began serious work on a book of poetry.[44] Many of the locals were already living what one could call a "counterculture" or "Beat-style" life: taking drugs and creating art, working when they needed to but not as a means to social mobility. With the exception of poet Charlie Foster, the Venice artists, unlike the San Francisco and Greenwich Village beats, had little if any association with universities or intellectuals in California or the East Coast.

However, through the publication of Lipton's book *The Holy Barbarians* (which included a photographic essay and a glossary of "Beat slang"), the Venice beats unwittingly provided the popular

---

39.   J.W. Ehrlich, ed., *HOWL of the Censor: The Four Letter Word on Trial Containing the Poem of Controversy HOWL By Allen Ginsberg*. Nourse Publishing, 1956, 140-141.

40.   Davidson, Michael. *The San Francisco Renaissance: Poetics and Community at Mid-Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989,27.

41.   Ehrlich, 121.

42.   Ibid.

43.   Maynard, 24.

44.   Ibid, 35.

model of Beat culture. Hollywood latched onto this, resulting in the portrayal of beats as benign characters like Maynard G. Krebs[45], and as more seedy characters like those portrayed in Paul Frees' 1959 movie *The Beatniks.* An additional occurrence that led to this stereotyping of the Venice Beats (and by association, all Beats) was the 1959 *Life* magazine article "Beatsville U.S.A. vs. Squareville U.S.A." Three teenage girls from Hutchinson, Kansas instigated the article. They wrote to Larry Lipton and asked him to come to their "square" town with some of his Beat friends. Lipton initially agreed, but the girls' parents made them rescind the invitation. However, word had gotten out and *Life* decided to run an article comparing the lives of the bohemian folk in Venice to those of "normal" families in Hutchinson, Kansas. Photographs depicted middle-class families at home in Hutchinson and bearded Beats in their "pad" discussing philosophy.[46] It was in all a rather even-handed article, but reinforced the black turtleneck-wearing, bearded stereotype that was gaining currency and downplayed the diversity that actually existed amongst the Venice and other Beat artists.[47]

Poet and painter Stuart Perkoff was Lipton's most important protégé. Perkoff grew up in St. Louis and exhibited a rebellious artistic streak early in life.[48] He moved to New York City, and after an arrest for refusing to register for the draft at seventeen he moved to Santa Barbara in 1948 settling with his wife, Suzan and child in Venice, one of the few cities affordable in their rather dire financial circumstances.[49] Perkoff was one of the few members of the Venice Beach group (Lipton aside) to have his work published. Born into a liberal Jewish family, Perkoff dabbled in Marxism and developed an interest early on in the primitive and tribal natures of humanity.[50] He reflects this interest in works like the following excerpt from "Pithecanthropus Erectus," after a song by Charles Mingus for whom Perkoff wrote the poem:

> the unpainted shamans
> of magic eyes
> present their visions
> for the tribe

And in a poem to his wife Suzan, from whom he was often estranged:

> inflated with the divine mother
> reliving traumas of her births
>   searching the wild beds and hatreds of the world
> for her twin

---

45. Ibid, 4.
46. Ibid, 7.
47. Ibid, 8.
48. Ibid, 62.
49. Ibid, 64.
50. Ibid, 61-62.

>   her strength
>   her unhad power
>   david, david
>   the tears that flowed
>   that there cd be such tears[51]

These works reflect a different aesthetic than the Zen-influenced poetry of the San Francisco poets and are a microcosm for the Venice movement itself. Many of the artists involved with Lipton were less worldly than those in San Francisco. With the exception of New England-born Charlie Foster, who gave up an extremely well-paying job as an advertising executive[52] to live the Bohemian life, the "fundamental raunchiness" of Venice Beach tended to draw people from poorer backgrounds with less traditional education.[53] As such, they were even further removed from the cultural mainstream than poets like Ginsberg and Kerouac, to say nothing of Abstract-Expressionist artists and others for whom the CIA and CCF had specific uses. The Beats were undeniably counter to the cultural inertia of the day. Whether one views their writings and lifestyle against the background of the mainstream culture or against some of the other progressive artistic movements such as Abstract-Expressionism, their work and respective lifestyles were assuredly something for which neither political nor business interests had any use. The Congress for Cultural Freedom never sent Allen Ginsberg abroad to read *Howl* as a symbol of American artistic freedom.

However, in *Countering the Counterculture,* Manuel Martinez asserts that the puritanical, capitalist society the Beats were supposedly rebelling against was only one aspect of American cultural development at the time. The Beats treated other important and more positive elements like the growing civil rights movement, women's rights and Mexican immigration, with varying degrees of ambiguity and condescension. Furthermore, their worldview was sometimes more in line with the reactionary constituencies that gave rise to the likes of McCarthyism than they would ever admit.[54] Thus, while the freedoms espoused by countercultural groups such as the Beats were certainly radical, they were essentially the same *negative* freedoms that the CIA and CCF were interested in promoting.[55] That is, they were interested in civil liberties and the personal freedom to write, say and live as they wished, but had little to say about the concept of "positive liberty" by which all could share in the economic and political life of American society.[56] Additionally there were some elements in the Beats' writings and experiences, particularly Kerouac's, which seemed anything but progressive.

As stated above, the Beats were influenced in part by nineteenth-century Romantic poets such

---

51.   Ibid, 73.

52.   Ibid, 83.

53.   Ibid, 1,14.

54.   Martinez, 24-25.

55.   Saunders, 81-83.

56.   Martinez, 7.

as Walt Whitman. Much of Whitman's poetry was distinctly expansionist in tone and mirrored the American dream of Manifest Destiny. Kerouac's novels *On the Road* and *Dharma Bums* have this flavor. Visions of westward expansion along with condescending descriptions of "dusky…mysterious, sensuous gals" and "forlorn Indians" decorate the plotline of an individual seeking "space outside the social structure he fears,"[57] that is, away from the demands of a purportedly egalitarian civic society.[58]

Joseph Heath and Andrew Potter make similar arguments in *Nation of Rebels*. Discussing countercultural movements at large, their first contention is that there is no real counterculture. Either mainstream society and the consumer culture co-opt the artifacts of subversive and rebellious movements and neutralize them as in the cases of "hippie" and "punk" fashion,[59] or those espousing revolution unwittingly display and popularize the artifacts of consumer culture as with the "rebel chic" associated with items such as Vans sneakers".[60] In this way cultures of America and Western Europe have been quite capable of tolerating and absorbing all manner of dissident art and political thought.[61] Their second argument is that the attention given to these countercultural movements distracts from political action within the "system." It forestalls developments that could lead to real progress for those who may be in difficult socioeconomic straights–the working class minorities and the poor.[62] This in turn reflects a larger problem for the counterculture, in that much of the working class actually has an interest in maintaining the general status quo, and that their needs are not such that actual revolution is required or even desired.[63]

Martinez' main point is well taken, and certainly an important counter to the prevailing notion of the Beats as either dangerous harbingers of a declining civilization or heralds of a new generation free from conformity-driven society.[64] Martinez, along with Heath and Potter, makes a good argument about the efficacy of countercultural groups as agents of real change in society. However, as seen above, the real impetuses for these movements were artistic and personal and the Beats' main interest was in breaking away from political and economic strictures, not in creating new ones.[65] Their true legacy is creative/artistic change both within their respective genres and in society at large.

Chapter 3

The punk movement represents another aspect of the connection between the counterculture and the mainstream culture. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the economic boom of the post-war years in

57.　　Ibid, 87.

58.　　Ibid, 15-16.

59.　　Heath, 34.

60.　　Ibid, 3-5.

61.　　Ibid, 35.

62.　　Ibid, 31-32.

63.　　Ibid, 32-33.

64.　　Martinerz, 24.

65.　　Johnson, 103.

the United States and Great Britain ground to a halt. This was due to several factors, including the Arab oil embargo and the post-Fordist exportation of manufacturing where businesses endeavored to free themselves from the social democratic "compromises" they had made with labor since the New Deal.[66] The result was a decrease in well-paying, pensioned, skilled-labor jobs and an increase in lower paid, white-collar service work. Additionally, there was a coincident change in the nature of consumer society reflecting a shift from the acquisition of consumer goods, to the creation of personal identity from media lifestyles as seen in movies, television and magazines. Moore puts it this way, "…media spectacles, celebrity images and corporate brand names have advanced from the status of merely "reflecting" society to become the backbone of global political economy and constitutive of social relationships."[67] Thus much commerce no longer involved the manufacturing of consumables (in the traditional sense) but created and sold "image" and hence had no use for skilled, unionized labor.

These developments greatly affected New York City. The loss of its manufacturing base was so devastating that it neared bankruptcy in 1975 and President Gerald Ford refused the city any federal aid.[68] The resulting ten-percent unemployment rate and decline in city social services meant that there were large numbers of youth seemingly without hope for a future as promised by the previous decades' growth.[69] Many saw the more utopian visions of the 1960s as having failed and the music of the mid-1970s began to reflect this. While some of the more anarchic bands of the late 1960s and early 1970s such as MC5 gave voice to disaffected urban dwellers, none of them had the impact of the early punk movement.

The quintessential New York City punk band was The Ramones. Consisting of four musicians from Queens they provided often humorous commentary on the alienation of many youth from the political and social realities of the day as in the song "I'm Against It"

> I don't like politics
> I don't like communists
> I don't like games and fun
> I don't like anyone…
> I don't like sex and drugs
> I don't like water bugs
> I don't care about poverty
> All I care about is me

---

66.   Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 306.

67.   Ibid.

68.   Moore, Ryan. *Sells Like Teen Spirit: Music, Youth Culture, and Social Crisis*. New York: New York University Press, 2010,2-3.

69.   Ibid, 3.

Well I'm against it![70]

In England, which was home to 1.5-million unemployed in 1975,[71] the example set by the Ramones inspired bands like the Sex Pistols and the Clash who respectively reflected the extremes of post-modern irony and a burgeoning political conscience.

> Don't ask us to attend
> 'Cos we're not all there
> Oh don't pretend 'cos I don't care
> I don't believe illusions
> 'Cos too much is real
> So stop your cheap comment
> 'Cos we know what we feel
>
> Oh we're so pretty
> Oh so pretty vacant
> And we don't care[72]
>
> An' if I close my eyes
> They will not go away
> You have to deal with it
> It is the currency
>
> Hate...hate...hate...
>
> The hate of a nation
> A million miles from home
> An' get war from the junkies
> Who don't like my form
>
> I'm gonna stay in the city
> Even when the house fall down
> I don't dream of a holiday

---

70.   The Ramones. *Loud, Fast Ramones:Their Toughest Hits.* Sire/Rhino: 2002

71.   Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 310.

72.   The Sex Pistols. "Pretty Vacant" *Nevemind the Bollocks, Here's the Sex Pistols.* Warner Bros. 1977.

When hate an' war come around[73]

As much as the punk movement was a reaction to the aforementioned economic difficulties of the time, there were artistic and cultural forces to which they reacted just as strongly. The mainstream of rock music was represented by strains of progressive rock, the mellow "California sound," and the vacuous pop music that every era has in abundance. Legs McNeil, co-founder of *Punk* Magazine, spoke about the early 1970s this way: "Everybody's nice, everything just seemed so mediocre, tedious, it was just awful."[74] Additionally, commercial culture had absorbed the formerly radical "hippie" culture and fed it back to society shed of its radical/political elements.[75] A large portion of society no longer considered long hair, Eastern religion or even sexual freedom taboo or strange. It was against these elements that the punk culture developed. Many of the youth saw a declining economy and a corresponding decline in the social services that governments instituted after World War II. Many aspects of 1960s counterculture no longer spoke to the problems extant at home and in the world at large. The promise of the peace movement died symbolically with the riot and murder at Altamont in 1969[76] and with it the "predominantly utopian opposition of Sixties counterculture."[77] Neither was the music, with a few exceptions, speaking in a voice that represented the disaffection, anger and energy that many felt.[78]

One can see the way the punk rock culture responded to these changes by analyzing two different facets of the movement which Ryan Moore calls the "culture of deconstruction" and the "culture of authenticity," and which can be roughly identified with the punk groups in New York and London and those in California and Washington DC, respectively.[79] The Ramones and the Sex Pistols represent the culture of deconstruction, and as such they attempt to isolate themselves from commercial post-modern culture by assembling materials from the past and combining them in an ironic fashion.[80] The Ramones took cues from such disparate elements as 1960s pop like The Beach Boys and fifties do-wop, merged them with a facetious sensibility borrowed from the New York Dolls, and created songs such as "Sheena is a Punk Rocker," "Beat on the Brat," and "Now I Wanna Sniff Some Glue."[81] Cartoonish

73. The Clash. "Hate and War." *The Clash*. CBS, 1977.

74. *End of the Century: The Story of the Ramones.* DVD. Directed by Michael Gramaglia and Jim Fields. Rhino Home Video. 2005.

75. Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 307-313.

76. Marcus, 89.

77. Bailey, Beth L and Dave Farber, Ed. *America in the Seventies*. University Press of Kansas, 2004, 183.

78. Moore, Ryan. *Sells Like Teen Spirit: Music, Youth Culture, and Social Crisis.* New York: New York University Press, 2010, 6-8.

79. Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 308

80. Ibid, 307.

81. Ibid, 313.

matching leather outfits and bowl haircuts exemplified their mocking seriousness.[82] The Sex Pistols used the very structure of rock and roll and the band format to "destroy" it,[83] turning the quasi-religious aura of a rock concert into an arena for full expression of disaffected, ironic mockery. In both cases the response from society at large was overwhelmingly negative, to the point that city councils and even club owners themselves blacklisted both bands from many clubs in their respective cities.[84] One British city councilman stated on camera that the Sex Pistols were the "antithesis of humankind. . . sudden death would be best."[85]Amazingly, the Sex Pistols had a number one hit with "God Save the Queen" in 1977, however the official report had the song blanked out of the number one spot.[86]

The punk scenes in California and Washington DC emerged later and illustrate, in part, Moore's "culture of authenticity."[87] I make this caveat because the initial Los Angeles/ Hollywood scene represented by bands such as X, The Germs, The Plugz, The Weirdos and The Bags was equal to New York in its eclecticism and variety. By the end of the 1970s and into the early 1980s however, the impetus of the California punk scene had shifted to Orange County, and San Francisco[88] where bands such as Black Flag and the Vandals in Orange County and The Dead Kennedys in San Francisco became prominent. The punk rock sound shifted to "hardcore," a style that emphasized the fast and aggressive aspects of the music. The bands did not all sound alike, or even similar, but the music had reached a point where it was more representative of itself and less a "deconstruction" of what had come before. [89]

California had its own peculiar socio-economic difficulties at the time. Proposition 13, passed in 1978[90], rolling back property taxes and resulting in underfunded schools and other social programs.[91] A latent homophobia manifested itself in the attempt to pass the "Briggs" amendment, which if passed would have resulted in the firing of gay teachers from public schools.[92] These reflected a conservative constituency well represented in suburban Orange County, and the nationwide mobilization of this more reactionary electorate went hand in hand with the ascendancy of the Moral Majority and aided the

82.   Ibid.

83.   Marcus, 57.

84.   *End of the Century: The Story of the Ramones* DVD.Directed by Michael Gramaglia and Jim Fields. Rhino, 2005.

85.   *The Filth and the Fury: A Sex Pistols Film. DVD* Directed by Julien Temple. New Line Home Video. 2000.

86.   Ibid.

87.   Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 308.

88.   Ibid, 316.

89.   Ibid, 308.

90.   Collins, Robert M. Transforming America: Politics and Culture during the Reagan Years. New York: Colombia University, 2007, 61.

91.   Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 316.

92.   Collins, 137.

election of Ronald Reagan in 1980.[93]

As a result, many suburban youth expressed as much disaffection as their urban counterparts in Los Angeles, New York and London. They too recognized the end of the "American Dream" as portrayed by traditional media and its political and corporate counterparts. Not only were times difficult economically, but family life was disintegrating with increasing divorce rates and the advent of "latchkey" kids. As Keith, a punker from Winnipeg, says in the documentary *Another State of Mind,* "…people believe that punks are out to ruin the family structure, but that is wrong. Family structure is already gone."[94] A worker at a halfway house for homeless punks in New York says that the American Dream "experience" for most of these kids is a broken home.[95]

Penelope Spheeris' movie *Suburbia,* about a group of homeless punk kids who become squatters in an abandoned housing tract in Orange County directly expresses these problems and sentiments. It is a fictional plot using unknown and inexperienced punk kids (including future Red Hot Chili Peppers' bassist Flea) as actors and incorporates performances by Orange County bands such as The Vandals and TSOL. The story revolves around Evan, a teenage boy who leaves his broken home and meets up with a group of like-minded kids whose own stories reflect the social dysfunctions of the late 1970s and early 1980s: single parent homes, abandonment, abuse and a perception that the future holds nothing good for them. Self-proclaimed vigilantes harass them and the kids eventually turn to petty harassment of their own with ultimately disastrous results.[96]

Punk bands like the aforementioned Vandals, and TSOL and Black Flag all represented, in varying degrees, as much of a concern with the moral breakdown of family and society as with the national economic difficulties of the time. Black Flag's "T.V. Party" and "Annihilate This Week" are two examples, humorously skewering the commercial television culture and the mindless promiscuous party culture, respectively.

In the early 1980s the so-called "straight-edge" movement came to represent the extremes of these sentiments. Straight-edge bands such as Washington D.C.'s Minor Threat made a point of rejecting drugs, alcohol and promiscuous sex.[97] This further exemplifies Moore's "culture of authenticity," as these bands, and others that identified with the "hardcore" movement, established and more or less followed, certain stylistically pure characteristics that ultimately came to represent "punk" rock: short hair, fast tempos, aggressive singing and nihilistic/fatalistic lyrics, occasionally coming close to espousing racism

---

93.   Collins, 175.

94.   *Another State of Mind: Social Distortion, Youth Brigade and Minor Threat.* DVD. Directed by Adam Small and Peter Stuart. Time Bomb Recordings (dist.) 2004.

95.   Ibid.

96.   *Suburbia.* DVD. Directed by Penelope Spheeris. Shout Factory. 1983.

97.   Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 320

and/or homophobia (Minor Threat, Fear).[98] Tellingly, when Black Flag began to grow their hair long and concurrently incorporate slower songs they experienced criticism from hardcore fans.[99]

This movement came to represent something rather different than the punk scenes that came out of New York, London and even Los Angeles. The stylistic diversity among bands such as The Ramones, Blondie, Television, Talking Heads, Sex Pistols, the Clash, The Weirdos, X, and The Gun Club altered as the hardcore movement (like the Beats) became a primarily while male club, with most references to R & B expunged from the music and the Chicano punk scene marginalized.[100] One can see additional parallels to Martinez' view of the Beat movement in that much of the hardcore punk movement was also a reaction to certain societal pressures, and they likewise saw themselves as representatives of an artistic and social alternative. However, at the same time they occasionally represented a reaction against the more pluralistic countercultural elements in society at the time.

There was another aspect to the "culture of authenticity" that Moore conveys which further represents the break with mainstream commercial culture. This was the DIY (do-it-yourself) aesthetic, which was a part of the punk movement from the very beginning, in literature as well as music. Homegrown punk fanzines like Britain's *Sniffing Glue* (1976-77)[101] and Los Angeles' *Slash* (1978-80) (which also produced records until it was sold in 1986) published gigs, interviews and commentary on the respective burgeoning punk scenes.[102] Black Flag's guitarist/leader Greg Ginn began SST records as an outgrowth of his electronic business. SST became home to bands like Husker Du, Meat Puppets, Sonic Youth and - especially relevant to this the DIY aesthetic - San Pedro's Minutemen.[103] The Minutemen represented the ultimate in DIY and even established their own brand of it: "we jam econo." Consisting of guitarist/vocalist D Boon (who died in 1985), bassist Mike Watt and drummer George Hurley, The Minutemen turned the traditional rock and roll "business model" on its head by viewing albums as promotion for their live shows, staying with friends and fans while on the road and other methods of cutting costs. They usually worked concurrent side jobs as well, all for the purpose of remaining independent of record company directives and the whims of the marketplace.[104]

In this way they remained steadfastly outside of mainstream consumer culture while at the same time projecting a political conscience that goes against Heath and Potter's assertion that those who

98. Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 317.

99. Moore, Ryan. *Sells Like Teen Spirit: Music, Youth Culture, and Social Crisis.* New York: New York University Press, 2010, 96.

100. Moore, Ryan. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction," *The Communication Review* 7 (2004): 322.

101. Triggs, Teal. "Scissors and Glue: Punk Fanzines and the Creation of a DIY Aesthetic." *Journal of Design History.* Vol. 19 No. 1 (2006): 70.

102. Moore, Ryan. *Sells Like Teen Spirit: Music, Youth Culture, and Social Crisis.* New York: New York University Press, 2010, 51.

103. *We Jam Econo: The Story of the Minutemen*. DVD. Directed by Tim Irwin. Plexifilm, 2006.

