

Contents

Letter from the Editors
Letter from the Faculty 4
BAYAN ABUBAKR, Black Citizenship And Welfare 5
MADELINE BELLO, 'Partner, Let Me Upgrade You': Placage in Antebellum New Orleans
CRAIG EPSTEIN, The Manipulation of Race: Black Racial Politics in the 2002 Newark Mayoral Campaign
BRITTA GIGLIOTTI, Growing Iowa: How The State Fair Impacted The Growth And Reputation Of Iowa From 1854-1904 31
LOLA JUSIDMAN, The Environmental Performance of the People's Republic of China during the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
SHIRA MOGIL, Promiscuous Boy, Promiscuous Girl: The Road to Sterilization in Virginia's Progressive Era
EVAN NEUHAUSEN, Solidarity in the Global South? Reporting of the Smith/Carlos Protest at the Mexico City Olympics
CHRISTOPHER VRADIS, Saint-Domingue: The Slave Revolution That Changed the Course of New World History
HONGXUAN YANG, The Anglo-Japanese Alliance Of 1902 And Its Unintended Consequences
Contributors Biographies

VOLUMR 58, SPRING 2017

Ryann McQuaid, Editor-in-Chief

Ahmed Hafezi, Managing Editor

Staff Editors

Julian Ehsan

Evan Neuhausen

Omar Etman

Christina Hong

Rose Khan

Olga Jablonski

Letter from the Editors

As students, we are proud to be able to present research of such quality. We believe these topics represent pressing historical questions, as well as contribute to contemporary conversations. As editors, we proudly present contributions of excellent scholarship.

We are grateful to the NYU Department of History and the CAS Student Council for their generous funding. We also extend a special thank you to our sponsors and advisors in the History Department, who's support and encouragement made this year's journal possible: Professor Stephen Gross, Jackie Menkel and Chelsea Rhodes, and the department's administrative staff.

Finally, we humbly thank those who took the time to entrust their work with our journal and to the professor who encouraged students to submit. We thank our readers for continues support and for taking part in this academic dialogue. We look forward to many more years.

With gratitude, we proudly present the fifty-eighth edition of *The Historian*.

Letter from the Faculty

This is the fifty-eighth edition of New York University's student-led undergraduate historical research journal, *The Historian*, a remarkable achievement for one of the longest running such journals in the United States. *The Historian* showcases some of the cutting edge research conducted by undergraduate students here at NYU, and it is with joy and pride that our community of historians and history lovers greets its publication each spring. All of the work that has gone into publishing this edition—the writing, the selection and editing, the cover art and digital design—has been the product of NYU history majors. It is to them, and the editorial team in particular, that I want to extend a sincere thank you.

The editors-in-chief for this year's publication—Ryann McQuaid and Ahmed Hafezi—have provided outstanding leadership and assembled with the help of their editorial team an exciting array of articles, all of which are based on primary source research. The themes and the geography covered in this volume are refreshingly varied, and representative of how our discipline has expanded dramatically in scope over the past years. We have here articles on the history of race and sexuality, diplomacy and protest, local politics and the environment. Indeed, it is the local and regional emphasis that stands out, perhaps not surprisingly given the increasingly pressing question of how global interconnections can, and have, interacted with local forces and actors to shape our world.

I am extremely grateful to have had the chance to participate in this project, or rather, to watch it unfold under the initiative and careful guidance of our undergraduates.

Stephen Gross Assistant Professor Department of History and Center for European and Mediterranean Studies New York University

Black Citizenship And Welfare

BAYAN ABUBAKR

Barack Obama has been accused of sympathizing with terrorists, forging a birth certificate, being born in Kenya, being a Muslim, and being a citizen of Indonesia. There is an entire Wikipedia page—currently at 11,421 words—dedicated to "Barack Obama citizenship conspiracy theories." Although Obama released his birth certificate in 2008, 23% of the United States continued to believe that he was born in another country. Skepticism about his citizenship existed beyond those who disliked him: nearly 29% of people who said Obama was not born in the United States approved of the job he was doing as President, of whom 23% said they wanted to see him reelected in 2012. ¹ The question of Barack Obama's citizenship wasn't a matter of politics, policy, or partisanship. It was a question of the legitimacy of a black man in the highest office of the United States. Being American, for a black man, is conditional on behaving like a "grateful guest." You can stay here, sure, but in the guest room. You can stay here, sure, but you can't be President. You can't be *the* American, at least not while being black.

Black Americans are treated as subjects rather than citizens. A subject "is under the power of another; but a citizen is a unit of a mass of free people who collectively possess sovereignty." This has manifested itself through state and federal welfare systems: "citizens receive welfare as an *entitlement* the government has an obligation [to fund] as compensation for their social contribution or as a prerequisite to their participation in sociopolitical and economic life." Subjects, on the other hand, receive "inferior, inefficient, and stigmatizing *assistance* at the government's discretion," and their benefits depend on their conformity to "behavioral rules and submission to government scrutiny and assessment." Ultimately, welfare for subjects allows the government to rule them, as they are vulnerable to "official or quasi-official state sanctioned inquiry and surveillance." This is accompanied by the government's authority to investigate and control these persons' behavior. For instance, some states have conditioned payments on mothers' compliance with varying standards of sexual morality and have tested her deviance through means and morals testing. In the last thirty years, at least thirty states attempted to modify their welfare programs to include some form of behavior modification. This system of welfare derives from a racist, divisive, and tyrannical history.

Modern welfare systems deny black Americans their right to privacy. This is maintained by the fact that they are not considered natural citizens of the United States. As an American,

¹ "Section 6: Obama, 2012, and the Tea Party," PEW Research Center (May 4, 2011)

 $^{^{2}}$ Wesley Morris, "Colin Kaepernick and the Question of Who Gets to Be Called a 'Patriot'" (September 12, 2016)

³ David Ramsay, "A Dissertation on the Manner of Acquiring the Character and Privileges of a Citizen of the United States," (1789).

⁴ Dorothy Roberts, "Welfare and the Problem of Black Citizenship," (1996)

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Joel Handler and Margaret Rosenheim, "Privacy in Welfare: Public Assistance and Juvenile Justice," (1966).