104. Ibid.

choose to remain "counter" do so at the expense of real political action. Their lyrics, especially Boon's, projected an informed and literate progressive reaction to the wave of conservatism sweeping the country in the 1980s such as in the song "The Big Stick" which criticizes American military involvement in Central America.[105] One reviewer noted that Boon "howled" his lyrics "… as if trying to overpower the Republican tidal wave of the 1980s with sheer volume…"[106] They were not the only band to do so. The Clash tackled political topics and Joe Strummer in particular supported left-wing causes[107] as did Jello Biafra of the Dead Kennedys. Biafra went so far as to run for mayor of San Francisco, and for the Green Party presidential nomination (finishing second to Ralph Nader).[108]An additional and more unusual case is the Ramones. On one side singer Joey Ramone (Jeffry Hyman), a noted liberal supported progressive causes and campaigned for Jerry Brown in the 1992 primaries. On the other, guitarist Johnny Ramone (John Cummings) was a conservative Republican who famously said, "God bless America and God bless President Bush" at the Ramones' induction to the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and was vocally a supporter of the Iraq war.[109]

It might seem that given the Ramones' (and Sex Pistols) inclusion in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, they no longer represented the counterculture. Likewise the Clash achieved a great deal of commercial success prior to breaking up. Some believe this undermines their credibility as "revolutionaries." One can safely sat that neither the Dead Kennedy's nor the Minutemen will be inducted into the Hall of Fame. And neither came close to the platinum success of the Clash. I submit that this is representative of the ultimate inadequacy of the counterculture/ consumer-culture dichotomy in the post-modern, post-punk era. From its inception the punk movement was an attempt to deal not only with the sixties counterculture that had gone mainstream and completely ingratiated itself into the consumer culture, but a mainstream culture that had, as Heath and Potter state, become so adept at assimilating the rebellious that the very idea of counterculture was effectively meaningless.[110] Each subset of punk rock, "deconstruction" and "authenticity," effectively neutralized the very idea of mainstream by first disassembling the very icons of consumer culture and sending them back out reconstructed in various ways, like the Sex Pistols with their safety pins. And then by creating a DIY tradition that in many cases allowed artists to remain "off the grid," while at the same time having great influence and nurturing a viable social conscience like the Minutemen.

Admittedly, punk rock fashion (and even many of the elements of the music) is well established

---

105.   Minutemen. *3-Way Tie (For Last).* SST, 1985.

106.   Buckley, Jonathan and Mark Ellingham, eds. *Rock: The Rough Guide.* London: The Rough Guides, 1996, 573.

107.   Salewicz, Chris. *Redemption Song: The Ballad of Joe Strummer.* New York: Faber and Faber, Inc., 2006, 290-291.

108.   Molen, Jodi Vander. "Jello Biafra Interview" *The Progressive.* February, 2002. http://www.progressive.org/mag_intvbiafra (accessed 12/05/10)

109.   *End of the Century: The Story of the Ramones* DVD.Directed by Michael Gramaglia and Jim Fields. Rhino, 2005.

110.   Heath, 34-35.

in what passes for the mainstream now (does one give a Mohawk a second glance anymore?). It is now more difficult to shock. It is not impossible as the Mapplethorpe exhibits in the 1990s proved, although that controversy had as much to do with the use of public funding as with the art itself.[111] More recently Lady Gaga resorted to wearing a "meat dress" in order to create a stir but the shock was short lived and quickly forgotten. Nothing has caused a mass cultural reaction comparable to *Howl* or *God Save the Queen*. And it is not that the sensibilities reflected in these two works have been fully absorbed or otherwise compromised; it is that the relationship between the mainstream commercial culture and the counterculture has changed. Johnny Rotten implied as much when he stated that the Sex Pistols' purpose was to destroy rock and roll, and with it, its place in the mainstream.[112] With his next band Public Image, LTD (not a band, but a "corporation" [113]) he proceeded to pick up the pieces and build something new that no longer had the concept of counter vs. mainstream culture as a backdrop, but was a self-contained, self-referential entity.

Conclusion

A cultural war enveloped American society after World War II. Artistic and social movements, some of which the CIA and State Department promoted and used, countered a few trends of conformity in order to project an image of the United States that in turn countered claims that America was culturally weak and stagnant. Domestically, however, matters were different. Much of the general culture was geared towards encouraging consumption, and with it a middle-class lifestyle that tied into the promotion of capitalism as a further counter to Soviet hegemony. Thus the government had no interest in either promoting or in any way supporting strains of art that made it a point to criticize or reject these mainstream cultural values.

The Beats rebelled against those aspects of society and art that they saw as requiring allegiance to this given set of values. In both their lifestyles and their works they distanced themselves from contemporary social mores. In so doing they expressed a new relationship to mainstream consumer culture, one that did not always directly engage the social order in support of progressive causes such as civil rights, but definitely had an effect on civil liberties with events like the *Howl* trial. Additionally, they furthered the process of freeing art from dependence on the strictures of conventional culture.

 In a similar way the Punks rebelled against the culture of the mid-1970s, a culture that in some respects represented the ultimate failure of the 1950s ideal. The economy that allowed for the growth of consumerism in the 1950s and 1960s had collapsed, and along with it the idealism of both the mainstream and those on the outside. They criticized this as a failure both of conventional society, and the counterculture of the 1960s. Their response was to try to create some form of authenticity within

---

111.   Collins, 188.

112.   Marcus, 57-59.

113.   *John Lydon on the Tom Snyder Show-1980.* [Video] Retreived 12/11/2010.
        From http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_BZ2UoBZzEI

the movement itself and to deconstruct and resubmit the artifacts of consumer culture as a way of rendering it impotent. This has made the process of identifying counterculture vis-à-vis the mainstream increasingly difficult. The Punks also developed a strong do-it-yourself aesthetic that freed them from the necessity of conforming to conventional artistic sensibilities. Both the Beats and the Punks successfully countered the traditional artistic paths that government and society encouraged and in so doing exercised an impressive level of independence and influence. As Minutemen bassist Mike Watt said, "We are kept in place (only) by our mind…the point is to get away with whatever you can. You don't have to be part of any machine."[114]

---

114.   *We Jam Econo: The Story of the Minutemen*. DVD. Directed by Tim Irwin. Plexifilm, 2006.

The Orientalism of *Heka*

Kevin Gleason

Introduction

Before Ptolemaic Egypt, Egyptian magic (*heka*) existed as an incorporation of temporal and spiritual elements into Egyptian culture.[1] Deified in the form of the Egyptian god *Heka* it pervaded Egypt as an intrinsic part of everyday life: from healing to harming.[2] *Heka* was not only magical in the westernized sense of the word but was a significant cultural element in Egyptian society. To understand *heka* is to first divorce the modern mind from the separation between science, magic, and religion.[3] *Heka* was all three and yet none as it existed only in the application of understanding Egyptian culture. The evolution of *heka* as a label changed with the influence of Greco-Roman thought due to the polarization between religion and science in those civilizations. *Heka,* as it is understood in the modern context, contains magic that is not associated with monotheistic faith or science. This is ultimately a product of *Orientalism*[4] derived from a lack of understanding and advancing the Greco-Roman narrative of ontological and epistemological thought.[5] During Ptolemaic and later Roman rule, Egypt was a

1. Robert Kriech Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1995), 1-28. For further definition and the role of *heka* see also: James H. Breasted's *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, Bob Brier's *Ancient Egyptian Magic*, *The Ancient Coffin Texts* translated by R.O. Foulkner, Siegfriend Morenz's *Egyptian Religion* and Geraldine Pinch's *Magic in Ancient Egypt.*

2. E.A. Wallis Budge, *Egyptian Magic* (New York: Dover Publications, INC., 1971), 219. Discusses a story where upon a man was distressed over his wife's *ka* visiting him three years after her death. To reconcile the situation he visits her grave and ties a papyrus with his complaints to a figure of his wife so that she will read it and leave him alone. Although Budge's translation is outdated, the basic premise of the story is an example of *heka* in everyday life.

3. Derek Collins, "Nature, Cause, and Agency in Greek Magic." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133 (Spring 2003): 18. "Part of the reason magic has yet to be dissolved as a concept-in the same way that the concepts of kinship and gift-exhange, for example, have been dissolved by anthropologists- and reformulated in terms of social, institutional, symbolic, or other categories, is that there is a funda mental conceptual division between scholars who see the basis of magic as objective and material and those who see it as subjective and psychological; there is no unified concept to dissolve." Collins does not specifically focus on Greek magic, but magic as a whole in this context. Magic as a label is wholly unsuited to the study of *heka*.

4. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 12.

5. Jacco Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brille NV, 2005), 7-10. This largely describes the first writers to introduce *heka* to a western audience, such as Manetho and Chaeremon. Both were Egyptian priests, but intentionally catering to the Greco-Roman audience and are part of the Greco-Roman narrative of *heka*.

conquered land, which affected national identity for Egyptians and placed the Greeks and Romans in a position where the narrative of Egypt stemmed from Greco-Roman thought.[6] While Said's *Orientalism* applies primarily to post-colonialism the concept remains similar. Translations of the papyri began in the early nineteenth century after Napoleon's invasion of Egypt and the discovery of the Rosetta stone. The translators themselves carried the biases of the time towards the East that culminated in Social Darwinistic thought in the late nineteenth century. Western writers created a distinction between Egypt and the West by a written discourse on *heka*. Conversely, Daniel Martin Varisco argues *Orientalism* detracts from true scholarship,[7] but one cannot ignore the bias of the Greco-Roman texts nor from those following the same Oriental ideology.

The Western view of heka

The pejorative view of Greek and Roman writers on *heka* influenced Egyptian culture through the emergence of religious and scientific structures that followed after Alexander's conquest of Egypt in the fourth century BCE and continued until the Muslim conquest of Egypt in the seventh century CE. In terms of historical study, the assessment of what modern historians term as magic equates to the beliefs and practices not associated with either western empirical thought or hierarchal

> **"What modern historians term as magic equates to the beliefs and practices not associated with either western empirical thought or hierarchical religious institutions."**

religious institutions.[8] Essentially, *heka* was such a significant part of Egyptian culture that in order for the Greeks and Romans to rule Egypt it was necessary to Orientalize *heka* in order to supplant it with Greco-Roman views of philosophy and medicine and further divide *heka* between the temporal and spiritual world. This is not to say the process of dismantling *heka* was conducted on a conscious systematic scale – it was the result of individual Greek, Roman, and Egyptian writers, from whom modern historians are directly influenced.

The term *heka* evolved linguistically as the western world began to interpret and understand how *heka* operated in Egyptian culture. In Coptic, *heka* became *hik* which became the Greek word *magia* and Latin *magica,* eventually translating to magic, which has a negative connotation as fraudulent.[9] In *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, Ritner provides a discourse on "Religion, Magic and *Heka*" substantiating the negative connotations to the word magic and *heka*.[10] His work does not claim

---

6.   Said, *Orientalism*, 204.

7.   Daniel Martin Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: said and the unsaid* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007), 304.

8.   Marvin W. Meyer and Richard Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 13.

9.   Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, 9.

10.   Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, 236-249.

the Orientalizing of *heka*, but the evidence provided by Ritner clearly illustrates western bias and that magic is a term not wholly applicable to Egyptian culture.[11] Primarily the argument is based on religion and magic, but it is necessary to incorporate science, not mentioned by Ritner, since *heka* consisted of all three. Empirical thought or methods of trial and error are undocumented simply because the evidence is dispersed throughout Egyptian history; however, it is naïve to assume Egyptian priests did not rely on some form of testing especially in healing. Therefore, magic as a label cannot be applied to Egyptian culture since western perception defines magic. In order to study and understand Egyptian science, magic, and religion, the term *heka* is a fitting label for this framework of study since it is the culmination of all three.

> **"It is naïve to assume Egyptian priests did not rely on some form of testing especially in healing."**

The Egyptian view of heka

As religion and science became institutionalized, *heka*'s became increasingly distant from Egyptian culture. The Egyptian priests lost power under Greco-Roman rule and the definition of *heka* became associated with antiquated rituals and rites considered ineffectual. Depending on the source, the Egyptian priest was viewed in either a positive or negative context.[12] For example, Imhotep was a priest, sage, scribe, astronomer, and architect but was primarily viewed by Egyptians positively as a magician-physician. He represented the positive view of *heka* through his knowledge of medicine by saving the life of Pharaoh Khasekhem's wife during childbirth, and while there was invariably a certain mythos surrounding Imhotep, he clearly used his knowledge of medicine in conjunction with *heka* to impress himself upon the Pharaoh.[13] Accordingly, he was estimated to be the author of the Edwin Smith, Berlin Medical, and much of the Ebers Papyri, and after his death was deified as the Egyptian god of medicine.[14] Egyptian sources tended to be positive towards *heka* and underscored its importance in Egyptian society. Conversely, non-Egyptian sources (such as Hippocrates and Pliny) were widely dispersed in the ancient world and utilized in empirical, or theological, teaching and were generally not positive.

Greek influence on heka

In Brian Copenhaver's recent translation of the *Corpus Hermeticum* he quotes Garth Fowden's view of the *Hermetica,* stating, "The technical and philosophical books are…related aspects of…a

---

11. Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, 236. Of specific mention is footnote 1092 in which Ritner quotes H.I. Bell's view,"But magic is after all no more than the disreputable basement in the house of religion."

12. Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites*, 239.

13. Jamieson Boyd Hurry, *Imhotep* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), 77.

14. Oriana Yu and Sze Ling Wong, "Secrets of Medicine in Ancient Egypt." *The Proceedings of the 13th Annual History of Medicine Days* (Calgary: Faculty of Medicine at the University of Calgary, 2004), 14.

practical spiritual 'way,'"[15] which is a summation of Greek philosophical methodology to rationalizing *heka*. The *Hermetica* is not purely a discourse on *heka* but rather an inquiry into the nature of the cosmos. The emergence of hermetical thought in Hellenistic Egypt was influenced by the multi-cultural

> **"Emerging scientific thought, particularly in the field of medicine, viewed heka as ineffectual and fraudulent."**

nature of this society, which the *Hermetica* is a product of. In the seventeen Greek treatises of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, evidence exists to substantiate how Greeks in Egypt attempted to understand *heka*.[16] This evidence does not specifically mention *heka*; however, the text is syncretistic including philosophy derived from Egyptian cultural influences. For example, in the *Corpus Hermeticum XIII,* the "Secret Sermon on the Mountain," a sunset worship was performed to the south instead of the west, which Egyptians viewed as the direction of death.[17] Exposure to Egyptian culture elicited questions by the Greeks on the nature of the cosmos, which culminated in the sixth tractate of the sixth *Nag Hammadi Codex*, the "Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth."[18] The combination of magic, religion, and philosophy discussed in "Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth" was part of the very nature of *heka*, which Greeks attempted to understand and subsequently on which they formed their own conclusions.

The Greek perception towards *heka* developed negatively in the sense that emerging scientific thought, particularly in the field of medicine, viewed *heka* as ineffectual and fraudulent. A strong bias against *heka* can be found in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* and specifically in the discourse of Hippocrates, *On the Sacred Disease,* written between the late fifth or early fourth century BCE.[19] It is not known whether Hippocrates himself wrote it or one of his students; regardless, it is an early example of the attitude western physicians felt towards utilizing *heka* in healing the sick even before Alexander's conquest of Egypt. This is significant as it shows that Egyptian medicinal practices and treatments influenced Greek physicians whose opinions were largely negative within Greek institutionalized education. The Egyptians viewed epilepsy as sacred due to the uncontrollable nature of epileptic episodes although the Egyptian treatment that Hippocrates commented on was lost. Hippocrates stated:

> [Egyptian healers]…pretend to be very reverent of the gods and to have superior knowledge. They hide behind the idea of the divine and disguise the fact they have nothing with which to fight the disease and bring relief. To make sure that their ignorance does not become evident, they spread the belief that this disease is "sacred".[20]

---

15.   Brian P. Copenhaver, *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a new English translation, with notes and introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), xxxvi.

16.   Copenhaver, *Hermetica*, xxxii.

17.   Copenhaver, *Hermetica*, 49.

18.   Copenhaver, *Hermetica*, xxxix.

19.   Georg Luck, *Arcana Mundi* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 98.

20.   Luck, *Arcana Mundi*, 98.

The problem with this view was the generalization of all Egyptian healers as intentionally deceiving their patients. This is not to say that deception did not exist on the part of Egyptian healers. Corruption within the Egyptian healers tended to exist in the upper classes of society rather than the lower classes where healers tended to people in exchange for bartered goods.[21] Egyptian healers used *heka* exclusively because of the belief that the initial cause of epilepsy was supernatural in nature.[22] The use of magic was a common method of treatment as discussed in the Ebers, Hearst, Berlin, Brooklyn snake, Chester Beatty, Edwin Smith, and Kahun papyri.[23] Numerous examples of diseases and treatments are discussed within these papyri – some purely magical, some natural (as is the case with the Edwin Smith papyrus), but most reflect a combination of the two since they incorporated *heka*. Epilepsy to the Egyptians ran in tandem to the belief that evil spirits were pervading the body contrary to a more scientific explanation by modern western medicine. Modern medicine refutes the efficacy of magic and religion, but cannot discount a placebo effect that plays a role in the healing process.[24] To state that Egyptian healers categorized a disease as sacred because they did not know how to cure it is a broad generalization and disregards Egyptian methodology. This speaks to a level of deceit that, at least within the Egyptian concept of *maat*[25] (as outlined in the negative confessions of the Papyrus of Ani), was not, in theory, acceptable within society.[26] It is unclear how widespread or applicable this code of ethics was in Egyptian society, but it does speak to, at the minimum, the existence of concepts between right and wrong. In *Setne and Sa-Osiris* the battle between a Nubian and Egyptian demonstrated the morality of magic to be tied with "good" and the nature of *heka* to be in standing with an incorporation of faith and belief, which produced positive effects for Egyptians, whether through the use of healing or battling a foreign magician.[27] Thus, the writings of Hippocrates on epilepsy spoke to a larger negative feeling of Greek physicians towards Egyptian medicine to substantiate their own

> *"That Egyptian healers categorized a disease as sacred because they did not know how to cure it is a broad generalization and disregards Egyptian methodology."*

> *"Egyptians viewed Greeks and Romans with equal disdain."*

---

21.   Worth J Estes, *The Medical Skills of Ancient Egypt* (Canton: Watson Publishing International, 1989), 136.

22.   Oriana Yu and Sze Ling Wong, "Secrets of Medicine in Ancient Egypt.", 10.

23.   John F. Nunn, *Ancient Egyptian Medicine* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 25.

24.   J.A. Turner, R.A. Deyo, J.D. Loeser, M. Von Korff, W.E. Fordyce, *The Importance of placebo effects in pain treatment and research* (Seattle: The Journal of the American Medical Association, 1994), 1609.

25.   Nicholas Lazaridis. (2008). Ethics. UC Los Angeles: UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4q20j8mw

26.   E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Papyrus of Ani: Egyptian Book of the Dead*, 2003), Negative Confession.

27.   Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites*, 237. "The magical tricks and the glorious past should therefore not be dismissed as mere folklore motives, but be regarded as the stake of a serious priestly effort to define Egypt's uniqueness and supremacy. For the author and his audience magic was not a silly and improper category, but a means to compel admiration and respect: magic as national pride"

explorations in healing as more effective. This is not to say that the negative attitude against Egyptians and *heka* was one-sided. Egyptians viewed the Greeks and Romans with equal disdain.[28] The Egyptian priests themselves were not blameless; their attempts to cover their knowledge in code helped engender such a negative reaction from the Greco-Roman world.[29]

Roman influence on heka

The Roman view on *heka* can largely be obtained from Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* written in the first century CE, in which he attempted to cover all of ancient knowledge in an encyclopedic work that is of significant historical value, but it is also an example of the negative Roman attitude

> *"Bias is ultimately a product of the availability and circulation of sources."*

towards *heka*. *Natural History* is a large body of work specifically written to educate and inform a wide audience and contains negative connotations to *heka*. Pliny's core beliefs on the nature of the separate existence of body and soul[30] were a detriment to understanding *heka*. The most telling aspect of his work was his comments on magic as an institution segmented from society and instituted by a singular authority rather than an integral cultural part of Egyptian society.[31] He even goes so far as to remark that Egyptian magic was abominable and included the drinking of human blood and ceremonies with corpses.[32] No doubt this is based upon a misinterpretation of Egyptian cultural practices that established the narrative from which subsequent historians followed.

Sources and bias

Bias is ultimately a product of the availability and circulation of sources. The historical record has been dominated by Greco-Roman writers simply because of the quantity of material produced by them. Neo-Pythagorean and Neo-Platonic philosophers commented on magical books influenced by *heka,* but all that remains are the quotations dismissing magic as ridiculous.[33] Comparatively, Egyptian sources are limited with variable interpretations and a Pre-Ptolemaic narrative that covered a large

---

28.   Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites*, 3.

29.   Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites*, 185-203.

30.   Lynn Thorndike, *History and magic and Experimental Science Part 1* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1923), 47.

31.   Thorndike, *History and magic and Experimental Science Part 1*, 59.

32.   Thorndike, *History and magic and Experimental Science Part 1*, 61.

33.   Hans Dieter Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), xlii.

stretch of time with fragmentary evidence on *heka*.[34] An article dealing with magic and the assassination of Ramesses III was published in 1963 reinterpreting the original translation to conclude that magic was not used.[35] If magic was not used during Ramesses III's assassination this suggests a bias towards *heka* by the original translator assuming magic was used exclusively when it is but a part of Egyptian society, not the entirety of it.

There is a definitive bias towards *heka* by western scholars such as Hans Dieter Betz's view recorded in the Preface of *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*:

> Why is magic so irrepressible and ineradicable, if it is also true that its claims and promises never come true? Or *do* they? Do people never check up on the efficiency of magicians? The answer appears to be that, in general, people are not interested in whether or not magicians' promises come true. People want to believe, so they simply ignore their suspicions that magic may all be deception and fraud.[36]

The same argument can be made for religion in general, essentially challenging faith and belief. There is no way to validate claims by religion. Underpinning his argument is the theory of cognitive dissonance based upon Leon Festinger's *When Prophecy Fails*.[37] Cognitive dissonance is best epitomized by Aesop's sixth century fable of *The Fox and the Grapes* wherein a fox wants to eat grapes hanging out of reach on a tree, unable to reach the grapes the fox surmises the grapes are not worth eating.[38] If Festinger's theory pervades western scholarly outlook regarding the translation of papyri and the bias towards general notions of Egyptian charlatanry, then is the accuracy of translation affected due to the bias of the translator? Are alternate translations available that can view papyri with societal and cultural pragmatism rather than placing historical records in context with *heka*? The answer seems to lean towards misperception of *heka* based upon its association with the western definition of magic.

Amulets and the way in which they progressed from their association with *heka* to their use by the Coptic Church are prime examples of the evolution and borrowing from *heka*, which spoke to Egyptian culture and the fragmentation involved. Prior to Alexander's conquest of Egypt, Egyptians utilized amulets inscribed with words of power or *hekau* which were the written embodiment of *heka* upon a material object.[39] Scarab amulets were extensively worn and found in great numbers at a variety

---

34.   John F. Nunn, *Ancient Egyptian Medicine* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 6.

35.   Hans Goedicke, "Was Magic Used in the Harem Conspiracy against Ramesses III?" *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 49 (December 1963): 90.

36.   Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, xlviii.

37.   Leon Festinger, *When Prophecy Fails* (Twin Cities: University of Minnesota Press, 1956)

38.   Aesop, *Aesop's Fables* (Philadelphia: Courage Books, 1999), 10.

39.   Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, 27. Budge's translations are outdated, but the description and function of amulets still pertains.

of archaeological sites.[40] These amulets were used as a form of protection and healing by Egyptians incorporating the *hekau* written on the base of the amulets as a symbol of *heka*. Of particular interest is the recounting of a tale about Alexander the Great during the construction of Alexandria by an Arab historian.[41] Sea monsters were attacking workers in the city from the sea and in order to deal with the

> **"Whatever did not fit into canon law was labeled as 'magic.'"**

situation, Alexander constructed a glass box by which he and two draughtsmen went into the sea to view the monsters. Upon viewing the monsters, he returned to the surface and placed talismans inscribed with *hekau* and pictures of the monsters upon pillars surrounding the city in order to protect it. If the recounting of this tale is assumed to be somewhat accurate, it speaks largely of the initial use of *heka* by Alexander where upon he borrowed a specific element from *heka* in the form of talismans in order to protect workers constructing Alexandria. While not malicious in nature, the inclination of Alexander was probably rooted in appeasing the Egyptian workers' concern over monsters from the sea, rather than a genuine understanding or belief in *heka*. The Coptic Church would later use amulets replacing *hekau* with biblical references as is the case with *Oxyrhynchus 1077* utilizing Matthew 4:23-24 (written to form a cross with the words).[42]

Later Christian influence on heka

The emergence of Christianity in Egypt in the first century C.E. with Saint Mark[43] and later in the form of the Coptic Church during the fifth century C.E. with the Council of Chalcedon in 451 C.E. separated *heka* from Egyptian culture, labeling whatever did not fit into the canon law as 'magic.'[44] The influence was decidedly unilateral, with the Coptic Church borrowing exclusively from *heka* to establish ritual and dogmatic belief. The dual nature relationship between *heka* and the *miaphysitism* of the Coptic Church incorporated both the spiritual and material world when addressing core belief. The Coptic Church believes that Jesus is divine and human while *heka* combines both spiritual and materialism.[45] This duality carried over from *heka* probably to maintain some form of continuity of belief in order to convert Egyptians more readily into a monotheistic faith. Christianity in Egypt was largely the continuation of this belief in duality suggesting fundamental cultural beliefs rooted in Pre-Dynastic Egypt. The church also translated *hekau* to biblical names in order to enact the same

---

40.   Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, 41.

41.   Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, 155-6.

42.   Marvin W. Meyer and Richard Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 33.

43.   Stephen J. Davis, *The Early Coptic Papacy* (New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2004), 6.

44.   Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 13.

45.   Thorndike, *History and magic and Experimental Science Part 1*, 9-14: Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, 2-4.

function,[46] but what was once *heka* became adopted by the Coptic Church.

Conclusion

Is *heka* a lens with which one may be able to view Egyptian culture despite modern definitions of Egyptian magic? The answer is undoubtedly yes. Approaching *heka* as its own select scholarly pursuit informs historians about cultural aspects of Egyptian society prior to the *Orientalism* of *heka*. Greco-Roman influences deconstructed *heka* from a unified part of Egyptian culture to the three separate structures of magic, religion, and science. The fragmentation of an integral part of Egyptian culture led to a social consciousness absent of the important role *heka* played in defining Egypt as a society.

---

46.   Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 56-7.

Daisy's Story:
A Tale of Sacramento in the Progressive Era

Lorraine Dias Herbon

Sacramento traditionally swelters in the summer heat, and August 9, 1915, saw temperatures soaring into the mid to upper 90's.[1] However, it was Saturday, and for seven-year-old Daisy Dias and two of her brothers, it was an opportunity to play outside in the sunshine, far away from the daily grind of schoolwork and household chores. The three children, as they had done many times before, walked the short distance from their home on 3rd Street in Sacramento to the grounds of the city's incinerator.[2] Located on the block between U and V, Front and Second Streets, the incinerator grounds saw many neighborhood residents crossing its boundaries, from children seeking a place to play to adults using it as a shortcut between Second Street and the embarcadero along the Sacramento River.[3] The deposits of garbage awaiting incineration in the giant furnace especially captivated the local children, tantalizing them with the promise of buried treasure. Daisy Dias was no exception. Spotting a porcelain doll laying just off the path she was walking, she impulsively stepped onto a pile of hardened ashes in an effort to secure the precious dolly for herself. Without warning, the cool crust on the top of the ashes gave way, and Daisy found herself sinking up to her thighs in hot ashes beneath.[4]

One can only imagine the little girl's screams as she desperately tried to push herself out of the smoldering embers. Equally horrific must have been the panic of her two brothers, just nine and five years old themselves, as they hastened to help their sister, pulling her from the ashes and crying out for adult assistance. Suffering burns to her legs, her forearms, and her hands, Daisy Dias died an agonizing eight days later from tetanus as a result of her injuries.[5]

Daisy's story has passed down through the generations of her family. Though tragic, the details surrounding her accident and surrounding the installation and maintenance of Sacramento's incinerator provide an interesting glimpse at a Progressive Era reform effort that was emblematic of both the good

---

1.   "Weather Forecast," *Sacramento Bee*, August 9, 1915.

2.   Dias family oral history as related to the author by her grandfather, Bart V. Dias.

3.   *Dias vs. City of Sacramento*, Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, Case No. 20756. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

4.   Dias family oral history as related to the author by her grandfather, Bart V. Dias.

5.   State of California, Department of Health Services, *Death Certificate of Daisy Dias*, August 17, 1915.

that came from that time and the shortcomings that tended to limit the success of reform endeavors. The civic leaders of Sacramento, as did others in leadership positions throughout the country, went about their business of governance with many of the characteristics typical of the Progressive Era.

"The effort to improve the city was compromised by class and ethnic biases."

These characteristics included the conviction that technology could solve many of society's problems, a belief in the benefits of sanitation for both health and moral improvement, and faith in the power of the collective efforts of citizens to affect change. Unfortunately, in this instance, the effort to improve the city through the installation of a modern garbage incinerator was compromised by other characteristics common to many Progressives—class and ethnic biases that tended to lash out, however benignly or inadvertently, against immigrant working-class Americans. Despite the biases against them and the diversity among them, however, residents of a Sacramento neighborhood banned together to protect their homes and businesses, a legacy of collaboration that has lasted to this very day.

Historians measure the Progressive Era as lasting from roughly 1890 until 1920. In many ways, it was a reaction to the tumultuous growth and change occurring in the United States as a result of the Industrial Revolution during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Progressives overall sought new solutions to the new problems of their individual communities and for the nation as a whole. According to historian Michael McGerr in *A Fierce Discontent*, middle-class men and women provided the driving force behind Progressive Era reforms throughout the United States. At the dawn of the twentieth century, these predominately white Protestant Americans had come to the opinion that both the upper class and the working class had developed values and practices that were unfamiliar, strange and, in some sense, even un-American. The Industrial Revolution had produced a definite divide between the classes; the merchants, shopkeepers, and professionals who made up the middle class saw the traditional values that had once encompassed the nation torn asunder. Middle-class men and women felt caught in the cross-fire between business and labor, between the very wealthy and the very poor, and they sought reforms to ensure safety and a secure future for both themselves and their children.[6]

The civic leaders in Sacramento just after the turn of the century comprised exactly the type of middle-class reformers about whom McGerr has written. The City Council of 1905 included nine men, all of whom were white, all but one of whom were born in the United States.[7] While eight of these men were first-generation American, their parents all emigrated from countries in the north and west of Europe, including Ireland, Germany and England. The lone foreign-born councilman, James Popert, was born in Germany but had lived in the United States for over 30 years by the time of his service to the city. The majority of the Councilmembers were independent businessmen, including a restaurateur,

---

6.   Michael McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 79.

7.   During the period covered in this work, Sacramento's leadership body was known at various times as a Board of Trustees, a Board of Commissioners, and a City Council. For clarity, the current designation of the leadership body, City Council, is used here.

a druggist, and four shopkeepers. There was only one man on the Council of that time identified as a laborer, R. E. Callahan, and he was a skilled laborer at that, a plasterer.[8] These men and men like them made up the backbone of the solid middle-class. In a city the size of Sacramento, they encompassed exactly the type of men one could expect to find in leadership roles during the Progressive Era.

As in many cities across the United States, Progressive reform efforts in Sacramento took a variety of forms. The city's (and the state's) largest employer, the Southern Pacific Railroad, had long dominated city government. Largely due to this situation, Sacramentans became early proponents of the "good government" movement sweeping California, hoping to root out the undue influence exerted by the railroad.[9] Civic leaders also promoted efforts to curtail illegal gambling, change the City Charter to make politicians more accountable and responsive, and worked to boost the image across California and throughout the nation that Sacramento was a fine place to live.[10]

Reformers in Sacramento and across the country sought to improve their communities in another way, through a theory called positive environmentalism. Positive environmentalism proposed the idea that improving the aesthetic and sanitary conditions of a community could inspire its residents to become better citizens.[11] According to engineer William Mayo Venable in his 1906 work *Garbage Crematories in America*, the goal of ridding the world of corruption in both government and private sector businesses also applied to a desire to improve the waste disposal methods of a city.[12] Michael Melosi, an historian who published *Garbage in the Cities* in 1981, put it another way. He wrote that the Progressives believed that "polluting the physical surroundings threatened health and promoted squalor….One could hardly expect citizens to seek moral and material progress in a despoiled habitat."[13] To build a community of good citizens, the physical surroundings needed to reflect a clean, orderly environment. In Sacramento, the effort to improve the community and its residents included new and more efficient means to dispose of solid waste materials.

As Sacramento civic leaders moved toward improving the community through positive environmentalism, they did so with a typical Progressive Era belief in the supremacy of science and technological innovation. The first decades of the twentieth century saw an increased emphasis on the use of technology to resolve problems, both in civic government and in the private sector. Garbage

---

8. Ancestry.com. 1910 *United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2006. Original data: United States of America, Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910*. Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1910, T624, 1,178 rolls.

9. Steven M. Avella, *Sacramento and the Catholic Church: Shaping a Capital City* (Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 2008), 138.

10. Steven M. Avella, *Sacramento Indomitable City* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Press, 2003), 78.

11. Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1978), 190.

12. Martin V. Melosi, *Garbage in the Cities: Refuse, Reform, and the Environment, 1880-1980* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1981), 105.

13. Ibid., 109-110.

incinerators constituted the cutting edge in waste disposal methods of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; as Martin Melosi put it, "disposal by fire was hailed as a technological panacea."[14] Installation of the first incinerator in the United States had occurred in New York Harbor in 1885 for the United States government.[15] Following those initial efforts, the use of garbage incinerators spread across the country, from New York to West Virginia, to Pennsylvania and to Iowa.[16] According to John Joseph Cosgrove, in his 1909 work, *History of Sanitation*, "…at the present time most of the large cities of the United States have constructed garbage destructors, or are seriously considering the step."[17] Sacramento was even a little ahead of the curve when they began considering the benefits of garbage incineration in late 1904. By bringing in the latest technology, civic leaders believed they were well on their way to creating a better environment for their residents.

Sacramento's leaders needed to ensure that they were employing the best and most effective means of garbage disposal when they made the decision to move from traditional landfills to an incinerator. As they accepted bids from various vendors of incinerators and "garbage destructors," they also sought information and endorsements from other cities employing this technology to eliminate solid waste material. Among the cities raving about the benefits of incinerators were Spokane, Washington, Atlanta, Georgia, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Johnstown, Pennsylvania. In addition, Sacramento city officials received correspondence from civic leaders in Los Angeles as to their findings as they contemplated the installation of an incinerator in that city.[18] It looked as if this new technology was having a positive impact across the country, and Sacramento was ready and willing to jump on the bandwagon.

Sacramento officials wanted still more investigation, however, before they committed. In early 1905, Mayor W. J. Hassett sent a representative, a Mr. C. M. Phinney, to Spokane, Washington, to investigate the operation of that city's state-of-the-art garbage incinerator. Mr. Phinney reported back to Sacramento city officials that the incinerator he had observed seemed sufficient to destroy the garbage collected; however, in spite of promises to the contrary, odors still emanated from the machinery. Possibly because of the health implications of these odors, Spokane city leaders made the decision to place the incinerator under the jurisdiction of their city's Health Officer.[19] The members of Sacramento's City Council reviewed and discussed this information upon its presentation, but they would seem to forget what they had learned when complaints rose in later years about the smoke and odors surrounding

14. Ibid., 48.

15. Richard C. Corey, *Principles and Practices of Incineration* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969), 3.

16. Martin V. Melosi, *Garbage in the Cities*, 48.

17. John Joseph Cosgrove, *History of Sanitation* (Pittsburgh: Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., 1909), 116-117.

18. City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Miscellaneous Reports 1/2 – 2/20," Box 75. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

19. City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Miscellaneous Reports 1/2 – 2/20," Box 75. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

Sacramento's own incinerator.

Having thoroughly investigated the technology and the results from other communities across the United States, the Sanitation Committee, an offshoot of the City Council, began studying the three proposals received from private companies to install and maintain an incinerator for the city. With the

"One Councilmember dissented. The influence of financial savings on the businessmen on the City Council proved strong."

testimonials and the site visit, the Committee decided to recommend the bid from the DeCarie Company to install their DeCarie Patent Incinerator, a model similar to that in Spokane.[20] One Councilmember and member of the Sanitation Committee, however, dissented from the recommendation. Councilman George Rider strongly urged his fellow Councilmembers to choose the less-expensive alternative offered, the Meldrum model offered by P. F. Dundon Steel Manufacturing of San Francisco. The financial savings achieved by choosing the Dundon model amounted to just over $6,000. The businessmen on the City Council well understood the notion of financial savings, and Rider's influence proved strong. The City Council took Rider's recommendation over the strongly voiced opposition of the other members of the Sanitation Committee, and Dundon won the contract to install Sacramento's first garbage incinerator.[21] Were the Councilmembers not swayed by their faith in their ability to manage money, they may have made a decision more in line with public health needs rather than in financial savings.

Indications are that the members of Sacramento's City Council had the best of intentions when they decided to install the incinerator. They followed the prevailing wisdom of the Progressive Era with regard to technology and sanitation; from all appearances, it is clear that their motives were noble. Unfortunately, those good intentions did not cover the site selection for placement of the incinerator. Here the Council fell short of its reform-minded intentions, when the members let traditional class and ethnic biases color their judgment. This, too, was in keeping with Progressive Era characteristics.

The Progressive Era, with all its good intentions toward improvement in government, the betterment of everyday life for the citizens, and the elimination of the wickedness believed to be inherent in urban life, was still a time in which bias, both classism and racism, ran rampant. The years between 1890 and 1920 saw some of the most restrictive immigration laws in the country's history. No less a person than Theodore Roosevelt, the Progressive reformer in the White House, was concerned about the ongoing flood of immigrants to America's shores. In his first State of the Union address after becoming President, Roosevelt warned that the current immigration laws existing in 1901 were insufficient. Under Roosevelt's watch, immigration law placed new restrictions based on the political views and economic feasibility of the immigrant seeking residency in the United States.[22]

20.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder "Miscellaneous Reports 5/15–5/26," Box 76. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

21.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vol. 12, Pages 244-246. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

22.   Michael McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, 211-212.

Immigration during the Progressive Era differed in two major ways from the immigration that had occurred during the nineteenth century. First, the number of immigrants stepping onto American shores was higher than ever before, with fifteen million new arrivals during the period between 1894 and 1914. Second, these immigrants flowing into the United States in such large numbers did not feature the same ethnic makeup as their predecessors of the nineteenth century. In his book *A Very Different Age*, historian Steven J. Diner notes that the majority of immigrants arriving after 1890 were from southern and eastern Europe, from Italy, Russia, Greece, Romania, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and Turkey. These new U.S. residents were not predominantly Protestant and the languages they spoke were unfamiliar to American ears.[23] Many Americans reacted to this influx of strangers with suspicion and distrust, and it showed in the laws enacted and the actions undertaken.

On the West Coast of the United States, concerns about immigration focused primarily on would-be citizens arriving from Asia, although the states felt keenly the influx of eastern and southern Europeans. In 1903, Congress renewed the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 at the urging of President Roosevelt, legislation that was far more restrictive than any impacting immigration from Europe.[24] Also under fire in the West at this time were immigrants from Japan, especially as the majority had settled in California. Initially protective of Japanese immigration, at least to some degree and due possibly to a need

> *"The Second Ward citizens, largely foreign-born, did not seem to have the political clout as the 'more American' neighborhoods in other wards."*

for positive diplomatic relations with Japan, President Roosevelt eventually caved to pressure from white westerners and allowed greater restrictions on Japanese people seeking to enter the United States.[25]

In Sacramento, the Second Ward especially was an enclave for immigrants and first generation Americans. Located from the center of K Street to the southern edge of the City limits (roughly where Broadway runs today) and from the Sacramento River to 3rd Street, the area became known as the "South Side."[26] According to the 1900 U.S. Census, while the city of Sacramento overall was home to a population that was 57 percent foreign-born or first generation American, the Second Ward's residents included 72 percent who were either immigrants from other lands or had at least one foreign-born parent.[27] The majority of Sacramento's first-generation or foreign-born residents were from Germany

---

23.   Steven J. Diner, *A Very Different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era* (New York: Hill and Ward, 1998), 77.

24.   Michael McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, 212

25.   Ibid, 212-213.

26.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vol. 12, Page 465. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

27.   United States Census Bureau, *Census of Population and Housing: 1900 Census,* http://www.census.gov/prod/www/abs/decennial/1900.htm. Methodology used to identify immigrant or first-generation Americans in Sacramento's Second Ward included a page-by-page review of digital copies of original census pages, available through Ancestry.com. *1900 United States Federal Census* [database on-line].

and Ireland, but, as was the case throughout the nation, there were a growing number of Italian immigrants as well as newcomers from South America and Mexico. The Second Ward was home to a large population of Portuguese families, as well as residents of Irish, German, and Italian descent. In addition, the Second Ward housed a large number of residents of Japanese ancestry and a smattering of residents with Chinese ancestry. These Asian immigrants made up nearly 11 percent of the Ward's total population.[28] Contrasted with the population of the entire City, these Second Ward citizens, largely foreign-born, did not seem to have the political clout as the "more American" neighborhoods in other wards.

The immigrant status not only affected the way in which the rest of Sacramento viewed the Second Ward, it was also somewhat different due to its mainly working-class population. Just as with the issue of immigration, Progressive Era minds were conflicted about class status. Dr. David Paul Nord, a professor of journalism at Indiana University, wrote in 1982 of the paradoxical way in which the Progressives viewed class. Nord points out, like McGerr, that the majority of reform-minded individuals were members of the white middle class, and these good citizens maintained a strong belief in popular democracy. Yet, at the same time, they found it within themselves to support "class-biased social reforms and undemocratic structural changes in city government."[29] This certainly was the case in Sacramento as the debate over the site of the city incinerator came to a head.

The majority of the residents of the Second Ward were part of the working class at the dawn of the twentieth century. In a study of 175 heads of household identified in the 1900 Census, 50 percent were unskilled laborers, including bartenders, laundrymen, hostlers, railroad workers, and servants. Another 30 percent listed themselves as skilled laborers, including engineers, machinists, tailors, musicians, barbers, plumbers, and carpenters. There were only 23 merchants counted in this cross-section of the Second Ward, including grocers, restaurateurs, and boardinghouse owners; an additional 11 residents claimed white-collar jobs, including salesmen and women, clerks, insurance agents, typewriters, and bookkeepers.[30] All considered, according to this sample, the skilled and unskilled workers made up 80 percent of the Second Ward's employed heads of household.[31] With a City Council

---

28. Ancestry.com. *1900 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2004. Original data: United States of America, Bureau of the Census. *Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900.* Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1900. T623, 1854 rolls.