⁷ Dorothy Roberts, "The Welfare Debate: Who Pays for Procreation?" in Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty, 226-230.

blackness is the ultimate marker of illegitimacy, and this has reinforced itself through various state sanctioned welfare systems. The development of welfare systems as a means of controlling poor individuals, families, and communities of color can be traced through four Supreme Court cases: *Dandridge v. Williams* (1970), *Wyman v. James* (1971), *Lyng v. Castillo* (1986), and *Bowen v. Gilliard* (1987).

To be black and a citizen of the United States is to live in a paradoxical world. Blackness and citizenship, in the ways in which they were constructed, exist in constant tension with one another. Citizenship was built off the backs of people of color by and for whiteness. Whiteness is the defining marker of citizenship without which one cannot be considered a natural citizen of the United States. Citizenship is itself an abstract term, but it signifies an emergence of liberties specific to the United States and the modernity of the Western world. Citizenship was constituted and reinforced by social relations established by colonial governance in the Americas, Asia, and Africa. These differences made it possible for Western liberalism to theorize and practice the universality of human freedom, "despite the fact that freedom for slaves, colonized, and indigenous people were exempted by this ideology." To individuals deemed worthy, citizenship granted them civility, and a right to privacy and intimacy.

Citizenship grants Americans political emancipation, social equality, and the promise of economic freedom. Political emancipation, in particular, is a critical part of citizenship. For European and North American citizens in the 19th century, ideas of privacy were constituted within an individual's right to political protection. This understanding of citizenship can be traced in the political philosophical traditions of Locke, Rousseau, Kant, and Hegel. They consider and analyze the modern individual, or the Western man, who possesses "interiority of person" as well as the private household. Hegel, for example, traced the development of citizenship through various forms of privacy: property, family, and domestic life. This notion of privacy became critical to defining the modern liberal individual and how citizenship itself became a function of privacy.

During the Progressive era, white women advocated for the universality of welfare systems, but made sure that black people were excluded from these systems. This was justified through beliefs such as: "blacks needed less to live on than whites," and that, as one Southern public assistance field supervisor claimed, "the number of Negro cases is few due to the unanimous feeling on the part of the staff and the board that there are more work opportunities for Negro women." The Civil Rights movement, however, began opening the welfare system to black Americans. It forced states to relax welfare eligibility requirements, raise benefit levels, and increase the availability of benefits to single-parent households. The federal government, under the scrutiny of the international community and civil rights activists, proceeded to set up several programs designed to integrate more black Americans into federal and state assistance programs. But this victory came with consequences. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), a system of welfare administered by states with federal funding, became "increasingly associated with black mothers already stereotyped as lazy, irresponsible, and overly fertile. It became burdened with behavior modification rules, work requirements, and reduced effective

⁸ Lisa Lowe, "The Intimacies of Four Continents," in *The Intimacies of Four Continents*, 16-20.

⁹ Ibid, 28.

¹⁰ Ibid, 27-29.

¹¹ Dorothy Roberts, "The Welfare Debate: Who Pays for Procreation?," in *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*, 202-246.

benefit levels."¹² Furthermore, the inclusion of black Americans in welfare programs became stigmatized as proof of black people's lack of work ethic, perpetual depravity, and dependency. The black woman, as a result, became the state's enemy. This black woman depleted the state's resources, was a site of poverty and destitution, and tarnished the purity of "Americanness." In response, welfare became a tool of social control and an entry point for the state into the lives of poor, black families.

Under AFDC, the state of Maryland computed a "standard of need" for each family. In Maryland, this standard increased with every additional member of the family, but at the same time, it incrementally decreased. Rather than paying the full amount of determined need to each family, the state, to conserve funds, established a "ceiling of about \$250 per month, regardless of the size of the family and its actual need." This resulted in smaller families receiving "100 percent of their state-determined minimum subsistence while larger families were receiving a lesser percentage, the exact percentage reduction depending upon the size of the family."¹⁵ Larger families were discriminated against and were more likely to starve than smaller families. This is invidious and explicitly prejudiced. Maryland could not direct its efforts to cap the state budget at larger families, as there is no compelling reason for them to do so. Larger families are no less justified to welfare benefits than smaller families. In its totality, this policy was designed to make life "more difficult for low-income families, thrust them deeper into poverty, and ultimately, discourage additional births." This family cap, and others like it, was intended to prevent mothers on welfare from having additional children, as this would ultimately ease public burden. This sort of policy is based on the myth of the sexually irresponsible welfare queen: a woman of color who has multiple children to cash in on her welfare benefits. This was built off the premise that women should not have children if they cannot provide for them without welfare; considering this, children by welfare mothers were another means by which the welfare queen could rob the state. Family caps are an extension of a "misogynoir" stereotype. ¹⁷ Capping welfare curbs the incentive to produce more children, supposedly putting an end to the moral decline and pathology in poor communities of color.

Dandridge v. Williams (1970) punished unconventional families through the state of Maryland's "standard of need." The plaintiffs were Linda Williams, a single mother, and Junius and Jeanette Gary, a married couple. They were parents of eight children each. They filed a case against Edmund P. Dandridge, chairman of the Maryland State Board of Public Welfare, because Maryland's method of calculating a "standard of need" discriminated against larger families and was a violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The plaintiffs also claimed that the "standard of need" calculation conflicted with the stated purpose of AFDC, as per the Social Security Act of 1935 ("[aid] shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals"). The District Court found that the regulation was unconventional and in violation of the Social Security Act. The Supreme Court, in a 5-3 decision, found that the Maryland provision was not unconstitutional and was not in violation of stated AFDC policies. The Court looked to a precedent set by King v. Smith (1968), which described AFDC as "a

¹² Ibid, 240-246.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Dandridge v. Williams, 397 U.S. 471 (1970).

¹⁵ Mevlyn Durchslag, "Welfare Litigation, the Eleventh Amendment and State Sovereignty: Some Reflections on *Dandridge v. Williams*," (1975).

¹⁶ Jamelle Bouie, "The Most Discriminatory Law in the Land," (June 17, 2014).