29. David Paul Nord, "The Paradox of Municipal Reform in the Late Nineteenth Century," *The Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 66, No. 2 (Winter, 1982-1983), 129.

30. To determine these statistics, the author conducted a page-by-page review of digital copies of original census pages for Sacramento's Second Ward, accessed through Ancestry.com. *1900 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. A total of 483 residents in the Second Ward were identified as heads of house hold who listed a paying occupation. Of those, a sample of 175 residents (36%) was taken to identify their occupations.

31. Ancestry.com. *1900 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2004. Original data: United States of America, Bureau of the Census. *Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900.* Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1900. T623, 1854 rolls.

populated mainly by self-employed merchants, the polyglot laborers of the Second Ward would have seemed like just the type of people who would benefit from the positive environmentalism embodied by a new garbage incinerator.

When the time came to make the decision for the site of the new incinerator, the ethnic and class status of the residents in each ward played a role, whether consciously or unconsciously, in spite of the best intentions. In the spring of 1905, the Councilmembers agreed that each of them would identify a possible location within their ward where the incinerator could be appropriately located.[32] Here the Council found itself caught on the horns of a dilemma. The very citizens whose moral improvement was their goal lived in the Second Ward. When the decision came for the location of the

> **"When the time came to make the decision for the site of the new incinerator, the ethnic and class status of the residents in each ward played a role."**

new incinerator, with its attendant odors, health risks, safety concerns, and unfortunate appearance, the Councilmembers representing the eight other wards in the city were determined not to see the incinerator placed within their neighborhoods.[33] Here was a "not in my backyard" approach to politics that would still seem familiar 100 years later.

The actual debate over where to locate the incinerator took place during June of 1905. City Surveyor J. C. Pierson and Councilmember George Rider recommended a site on the block surrounded by U and V, Front and Second Streets.[34] Putting the recommendation before the Council at their June 12, 1905, meeting, it immediately stirred controversy. Councilmember McEwen indicated that he and the residents of the Second Ward were opposed to the recommended site, suggesting instead that the city should advertise for bids as part of a new selection process. Second Ward resident P. H. Hannahan, a Massachusetts-born merchant, spoke on behalf of his neighbors, warning that he thought the new incinerator was a "cheap-John affair" and would certainly lower the property values in the area.[35] Next to speak for the neighborhood was one M. F. Kent, an Irishman who operated a bakery.[36] According to coverage in the *Sacramento Union*, Kent told the Council that "the people of the Second Ward thought as much of their property as do the people on H Street and did not want a garbage crematory." George Rider, the Councilmember whose urging had resulted in the selection of the Dundon incinerator,

---

32.   "Meldrum Plant Will Be Tried," *Sacramento Bee*, May 30, 1905.

33.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vol. 12, Pages 244-246. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

34.   Ibid, 280.

35.   "Locating the New Crematory," *Sacramento Union*, June 13, 1905.

36.   Ancestry.com. *1910 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2006. Original data: United States of America, Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910.* Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1910. T624, 1,178 rolls. Census Place: *Sacramento Ward 2, Sacramento, California*; Roll *T624_92*; Page: *5B*; Enumeration District: *103*; Image: *911*

protested that the residents of the Second Ward were complaining before they had even been hurt.[37]
Yet the evidence in the City Council minute records is clear—Rider and the other members of the
Council knew there were actual health and safety concerns attendant to having the incinerator in the
neighborhood. The initial report made by C. W. Phinney during his site visit to Spokane indicated that
the site for a garbage incinerator should not be near a residential neighborhood due to the odors and
soot.[38]

The residents of the Second Ward themselves reacted to the recommendation on placement of the
incinerator in a collaborative manner more typical of the Progressive methods of their white, middle-
class Sacramento city leaders. They came together as a group to fight for their neighborhood, submitting
two petitions, one by residents and one by local businesses, to protest the site selection.[39] This must
have been a surprise to the City Council at their June 12 meeting. After all, the Councilmembers were
the true reformers in Sacramento, the men chosen to make the hard decisions that would give rise to a
better place to live. Yet here were a group of immigrant working-class citizens who formed a cohesive unit and actively campaigned for the improvement and protection of

"In the way they chose to protect their homes and families, the Second Ward residents rejected the traditional bulwark of Americanism, the emphasis on the individual, and relied instead on collaboration."

their neighborhood.

In the way they chose to protect their homes and families, the Second Ward residents rejected the
traditional bulwark of Americanism, the emphasis on the individual, and relied instead on collaboration.
According to Michael McGerr, the Progressives discovered the power of the collective effort as a result of
witnessing the sometimes violent labor strikes of the 1890s.[40] Happily for the tranquility of Sacramento,
the residents of the Second Ward chose a more peaceful means of making their collective voices heard.
The citizens produced a petition, labeling themselves the "property holders of the Second Ward" and
protesting "having the Garbage Crematory located at Front and S Street." They claimed in their petition
that the incinerator "would be an injure [sic] to the property and health of the people of this part of
the city." Included among the over 80 signatories was a cross-section of residents of the Ward. Names
like Soares, Frates, Azevedo, and Enos featured prominently, marking the influence of the Portuguese
community in the Second Ward. There were also names like Cecchettini and Caligari representing the
Italians, Daily and Burke of Irish descent, and Meyer and Newbauer of German/Austrian ancestry.[41]

37.   "Locating the New Crematory," *Sacramento Union*, June 13, 1905.

38.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Miscellaneous Reports 1/2 – 2/20," Box 75. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

39.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Protests," Box 77. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

40.   Michael McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, 59.

41.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Protests," Box 77. Accessed at

Included among the signatures on this petition were those of the father, the grandfather, and the great-uncle of little Daisy Dias who would lose her life at the incinerator site in August of 1915.[42]

While its ethnic make-up may have been diverse, the cohesiveness of the Second Ward may have come from its working-class status. Roughly 52 percent of the signatories to the residents' petition were unskilled laborers, with over half of those working for the railroad. Another 21 percent were skilled workers, including shoemakers, carpenters, and barbers. Only 13 percent of the signatures on the petition came from the merchant or white-collar class, including grocers, shop managers, saloon owners, and clerks. There were an additional eight signatures from women residents of the Second Ward, and one from a man identifying himself as a Deputy City Collector.[43] With nearly three-quarters of the signatories to the residents' petition coming from the working class, the white middle-class members of the City Council clearly found the plea to move the incinerator site to be less than persuasive.

Private citizens were not the only entities concerned with the placement of the incinerator in the Second Ward. Neighborhood business owners submitted a separate petition to the City Council. Among the 47 signatories to this petition were representatives of Friend & Terry Lumber Company, Premier Box Company, Capital Box Factory, Sacramento Laundry, Castle Brothers, and many small-business owners. Their concerns included the odors emanating from the incinerator and the effect these smells would have on property values, as well as the fact that "some of the largest lumber yards of this City are located in that vicinity and the danger to them from fire will greatly increase the insurance on such stock of lumber." They were also worried that the stench from the incinerator would prohibit the expansion of Sacramento's waterfront usage south from R Street, right through the Second Ward. With their claim that the waterfront as it existed at the time in Sacramento was much too small, this smelly incinerator would surely "retard the growth of Sacramento City" and limit the possibilities for improvement in the south side.[44] While their interests overlapped in some measure with the residents surrounding their businesses, their businesslike perspective would have resounded with the businessmen of the City Council and would likely have had more impact on subsequent Council decisions.

The debate stretched into the Council's June 19, 1905 meeting and grew more contentious. Councilmember McEwen urged reconsideration of the site selection. Councilman John C. Ing reminded

the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California. Also, Ancestry.com. *1900 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2004. Original data: United States of America, Bureau of the Census. *Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900.* Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1900. T623, 1854 rolls.

42.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Protests," Box 77. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

43.   To determine the occupations of the signatories to the residents' petition, a search was made of the Sacramento City Directories of 1904, 1905, and 1906; in addition, a page-by-page search was made of the 1900 and 1910 United States Federal Census records for Sacramento's Second Ward. Of the 80 signatures on the petition, 62 residents (78%) were identified, and their occupations were used to determine the percentages used above.

44.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Protests," Box 77. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

the Council that some of the signers of the protest petitions were "heavy taxpayers," and worried that, should the incinerator not operate as promised, it would have to be torn down to appease these revenue-generating entities. Things got particularly ugly at the meeting when Councilmember Rider called out by name several of the protesting residents of the Second Ward, claiming that their own property was not sanitary and, thus, they had no call to complain about the incinerator.[45] If anything demonstrated the Council's underlying reasoning, it was Rider's contention that the properties of the Second Ward were already disreputable and the residents deserved the placement of the incinerator in their neighborhood. Rider's disdain proved persuasive. When put to a vote of the Council, approval of the site in the Second Ward carried by a six to three margin.

Perhaps as a result of the controversy over the site of the crematory, the Second Ward residents subsequently became more active in their efforts to protect their neighborhood. This involved another familiar aspect of the collective spirit of the Progressive Era—the establishment of improvement clubs. According to historian Martin Melosi, improvement clubs in specific communities across the country dedicated themselves to enhancing the living conditions, aesthetics, and overall health of their residents.[46] In Sacramento, improvement clubs included the Oak Park Improvement Club, the M Street Improvement Club, and several others.[47] With their petition efforts before the City Council, the residents of the Second Ward were taking the first tentative steps in what would eventually result in the South Side Improvement Club.

When the debate was finished and the final decision made to locate the incinerator in the Second Ward, P. F. Dundon Manufacturing built and began testing their Meldrum model incinerator in December, 1905.[48] Unfortunately, after a lengthy test period, the model proved unable to meet the specifications originally set by the Council. George Rider, in spite of the evidence that the incinerator could meet neither the volume of garbage nor the cost limit set, still advocated for the Meldrum. This time, however, his influence over his fellow Councilmembers proved insufficient.[49] The Council rejected the Meldrum model and reopened the bidding process. In October of 1907, a DeCarie model, similar to that in use in Spokane and recommended by the original Sanitation Committee, replaced Dundon's Meldrum model.[50] With this latest improvement, surely now the City could begin to enjoy the fruits of positive environmentalism.

Even with the newer, more efficient incinerator in place, the residents of the Second Ward were still concerned. By 1913, with the establishment of the South Side Improvement Club, residents once

---

45.   "Sump Chosen for Crematory," *Sacramento Bee*, June 20, 1905.

46.   Martin V. Melosi, *Garbage in the Cities*, 108.

47.   Various improvement clubs are noted in City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vols. 12, 13, 14, 20B, and 22B. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

48.   "Garbage Destructor to Begin Thursday," *Sacramento Union,* December 5, 1905.

49.   "Garbage Crematory Rejected by Trustees," *Sacramento Union,* May 30, 1906.

50.   "Incinerator is Tested," *Sacramento Union,* October 15, 1907.

again came together to request that the incinerator be moved out of their residential neighborhood. The fact that city and DeCarie officials had promised an odorless, smokeless operation of the incinerator proved to be untrue; Second Ward residents complained that, when there was no breeze blowing, the incinerator's smoke hung over their homes for hours at a time.[51] Again, their complaints fell on deaf ears, and the DeCarie garbage destructor continued to operate in the Second Ward.

Not only was the DeCarie incinerator bringing ashes and odors into the homes of Second Ward residents, it proved an eyesore to the neighborhood as well. Attorney Eugene Wachhorst, in documents he filed in support of the 1915 lawsuit of Joseph X. Dias, Jr., provides a detailed description of the premises, although admittedly one designed to favor the cause of his client. Wachhorst asserts that, in addition to the incinerator and loading platform, it had become the practice of the laborers at the incinerator to collect the noncombustible items, articles made with iron or tin, into piles located around the grounds. These piles, growing over the years, had reached heights of up to 15 feet by 1915. In close proximity to these piles were the ashes taken out of the incinerator, these also containing articles that did not burn completely during the incineration process. The ashes alone, stacked in piles just like the noncombustible materials, reached heights upwards of six to ten feet. While the City, in its defense of the lawsuit filed by Attorney Wachhorst, denied this description, it did admit to the fact that the deposits of ashes and other materials raised the grounds of the incinerator above the actual street level of the roads around it. In addition, these piles of ashes and other materials spilled out onto Second Street at a height of five to six feet, causing the City to block Second Street between U and V Streets to both pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Materials spilled out also onto U Street, causing closure of that thoroughfare between Second and Third Streets as well. These road closures, and the fact that the incinerator grounds were not fenced in any way, left pedestrians with a means of taking a quick shortcut through the grounds to get to Front Street from Second Street.[52] Ultimately, it was this free passage of people across the grounds that would lead to disaster for the Dias family. Additionally, between Wachhorst's assertions and the admissions of the City, it is clear that the grounds of the incinerator were not aesthetically pleasant and must have caused quite an eyesore in the Second Ward. This hardly seems in keeping with the Progressive ideal of positive environmentalism.

The death of little Daisy Dias on August 17, 1915, reverberated through the Second Ward, and city officials were quick to bring out a defense in the press. According to the *Sacramento Bee*, City Councilman Thomas Coulter indicated that he did not believe the ash heaps on the incinerator grounds could adequately be fenced and, in any event, there were other methods to keep out the local children. He did not apparently elaborate on what those other methods might include, but he did indicate that there were no funds available for the construction of a fence or the employment of a guard.[53] In all

---

51.   "South Siders Want Crematory Moved," *Sacramento Bee*, November 3, 1913.

52.   *Dias vs. City of Sacramento*, Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, Case No. 20756. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

53.   "Guard Unlikely for City's Hot Ash Dump," *Sacramento Bee*, August 19, 1915.

DAISY'S STORY

likelihood, the simple logistics of fencing the incinerator grounds made the plan initially impractical in the eyes of officials like Coulter. Ashes piled onto both 2nd Street and U Street made any attempt to fence in that portion of the incinerator grounds extremely complicated. As there had been no attempt during the prior ten years to protect the residents of the Second Ward from such a safety and health menace, nor to address the aesthetic concerns that had existed since the 1905 decision on the incinerator's location, Coulter's opinion about the fencing was not surprising.

Daisy was not the first child injured on the grounds of the incinerator, and her death sparked concern over the safety of the site. According to a further *Sacramento Union* report published after her death, "a number of children had been hurt" during the 10-year existence of the incinerator. Later, the defense put forth by the City of Sacramento was that the manager of the incinerator, M. J. Lamb, was alone on the premises when the accident occurred, and he claimed to have warned the Dias children just moments before the accident to leave the premises.[54] Interestingly, Lamb was one of the original signers of the 1905 petition protesting the installation of the incinerator in the Second Ward.[55]

As they had done in 1905 and again in 1913, community members representing the Second Ward came together to address the City Council on the topic of the incinerator, this time with the death of the Dias girl fresh on their minds. In a statement submitted on August 23, 1915, before the Council's meeting the next day, John Irwin, a Second Ward resident and laborer working for the railroad, penned an eloquent plea asking that the Council find the funds necessary to provide a fence for the incinerator grounds. Irwin wrote:

> Recently, as you are fully aware, the life of a little girl was unfortunately forfeited, by
> innocently (while playing in this lot) jumping into a pile of hot ashes dumped from the
> crematory. Whether through any carelessness on the child's part, or of any one else, is
> not to be discussed at this time, but the fact remains that, if this lot had been properly
> enclosed, the little girl would still be in the land of the living. The cost of erecting a fence
> is not to be considered, if the lives of innocent children at play, are placed in jeopardy.[56]

This time, the Second Ward's efforts were successful, at least partially. In spite of former statements that there was not enough money, nor even a need, for a fence, the City Council approved the expenditure of funds to enclose the entire yard in August of 1915.[57] They further unanimously voted in favor of the City obtaining several blocks of land outside the City limits on which to dispose of the

54. *Dias vs. City of Sacramento*, Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, Case No. 20756. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

55. City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1905*, folder marked "Protests," Box 77. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

56. City of Sacramento, *City Council Minute Records 1915*, folder marked "Petitions, July-Dec. 1915, File 460," Box 166. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California,

57. City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vol. 22B, Page 126. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

residue from the incinerator.[58] It would be another seven years, however, before Sacramento civic leaders would see fit to consider moving the incinerator from the residential neighborhood of the Second Ward to a location in an industrial part of town.[59]

The tardy decision of the City Council to address Second Ward concerns over the incinerator was not enough for the despondent father of Daisy Dias. On April 5, 1916, Joseph X. Dias, Jr., filed a lawsuit against the City of Sacramento for the wrongful death of his daughter. The case lingered in the court system for more than three years before Dias accepted an out-of-court settlement of $2,000.[60] The matter was finished, but the story would linger on in the Dias family for years to come.

In just a ten-year period, from 1905 to 1915, residents of Sacramento's Second Ward saw their lives changed significantly. The decision by city officials to install a garbage incinerator spoke to both the good and the bad of the Progressive Era. It was certainly a step toward positive environmentalism, a means of ensuring a more sanitary, orderly venue in which residents could lead their lives and pursue their business interests. The good intentions of the City Council over the ten year span were clear—they meant to improve the living conditions for Sacramento residents, ultimately to make them better citizens. Progressive leaders in the city government firmly believed the new technology of garbage incineration would aide them in their efforts. In the end, however, the Councilmembers could not overcome their own biases. The working-class, ethnically diverse neighborhood of the Second Ward proved too tempting as a location for the incinerator. No one considered placing the incinerator near the affluent residents of the H Street corridor or the wealthy landowners of Poverty Ridge. As Councilmember Rider proved when he took Second Ward residents to task for the conditions of their property, the bias against that neighborhood and its residents undermined and tainted the Progressive drive for positive environmentalism.

In spite of everything, or maybe because of what happened surrounding the incinerator, the residents of the South Side came together to protect and defend their unique neighborhood. Even today, current and former residents of the South Side gather monthly to discuss issues, raise funds, and reminisce about the old days. Among those former residents participating in the South Side Club are two grandsons of Joseph X. Dias, Jr., two men who still remember the story their elders told them of the tragic fate of their young aunt, Daisy. Perhaps that sense of cohesiveness and community collaboration, beginning in 1905 and still true today, is the real Progressive victory for Sacramento. Perhaps that is the true legacy of little Daisy Dias.

---

58.   Ibid, 142.

59.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vol. 26A, Pages 315. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California.

60.   City of Sacramento, *City Council Minutes*, Vol. 26A, Page 315. Accessed at the Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento, California..

TERTULLIAN: RHETORICAL FOUNDATION, REVELATORY INSPIRATION

Christopher Hoganson

"*Credo quia absurdum*" along with "Play it again Sam" and "Beam me up Scotty" belongs to the realm of famous quotes never said. Many have used the phrase to cast Tertullian as an advocate of irrationality who set religion as a realm defined exclusively through subjectivity and inspiration. In his work *Tertullian*, Timothy Barnes wonders, "If that was his true attitude, why did he ever descend to apparently rational argument?"[1] In response John Helgeland quips, "If, as Tertullian said, Athens and Jerusalem had nothing to do with each other, Rome and Jerusalem certainly did, for Tertullian was an educated Roman."[2] Instead of a clash of cultures, Robert Sider describes Tertullian's true goal as a conjunction of rhetoric and theology "as though he would forge a new and enriched culture out of the two separate traditions."[3] Tertullian's amalgamation of rhetorical foundations and Divine revelation expresses itself in his extant works. Through an examination of *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum* and *Ad Uxorem* it becomes possible to illuminate the rhetorical superstructure employed by Tertullian in composing his works and exploring the various methodological tools stored in his armory.

Born in the middle of the second-century and raised in the Roman West, Tertullian undoubtedly received a formal education in philosophy, rhetoric, and literature. Taken together these skills could hone one into a master orator. Barnes describes the common devices of the orator as "sophistical argument (in the bad sense), irony and invective, the use of maxims, anecdotes and historical examples, a large range of stylistic tricks to impart vigour and variety."[4] The rhetor's skills prepared the individual for a career in law and politics. Tertullian's legal acumen will be illustrated below in analyzing his treatise *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum*. In his work *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, T. R. Glover described Tertullian as "the first man of genius of the Latin race to follow Jesus Christ, and to re-set his ideas in the language native to that race."[5] While it is impossible to prove

---

1. Timothy David Barnes, *Tertullian A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 223.
2. John Helgeland, review of *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian*, by Robert Dick Sider. *Newsletter: Rhetoric Society of America* 4, no. 4 (October 1974), 5.
3. Robert Dick Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 129.
4. Barnes, 212.
5. T.R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* (London, 1909), 307, quoted in Bruce M.

whether Tertullian originally coined many of the concepts he used, he is the earliest extant writer to divide scripture into old and new testaments and he is also the first to use the terms *trinitas*, *persona*, and *substantia*. While he often composed invectives against philosophers and reason, an examination of Tertullian's writings leads one to ponder if the lad doth protest too much, methinks.