¹⁷ Eliza Anyangwe, "Misogynoir: where racism and sexism meet," (October 5, 2015).

scheme of cooperative federalism," and granted the states "considerable latitude in allocating their AFDC resources, since each state is free to set its own standard of need and to determine the level of benefits by the number of funds it devotes to the program." The Court also reasoned that the state, by capping welfare benefits, could encourage employment in the marketplace. In his dissent, Justice William Douglas warned of "the danger that the state could use welfare programs to 'wield its economic whip' over disfranchised groups, forcing them to dance in response to the dominant groups' fantasies and phobias about its own Soul." ¹⁹

Welfare caps policed welfare recipients. These caps weren't the only barriers to welfare, however. Caseworkers prove to be yet another means of restricting access to welfare, and they negatively affect the experiences of welfare recipients of color.

Caseworker visits are an essential part of the welfare system's oppressive and invasive methods. They are a form of checks and balances that ensure that the state's money is being used as directed. These visits come with intrusive questions with prodding, and suspicious undertones. They are also laced with a systemic racial bias; "white welfare recipients benefit considerably from the discretionary actions of their caseworkers...black and white welfare clients may be incorrectly attributed to differences in work ethic, personal motivation, or attitude."²⁰ Caseworkers are the intermediaries between welfare systems, relevant government agencies, and welfare recipients. They can help define and set the parameters of a recipient's under welfare, and they have free reign in doing so. Unequal treatment at the hands of caseworkers is unfair, discriminatory, and reinforces the stereotype of the malicious black welfare recipient. The same stereotypes that drove welfare agencies to enforce means and morals testing to validate eligibility for welfare created the need and desire to use caseworkers as the designated gatekeepers of welfare. Caseworkers are another agent of surveillance that can ensure where, why, and most importantly, to whom welfare is being distributed. Caseworkers are a point of entry into the lives of poor families. When these poor families are also families of color, caseworkers become a point of entry, monitoring, and behavior modification. The biases that muddle a caseworker's judgment can play into the benefits a recipient is eligible for. It is for this reason that welfare should not have to depend on caseworker visits to "verify" the legitimacy of a recipient's claims.

Wyman v. James (1971) was a direct and insidious violation of Barbara James' right to privacy. James was a welfare recipient and single mother. After having a son, James applied for assistance under New York's AFDC program. She was deemed eligible and began receiving her benefits after a caseworker visited her apartment. Two years later, James was scheduled to be visited again by another caseworker—this was required under New York state law and could affect James' benefits under AFDC. James refused the caseworker's visit because "questions concerning personal relationships, beliefs, and behavior are raised and pressed, which is unnecessary for a determination of continuing eligibility." James continued to refuse the visit, and AFDC assistance was terminated, even though James "expressed willingness to cooperate and to permit the visit elsewhere." James filed a claim under Section 1983 of the Civil Rights Act of 1971 in the District Court for the Southern State of New York. She claimed "that the

¹⁸ King v. Smith, 392 U.S. 309 (1968).

¹⁹ Dandridge v. Williams, 397 U.S. 471 (1970).

²⁰ Susan Gooden, "All Things Not Being Equal: Differences in Caseworker Support Toward Black and White Welfare Clients," (1997).

²¹ Wyman v. James, 400 U.S. 309 (1971).

²² Ibid.

caseworker visit was a search,"²³ and as such, would violate her Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. The District Court ruled in her favor, the state of New York appealed, and the case was sent to the Supreme Court. In a 6-3 opinion, the Court found that the caseworker visit was not an "unreasonable search or seizure," and therefore, was not in violation of James' Fourth Amendment rights. Justice Harry Blackmun, writing for the majority of the Court, reasoned that the visit was not forced or compelled, meaning that "there is no entry of the home and there is no search."²⁴ Furthermore, Blackmun argued the visit would allow the state to ensure that its welfare funds were being spent appropriately. In his dissent, Justice William Douglas argued that welfare was a form of surveillance:

In this manner, welfare acted as an agent of violence; Welfare has long been considered the equivalent of charity and its recipients have been subjected to all kinds of dehumanizing experiences in the government's efforts to police its welfare payments. In fact, over half a billion dollars are expended annually for administration and policing in connection with the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. Why such large sums are necessary for administration and policing has never been adequately explained. No such sums are spent policing the government subsidies granted to farmers, airlines, steamship companies, and junk mail dealers... The bureaucracy of modern government is not only slow, lumbering, and oppressive; it is omnipresent. It pries more and more into private affairs... ²⁵

Wyman v. James legitimized yet another tool of government and state-sanctioned surveillance. It legalized an odious and discriminatory invasion of privacy that sustained the notion that black Americans should be treated as subjects, always to be surveilled, rather than as citizens of the United States.

In 1982, the Food Stamp Program was amended and eligibility and benefit levels in the program began to be determined on a "household" basis. This definition of "household" did not include more distant relatives or groups of unrelated persons living together. Rather, a "household" consisted of two parents, their children, and the parents' siblings. Before this revision, the federal food stamp program evaluated eligibility on an individual basis. A group of individuals would be eligible for more food stamps if they consisted of several households. rather than just one. These amendments target a particular kind of welfare recipient, the recipient that does not fit into the traditional, normalized definition of a "household": "in Lyng v. Castillo several families lost all or part of their food stamp benefits when adult children or siblings were forced to reside together...[T]he Food Stamp Program penalizes families that turn to their relatives for shelter." ²⁶ Children whose income is available to a household applying for assistance were forced to consider moving out of their homes, refusing to help support their family, or surrendering their income to support their household's chance at receiving adequate benefits. These amendments fall in line with other revisions to welfare programs during the late 1980's and early 1990's that represented an ideological shift in response to the War on Poverty. This shift called for federal deregulation, criticized the welfare state, and aimed to reduce federal

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Lyng v. Castillo, 477 U.S. 635 (1986).

aid to impoverished communities. Communities and individuals of color were scapegoated, as they were, by mainstream definition, the quintessence of the welfare state and how damning it was to American society. This is the sort of ideology that created the foundation for the statutory revision in question. It redefined what a "household" could legally look like for families in need of welfare. Through its intrusive approach to regulating funds, it treated welfare recipients like subjects, rather than citizens.