To properly understand the techniques underpinning Tertullian's works it is necessary to formulate a basic framework of the rhetorical method. Robert Sider defines six major characteristics common to all rhetorical speeches. The first aspect of the rhetorical model is that all speeches fall into one of three genres; following Quintilian, Barnes defines them as epideictic (show pieces), deliberative (persuade a course of action), and forensic (civil or criminal cases).[6] The second aspect of rhetoric is that speeches are divisible into three primary parts each composed of predictable subcategories. The introduction generally contains: an *exordium* – an immediate attempt to appeal to the audience through an emotional or ethical approach; a *narratio* – a simple narration of events; a *propositio* – sets out the main point of dispute; and a *partitio* – the speaker indicated how far he agrees with the opponent, what remains in dispute, and lists essential points speech will make. The body generally encompasses: a *praemunitio* – clears away major obstacles over which no argument could proceed and builds fundamental presuppositions into its base; a *confirmatio* – confirmation of one's case; and a *reprehensio* – refutation of the opponent's argument. Finally, the Conclusion usually offers an emotional appeal to the audience. The third aspect of rhetoric defines the three forms of persuasion available to the orator as *ethos* – appeal to character, *pathos* – appeal to emotions, and *logos* – appeal to reason. For the fourth aspect, Sider claims all proofs contain evidence which is either categorized as irrefutable or probable. The fifth aspect shared by rhetorical speeches is the Topical nature of debates. The focus of a speech will either be memorized maxims; persons – centered on the individuals name, fortune, and character; actions – where the time, place, and occasion of the action are explored; and formal topics – which involves arguments from similarity or contraries. The sixth aspect common to all rhetorical method involves the issues on which argument can be based. Sider provides four possible issues: conjectural, definitional, qualitative, and competence. Each of the above aspects of the rhetorical technique are easily illustrated in Tertullian's works, proving that far from irrationality, Tertullian approached his treatises with a keen and reasoning mind.[7]

Along with mastering the rhetorical method, students were exposed to *exempla*, which were lists of examples, particularly historical examples; one could use the *exempla* to illustrate a point without the effort and tedium of actually reading the specific history, poem, or literature and running the risk of actually learning something (similar to a modern book of factoids or Cliff's notes). Barnes argues the case that much of Tertullian's erudition was borrowed by utilizing exempla and compendia.[8] Although

---

Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 157.

6. Barnes, 224.

7. Rhetorical background drawn extensively from Sider, 11-20.

8. Barnes, 196.

some of his references clearly come from secondary sources, it is undeniable that Tertullian possessed a vast vocabulary and breadth of knowledge, the least of which included his expertise with scripture.

Coupled with the rhetorical style, Tertullian possessed a unique exegetical methodology. Sider argues that Tertullian's exegetical principles are not founded in theology; instead, "classical rhetoric provided him with exegetical principles, such as the rule of context, which corresponded with those available from his Christian heritage."[9] As noted below in the analysis of both *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum* and *Ad Uxorem*, Tertullian emphasized the necessity of understanding context in dealing with scriptural texts. An interest in context more closely relates to the rhetoric style than theological thought; that it finds expression in the works of Cicero is further evidence that Tertullian approached scripture with an eye toward reason.

Tertullian approached the world through the eyes of dualism. Visible throughout his discourses is the conception of a universe divided between light and dark, God and Satan, spirituality and materialism. This served not only a theological purpose but also rhetorical. By approaching topics through a dualistic framework, Tertullian could employ the comparative style, which is one of the previously mentioned formal rhetorical styles. This creates a strict either/or dichotomy in his arguments. In *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum* the divide is between good Christians and heretical philosophers while in *Ad Uxorem* one belongs either to God or Satan. There is no middle ground, allowing Tertullian to more easily compare the opposing factions and readily condemn the one which wavers from his truth.

Tied to his notion of duality, Tertullian's methodology involved an unwavering quest for the Truth. In a black and white world, there must be complete truth and total falsehood. For Tertullian, the core nature of truth was simplicity. There was no need for allegory or philosophy, God placed everything one needs to know clearly within scripture. E. Glenn Hinson explains, "The western fathers used allegory cautiously . . . Tertullian preferred the literal sense of Jesus' words and did not allegorize even Old Testament dietary laws. He formulated the rule that it is better to find less meaning than more meaning in the text."[10] W. H. C. Frend describes Tertullian as "a Christian sophist (*ecclesiarum sophista*) who by uniting the arts of philosophy and rhetoric solved the antitheses between Athens and Jerusalem, the Academy and the church."[11] But, Arnaldo Momigliano rejects the characterization of Tertullian as Sophist promoted by Barnes and Frend. Momigliano asks, "Did any Sophist ever worry about *simplicitas veritatis* . . . as much as Tertullian?"[12] He also notes, "The effort to understand exactly the message of the sacred texts is another of those primary criteria of differentiation between Pagan Sophist and Christian

---

9.   Sider, 9.

10.   E. Glenn Hinson, *The Early Church, Origins to the Dawn of the Middle Ages* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 186.

11.   W. H. C. Frend, Review of *Tertullian, a Historical and Literary Study*, by T. D. Barnes. *The Classical Review*, New Series 24, no. 1 (March 1974), 72.

12.   Arnaldo Momigliano, review of *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, by T. D. Barnes. The Journal of Roman Studies 66 (1976), 274.

theologians which must not be forgotten simply because they are too obvious."[13] Tertullian's insistence on one simple truth and the constant search for that ideal separates him from the Sophists.

The final two aspects of Tertullian's general methodological approach of note are his insistence on scriptural infallibility and adherence to *regula fidei* (Rule of Faith). Belief in scriptural infallibility follows logically from his dualistic approach to the universe. God is perfection and truth, God inspired scripture, therefore scripture must be perfect. The *regula fidei* exists in synch with scripture and serves to corroborate Biblical integrity. An early form of creedal expression, for Tertullian it served as the yardstick of scriptural truth and "the immemorial belief of Christians, derived from the Scriptures, and most succinctly set forth in the baptismal creed."[14] God gave his message to Jesus, Jesus transmitted it to the Apostles and the Apostles disseminated it amongst the Churches. In Tertullian's estimation, any exhortation or writing in conflict with the *regula fidei* was de facto false. As shown below, it is the greatest charge he levels against the heretics as proof of their false teachings. Rhetorical structure, reason, legal acumen, a focus on context, dualism, truth, scriptural infallibility, and the *regula fidei* form the core of Tertullian's methodology exemplified by the following documents.

In *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum* (*Prescription of the Heretics*), Tertullian illustrates not only his adept skill as a rhetor but also his grasp of Roman legal proceedings by styling his argument against heretics as a formal objection. He attempts to terminate the debate based on what modern attorneys would call, "a technicality." In Roman law, a prescription entailed the cutting short of a question by the refusal to hear the adversary's arguments based on an anterior point which pulls the rug out from under his feet. Tertullian's argument is based on Paul's insistence that, "a man who is a heretic must be rejected after the first admonishment."[15] Paul does not suggest heretics receive even a single hearing; they are to be admonished then ignored. Further, by acting against the *regula fidei* and scripture, heretics forfeit their right to scripture. Barnes describes Tertullian's approach, "he applies for an injunction to restrain any heretic from trespassing upon holy scripture, which is the sole property of Christians."[16] The question then becomes, "Who is a Christian?"

Tertullian begins by suggesting that heresies must exist since scripture, an infallible source, predicted their appearance. Further, they serve a positive rôle by challenging the faithful and rooting out the unfaithful. Tertullian next describes man's inherently weak nature by offering the Biblical examples of Saul, David, and Solomon.[17] The heretic's weak will allows him to fall prey to philosophical musings. Peter Kaufman calls Tertullian's argument a version of "enough rope."[18] You can easily divide the flock

---

13.   Momigliano, 274.

14.   Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 158.

15.   Tertullian. "The Prescription Against Heretics," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, volume 3, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Massachusetts: Henrickson Publishers, Inc., 1995), 245.

16.   Barnes, 64.

17.   Tertullian, *Prescription*, 244.

18.   Peter Iver Kaufman, "Tertullian on Heresy, History, and the Reappropriation of Revelation." *Church History* 60, no. 2 (June 1991), 167.

of faithful believers from the "ravening wolves in sheep's clothing" who constantly doubt and question. Turning to epistemology, Tertullian argues that the heretic is self-condemned, because the word heretic derives from a Greek word implying choice. Therefore, the heretic deserves no sympathy since he has succumbed to his own weakness and willfully chosen to question God.

Tertullian declares his *propositio* clearly in chapter fifteen, "In the encounter itself, however, they weary the strong, they catch the weak, and dismiss wavereres with a doubt. Accordingly, we oppose to them this step above all others, of not admitting them to any discussion of the Scriptures."[19] He follows in chapter nineteen with his *partitio*, "With whom lies that very faith to which the Scriptures belong. From what and through whom, and when, and to whom, has been handed down that rule [*regula fidei*]."[20] The question remains, "Who is a Christian?"

To answer the question at the core of his argument, Tertullian turns to two gospel passages and a definition. The first: "Seek and ye shall find."[21] The second: "Your faith has saved you."[22] The definition: faith equals adherence to a creed. Tertullian first explicates Matthew's passage insisting the reader delve into the context of the saying. Reading the entire passage, Tertullian argues, it becomes apparent that Jesus was speaking directly to the Jews, telling them to look further into scripture until they discover the truth of the Christ event. But Christians should not look, since they have already found truth. In a similar fashion we always find what we seek in the last place we look as it would be folly to continue seeking once the object of our desire is found. If the Christian keeps looking then he must not have faith in the truth he found. Together these passages form a logical syllogism for Tertullian. 'Faith' by definition means 'faith in something' which involves assent to a credal formula. Since the heretic still seeks, he cannot have found. Since he has not found, he cannot believe. If he does not believe, he is no Christian. Conversely, those who adhere to the *regula fidei* and have faith in the Apostolic Church are true Christians.[23]

For Tertullian the crux of the matter rests in faith, adherence to *regula fidei*, and obedience to scripture. Trouble only arises when those of weak faith question the *regula fidei* and scripture. Peter Kaufman describes the situation as "Philosophers dragged troubling passages from their contexts. They hauled hostage sentences along a backstairs route, through the schools or systems of pagan philosophy, until they imagined they found the truth that the puzzling passages figuratively expressed."[24] As shown above, Tertullian did not accept the notion of backstairs routes, God laid everything out clearly in scripture, conflicts came from a lack of context or a willful attempt to obscure what was inherently simple. *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum* offers an early definition of Apostolic Succession and

---

19.   Tertullian, *Prescription*, 250.

20.   Tertullian, *Prescription*, 251.

21.   Matt. 7:7

22.   Lk. 18:42

23.   Barnes, 65.

24.   Kaufman, 171.

demonstrates a nascent conception of orthodoxy.

Tertullian did not limit himself to legalistic proceedings. Another method he employed to great effect involved amassing multiple arguments against his adversary, whether individuals, heretics, or concepts. If one argument is convincing, than an inundation of proof is far superior. By offering a multitude of responses for each situation Tertullian provides his reader with a rich arsenal against their foes. Readers could then select the most compelling or easiest to remember argument and wield it against their foe in future debates. Like a hydra, if your opponent somehow undermined one argument you could strike back with another and another, until they eventually capitulated under your withering hail of fire.

Ad Uxorem (*To His Wife*) provides an excellent example of Tertullian's varied methodologies marshaled against a single concept. The document is cast as an open letter to his wife in which he advises her against remarrying should he die before her. His concern in writing the work is proper Christian behavior, specifically regarding marriage and chastity. Timothy Barnes describes the work as "an appreciation of Christian marriage unequalled in patristic literature, but is deficient in casuistry."[25] This assessment should come as no surprise when regarding a text by Tertullian whose dualistically composed universe could not fathom the grey areas of the casuist. Although most likely written before his involvement with Montanism, the letter still offers a rigid view of human weakness and the corrupting effects of the material world. Sider describes the treatise "Tertullian works out the deliberative themes of advantage, honour, and necessity, quite specifically in relation to the idea of motivation or cause."[26] Tertullian organizes his attack over eight chapters; in each he presents a different argument against the problem at hand. In common with his other treatise, the primary skeleton of *Ad Uxorem* closely follows the rhetorical style.

The *exordium* sets out to illuminate the virtue of remaining unwed and disavows any personal motives for the letter. Referring to Matthew 22:23-30, Tertullian explains that "when the future time arrives, we shall not resume the gratification of unseemly passion" and further "[the dead] will, it is clear, be changed to the state of holy angels."[27] His not so subtle implication is that since he can gain nothing by this letter it should be received without suspicions. With the *exordium* complete, he quickly arrives in chapter one at his *propositio*, "This charge, then, I lay on you – that, exercising all the self-control of which you are capable, you renounce marriage after I have passed away."[28] He finishes chapter one by expanding the letter to encompass not only the concerns his wife but to all Christian women.

Chapters two and three involve the *partitio* in which Tertullian acknowledges the legitimacy of marriage and insists that he is not attempting to undermine, only limit, an institution set down by God. Since the cornerstone of Tertullian's arguments involves Biblical precedence, and the Bible contains

---

25. Barnes, 137.

26. Sider, 118.

27. Tertullian. "To His Wife," in *After the New Testament, A Reader in Early Christianity*, Bart D. Ehrman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 400.

28. Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 400.

many undeniable examples of marriage in, he cannot ban it outright. Further, he sides against those who forcefully demand that married Christians should divorce one another. Tertullian seems confident in narrowing marriage to an institution that Christians could only enter into once. Looking to Genesis for his support, he wittily comments, "Adam was the only husband that Eve had and Eve was his only wife; one rib, one woman."[29] While he acknowledges that the patriarchs were allowed multiple wives and concubines, Tertullian insists that Jesus, the Word, replaced the Law and introduced a new spiritual circumcision, a new dispensation. What was good for the goose is not necessarily good for the gander in Tertullian's estimation.

In chapter three, Tertullian begins his first philosophic proof against marriage. While he acknowledges marriage as a good, he turns to scripture where Paul is shown permitting marriage but "preferring" celibacy.[30] Human flesh is inherently weak and filled with lustful desires; out of love, God granted humanity the institution of marriage so they possess an appropriate venue for partaking in their lusts. Tertullian describes the situation as "the principle that marry we may because marry we must. But what necessity proffers necessity cheapens."[31] He further illustrates that Paul viewed marriage as an alternative to burning in Hell for one's lustful acts. Utilizing a form of the "two wrongs do not make a right" argument, Tertullian opines that something can not be truly good solely because there is something worse; in fact, "How much better it is to neither marry nor burn!"[32] Since marriage is offered out of necessity and is not a good in itself, Christians should choose to pursue what is inherently good: celibacy, according to Paul. After arguing against marriage, Tertullian adds further scriptural references from Philippians and I Corinthians where Paul illustrating the deficiency of the married state. While married, a wife's attention focuses on her husband instead of God where it rightly belongs. Once widowed, a good Christian is able to return her attention and zeal solely to God.

In accord with the rhetorical style, Tertullian next provides a *reprehensio* containing three arguments against his case, and then dispatches them in chapters four and five. He acknowledges that some wish to marry due to concupiscence of the flesh, others from concupiscence of the world, and yet others desire children. The first two he describes as the weaknesses of lust and ambition respectively, which "We servants of God ought to scorn both weaknesses."[33] While realized some would point to the passage in Matthew 26:41 proclaiming "the flesh is weak" as an excuse for their behavior, Tertullian demands a closer examination of the Biblical source. Insisting that context is key, he illuminates the complete passage including the claim "the spirit is strong." One cannot focus on only half of the passage at the expense of the rest; to do so alters the meaning. While human weakness is acknowledge, the real meaning is that the spirit should take control of the body. When the spirit rules the body, argues

---

29. Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 400.

30. I Cor. 7:1-2.

31. Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 401..

32. Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 401..

33. Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 401.

Tertullian, God will replace the transient, fleshy rewards of beauty and lust with eternal rewards. Logic dictates one should forgo the fleeting for the eternal.

Moving from fleshy desires to worldly ones, Tertullian returns to Biblical citations to dissuade the widow from weakness. Like Matthew's lilies of the field and birds of the sky, the Christian widow must trust in divine providence for her needs. As God clothes the lilies and feeds the birds, so too will He provide for the widow. True Christians place their faith in God and accept the fate handed them by divine providence. A widow concerned with worldly needs exhibits a lack of faith in God and is therefore no true Christian.

The final argument for marriage, the desire for children, Tertullian emphatically describes as "sheer nonsense."[34] As a believer in the imminent eschaton, Tertullian could not fathom why one would chain themselves to this dying world. Once again turning to scripture for his proof, Tertullian cites Matthew 24:19 where Jesus proclaimed, "Woe to them that are with children and that give suck." Viewed at face value, his preferred method for approaching scripture, Tertullian claims it is clear Jesus viewed children as a burden and a handicap to those who bear them when the Day of Judgment arrived. Further, how embarrassing for the bride and groom if the trumpets sounded during their marriage ceremony! Tertullian then likens Christians who continue to wed with the sinners in Sodom and Gomorrah who went about their lives unaware of the doom hovering over them.

After refuting three possible objections to remaining a widow, Tertullian turns to a more *ad hominem* style to win his argument. If reason alone is insufficient in producing proper behavior perhaps shame will. The reader is reminded that many Christians have opted to swear virginity from the moment of baptism and that there are also those who, although married, mutually vow celibacy; in accordance with Matthew 19:12 they "made themselves eunuchs because of their desire for the kingdom of Heaven." In light of these rigorous individuals, Tertullian argues, "If they are able to practice continence while remaining married, how much easier is it to do so when marriage has been dissolved!"[35] The reader is shamed into proper behavior. If married people can willing remain celibate, how pathetically weak must a widow be who cannot match their determination? The widow should aspire to match these Christian paragons of virtue or live in shame.

Tertullian does not stop with Christian exemplars of virtue; chapter six also highlights the actions of celibate pagans. The Vestal Virgins, the Pythia at Delphi, and the widows who minister to the African Ceres are all highlighted as instances of pagan virtuosity. In accord with Tertullian's perception of a dualistic world, the reader is reminded that unlike virtuous Christians these pagans are all in league with Satan. In structuring this invective, Tertullian utilizes a rhetorical technique common in his writings at this point: the argument from comparison. Sider reminds the reader, "A dominating idea here is the contrast between the world and the Church, the heathen and the Christians, which has the

---

34.   Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 402.

35.   Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 403.

effect of pointing sharply to the necessary course of action for the Christian."[36] One can feel the wagging finger of shame. Tertullian laments, "This is what the devil teaches his disciples. And they obey! As though on equal terms, the chastity of his followers challenges that of the servants of God."[37] While failing to emulate the piety of her fellow Christians would bring shame upon the widow, to be outdone by Satan worshippers is utterly inexcusable.

In case his attempts at shaming the reader into right action fails, Tertullian's approach, in chapter seven, transitions to a logical argument concerning the human response to God's Will. Tertullian begins the syllogism by setting the claim that no leaf falls to the ground unless God wills it. It then follows that no human dies without God willing it since we are higher up the chain. Therefore, if God wills a woman to lose her husband by his death, then God must also necessarily will that she no longer be married. In a reversal of the traditional marriage vows, Tertullian asks, "Why attempt to restore what God has put asunder?"[38] Therefore, a widow who remarries is acting directly against the will of God. Since good Christians desires to live in harmony with the will of God, they will not remarry. Tertullian also echoes back to his earlier arguments of continence by suggesting that the death of one's husband is God's way of restoring the widow to celibacy. As argued previously, marriage is a necessary evil due to bodily desires but by removing the husband, God gives the widow a second chance at purity.

Finally, chapter eight provides the conclusion for *Ad Uxorem*. In common with the rhetorical style, Tertullian closes with a *pro hominem* appeal to the widow. He admits that it is an inescapable truth that virgins will look upon the face of God most closely, but the widow can also attain a deeply personal relationship with God since He serves as their benefactor and advocate. Tertullian implies the widow can attain a relationship with God even closer than that of the virgin. The widow should feel greater pride, an odd reward for a Christian, since her sacrifice is superior to the virgin's because the widow knows what she is missing. While the virgin exhibits grace, the widow represents virtue *par excellence*. In case the carrot fails to induce the proper response from the widow, Tertullian ends with Paul's warning that, "Evil associations corrupt good manners."[39] He adds an invective against "chattering, idle, winebibbing, scandalmongering women" whose "'god is their belly,' as the apostle says; and so also is that which lies adjacent to it."[40] You better behave because you certainly do not want people to group you with such unsavory women.

The arguments in *Ad Uxorem* follow the basic structure of the rhetorical model and encompass many modes of attack. Tertullian brings ethos, pathos, and logos to bear in dissuading the reader against remarriage. In so doing, readers find themselves armed with a multitude of arguments they can bring to bear against a widow wishing to remarry. If logic fails, turn to Biblical references, if those fail turn

---

36.   Sider, 109-110.

37.   Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 403.

38.   Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 403.

39.   I Cor. 15:33.

40.   Tertullian, *To His Wife*, 404.

to ethos and a desire for the "good," failing that, attempt to humiliate the widow into proper behavior by contrasting them with the wicked heathen, failing all that attempt to butter the widow's ego with promises of direct relations with God and a feeling of superiority in respect to those overly righteous virgins. Though a short treatise, *Ad Uxorem* illustrates the diversity of Tertullian's methodology and the myriad tools at his disposal.

Contrary to the view Tertullian was foe of reason and Classical education, Sider argues, "[His] uniqueness as a second-century exegete was made possible by the special skill through which he was able to adapt his training in classical rhetoric to Biblical materials and thus sharpen and improve the tools he inherited from the tradition."[41] As demonstrated earlier, Tertullian composed his treatises in accordance with rhetorical techniques. Each idea, paragraph, and phrase finds its genesis in rhetoric. The flow of his writing is often dictated by the rhetor's art. The significance of Tertullian's contribution rests in the fact he "force[d] the Roman world to consider Christian realities because they had been placed in the forum of Roman rhetoric. In so doing he created new contexts, new facts, and new reality for both the Roman Imperial world and the Christian world."[42] Contrary to the image of Tertullian as "a doughty defender of revelation against reason," Sider contends, "The Scriptures, then are for him not merely the 'source of revelation' or the 'precipitate of revelation,' . . . They are also a source of data which had to be sifted and weighed in a strictly rational way as any other body of facts to establish credence and authority."[43] As a Montanist Tertullian believed in the power and activity of the Holy Spirit, but the exhortations of others must be scrupulously evaluated and logically compared to the *regula fidei* and scripture before gaining acceptance as true revelation. Charismatic groups often lead to chaos and anarchy as counter revelations appear and conflict with one another.

Far from tumultuous, Tertullian's system demanded a rigorous logic and the exercise of strict reason. Peter Kaufman notes that although Tertullian expounded the sinister influence of philosophy, "his sensitive handling of pagan political thought and his profound debts to classical rhetoric betoken generally positive assessments of the culture of classical antiquity."[44] With such a deep commitment to rhetoric techniques it becomes nearly impossible if not highly impractical to maintain the view that Tertullian wished to abandon fully the classical traditions and secular culture surrounding him. It is equally improbable that the wit and keen mind responsible for works like *De Praescrtiptione Haereticorum* and *Ad Uxorem* would honestly support the abandonment of reason.

---

41.   Sider, 9-10.

42.   Helgeland, 6.

43.   Sider, 131.

44.   Kaufman, 170.

Vukovar: Memory, Media and Myth

Annie Snider

Vukovar is small city located on the banks of the Danube in the northeastern portion of Croatia, approximately an hour's drive west of the border with Serbia. In 1991, following the declaration of independence of by the Republic of Croatia, some of the first war crimes perpetrated by Serb military forces occurred during a three-month siege of the city. It is important to understand the events in Vukovar because the siege has become a cornerstone in the story of Croatian independence. The battle of Vukovar represents some of the larger barriers to reconciliation facing Croatia and Serbia as collective memory perpetuates the "victim/perpetrator" mentality among Croats and Serbs, with both sides inserting themselves into the role of "victim" and the other into the role of "perpetrator." Yugoslavia's system of state-controlled media produced incorrect and, in some cases, blatantly false information during the battle for Vukovar while at the same the time politicians on both sides utilized the media to instill fear and hatred in citizens. The daily events during the siege of Vukovar, covered almost exclusively by Croat and Serb journalists, resulted in two competing accounts of events that were influential in creating myths now embedded in collective memory. I will argue that the Serbian media played a pivotal role in falsely reporting information that propagated ethnic hatred and hostilities toward the Croat population and in many ways influenced the creation of myths that continue to hamper reconciliation to this day.

Myths that led to War

A common facet of communist countries is state-controlled media, and in Yugoslavia this was no different. Following the death of Josip Broz Tito in 1980, Slobodan Milošević ascended to power, and immediately undertook specific measures to insure media support of his regime. Beginning as early as 1987, Slobodan Milošević used Serb media such as *Radio and Television Serbia*, and newspapers such as *Blic*, *Politika* and *Večernje novosti* to strengthen support for a greater Serbia. He purged the Yugoslav media of journalists that did not report news containing his biases and harnessed the media to support his agenda for a greater Serbia.[1] Journalists who attempted to produce independent stories were

---

[1]. Renaud de la Brosse, "Political Propaganda and the Plan to Create a 'State for all Serbs:' Consequences of using the Media for Ultra-Nationalist Ends," Special Report for International Criminal Tribunal Slobodan Milošević Indictment Case no. IT-02-54-T.

marginalized and in some cases fired from state sponsored media agencies.[2] Some journalists found work in smaller regional television and newspaper agencies in Croatia. It is important to understand that Serbian media was accessible throughout Yugoslavia as the national media, while regions such as Croatia had regional news coverage of important news and information within Croatia. Unlike Serbia, Croatian news agencies did not present an inflated nationalized version of news until well after they declared independence in 1991.

As tensions mounted in the various regions of Yugoslavia, Croatia began talks of succession. Increasingly Serbian media instigated public outrage against Croats with stories containing accusations of Croats being fascists Ustaše, a historical term referring to the Nazi collaborators that persecuted Serbians during the Nazi occupation of Yugoslavia during World War II. The Serb media used several events undertaken by Franjo Tuđman shortly after becoming president of Croatia in 1990 to insight public fear. Specifically, Tuđman re-introduced the *šahovnica,* the red-and-white checkerboard coat-of-arms. The Serb media overlooked the historical background of the *šahovnica*, which originated during the tenth century, and instead compared it to the coat of arms displayed by Croatian fascists during World War II.[3] Although similar, the first square in upper-left corner of the fascist era coat-of-arms was white whereas the first square in the modern coat-of-arms is red, an intentional change in order to differentiate the new symbol from a difficult past.[4] The Serb media also published stories reminding the public of the violence perpetrated by fascist Croats and Nazis against Serbs during World War II, most notably the massacre of Serbs at the Jasenovac concentration camp. The purpose of these stories seemed to be to revive past animosities by noting similarities between the current symbols of Tuđman's government and those of a painful and violent period for Serbs; the implication being, it could happen again.

As tensions mounted in the spring of 1991, Milošević declared the necessity and intent to protect Serb "majorities" within Croatia. Interestingly, the population of Vukovar was 84,189 with approximately 43.8 percent Croats and 37.4 percent Serbs, yet Vukovar became one of the first locations Milošević sought to "protect," even though there was no Serb majority.[5] There has been some debate as to why Milošević chose Vukovar as a city of importance. Militarily and strategically there was no significance to the city. The town did not have any major industries or supply lines and held little to no significant historical value to Serbs. So the question remains unanswered, however, it is important to note that a town with no geopolitical or historical significance prior to the Homeland Wars emerged

2. *Frontline*, "The World's Most Wanted Man: How Yugoslavia's Destroyers Harnessed the Media," http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/karadzic/bosnia/media.html (accessed October 5, 2010).

3. Sabrina P. Ramet, *Thinking About Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 6.

4. Ibid.

5. ICTY 1997 amended indictment against Mile Mrkšić, Miroslav Radić, Veselin Šljivančanin, and Slavko Dokmanović for the mass killing at Ovčara of approximately 200 Croatian and other non-Serb persons who had been removed from the Vukovar Hospital on November 20, 1991, Case no. IT-95-13a-I, http://www.icty.org/x/cases/dokmanovic/ind/en/mrk-2ai1971202e.pdf (accessed April 28, 2009).

from the battle cloaked in national symbolism for Croatians.

The Battle of Vukovar

In June 1991 Croatia declared independence and Milošević immediately sent in the Yugoslav national army (JNA) troops to secure the city of Vukovar. A three-month siege ensued, which resulted in the almost complete destruction of the town by a daily barrage of bombs from August until November 1991. The JNA and Chetnik[6] forces greatly outnumbered the approximate 1800 Croat militia. Approximately 1,624 people were killed and 2,557 were wounded during the three months of fighting.[7] Other accounts put the number of missing and killed closer to 4,000 with approximately 22,000 citizens forced to flee the city.[8]

The Vukovar hospital, which housed many of the Croatian wounded, became the last refuge for many of the town's remaining inhabitants who hoped to be evacuated along with the patients in the presence of neutral international observers. When it became apparent the city was going to fall, staff from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) negotiated with the JNA leaders for the evacuation of patients and staff from Vukovar hospital to take place on November 19th.[9] However, on the morning of the 19th JNA forces denied the Red Cross entry to city to evacuate the hospital. Not until six years later did the public learn the truth about the fate of the hospital's occupants. Instead of evacuating the hospital's occupants to concentration camps as the army later claimed, the JNA actually bused the approximate three hundred patients and staff out of the city to a compound on the outskirts of town in nearby Ovčara. Serb paramilitary forces beat the victims for several hours prior to executing them and dumping their bodies into a mass grave.[10] The lack of accurate information regarding the fate of the hospital staff, patients, and other civilians in the town perpetuated a legacy of rumors and myth whose roots lie in the fictitious Serbian media and military accounts of the battle of Vukovar.

Media

The dichotomy between Croatian and Serbian media accounts is telling. *Vreme* described the siege as "Serbia's Gallipoli" while the Croatian press described it in terms of a battle between "David

---

6. During World War I, Chetniks were elite troops of the Royal Army of the Kingdom of Serbia. During World War II, Chetniks led by Draža Mihailović were devoted to the King and were particularly known for their brutality in war. Mihailović's Chetniks and Josip Broz Tito's Partisans were the main anti-Axis troops that fought against Croat Ustaše (pro-German) and Nazis the occupied Yugoslavia beginning in April 1941. During the Yugoslav wars from 1991 to 1995 several Serbian paramilitary units adopted the historical name "Chetnik." During this time Chetnik was also as a derogatory term for any Serb.

7. Goran Jungvirth, "Vukovar Still Divided 15 Years On," *B92*, November 27, 2006, http://www.b92.net/eng/insight/opinions.php?nav_id=38241&version (accessed April 26, 2009).

8. Helen Seeney, "Croatia: Vukovar is Still Haunted by the Shadow of its Past," *Deutsche Welle-World.De*, 22.08.2006, http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,2129420.html (accessed April 26, 2009).

9. ICTY Case no. IT-95-13a-I.

10. ICTY Case no. IT-95-13a-I.

and Goliath" and as Croatia's "Stalingrad."[11] In an August 30, 1991 article the Croatian newspaper *Vjesnik* proclaimed, "Croatia at War for Defense of Freedom" and in the bi-line states "Generals' Fury Destroys Towns."[12] The accompanying picture shows the ruins of buildings in Vukovar. Conversely, the Serbian media frequently portrayed more sensationalized events in broadcasts that resulted in a more emotionally charged response from both Serbs and Croats. For example, JNA and Chetnik soldiers were shown chanting "Slobo, bring the salad, there will be meat, we're slaughtering the Croats."[13] This story and other similar stories of Serb atrocities against Croats caused mass panic and outrage within Croatia.

Serbian news also included stories containing military personnel and civilians using ethnic slurs that depicted Croats, regardless of whether they were civilian or military, as murders that deserved to die. The international press also published similar news stories. For example, during an October 29th interview with BBC journalist Carole Walker, a JNA leader tried to explain the importance of Vukovar stating, "It's not Croatian territory, it's the territory of Yugoslavia. The fact is that those Croatian forces, they are the ones who have killed, strangled, and massacred the people who were living here."[14] The slant of the Serb account of the events in Vukovar was apparent to journalist Alan Ferguson of the *Toronto Star* who interviewed Lt. Colonel Miodrad Panic just days after the fall of Vukovar. Ferguson noted, "In their crude attempt yesterday to brand Croats as the sole evil-doers in Vukovar, army commanders used a language that appealed *more to the emotions than the intellect*."[15] Ethnic slurs, images of dead bodies strewn along roadsides, and images of elderly Croat civilians fleeing the city on foot followed by Chetniks mocking them heightened emotions on both sides and appeared repeatedly in the Serb media broadcasts. These images became embedded in collective memory and continue to produce emotional and nationalist responses nineteen years after the fact.

The fictitious stories published by the Serbian media were perhaps the most damaging and a vital element that embedded myth into collective memory. One story in particular surfaced in the Serbian press as factual, even though reporters had not verified the source. The story, really nothing more than a rumor, emerged regarding the discovery of forty Serbian school children in a kindergarten with their throats slit by Croatian forces in a suburb of Vukovar.[16] The report allegedly came from a *Reuters'* journalist who witnessed the incident, however *Reuters* never published the story and none of

11. Milos Vasic, "The Vukovar Front: The Galipoli of Serbia," *Vreme News Digest Agency* No. 7, November 11, 1991, http://www.scc.rutgers.edu/serbian_digest/7/t7-2.htm (accessed September 3, 2010).

12. Dubravka Žarkov, *The Body of War: Media, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Break-up of Yugoslavia* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 47.

13. Eric Stover and Gilles Peres, *The Graves: Srebrenica and Vukovar* (New York: Scalo, 1998), 266.

14. BBC, "Vukovar Massacre: What Happened," BBC News Web site, Real Player video file, 2:37, http://news.bbc.co.uk/media/video/39160000/rm/_39160412_vukovar1991_walker_vi.ram (accessed August 8, 2010).

15. Alan Ferguson, "Fallen Vukovar Reveals War Horrors," *Toronto Star*, November 22, 1991. Emphasis mine.

16. "Politika falsifikata," Dosije *Vremena,* January 23, 1999, http://www.vreme.com/arhiva_html/431/8.html#IVC (accessed August 8, 2010); Žarka Radoja, "Krvavi Medijski Pir Nad Izmisljenim Zločinima," *e-Novine*, November 18, 2009, http://www.e-novine.com/feljton/32294-Krvavi-medijski-pir-nad-izmiljen im-zloinima.html (accessed July 14, 2010).

the *Reuters* correspondents verified the incident. Other news agencies, such as *NPR*, attempted to verify the story and were unable to. In a broadcast on November 20, 1991 journalist Tom Gjelten reported the evacuation "400 sick and wounded Croatians" from the Vukovar hospital by the JNA. He described the chaos in Vukovar following the fall of the city noting, "Each side is accusing the other of a massacre." Gjelten admitted surprise at hearing the rumor about the massacred children in Borovo Naselje stating he had recently been in the suburb and "most of the Serbs, certainly the children, had gotten out of the town several months ago."[17] The story was later determined to be completely fictitious, yet there was no retraction issued by the Serbian press. The public responded to the story immediately with outrage and the story continues to circulate as fact in public discourse. It is ironic to note that this story coincided with rumors emerging out of Vukovar regarding the massacre of the hospital staff and patients.

Similar fictitious stories published in Serbia's *Politika* on November 18, 1991 described Croatian National Guardsmen walking around "with necklaces containing the gold teeth of elderly victims and fingers cut from murdered Serb children."[18] These stories incensed the Serbian citizenry who demanded retribution. This, in turn, justified any military action carried out against Croatia's civilian population. Because these events, distorted and fictionalized by the Serb media garnered such immense political support for the war, they created a precedent followed later by the Croatian media during the wars in Bosnia. Media accounts justified atrocious crimes committed by both sides during the war, which in a different political atmosphere, would have resulted in immediate public outcry. The use of atrocities directed against children and the elderly emerged repeatedly in the Serb press. Stories of atrocities committed against the young and elderly civilians who are perceived as particularly vulnerable routinely emerge in the midst of wartime environments. These types of stories have been used repeatedly throughout history and date back to the Middle Ages and Christian accounts of Jewish atrocities directed against Christian children. Similar stories emerged during World War I of innocent Belgium children having hands severed by vicious German soldiers and again during World War II with examples such as Anne Frank.[19] While not all of the stories were true, they were presented to the public as factual and frequently intertwined with truthful events, which in turn transformed them into believable accounts. The purpose of these types of stories was simple; they were intended to generate an emotional response from the public, which would guarantee continued support of the war. This is one example of how myth evolved from rumor to fact and has become embedded in public discourse and memory surrounding the siege of Vukovar.

Sensationalized and fictitious media stories were common place in Serbia, even though some were so incredible it is difficult to understand how such stories were accepted as accurate and truthful. For example, *Politika* in an article in October 1991 described the capture of fourteen Czech women fighting for the Croatians. The story described the women as being "Catholic parachutists in NATO camouflage

---

17.   *All Things Considered*, NPR, November 20, 1991.

18.   Radoja, "Krvavi Medijski Pir Nad Izmisljenim Zločinima."

19.   John Horne and Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 369.

uniforms that had been dropped in the area of Osijek [near Vukovar] from Hungarian planes."[20] These types of fictitious stories frequently overshadowed truthful accounts describing atrocities committed in Vukovar directed against Croat civilians, making the truth about what happened difficult for anyone to ascertain.

Memory

The emotions that evolved from media reports had a lasting effect on the collective memory of both Serbs and Croats. Serbs believed the information broadcast through their media that, in many ways, created a biased and often blatantly fictionalized account of events in Vukovar. The media portrayed political and military personnel, such as Milošević and JNA captain Miroslav Radić, as protectors and heroes who had delivered Serbs from the violence of fascist Croats. The impact of the media stories became evident in the years following the war, when mass graves containing the bodies of Croat civilians were discovered and war crimes indictments issued against Serb military leaders and President Milošević. Large protests followed the arrest of Milošević because Serbs believed their heroes had been victimized by false evidence and were being framed. The Serbian media's portrayal of the participants in the battle of Vukovar and the reasons used to justify the senseless destruction of the city served as a basis for the cultural discourse surrounding the war and in many ways shaped Serbian perception of events in Vukovar.

Heroes emerged during the battle for Vukovar in Croatian news as well. Siniša Glavašević, the lone journalist from Radio Croatia Vukovar who provided hourly updates of the fighting from his home inside the city was celebrated as a national hero for attempting to broadcast the truth about what was happening in Vukovar. Croat military personnel such as Commander Blago Zadro, killed during fighting in Vukovar on October 16, 1991, and Colonel Marko Babić have been exalted as national heroes. There are YouTube videos, Facebook pages, and websites devoted to Vukovar and the heroes from both sides. Social media formats combine with the fact that people can respond anonymously, thereby giving them the freedom to speak without fear of recourse. This brings up an interesting question about how memory and fact are shaped and re-shaped through social media formats. While historians may discount Facebook and other forms of social media as not being valid formats for historical information, these formats nonetheless force historians to consider how memory is constantly being reshaped and the fact that social media allows a continuous and ever evolving discourse of historical events. Especially in an age when the then children or even those who were not born at the time of the battle of Vukovar are now commenting on events of the past and their basis of knowledge is often second generational memory and myth. It is therefore important to note the significance of social media and the internet in re-shaping memory.

Social media formats are also interesting to examine in the ways in which myth and

---

20.   Stojan Cerovic, "In the Trap of Patriotism," *Vreme* News Digest Agency No. 10, December 2, 1991, http://www.scc.rutgers.edu/serbian_digest/10/t10-9.htm (accessed September 3, 2010).

misinformation have become engrained in the discourse of a much younger generation. Younger generations are much more computer savvy and capable of posting videos to YouTube and other formats, bringing events to a broader audience while at the same time engendering them with their own biases and interpretation of events. For example, a YouTube video of the evacuation of the non-Serb civilians from a suburb of Vukovar prior to the fall of the city entitle "Exodus: Vukovar 1991." The title alone suggests a religious connotation to the suffering of the civilians shown in the video. The video is set to Samuel Barber's *Adagio for Strings*, which makes the video much more moving, and by design generates a more emotional response, as opposed to reading about the evacuation in a newspaper. The video was originally posted to YouTube in December 2006 and since that date has been viewed 208, 672 times and posted to Facebook 1,349 times. The most recent comment requesting information about the events depicted in the video was posted January 4, 2010.[21] As long as videos remain in the YouTube library they are available for viewing and continue to impact memory and spawn dialog on the events in Vukovar. Therefore, the power of social media can not be underestimated, especially as it relates to the construction or memory and truth.

The competition between mythical discourse and fact continues to this day and is especially visible in the news articles in the weeks leading up to November 18, Croatia's national Day of Remembrance of the fall of Vukovar and the massacre that followed. There are songs, movies, and television dramas devoted to Vukovar that, in some cases, attempt to initiate a dialog in order to facilitate reconciliation and dispel rumors. However, there are far more websites and blogs that perpetuate a competing discourse between Croats and Serbs and distort facts while others are simply hate filled rants.

Interesting as well are the number of memorials dedicated to the heroes and victims of Vukovar, but what is more telling is the lack of memorials dedicated to Serbian victims. A fact that is often overlooked is that innocent civilians, both Serb and Croat, suffered as a result of the siege of Vukovar. Since Vukovar was turned over to Croatia in 1996, the city has been clothed in a mythic quality of sacredness that purposely ignores the former Serbs who lived and died there and denies Serbs who returned active participation in the discourse on the memory of the siege. Catholic representations and memorials carrying the Croatian *šahovnica* are common. Memorial candles burn night and day while flowers, ribbons, and Croatian flags are a constant presence. Noticeably absent are Orthodox representations and memorials to the Serbian victims of the battle. The town cemetery containing the remains of all of the town's inhabitants, regardless of ethnic heritage, frequently suffers vandalism and desecration of the Serbian Orthodox headstones.

The events of Vukovar and the larger issues that brought about the dissolution of Yugoslavia continue to be misunderstood on an international level, in many ways due to misinformation passed on by American media, but also due to a lack of historical knowledge about the country. So confusing were the wars in the various territories that several international television networks decided against

---

21. "Exodus: Vukovar 1991," *YouTube*, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EyxXDnSgJXw (accessed January 7, 2010).

explaining the various regional differences because they reasoned it "would be beyond viewers' comprehension."[22] The U.S. media formats news stories in short fifteen to twenty second segments because the attention span of the public has been deemed to short to hold interest in longer news. The news is also mediated for the public by those who produce it. News organizations and their owners determine what is news worthy and in 1991 when war broke out in Yugoslavia, the attention of the United States was on the Persian Gulf War. Therefore, there remains little understanding of the events in Vukovar and of the Homeland Wars within the United States. More attention has been devoted to the International War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague following the dissolution of Yugoslavia than was ever devoted to the actual events that caused it.