Lyng v. Castillo (1986) restructured and redefined the statutory definition of a household. The Castillo family—the plaintiffs—consisted of a mother, a father, and their children who lived with the mother's adult daughter. Although they were separate living units, the Castillos were denied eligibility as a separate household because they lived with an adult who already received food stamps. The Castillos claimed that "the statutory distinction between parents and children, and all other groups of individuals violates the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment."²⁷ The District Court of the Southern District of Texas invalidated this distinction because it "directly and substantially" interfered with family living arrangements. The decision was sent to the Supreme Court, where the lower court's decision was reversed; a state's ability to define a "household" was found constitutional. The Court found that "Congress could reasonably determine that close relatives sharing a home—almost by definition—tend to purchase and prepare meals together while distant relatives and unrelated individuals might not be so inclined." The Court also reasoned that Congress had an "undeniably legitimate desire to prevent fraud and waste in the food stamp program." Justice Thurgood Marshall, in his dissent, argued that "the government has chosen to intrude into the family dining room...[and] what possible interest can the government have in preventing members of a family from dining as they choose?" He claimed that there were no grounds for Congress's assumption that related persons living together were a significant source of fraud. Rather, Marshall claimed that Congress determined that the government could save money by "tightening the definition of an eligible food stamp household" and scapegoating larger, more unconventional families. ²⁸ Lvng is discriminatory in that it doesn't provide reasonable rationale for it targeting blended or unusual "households," and in doing so, appears to directly attack the poor, "unconventional" welfare recipient.

The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 (DERFA) was an attempt by the AFDC, backed by Congress, to use family size as a marker for eligibility. Before 1984, families with dependent children applying for AFDC could exclude children with outside financial support from their filing. This changed with the passage of DERFA. DERFA amended the AFDC program to require families to include all children living in the same house in the filing, even if they had outside support. This meant that the total sum of AFDC benefits could be reduced by an amount corresponding to the sum of any child support received. DERFA served as an intrusion into private households and family networks. It punished families that did not operate as typical two-parent households: families that are blended, families with multiple parents, and families that don't fit the "two-point-five-kids" mold. In America, these are families with grandmothers raising their grandchildren, with aunts raising their nieces and nephews, and families where kinship exists beyond bloodlines and biological parenthood. Although "kinship care" is common among all races, cultures, and ethnicities, black children are "more likely than other racial or

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

ethnic groups to live in a household without either parent and not be raised by kin." DERFA was in reckless disregard for the privacy to which these households are entitled.

This, however, fails to have any substantive meaning because poor people of color are considered subjects, rather than citizens of the state. Their homes warrant surveillance and intrusion because their homes are where poor people of color breed their illegitimate and toxic cultures, the very cultures that push them in the direction of welfare. These are families that are considered illegitimate because fathers don't live with their children, and the mothers in these households are not always the mothers of said children. These families are looked upon negatively because they use the state's money to fund their "unorthodox" lifestyles, and this is unacceptable. Therefore, welfare recipients—especially recipients of color who lead "unconventional" lifestyles—need to be monitored by the state.

In Bowen v. Gilliard (1987), the Supreme Court found that the state may force families to "shrink rearrange, or break up to qualify for benefits" through DERFA. 30 In 1970, Betty Mae Gilliard, a welfare recipient, gave birth to her second child. Since she was receiving child support from the child's father, the state deducted the child support from the benefits she was eligible for as the parent of an eight-person household. Gilliard sued and the District Court ruled in her favor. The court claimed that she could exclude the child receiving child support from her filing unit because the seven-person family benefits were greater than what she would receive from the eight-person family benefits minus the child support. When North Carolina adopted the DERFA, Gilliard and other members of the class action filed a motion to reopen the case. They argued that the DERFA was a violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the takings clause of the Fifth Amendment. The District Court ruled in Gilliard's favor, North Carolina appealed the decision, and the case was sent to the Supreme Court. The Court found that the DERFA amendment did not violate the due process clause and its equal protection component because it "does not interfere with a family's fundamental right to live in the type of family unit it chooses." ³¹ Furthermore, the Court found that Congress's rationale for passing DERFA—reducing the national deficit and distributing aid to needy families in the fairest way possible—was constitutional. The majority decision failed to consider how DERFA would affect family structures and networks once it was put into place. These ramifications were explored in Justice William Brennan's dissent, where he argued that DERFA was an intrusion that was unprecedented, intolerable, and muddled the line between "public citizen and private person." In this case, the federal government "directly and substantially interfered with family living arrangements.",32

The Supreme Court played a substantial role in legitimizing stereotypes and commonly held beliefs of welfare recipients. These beliefs, given welfare's racialized history, were projected onto the lives of people of color, and these projections fed into policy and rhetoric. They further reinforced the idea that welfare recipients of color were subjects of the state that needed to be policed, rather than citizens. These Supreme Court rulings are important because they shed light onto the perception of welfare during what some might argue to be its demise. The fall of welfare was marked by the rise of the War on Drugs and the heightened

²⁹ Tyreasa Washington, James P. Gleeson, and Kelly L. Rulison "Competence and African-American Children in Informal Kinship Care: The Role of Family," (2013).

³⁰ Bowen v. Gilliard, 483 U.S. 587 (1987).

³¹ A.W. Phinney III, "Feminism, Epistemology, and the Rhetoric of Law: Reading Bowen v. Gilliard," (1989).

³² Bowen v. Gilliard, 483 U.S. 587 (1987).

criminalization of the black body, the black family, and black communities. It is unsurprising, to say the least, that welfare became another means by which the government could target people of color

People of color have and will continue to be subjected to the tyranny of the United States. They are not natural citizens of the United States. They created citizenship, but citizenship was not created for them. Welfare is based on this notion, and it has, and will continue to, operate on the body of the black subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anyangwe, Eliza. "Misogynoir: where racism and sexism meet." *The Guardian*, October 5, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2015/oct/05/what-is-misogynoir

Bouie, Jamelle. "The Most Discriminatory Law in the Land." *Slate*, June 17, 2014. http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2014/06/the_maximum_family_grant_a and family caps a racist law that punishes the.html

Durchslag, Melvyn R. "Welfare Litigation, the Eleventh Amendment and State Sovereignty: Some Reflections on *Dandridge v. Williams*." *Case Western Reserve Law Review* 26, no. 1 (1975): 60-100.

Gleeson, James P., Kelly L. Rulison, and Tyreasa Washington. "Competence and African-American Children in Informal Kinship Care: The Role of Family." *Children and Youth Services Review* 35, no. 9 (2013): 1305-12.

Gooden, Susan. "All Things Not Being Equal: Differences in Caseworker Support Toward Black and White Welfare Clients." *Harvard Journal of African-American Public Policy* 4 (1997): 23-33.

Handler, Joel, and Margaret Rosenheim. "Privacy in Welfare: Public Assistance and Juvenile Justice." *Law and Contemporary Problem* 31 (1966): 377-412.

Lowe, Lisa. The Intimacies of Four Continents. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.

Morris, Wesley. "Colin Kaepernick and the Question of Who Gets to Be Called a 'Patriot'" *The New York Times Magazine*, September 12, 2016. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/magazine/who-gets-to-be-called-a-patriot.html

Phinney III, A.W. "Feminism, Epistemology, and the Rhetoric of Law: Reading *Bowen v. Gilliard.*" *Harvard Women's Law Journal* 12 (1989): 151-80.

Ramsay, David. "A Dissertation on the Manner of Acquiring the Character and Privileges of a Citizen of the United States." *Evans Early American Imprint Collection*, 1789. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=evans;idno=N17114.0001.001

Roberts, Dorothy E. "Welfare and the Problem of Black Citizenship" (1996). Faculty

Scholarship. Paper 1283. http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty/scholarship/1283/

—. Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty. New York: Penguin Random House, 1998.

"Section 6: Obama, 2012, and the Tea Party," *Pew Research Center*, May 4, 2011. http://www.people-press.org/2011/05/04/section-6-obama-2012-and-the-tea-party/

Dandridge v. Williams, 397 U.S. 471 (1970).

Bowen v. Gilliard, 483 U.S. 587 (1987).

Lyng v. Castillo, 477 U.S. 635 (1986).

Wyman v. James, 400 U.S. 309 (1971). King v. Smith, 392 U.S. 309 (1968).

'Partner, Let Me Upgrade You': Placage in Antebellum New Orleans

MADELINE BELLO

The acquisition of the Louisiana territory in 1804, by the United States, left the city of New Orleans in a seemingly awkward position. By the time Louisiana was acquired by the United States in 1803 from France, and before then Spain, the city of New Orleans had become its own progressive and diversified cosmopolitan with pre-existing customs that contributed to the presence of an array of cultures and races. White and black creoles, along with Spaniards and Frenchmen, signares, mulattos, quadroons and octoroons, free, enslaved, etc.; the categories were endless. Before the turn of the 19th century, the people of New Orleans lived in a quasi-melting pot type setting with different kinds of racial mixing prevalent. These practices were permitted through some of the rules of *Code Noir*, which detailed and also restricted the conditions of slaves, free people of color, and their sexual relationship to white creoles under the French empire. This admixture and racial ambiguity seen throughout the city was startling and yet fascinating to American travelers and settlers, who migrated to the city during westward expansion and brought with them their own American customs and laws. This meant the replacement of the Code Noir with a range of stricter American laws outlining racial categories and their many restrictions, like miscegenation laws.

The shift in power certainly did not stop people from engaging in interracial relationships, in fact, they continued to persist into and throughout the antebellum period. Historians observed that during this time, there was a noticeably high percentage of women of color entering into relationships with white men because of the possibilities to social and economic access.³ These white men typically had their sights set on mixed black women in particular, usually seeking mulattos (half black), quadroons (quarter black) and octoroons (an eighth black) to take as partners.⁴ Likewise, many mixed women who understood these men's desire for exoticism sought after wealthy white men.

Outside travelers exploring New Orleans often called these sorts of extralegal relationships *placages* (pluh-sahzh), . They claimed that wealthy white men would take a mixed woman of color (quadroons and octoroons being the most popular) as a sexual partner/concubine while also becoming the woman's sponsor. This was typically guaranteed and carried through with a drafted contract.⁵ In more recent scholarship, placage is used as an umbrella term to cite these relationships, yet they are often strictly defined as regarding to quadroon and octoroon women whose mother (usually a mixed women herself) would conduct the matchmaking to a wealthy white man.⁶ Scholars often state that man would rarely marry the woman but would conceive children with her. Historical findings also indicate that these relationships were often voluntary but occasionally set up by relatives of the woman and sometimes non-consentive. This paper, therefore, explores the circumstances for why some mixed black women entered into

¹ Michael Gomez, Reversing Sail (Cambridge University Press, 2005), 94.

² Shirley Thompson, Exiles at Home-The Struggle to Become American in Creole New Orleans (Harvard University Press: 2009), 114.

³ Thompson, Exiles at Home, 13.

⁴ Ibid, 52.

⁵ Ibid, 11-12

⁶ Monique Guillory, Some Enchanted Evening on the Auction Block The Cultural Legacy of the New Orleans Quadroon Balls, (New York University: 1999), ix.

placage relationships during 19th century antebellum New Orleans; using placage as a more umbrella term for contracted relationships. What were the social, economic, and political benefits, and also challenges, that made their positions so enticing? In understanding their agency and autonomy, were these women mere concubines or, did they make the system work for themselves?

Social Benefits and Challenges of Placage

Women in 19th century America typically had minimal freedom and were limited to their traditional gender roles. Free black women and other women of color were susceptible to the same limitations, in addition to what Liza Ze Winters cites as "the racial caste system". This meant that women of color were extremely confined to a small number of social positions and strata outside of a slave. Since New Orleans became an American city, American social stratas were implemented and orchestrated throughout the region leaving free blacks with limited social opportunities for uplift. However, black women who were clearly phenotypically mixed were able to find sources to elevate themselves socially by engaging in a placage relationships. This was usually gained through any children born out the relationship.