The distortion of events in Vukovar by the Serb media is also important to understand due to the fact that U.S journalists frequently used Serb journalists as sources for factual information as well as translators, and unwittingly passed on Serb biases. The lack of historical understanding about the region exacerbated this problem. Prior assumptions about Slavs in general, "and Yugoslavia and its history in particular, determined reporting, influenced editorial positions, and otherwise distorted reporters' grasp of reality and acted as filters on their mediation of events and personalities."[23] This lack of understanding continues today. The difficulty in trying to determine the truth of events is extremely complicated in the climate of competing historiographies that emerged in the wake of the war. Much of the historiography has itself incorporated myths and misinformation that emerged from the Serbian account of events, both by military and media which makes it frustrating to try to determine the facts of events. Transcripts of the war crimes trials at The Hague remain one of the better sources of information, yet one that the average citizen is not going to seek out. Instead, media accounts of the trial remain a popular source of information.

Myth

The fact that the siege of Vukovar was covered predominantly by Croatian and Serbian media robbed the world of the unbiased voice of disinterested outsiders. Myth shaped historical perceptions during the years in which factual information was not widely available. For example, Serbs initially claimed that the bodies located in mass graves in and around Vukovar were Croat soldiers who had been killed in the course of war. This was later determined to be false, but in the interim factual knowledge about the fate of victims remained elusive, and loved ones readily developed their own imagined stories about the fate of their loved ones. Survivors cleave to memories of those whom they lost during the war and erect memorials for the missing.

Families of the missing repeatedly eulogize missing loved ones, but for some, the difficulty of remembering and the refusal to acknowledge the deaths of sons and husbands adds to the complexity of Vukovar. Many of the women used denial and dissociation as coping strategies, clinging to the hope

---

22. Cerovic, "In the Trap of Patriotism."

23. James J. Sadkovich, *The U.S. Media and Yugoslavia, 1991-1995* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1998), xiii.

that their missing loved one would someday return.[24] In some cases, loved ones created idealized myths about how their sons died in battle or escaped. The trauma associated with identifying remains, some of which are only fragments of bones, in some cases perpetuates these myths and conflicted memories because the mothers refuse to accept that their sons are dead. "Victims of trauma frequently lack the ability to consciously integrate their experiences. As long as there is interruption in the flow of memories, the trauma cannot be shaped into a personal narrative."[25]

Legacy

November 18, 2010 marks the nineteenth anniversary of the massacre and attempts to foster reconciliation continue between newly elected Croatian president Ivo Josipović and Serbian president Boris Tadić. News coverage of Tadić's recently announced plans to visit Vukovar in order to pay his respects to the victims was met with a mixed response. Some Croatians responded angrily and right-wing politicians recounted Vukovar as "sacred soil" that Tadić had no right to step foot on.[26] Some Serbians responded with an equal air of frustration that Croatians unjustly claimed sole ownership of the title of "victim" in Vukovar. However, there were Croats and Serbs who responded acknowledging it is time to move forward instead of constantly rehashing the pain and suffering that both sides inflicted on each other during the Homeland Wars.

What was perhaps more interesting was the response from both sides once Tadić actually set foot on Croatian soil on November 4, 2010. Very few of the right-wing protestors who had spoken out against Tadić's visit in the Croatian media actually made the trek to Vukovar to participate in any form of physical protest. Instead, a handful of protestors formed in front of the water tower in Vukovar with signs that read "our blood is on your hands" and "our blood can't be washed away."[27] Tadić and Croatian president Ivo Josipović visited Vukovar together with approximately fifty onlookers in black morning attire. Tadić laid a wreath at the Ovčara Monument and gave a brief speech. His message was one of moving forward towards reconciliation, with the visit to Vukovar being the first step. Tadić said, "I am here to once again offer words of apology, to express regret and create a possibility for Serbs and Croats, Serbia and Croatia, to turn a new page of history."[28] He further stated, "Everything that happened to Serbs and Croats in the twentieth century can be put in the book of the past, which in itself would be an

---

24.   Slavica Jurcevic, Ivan Urlic, and Mirela Vlasterlica, "Denial and Dissociation as Coping Strategies in Mothers' Postmortem Identification of Their Sons," *American Imago* 62, no.4 (Winter 2005), http://muse. jhu.edu.proxy.lib.csus.edu/journals/american_imago/v062/62.4jurcevic.pdf (accessed February 2, 2009).

25.   Jurcevic, Urlic, and Vlasterlica, "Denial and Dissociation."

26.   "Tadić Not Welcome in Vukovar*," B92,* September 18, 2010, *http*://www.b92.net/eng/newscomments. php?nav_id=69743#hrono (accessed September 18, 2010).

27.   "Vukovar je Ovčara," *Jutarnji.hr*, November 4, 2010, http://www.jutarnji.hr/foto-prosvjednici-u-vukovaru-porucili-borisu-tadicu--nasa-krv-na-vasim-je-rukama/900688/ (accessed November 4, 2010).

28.   "Serb Leader Tadic Apologises for 1991 Vukovar Massacre," *BBC,* November 4, 2010, *http*://www.bbc. co.uk/news/world-europe-11689153 (accessed November 5, 2010).

act of writing a book of the future."[29]

Once again, the message of events was presented through the media, this time however through a more unbiased approach. Unlike the 1990s, modern on-line newspapers have the ability to allow responses from readers through blog format. The responses to Tadić's visit were again mixed, however what was more telling was how quickly constructive comments and opinions descended into name calling and ridiculous banter filled with much of the falsities and ethnic slurs that were rampant in the Serb media releases during the Homeland Wars. This is perhaps the best evidence of the long lasting effect of Serb media misinformation that continues to appear in modern discourse. While some may discount news blogs and social media as not sound historical sources, they do beg the question of how modern communities communicate and disseminate ideas. How important are these forms of media communication in passing on misinformation and biases? Or more importantly, do they re-shape memory in a positive or negative way? In 2009 Serbia's war crimes prosecutors finally initiated an investigation into the role of the Serbian journalists in "stoking war crimes" during 1991-1995 by using inflamed language, distorting events, and creating fictitious stories.[30] As yet no indictments have been issued against journalists, but at least attempts are being made to reveal the truth about the media's role in inciting animosities.

The battle for Vukovar has become a national symbol of Croatia's struggle for freedom. Reconstruction is a slow process in Vukovar, battle scars remain everywhere and serve as a reminder to the wounds that have not healed. The 2001 census reveals that fewer Serbs than Croats have returned to Vukovar following the war. The population of Vukovar in 2001 was 31,670 with Croats 57.46 percent and Serbs 32.88 percent.[31] Thousands of tourists visit the memorials in Vukovar and Ovčara every year. They continually memorialize the heroics of those who died there. Every November 18 is a national Day of Remembrance in Croatia. These events help victims recover from their loss but in some ways they also serve as a painful reminder. The legacy of Vukovar serves as an example of how words and images published by a biased media instigated ethnic animosities that helped dissolve a country.

29. "Tadić apologizes during Vukovar Visit," *B92*, November 4, 2010, http://www.b92.net/eng/news/politics-article.php?yyyy=2010&mm=11&dd=04&nav_id=70684 (accessed November 5, 2010).

30. Aleksandar Vasovic, "Serbia Investigates Media Role in War Crimes," *Reuters,* June 8, 2009, http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L865643.htm (accessed October 4, 2010).

31. Croatian Bureau of Statistics 2001 Census, http://www.dzs.hr/default_e.htm (accessed February 15, 2009).

Memorial at Ovčara where 200 bodies of the patients, staff, and civilians removed from Vukovar hospital were located in a mass gravesite in 1996. The bodies of the remaining 61 persons taken from the hospital have never been located. Photo by Annie Snider.

Ancient Israel: From Polytheism to Monotheism

Scott Spitzer

Introduction

Charting the development of deities is no easy task. It is difficult enough for the historian to determine the truth of specific events as they relate to people who left behind archaeological evidence, let alone the truth of the thoughts or beliefs they held. The difficulty of the task becomes compounded when studying ancient cultures, of which comparatively little evidence remains. In the case of ancient Israel, historians possess many written documents from which to draw evidence, but even this is a tricky task. The Hebrew Bible, far from being a singly composed body of work, was written by several different authors over a time span of nearly a thousand years. Inevitably, the culture of the peoples described in it changed over this time, along with their beliefs. In addition, different authors brought different ideologies and influences to the table, further muddying the water for historians concerned with Israelite beliefs. Traditionally, the Israelites are thought of as having been the first culture to practice true monotheism, or belief in one exalted, all-powerful deity. To some extent this is true; however, the road to monotheism for the ancient Israelites was a long and complicated one.

This paper will examine the cultural background of the ancient Israelites in an attempt to shed light on their religious beliefs. It will consider the polytheistic beliefs of the ancient Canaanites, who occupied the same geographic area as the Israelites, and may in fact have been ancestors to the Israelites, or even the Israelites themselves.[1] It will examine the identifications of Israelite deities with those of the Canaanite culture and any possible religious syncretism that occurred by drawing largely from the texts of the Hebrew Bible. It will be argued that historically a trend can be discerned that moves from polytheistic practices toward emerging ideas of monotheism. However, the Hebrew Bible was not written in a chronological manner and thus the final challenge will be to unravel the various texts and the motives of the authors behind them to gain insight into the social and political movements that shaped religious belief. Historians must take care not to confuse the actual past with what a written account says of it. In examining these issues a picture will emerge of Israelite religious practices closely intertwined with political motives, which in turn, ended up shaping the beliefs that led to monotheism.

---

1.   There are many scholarly opinions regarding this issue, which will be explored later in the paper.

Identifying the Ancient Israelites

First an inquiry must be made into who the ancient Israelites were. As William Dunstan clearly catalogues, many different cultures populated the area west of the Euphrates and east of the Mediterranean Sea between the fifteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C.E.[2] A major challenge faced by historians is attempting to determine the geographical boundaries or even the very definitions of these cultures. Because historians often disagree on definitions, they are often provided for the purpose of putting forth an argument, which ultimately renders them subjective. The term "Israelite" is nothing more than a concept, usually used to refer to the people who eventually composed the

> *"The term 'Israelite' is nothing more than a concept… a scholarly construct."*

Hebrew Bible. But, labels are necessary for concepts and an examination of the "Israelite" label will prove useful for our purposes.

Robert D. Miller notes that the term "Israelite" has often been used to denote a particular ethnicity.[3] But how does one determine an ethnicity? Is it biological? Cultural? Genealogical? Geographical? Or, is there no such thing – the term being nothing more than a scholarly construct? Once again, this is contingent upon definitions. To avoid getting bogged down in a discussion on theoretical semantics, we can acknowledge that differences in artifacts are apparent at least among large geographical regions. Miller notes that material culture such as pottery, settlement pattern, architecture, burial customs, and metals can be useful evidence in determining a culture or ethnic group.[4] More importantly, it is the historical continuity traced through these artifacts that European scholars have traditionally used to define ethnicity.[5] Approaching the issue more genealogically, Elizabeth Bloch-Smith defines *ethnos* as "a group of people larger than a clan or lineage claiming common ancestry."[6] Furthermore, it is the "fabricated collective memory… or putative myth of shared descent and kinship" that reinforces the lineages.[7] This provides a more internal definition of "ethnicity" – how the culture defines itself, whereas Miller's definition is more external – how foreigners would define and classify it. In either case, both approaches are equally valid for their own purposes.

Ultimately, what the historian must recognize is that the past is constructed in the modern mind. Yes, artifacts such as pottery, architecture, and texts have been found and can be dated with reasonable accuracy, but the context for those artifacts is largely constructed. It is the inferences about these very

---

2.   William E. Dunstan, *The Ancient Near East* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1998).

3.   Robert D. Miller, II, "Identifying Earliest Israel," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 333 (Feb., 2004), 55-6. <u>JSTOR</u>. CSUS Lib., Sacramento, CA. November 17, 2009.

4.   Miller, 63.

5.   Ibid.

6.   Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, "Israelite Ethnicity in Iron I: Archaeology Preserves What Is Remembered and What Is Forgotten in Israel's History," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 122 (Autumn, 2003), 402. <u>JSTOR</u>. CSUS Lib., Sacramento, CA. November 17, 2009.

7.   Ibid.

ideas – how a culture defined itself, other cultures with whom they frequently interacted, indeed the specific cultural and ethnic labels ascribed to them and all the connotations those labels imply – that are

> *"The historian must recognize that the past is constructed in the modern mind."*

modern constructs. They can likely be *inferred* from other archaeological or textual evidence but cannot be known with certainty. With this in mind, we can now turn to an examination of the labels used for the people of the northern Levant in the fifteenth to thirteenth centuries.

The term "Canaanite" simply refers to the people occupying what is now Lebanon and Israel from roughly 1500-1200 B.C.E.[8] Most of the information and evidence scholars have about the Canaanites comes from the city of Ugarit, several miles northwest of what is typically designated as Canaan.[9] One text found at Ugarit makes mention of the term "Ugarit" as distinct from "Canaan,"[10] while others seem to imply that they were the same people, as they shared a common linguistic background.[11] Furthermore, there are no records of Canaanites referring to themselves as such; the term comes from documents recorded by foreign cultures, such as those found in Egypt, Hatti, and Mesopotamia.[12] Yet it is widely used to refer to the people described in Ugaritic texts and occupying land shared by the Israelites. It is just as likely that the people commonly referred to as "Ugaritic," "Canaanite," and "Israelite" were, in fact, one culture at some point. Miller, in examining the ethnic origins of the early Israelites, suggests that frequent trade and interaction between regions in the Iron I highlands points to a cultural stylistic homogeneity among the residents.[13] However, he argues against the idea that any specific artifact can be used as an ethnic identifier.[14] It is the style – the "part of the formal variability in material culture" – that communicates a shared and developing social networking strategy, not only to the surrounding cultures of the time, but to the modern archaeologist as well. Indeed, archaeological evidence from Ugarit suggests the people there were successful traders, interacting with Mycenaean Greece, the island of Cyprus, and Egypt.[15]

External influence from other cultures inevitably affects the original culture and often changes it drastically. Cultures often adopt ideas and practices of their neighbors; this makes it very difficult to draw conceptual boundaries around a specific culture. To aid in understanding this problem, Marian Feldman distinguishes between "indigenous" and "international," with the former referring to "features

---

8. Dunstan, 179.

9. Dunstan, 180.

10. Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 15.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Miller, 57.

14. Ibid.

15. Dunstan, 180.

found almost exclusively in a single, bounded geopolitical area," and the latter referring to "features that have been hybridized to the extent that they can no longer be attributed to a single specific regional tradition."[16] Tracing material artifacts such as statues, stele, plaques, and pendants in Ugarit and the Levant between 1400 and 1200 B.C.E., she concludes that an "identifiable indigenous artistic tradition" existed in the region.[17] This is in agreement with Miller's idea that style (within reasonable variation) can contribute to our understanding of culture and ethnicity. With this homogeneity of artistic style in mind, we can turn now to religion and argue that the religious beliefs of the Canaanites and the Israelites merged over time, and evidence of this merging can be found in the texts of the Hebrew Bible.

The Canaanite "El"

But first, an examination of Canaanite religion is needed. The Canaanites believed in a pantheon of deities, but one god, El, presided over them all.[18] The name "El," in fact, is found throughout the texts of the Hebrew Bible and there is much debate about what is meant by the term. "El" is simply the word for "god" in many West Semitic languages,[19] which begs many questions. Was the Canaanite "El" so pervasive that other cultures began to adopt the term to refer to their own concepts of deities? Or was the word used by the Canaanites to embody the deistic pinnacle of their religion? Unfortunately, the answers to the origins of El are unknown, and perhaps these questions are too provocative and presumptuous. With respect to the first question, however, we may tone it down a bit and say that the culture that came to be known as the Israelites certainly knew of El, as we shall see, and referred to their own supreme deity using the name "El."

The Ugaritic texts refer to "El's family,"[20] "Kind El, the Compassionate,"[21] and "ageless one."[22] El is understood as often presiding over a divine council and is depicted as an elderly, bearded figure.[23] He is highly anthropomorphized, described as engaging in social activities such as drinking, belonging to clubs, and having affairs with women.[24] He is described as having a wife, Athirat, and many children, the most prominent of which is Baal.[25] He is associated with a bull, likely due to his strength and status as chief of gods.[26] Some of these descriptions fit with those found in the Hebrew Bible, such as the deity

---

16.   Marian H. Feldman, "Redefining a Mediterranean 'International Style,' 1400-1200 B.C.E.," *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 84, No. 1 (Mar., 2002), 7. <u>JSTOR</u>. CSUS Lib., Sacramento, CA. November 17, 2009.

17.   Feldman, 13.

18.   Dunstan, 180-1.

19.   Smith, 135.

20.   Ibid.

21.   Smith, 136.

22.   Ibid.

23.   Ibid.

24.   Ibid.

25.   Smith, 135.

26.   Ibid.

presiding over a divine council,[27] exercising kindness and compassion, as well as having connections to a bull.[28] The name El is referred to as the central Israelite deity many times throughout the Hebrew Bible in the forms of El-ʿelyôn,[29] El-elohey-israel,[30] and El-Shadday,[31] to name a few. However, the traditional name for the god of the Israelites, expressed far more widely in the Hebrew Bible, is Yahweh.

So, why are references to a supreme deity named "El" in the Hebrew Bible? Is this Israelite "El" the same as the Canaanite "El"? Mark S. Smith seems to think so, and he provides persuasive evidence

"Why are references to a supreme deity named 'El' in the Hebrew Bible?"

to support this claim. Smith notes that the name "Israel" does not contain the divine element of Yahweh, but rather the element ʿel.[32] This implies that the central deity of the group "Israel" went by the name "El."[33]

Smith argues that Yahweh was originally a lesser deity in Israelite religion, subordinate to El. He notes Deuteronomy 32:8-9:[34]

> When the Most High (ʿelyôn) gave to the nations their inheritance,
> when he separated humanity,
> he fixed the boundaries of the peoples
> according to the number of divine beings.
> For Yahweh's portion is his people,
> Jacob his allotted heritage.

In this passage, ʿelyôn (or El) is the supreme deity, while Yahweh only has claim to a portion of humanity. In time, Smith argues, Yahweh assimilated El's characteristics and status and came to be identified with him.[35] Support for this claim comes in the passage of Joshua 22:22 (cf. Ps. 50:1; 136:1-3):[36]

> God of gods is Yahweh. (ʾēl ʾĕlōhîm yhwh)

This clearly implies not only an elevation of Yahweh's status, but Yahweh's identification with El. Indeed, Smith notes that there are no biblical polemics against El, suggesting the two deities were identified at an

---

27.   Job 1:6, 2:1; Ps. 82:1, 6; 1 Kings 22:19-23.

28.   1 Kings 12:28.

29.   Gen. 14:18-20.

30.   Gen. 33:20.

31.   Gen. 17:1; Exod. 6:2-3.

32.   Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel, Second Edition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002), 32.

33.   Ibid.

34.   Ibid.

35.   Smith, *The Early History of God*, 33.

36.   Smith, *The Early History of God,* 34.

early stage of Israelite religion.[37]

However, this passage from the Book of Joshua also implies that Yahweh was not alone among deities. Yahweh is clearly regarded as supreme, while other deities are acknowledged, suggesting that ancient Israel was a polytheistic culture. But, this suggestion requires careful examination. After all, the Hebrew Bible is largely the story of a culture of people struggling to reject other deities and worship Yahweh alone. If, as was suggested earlier, the Israelites and the Canaanites came from a similar background, then is this a story of one people warring ideologically with themselves and monotheism was the eventual result.

Historical Origins of the Ancient Israelites

Stephen L. Harris notes there are three scholarly camps when it comes to explaining the origins of the ancient Israelites. The first is that described in the Book of Exodus – the ancient Israelites, already monotheistic and enslaved in Egypt, arrived in Canaan led by their nationalistic god Yahweh and conquered the inhabitants.[38] The evidence for this lies in the text of the Hebrew Bible (the books of Exodus through Joshua), and ancient sites at Hazor and Debir appear to have been destroyed near the end of the Bronze Age.[39] However, there is no evidence that the destruction was caused by the Israelites and furthermore there is no archaeological evidence of a mass exodus of any peoples at any time out of Egypt.[40] The only reference made by the Egyptians to a people known as "Israelites" is carved on the victory stele of king Merneptah around the year 1200 B.C.E.[41] The inscription merely recognizes the Israelites as a people inhabiting the area of Palestine,[42] implying that they were already settled by that date. The Exodus from Egypt then, if there was one, likely happened in the mid-thirteenth century BCE. However, archaeological evidence at Jericho and ʿAi, the cities the Israelites are described as having conquered in the Book of Joshua, suggests these cities were abandoned long before the end of the thirteenth century.[43]

A more likely scenario, backed by stronger archaeological evidence, proposes that the Israelites (whoever they were) gradually settled on the outskirts of Canaan and slowly and peacefully assimilated themselves into Canaanite culture.[44] According to this view, some Israelite immigrants may have come from Egypt, but largely the culture was one of gradual assimilation. This would explain the blending

---

37.   Smith, *The Early History of God,* 33.

38.   Stephen L. Harris, *Understanding the Bible.* Sixth Edition. (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2003), 168.