Ancestry and blood relations were vital to most Americans in the beginning of the 19th century, but especially to blacks. Being able to trace one's ancestors was a huge privilege that asserted wealth and high social class with the ability have a substantial family tree. Therefore, women of color, who were in intimate relationships with wealthy white men, often wanted their children to carry a well standing surname. The benefit of association was different of course for each gender, for example, for male children, it meant that they could possibly carry on their father's name, while using it as a social networking tool and (depending on his ability to pass as white) potentially marry a white woman, hopefully producing white passing children. For a female child, she would have also been able to use her last name given by her father as a tool to navigate the social arena in hopes for a suitable bachelor that could support her standard of living. The support of the standard of living.

These benefits came with only the assumption that the father would recognize and legitimize any children produced from his relations with a mixed woman. This was one of the biggest challenges these women and their children faced for even with their skin privilege, mixed women in New Orleans still found themselves bound by American attitudes towards blacks, especially those who could potentially pass as white. Jennifer Spear in her book *Race, Sex and Social Order in Early New Orleans* describes how the protection of whiteness was a popular cause in reaction to heavy anxieties in the antebellum south, giving way to legislation like the 1808 ban on "marriage between free whites and free people of color and free whites and slaves," used in order to prevent admixture. Such laws and policies did not stop people from living together nor seeing each other socially, but instituted miscegenation socially as a highly shameful act that was typically placed shame on the mixed black mothers and children and would continue for generations.

These challenges also, at times, denied many mixed women and their children from forming wider kinships and disrupted areas of family intimacy. By disassociating the mother and

⁷ Lisa Ze Winters *The Mulatto Concubine: Terror, Intimacy, Freedom, and Desire in the Black Atlantic,* (University of Georgia Press: 2016), 42.

⁸ Jennifer Spear, Race, Sex and Social Order in Early New Orleans, (John Hopkins University: 2009), 218.

⁹ Thompson, Exiles at Home, 141.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Spear, Race, Sex and Social Order, 201.

child from the father and his family often isolated them into a state of near invisibility. For example, if the father did not recognize nor legitimized the child, they would be cast out of his social and family circle and kept at a quiet distance. Clark says in one instance of her book, *The Strange History of The American Quadroon*, that placage relationships were deemed as "extramoral associations... happening alongside the moral and juridic family", meaning the white man would have two families; one he would recognize socially and one kept hidden from the public, despite the commonality. Surely, this realization for the outcasted family must have been difficult in understanding one's own system of kinship was strained and partly removed, especially when understanding siblinghood with the father's "legitimate children" 13.

One question that many historians and scholars wonder about, in regards to these relationships, is how were these formally arranged? I found that the answer is multilayered and circumstantial for not every mixed woman entered into these situations for the same reason. However, one of the most popular and notorious social pathways were the quadroon balls. In contemporary discourse this is a highly debated topic on whether these social occasions were used as a formal liaisons for mixed black women and wealthy white men or perhaps mythology for tourist. Monique Guillory in her dissertation, *Some Enchanted Evening on the Auction Block The Cultural Legacy of the New Orleans Quadroon Ball*, argues that there were no formal records stating that these quadroon Balls were official forms of practices nor settings for placages set ups. ¹⁴ She also states that the documentation written by travelers from the North during antebellum were "skewed by their own personal prejudices", especially when his or her agenda was to display the racially harmonious lifestyles people in New Orleans lived for the abolitionist cause. ¹⁵

In John Blassingame's research for his 1973 book *Black New Orleans* however, he cites a specific Quadroon picnic that was held in July 1847, reported by the New Orleans *Republican*, obviously a local newspaper. ¹⁶ In the article he states that it was set up by distinguished quadroon women who invited wealthy white men. ¹⁷ The argument provided by Guillory is certainly something to consider while understanding quadroon balls yet, the evidence Blassingame shows can also tell us that these were social occasions with a highly exclusive guest list. Although these texts were written in very different times, they both offer different views in scholarship of these balls and pathways into placage relationships. Another instance when a woman would be arranged and perhaps forced into a placage relationship is when she was formerly enslaved by her partner.

This then becomes arguably another social benefit that placage relations offered for mixed women during antebellum New Orleans --the possibility of manumission. The discussion of placage relationships during the pre-Civil war era must then be considered with the experiences of non-freed mixed black women. Because of various legislation preventing white males from marrying their slaves, a previously popular way of manumission, white men had relations with female slave under the veil of concubine. Lisa Ze Winters cites Eliza Potter's autobiography, that details her travels to New Orleans as a free black woman from Philadelphia in the 1840's, where she discovered one interesting case in particular between a white man and

¹² Emily Clark, *The Strange History of the American Quadroon: Free Women of Color in the Revolutionary Atlantic World*, (University of North Carolina Press Books: 2013), 159.

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ Guillory, Some Enchanted Evening on the Auction Block, 19.

¹⁵ Ibid., 20.

¹⁶ John Blassingame, Black New Orleans, (University of Chicago Press: 1973) 202-203.

¹⁷ Ibid., 202.

his mulatta slave:

In contrast to travelers accounts that cast New Orleans's free(d) quadroons as extraordinary agential, Potter's descriptions of placage and quadroon balls foreground the slave economy that anchors sexual relations between white men and women of African descent, whether bonded or free. Noting that free women of color often proprietors of boarding houses in New Orleans, Potter introduces her reader to one such woman who is "very beautiful and very wealthy"...Discussing the woman, Potter rights, "she inherited this property by her husband and master, he emancipated her... he died, leaving her in possession of his wealth".¹⁸

Winter points to an unromanticized viewing of placage relations through this primary account that depicts a mulatta concubine and her master then turned husband. Viewing this description socially, the reader can see that although this unidentified woman was this man's slave/concubine, she was able to access a way to freedom and eventual wealth because of her relationship with her master and eventually inherited his entire estate. Achieving manumission placed this women into a new strata in society, consequently enabling her to receive her husband/former master's inheritance which she could certainly not do as his slave. Simultaneously, Winters argues that this woman's wealth was made by her husband through herself being his property thus Winters sees the woman still as a passive figure socially and then economically. Agency, therefore, was absent in this woman's pathway to freedom who inherited his property which at one point included her, ironically. This contributes towards some of the social challenges that mixed women who were freed by their partner encountered.