39.   Ibid.

40.   Ibid.

41.   Dunstan, 193.

42.   Dunstan, 195.

43.   Harris, 168.

44.   Ibid.

of qualities between Yahweh and El, and the persistence of Canaanite deities such as Baal and Asherah in the Hebrew Bible, as well as the skepticism and distrust directed toward the monarchy in the tenth through the sixth centuries.[45] If the Israelites had gradually assimilated, the monarchy would largely have been Canaanite, ruling with reverence for Canaanite deities. Understandably, this would upset the more assimilated Israelites, who had their own religious ideas.

However, there is a third model for which I shall argue strongly later in the paper. This model holds that there was little, if any, distinction between the Canaanites and Israelites, and the tensions expressed in the Hebrew Bible are largely those of the underprivileged rebelling against the aristocratic elite.[46] In this model, the Canaanites would be understood as an outdated, conservative culture overthrown by a radical, reactionary movement – the Israelites. This would explain the common linguistic background of the two cultures, as well as adoption of old religious ideas reframed anew. Furthermore, it is

> **"There was little, if any, distinction between the Canaanites and Israelites."**

corroborated with archaeological evidence of weakening Egyptian control over the Canaanite region in the mid-twelfth century.[47] This weakening of centralized power would have been a perfect opportunity to stage a revolt and assert a new religious ideology. Finally, it again fits with the distrust of the kingship from the tenth to the sixth centuries since centralized power was the problem in the first place.

This view, however, leaves numerous gaps when looking at the Torah in particular. Why is there such heavy emphasis on an exodus from Egypt? Why is Yahweh constantly singled out for exclusive worship? Why is the bull seen as an idolatrous figure if Yahweh and El are the same deity? Furthermore, is there any evidence of the Israelites staging a revolt? These questions will be addressed a bit later, but first let us focus on further ways in which religious pluralism was expressed in ancient Israel, beginning with the idea of the bull.

Baal Worship in Ancient Israel

If the social uprising theory of Israelite origins is correct, we would see resentment directed towards deities associated with the older culture. Indeed, this is precisely what we find, particularly with Baal. The Canaanite deity Baal, as mentioned earlier, was the most prominent of El's sons, and was likely a storm god with strong associations with fertility.[48] Baal was often represented by a bull, a powerful Canaanite symbol of fertility.[49] Smith argues that by the time Israel established a monarchy in the tenth century, El and Yahweh had been merged into one deity, but Baal was still distinct.[50] In fact, Baal was

---

45.   Harris, 168-9.

46.   Harris, 169.

47.   Ibid.

48.   Dunstan, 198.

49.   Ibid.

50.   Smith, *The Early History of God*, 57.

likely worshiped throughout the monarchy, up until the sixth century. Evidence for this is abundant in the Hebrew Bible. The first notable instance is in Exodus, when Moses comes down from the mountain and sees the Israelites worshiping a golden bull-calf.[51] The Book of Judges describes the settled Israelites turning away from Yahweh and toward the "baalim," or many forms of Baal.[52] Just a few chapters later, Gideon is called by Yahweh to destroy the temple of Baal, and does so.[53] Later in the Kingly Period, Jeroboam erects statues of golden calves for worship – one at Dan, the other at Beth-El.[54] King Ahab and his wife Jezebel in the mid ninth century are described as active worshipers of Baal and are demonized.[55] Again, reform is enacted when Jehu has all the local worshipers of Baal killed.[56] These are only a few examples. Perhaps the most sweeping reform (at least as depicted in the Hebrew Bible) is at the end of the Kingly Period, with King Josiah destroying the temples to Baal at Beth-El and in Samaria.[57]

All of this is seen through the filter of the author of the Deuteronomistic History (the books of Deuteronomy through 2 Kings). For this person, likely writing in the seventh century,[58] Baal worship was viewed quite negatively. Smith, attempting to reconstruct the actual history of Baal worship in ancient Israel, paints a different picture. First, with respect to Gideon, the author of the book of Judges claims that he was renamed Jerubbaal – a taunting of Baal to "plead his case" against Gideon, who had just destroyed his altar.[59] However, Smith notes that the name incorporates *Ba'al* as its theophoric element and would thus suggest someone who is a worshiper of Baal, not a ridiculer.[60] Smith sees the religious program of Ahab and Jezebel elevating the status of Baal as a way of promoting theopolitical unity in the north, where many people still worshiped Baal.[61] Furthermore, Smith supplies evidence that Ahab was far from abandoning the cult of Yahweh – his sons Ahaziah and Joram bear Yahwistic names.[62]

Finally, the associations between Baal and Yahweh in the Davidic conquests are difficult to deny. Smith notes the Canaanite imagery associated with Yahweh in Psalm 18, depicting Yahweh as a storm god, a common characteristic of Baal.[63] In Psalm 89, the language recalls Baal as well: "I shall establish

---

51. Exod. 32.

52. Judg. 2:11-13, 3:7.

53. Judg. 6:25-32.

54. 1 Kings 12:28-32.

55. 1 Kings 16:30-33.

56. 2 Kings 10:18-29.

57. 2 Kings 23:4-15.

58. Richard Elliott Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 135.

59. Judg. 6:31-32.

60. Smith, *The Early History of God*, 43.

61. Smith, *The Early History of God,* 72.

62. Ibid.

63. Ps. 18:7-19.

his rule over the sea, his dominion over the rivers."[64] Smith notes that Sea and River are titles of the enemies of Baal in the text of the Ugaritic Baal cycle, and by using them to suggest David's rule over these lands, the author is attributing Baal's warrior qualities to Yahweh.[65] Furthermore, when David defeated the Philistines, the book of 2 Samuel quotes David as saying, "'The Lord has broken through my enemies' lines… as a river breaks its banks.' That is why the place was named Baal-perazim."[66] It is curious that a place would be named Baal-perazim as a consequence of the powers *Yahweh* conferred on David. Smith suggests that associating Yahweh with a warrior-god such as Baal would have appealed to a great warrior such as David, and furthermore the accompanying imagery blurring the lines between Yahweh and Baal would have encouraged worship of Baal alongside Yahweh at this early stage.[67] Indeed, it was not until a hundred years or so later in the ninth century that Baal was seen as a threat to Israelite religions.[68]

Baal worship, then, far from the depictions presented in the Hebrew Bible, can be understood as flourishing productively throughout ancient Israel, up until the sixth or seventh century. It likely posed little to no threat to worshipers of Yahweh for the most part; indeed the same people likely worshiped both deities without problem. But, the authors of the Hebrew Bible certainly had a problem with Baal worship. To examine why this may be, we must turn our attention to unraveling the various texts of the Hebrew Bible in an attempt to uncover the biases and motives of the authors while keeping in mind the social uprising theory posed earlier.

The E Source

Biblical scholars largely agree that the Hebrew Bible is composed of many different sources, and in the case of the books from Genesis to 2 Kings, the redactors are narrowed down to four.[69] This is called the documentary hypothesis, which goes against the traditional view that Moses wrote the Torah in its entirety. The four agreed upon sources vary in style and substance. The first four books of the Torah – Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers – are an intricate weaving together of three different narrative sources, referred to by scholars as J, E and P.[70] Deuteronomy through 2 Kings are understood as largely the work of one author, referred to as D.[71] The letters are used to denote certain characteristics about the authors: the author who refers to God as Yahweh is called J (in German, the name of God is translated as Jehovah, hence the J); the author who refers to God as Elohim is called E; the author

---

64.   Ps. 89:25.

65.   Smith, *The Early History of God*, 92.

66.   2 Sam. 5:20.

67.   Smith, *The Early History of God*, 94.

68.   Smith, *The Early History of God*, 75.

69.   Harris, 100.

70.   Friedman, 24.

71.   Friedman, 117.

known as P is understood to have been a later priest, since priestly issues are of prime importance in that narrative; and the author who wrote the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy through 2 Kings) is referred to as D.[72]

For now, we will primarily concern ourselves with the E author, since it is in this narrative where the first instance of overt Baal worship is found – when Moses sees the Israelites worshiping the golden calf. It is worth noting the importance the E author places on Moses in comparison to other authors. Richard Elliott Friedman astutely notes that the E author sympathizes far more with Moses than the J author does.[73] Indeed, the E author stresses the covenant God makes with Moses and *never mentions* the covenant made with Abraham.[74] In contrast, the J author heavily emphasizes the Abrahamic covenant and vastly downplays the role of Moses.[75] Friedman makes the claim that since the J author stresses the promise God made to Abraham, which was realized under King David, J was a writer probably living in Judah in the south after the kingdoms divided.[76] The E author, by contrast, likely lived in the northern kingdom of Israel says Friedman, and he explains this by examining the golden calf story.

In this story, it is Aaron to whom the creation of the golden calf is credited.[77] Moses is the one who gets upset and reprimands the Israelites.[78] After the kingdoms separated in 922, Jeroboam became king of Israel in the north, while Rehoboam (the successor to Solomon) ruled in Judah in the south. Under Solomon, Shiloh priests (thought to have

> *"It was Yahweh who gave the covenant to Moses and sparked a turning point in Israelite history."*

descended from Moses) were expelled from their land, going north with Jeroboam, while Zadok, a chief priest thought to have descended from Aaron, remained in power in Judah.[79] If it was a Shiloh priest who composed the E narrative, Friedman argues, this would explain the hostility toward Aaron in the golden calf narrative. It would also explain the emphasis on Moses, since Shiloh priests were thought to have descended from him. If the author of E was a Shiloh priest, his real anger would have been directed at Zadok (a descendent of Aaron) for remaining in power in the south while he was exiled to the north. The golden calf story would then be understood as an allegory of the splitting of the kingdoms. But, why a golden calf? Interestingly enough, the king of the northern region of Israel, Jeroboam, erected two golden calf shrines – one at Dan and one at Beth-El.[80] This likely would have frustrated the Shiloh priests further if they understood themselves to be descendents of Moses. It was *Yahweh* who gave the covenant

---

72. Harris, 101.
73. Friedman, 80.
74. Ibid.
75. Friedman, 83.
76. Ibid.
77. Exod. 32:1-6.
78. Exod. 32:19-24.
79. Friedman, 72.
80. 1 Kings 12:28-29.

to Moses and sparked a turning point in Israelite history, according to the E author.[81] The erection of golden calves, symbols of Baal, would have been understood as heresy. So if the E author was a Shiloh priest, the golden calf story illuminates two historical factors – the rejection of their authority in the south, expressed by the hostility toward Aaron; and the rejection of their religious views in the north, expressed by the worship of the golden calf. The E author's hero, Moses, takes care of both problems: he reprimands Aaron, and grinds the golden calf to dust.[82]

Taking a step back, we can see how this fits with Smith's view that Baal worship started encountering difficulties in the ninth century. Fittingly, Friedman dates the author of E between the tenth and eighth centuries.[83] Furthermore, the opposition to both the power structure of Judah and the religious worship as allegorized in the golden calf story can be understood as an expression of political resentment and religious

> *"There is no archaeological evidence of a mass exodus out of Egypt by Israelites or any other tribe of people."*

betrayal, lending support to the social uprising theory of Israelite origins. Here we must be very careful to not confuse the literary evidence with the archaeological evidence. The majority of scholars agree the earliest narrative in the Torah could not have been composed before the tenth century. Friedman says it was E,[84] Harris believes it was J.[85] In any case, the split between the north and the south in 922 had either already occurred or was showing imminent signs by the earliest composition. If this is right around the time that Baal worship started to become problematic, we would not expect to see any accepted worship of Baal anywhere in the Torah. And we do not. The narratives would largely be heavily biased accounts of highly politicized theology, since the splitting of the kingdom was a critical juncture in the monarchy. With this in mind, we can now turn to the earlier problematic question of why an exodus from Egypt plays such a large role in the Hebrew Bible.

The Real Exodus?

As noted earlier, there is no archaeological evidence of a mass exodus out of Egypt by Israelites or any other tribe of people. While it is certainly possible that a number of Egyptians assimilated themselves into Israelite culture, it is likely a small number. If the Israelites, as proposed, originated in the Canaanite region and perhaps came from the same people, why would a story of slavery and exile assert itself so strongly? A provocative theory comes from Michael Oblath, who argues that the Exodus possibly took place right then at the juncture of the ninth and tenth centuries, right before or during the

---

81. Friedman, 78.

82. Exod. 32:20-21.

83. Friedman, 87.

84. Ibid.

85. Harris, 46.

composition of the J and E narratives.[86]

In the middle of the tenth century, the kingdom was united under Solomon. He underwent a massive construction campaign of a temple palace that covered 11,250 square feet and required a massive labor force.[87] 1 Kings 5:13-18 describes Solomon employing forced labor from thirty thousand of his own subjects, while 1 Kings 9:20-23 describes him using non-Israelite labor. However, his son and successor Rehoboam is described as having not only continued his father's forced labor policies but intensifying them.[88] A campaign such as this would likely have been widely unpopular, and the book of 1 Kings admits as much, describing a man named Jeroboam who fled to Egypt to take refuge from Solomon.[89] It is Jeroboam, encouraged by the Shiloh priest Ahijah, who succeeds in breaking away to the north, along with ten of the original twelve tribes, and is made king there by the people.[90]

This, Oblath suggests, is the exodus written about in the Torah.[91] It is the story of forced labor – virtual slavery – by a hard-hearted ruler and a migration of people to a different land, all the while questioning their national identity. More importantly, it is an epic tale of the Israelite supreme deity harnessing the power of the cosmos to wreak havoc upon the Egyptian pharaoh and free the Israelites, evoking the powerful imagery of the creation myth in Genesis in order to tell a creation myth of the

> *"Moses would be understood as the hero Jeroboam failed to become."*

origins of the Israelites.[92] To strengthen his thesis, Oblath draws upon geography to point out the contradictions and inconsistencies between the sites described in the Hebrew Bible (particularly the Red Sea, or Yam Sûp) and the actual geography of the land. Oblath concludes that the path taken out of Egypt, as described in the Hebrew Bible, is not a plausible one.[93] Thus, drawing upon Bloch-Smith's idea of "ethnos," one could understand the Israelite culture, however exaggerated or mythological it may be, as sharing a collective memory of the exodus. As Hendel notes, the pharaoh is not named in the exodus story, which thereby opens the collective memory to all Israelites who had felt the burden of oppression.[94]

If this is correct, it would corroborate Friedman's theory that the writer of the E source was a Shiloh priest in exile from the south and would explain the heavy emphasis on Moses, the liberator, written to stand in for Jeroboam, who was already hiding in Egypt from Solomon. But, Moses is still a

---

86.   Michael Oblath. The Exodus Itinerary Sites. Guest Lecture at American River College. Sacramento, CA. 12 February, 2005.

87.   Harris, 194.

88.   1 Kings 12:1-17.

89.   1 Kings 12:2.

90.   1 Kings 12:20.

91.   Oblath, 12 February, 2005.

92.   Michael D. Oblath, *The Exodus Itinerary Sites: Their Locations from the Perspective of the Biblical Sources* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 25.

93.   Oblath, 98-105.

94.   Ronald Hendel, "The Exodus in Biblical Memory," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 120, No. 4 (Winter, 2001), 604-5. JSTOR. CSUS Lib., Sacramento, CA. November 19, 2009.

larger-than-life figure in E. Jeroboam, it should be remembered, erected golden calves at Dan and Beth-El. In this sense, Moses would be understood as the hero Jeroboam failed to become – maintaining his covenant with Yahweh and destroying the golden calves. Thus Moses is elevated to iconic status in E, a figure the exilic northerners could look to with reverence and hope. Indeed, Friedman notes that in the E version, Moses himself is emphasized as acting to free the people, whereas in the J version, it is God who brings about liberation.[95] One might then ask why the J version includes references to Moses and liberation from slavery if the author was from Judah. If Friedman is correct in dating the author of E between 922 and 722, and the author of J between 848 and 722,[96] this allows for plenty of time for oral circulation of the stories before being written down. If the kingdom split in 922, the seventy-four years until 848 is plenty of time for a Jeroboam-like figure to become elevated to a status occupied by Moses. While the two kingdoms were separate politically, the Israelites still regarded themselves as one people and it would be difficult for a compiler of history to omit a story held in such high esteem by a large number of people. Understandably, however, we would expect to find its significance downplayed somewhat, and this is exactly what we find in the J narrative.

Furthermore, if the narratives of the Torah began as a reaction to the socio-political events of the authors' time, the idea that the Israelites originated in the land of Canaan is given more support than theories of conquest or gradual assimilation. Here we find stories of social uprising and religious reform depicted within the same culture. However, it is important to note that the uprising was not necessarily one of class; rather, it likely originated among an educated, yet politically underprivileged marginal group. As we have seen, Baal worship and the Yahweh cult likely co-existed among the majority of the public for centuries. It was the Shiloh priests of Yahweh who began to criticize Baal after they were no longer recognized as a legitimate political force, likely long before kings or the general public felt it necessary. The social uprising theory of Israelite origins then would suggest a much later date for the development of monotheism than the conquest or assimilation theories. Indeed, up until the fall of Judah in 587, there is evidence in the Hebrew Bible of Baal and Asherah worship, although it is not depicted in a positive light.

The D Source

Finally then, we may turn to the source that comprises the seven books of the Hebrew Bible known as the Deuteronomistic History. It is widely accepted (by Friedman, Harris, and others) that the books from Deuteronomy through 2 Kings were likely composed in the seventh century by someone who was very close to King Josiah.[97] The evidence is plentiful. Every king in the entire monarchy is criticized for not removing the golden calf shrines with the exceptions of Hezekiah and Josiah, who

---

95.   Friedman, 80.

96.   Friedman, 87.

97.   Friedman, 117.

removed them.[98] Josiah alone is described as having followed the whole Law of Moses.[99] The entire Deuteronomistic History culminates with the reign of Josiah, with the exception of two final chapters that appear tacked-on, as they lack reference to the "high places" of the calf shrines, which apparently were reinstated after Josiah's death.[100] It seems the author of the D source was greatly concerned with Josiah's religious reform, namely eradicating Baal worship. Friedman draws attention to the covenant Yahweh made with David in 2 Samuel 7:16: "Your family and your kingdom will be established for ever in my sight; your throne will endure for all time." Here, then, Yahweh is depicted as having made a covenant with a king. Josiah reigned from 640-609, which would put the author of D considerably later than when the E and J documents were composed. This seems to suggest that Yahweh's status gradually became more closely associated with the nation of Israel toward the seventh century. The author of D went to great lengths to link Yahweh with the monarchy of Judah in the south and strictly opposing the worship of other deities. Indeed, Josiah's religious reform is a central theme in the Deuteronomistic History. The author even goes so far as to include a prophesy of the reform three hundred years before it occurs.[101] Yahweh, then, firmly linked in a covenant with the monarchy by the seventh century, can by this period be understood as a national god meant to promote the well-being of the state. The author of D sticks with all the kings of Judah, no matter how corrupt they ultimately became, because the religious reforms of Josiah fulfilled the Davidic covenant.[102]

Final Considerations on the Emergence of Monotheism

If it is to be argued that nationalism and political conflict contributed to the rise of monotheism, it must be remembered that twenty-two years after Josiah's death, Judah fell to the Neo-Babylonians in 587. Large powers were on the rise and occupied large amounts of land. The Israelites had already seen this once before when the northern kingdom of Israel fell to the Assyrians in 722. Smith draws attention to the fact that these mighty empires dominating the seventh and sixth centuries attributed their conquests of other lands to the strength of their gods.[103] With Israel and Judah both conquered, the idea of a nationalistic deity seemed beside the point. Rather, Smith argues, "the rise of supra-national empires suggested the model of the super-national god."[104] The Israelites' god, Yahweh, then vaulted to all-powerful controller of the universe. Larger forces were at work than the Israelites were capable of grasping.

Along with this idea, we must take into consideration that the Israelites, like most cultures of the Levant, were great synthesizers. At the beginning of this paper, it was argued that the Israelites and

---

98.   2 Kings 23:15.

99.   2 Kings 23:25.

100.   Friedman, 115.

101.   1 Kings 13:1-3.

102.   Friedman, 115.

103.   Smith, *The Origins of Monotheism in the Bible*, 165.

104.   Ibid.

the Canaanites may have been the same people. We must acknowledge that this may not have been the case. There were many cultures interacting in that region in the twelfth and eleventh centuries and they undoubtedly influenced each other. With respect to religious beliefs, it is particularly difficult to pinpoint the essence of a unique culture, given the heavy interaction among the cultures. However, even if the Israelites and Canaanites were separate cultures, they shared religious ideas, motifs, and even names, as we have seen. The origins of specific deities, for the purposes of this paper, are less important than the synthesis of their traits. It is not, nor may it ever be, clear who the early Israelites really were. Indeed, as Bloch-Smith notes, it was not until the eleventh or tenth century that style of material artifacts "coalesce[ed] into forms continuous through the sixth century."[105] What is clear is that polytheistic ideas were shared and synthesized for centuries until a specific (likely very small) group of people triumphed politically between the seventh and sixth centuries and established a religion with an elevated supreme deity.

---

105.   Bloch-Smith, 411.