In addition to Winters's point, it is interesting to consider situations where enslaved women entered as a concubine (consensually or not), but then freed by their sponsors. Were these freed women still expected to abide by any accords drawn out in the relationship prior to manumission? One could argue yes, because of their limited social power and access to resources put them at a disadvantage and even still indebted to them former master. Not much data has shown quantitative results of how many enslaved women entered into the relationships as drafted concubines or as sexual/romantic partners, but either way, that is difficult to decipher when considering a woman's consent while simultaneously being the man's physical property. Another downside or limitation that mixed black women in placages faced was their permanent place in the racial caste system, which blocked them from accesses to various social resources while still providing a second class citizenship. Many women involved in placages however, found various ways and loopholes to their fixed position through monetary means.

Economic Benefits and Challenges in Placages

Sponsorship was perhaps one of most enticing elements that was typically promised through placages relationships with wealthy white men. This meant that in the terms and conditions of the contract, formal or informal, the woman would receive "gifts" in exchange for any services requested of her. When understanding these agreements at first, it is easy to quickly label such relationships as a fancy way of performing prostitution. In fact, these women, and other women of color who were deemed as sexually available to white men outside of placages, were sometimes referred to in letter writings by men as "fancy maids" because of the

¹⁸ Winters, The Mulatto Concubine, 173.

¹⁹ Blassingame, Black New Orleans, 17.

exchange in monetary values.²⁰ It is also important to note too that the title "fancy maid" was a tool employed to veil not only the race of the "maid" but also the extent of the the encounter (i.e. rape, consensual miscegenation, etc.).

Following the aforementioned assertion, the fancy prostitute stigma grew in popularity during the antebellum New Orleans as an increasing number of Anglo-Americans migrated to the Louisiana. Many migrants came from southern states to set up more plantations near and around the city thus brought with them many of their racist ideologies. Still, it can be assumed that there were many mixed black women who entered into placage relationships, who knew of the hazards of being apart of that stigma but, decided to pursue a white wealthy man as her sponsor in order to be financially secure. Because these women's social opportunities were vastly limited, they were still able to find economic outlets to any financial struggles or to maintain their standard of living. According to Thompson, the contracts that were set in place for these relationships would cite what specific "gifts" the woman and any possible children would receive. This included a small house that was usually far from the man's own home, an allowance (weekly, monthly, etc.) for food, clothing, household materials, and anything needed for her children.²¹ On some occasions too, the man would give her a sort of bonus like small luxury items.²²

Ownership and inheritance of land and other real estate were another economic benefit that these women of color were able to receive in many placage relationships. This is one perk that contributed towards many of these women's wealth accumulation and even generational wealth. In some of these relations, men would often give the house and land to the woman and her children he was involved with, who would be owners of said property outright or when the relationship was deemed over, or in the case of his death. In many circumstances, in fact, the man would leave the house to the woman and her children in the will of his death. There are many instances in which mixed women, who were involved in placages with a wealthy white men, were able to obtain valuable assets left by the man in his will.

For instance, the famous case of Eulalie Mandeville, who was the daughter of Count Mandeville and his former slave mulatta Marie Jeanne. ²⁴ Eulalie (a quadroon), was recognized and legitimized by her father and went on to be in a relationship (suggestively placage) with Eugene Macarty, a wealthy white man who inherited his family fortune, and had several children with him. Before his death, Mandeville and Macarty were married, despite several civil codes forbidding miscegenation, however Macarty died only a few days after in 1845. Upon his death, Macarty left most of his real estate and other assets to Eulalie and her children inciting a lawsuit made by the Macarty family but lost their appeal in the Supreme Court of Louisiana. After her fight to keep Macarty's assets, Mandeville became one of the wealthiest women of color in New Orleans history prior to the Civil War, with her family inheriting the money for several more generations. ²⁵ Mandeville's case is extremely extraordinary especially with her success as a free black woman during the time of antebellum, and after into reconstruction when so many blacks were disenfranchised that is was nearly impossible for most to build any sort of wealth nor generational wealth.

²⁰ Edward Baptist, "Cuffy,' 'Fancy Maids,' and 'One-Eyed Men': Rape, Commodification, and the Domestic Slave Trade in the United States", *American Historical Association* (2001), 1621.

²¹ Thompson, Exiles at Home, 166.

²² Ibid., 167.

²³ Ibid.,165.

²⁴ Ibid.,190.

²⁵ Thompson, Exiles at Home, 195.

The case of Mandeville yields back to the legitimization of children who were born out of placage relationships and what they gained in the economic benefaction of their mother. As seen with the Mandeville/Macarty case, many of these men would leave assets to their children in the case of death however, there are many instances when the man dies the mother and children are not left with anything. Often times, the family of the man took hold of his capital and removed the mother and children of his placage relationship from their house and/or belongings. Thus, in order for the mother to ensure the child would receive benefits (inheritance being the most important), she has to make sure her children are first recognized and made legitimate legally by the father in his estate. That way even if the father does not our line inheritance in his will after he dies, the mother and child can still legally fight for atonements.

This can be seen in the case of Magdelaine Cabaret who, similar to Mandeville, lived for many years as a concubine to Joseph Carrel whose siblings attempted to disinherit her and her children (legitimized by the father) after Carrel's death in 1843. ²⁶ The court however ruled against Cabaret on the bases that "Carrel's will had not been properly written" meaning he did not specifically outline inheritance for her or her children. ²⁷ When she appealed to the Louisiana Supreme Court they overturned to decision making her the "universal heir". ²⁸Cabaret's case displays how important it was for her children to be recognized by the father and state in order to assure that they would be taken care of financially throughout their lifetimes. It also shows how sometimes these women are able to gain economic agency through their inheritance because of their associating with their wealthy white partner.

Cases of legitimacy can also be one of the biggest challenges that women in placage relationships had to face in regards to their children or perhaps their own inheritance. As seen with the two cases outlined above, even when the children are legitimate and recognized legally by the father, the women still often fought for reparations from the man's family after the his death. What made legitimacy even more complicated and difficult to obtain was the process that must be done in order for the children to become legally legitimate. Temple outlines the legal procedures in antebellum New Orleans that had to be taken for a child of a interracial couple (placage or not) to become a legitimate child of the father, and not simply a bastard therefore, degenerate.

"Proof of Parental descent" could be made in three ways, according to the code [Civil Code Article 227]: in a private correspondence in which the "father acknowledges the bastard as his child," when the "mother of the child was known as living in a state of concubine with the father and resided as such in his house at the time the child was conceived," or "when the father in public or private has acknowledged him as a child or has called him so in conversation or has caused him to be educated as such."²⁹

Indeed these requirements were extremely circumstantial and tentative but also clearly at the discretion and even mercy of the father. This indicates that the white father could and could not acknowledge his "bastard" children while simultaneously publicly acknowledging his concubine/package relationship unashamed. This harkens to the argument that placage relationships were perhaps "fancy maids" who were essentially employed by these wealthy white

²⁶ Spear, Race, Sex and Social Order, 209.

²⁷ Ibid, 210.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Thompson, Exiles at Home, 198-199.

men, paid as a concubine and often flaunted publicly as a trophy for the man's masculinity. Not having your child be recognized was also a vulnerable place for the mother and children's financial stability because, even though the father is supporting them for the duration of the affair, if he died neither mother nor child would receive anything in monetary value.

Political Benefits and Challenges in Placages

Finding ways for social and economic opportunities we see was a huge struggle for many women of color during the antebellum era in New Orleans, and being in placage relationships still allowed room for difficult hurdles. The same difficulties were seen in the political arena as well. Free women of color involved in placages had very few rights as citizens and those who were freed through the affairs, were at the mercy of their former masters. In the antebellum south, those people of color who were free, both men and women, were restricted from many and most freedoms and had to abide by very strict laws that limited their movement and livelihood. What was known as the Code Noir under the French regime, were transformed into Civil Codes under the Americans, which was much more strict and harsh to blacks than the people of New Orleans had experienced before. Interracial marriages were once legal and common in the city, but after the United States purchased Louisiana, miscegenation, in all forms, became highly politicized and of course illegal, thus placage relations fell into the same reproach. Spear cites that Anglo-Americans coming into New Orleans were determined to, ironically, "integrate the city into a racial hierarchy" and construct a binary that would dissolve the racial ambiguity of the city. She says this was achieved through colonial official and authorities that would

undermine the legal and social position of [free people of color] by restricting manumission, limiting immigration, criminalizing racially exogamous marriages and constraining the capacity of Euro-Louisiana men to transfer property to non-white consorts and children. ³²

Spears claims also that this ironically made judges more sympathetic to people of color who would often rule in their favor. ³³ But, it was still hard to maneuver your way around the city being a person of color, and in the instance of being a black woman cohort to a white man was almost too dangerous; there was hardly anyway out or up.

This is especially relevant for enslaved women cohorts who sought manumission through placage relationships but struggled to achieve full citizenship, even as the concubine of a wealthy white man, who more often than not was the only one who can emancipate her. In the case of Louisa Picquet, mentioned in Lisa Halcomb "Autonomy in Abuse: Glimpses of Freedom in New Orleans", who was the mulatta concubine slave of a Mr. Williams known as a "fancy girl". In the 1830's, she was able to obtain freedom for herself and her children through her former master but had to sue for it. We can see through women like Louisa that women in placages (especially as concubines) therefore, had little to any political agency during this time, or if they did, it was rare to come across. Getting the rights of one's poverty and/or body promised to them,

³⁰ Clark, The Strange History of the American Quadroon, 54.

³¹ Spear, Race, Sex and Social Order, 179.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Lisa Halcomb "Autonomy in Abuse: Glimpses of Freedom in New Orleans" Oshkosh Scholar (University of Wisconsin: 2006), 74.

³⁵Halcomb, "Autonomy in Abuse", 74

was near impossible for place women in many circumstances because of the restrictions outlined above.

However, we have already explored how mixed women involved in placage relationships were indeed able to gain legal recourses. In the Mandeville, Cabaret, and Picquet cases, all women were able to obtain their assets or property promised to them with their pursuit of legal recourse against their former master's or former partner's white family, which is rather monumental for their time. Another case study the displays political agency, was cited by Spear involving Adelaide Jung whose white father, Francois Bernoudy, left some inheritance money to her in his passing in 1816. Bernoudy's legitimate children denied Jung the money because, she was unfortunately not recognized/legitimized by her father. She sued the siblings but the court did not rule in favor stating the 1825 civil code which did not permit illegitimate children to inherit any parent's estates. ³⁶

Another case that displays this kind of political and legal action is with Maria Cecilia Lacroix (described as an octoroon), who was the granddaughter to Frenchmen Francois Lacroix and sued his "legitimate" children for the ownership of her inherited estate promised to her in her grandfather's will. ³⁷ Fortunately for her, she won her case as she was made arbiter to her grandfather's estate. ³⁸ Although Jung lost her case and Lacroix won hers, their pursuit still displayed the many instances when mixed women of color engaged in placage relationships, or in their cases, the outcomes of, were able to fight the politics and policies in antebellum New Orleans that disabled them from certain freedoms and opportunities.

Conclusion

Through the evidences and arguments provided throughout this paper, it shows the complex views and understanding of mixed women who participated in placage relationships during New Orleans in antebellum America. We can also see that despite the fact that this was a time of great restraint on people of color, these women found many different ways around them and found access to self uplift while in placages. These accesses included social prosperity, economic assets and political/legal recourses. Indeed, these benefits or perks came with immense struggle and various challenges that left some defeated but, what is extraordinary about these women was their pursual to attack these hurdles and set precedents for other women of color in the future, intentionally or not. On whether or not some these women were used concubines or used their affairs to gain access with such benefits listed above, it is up to the reader to decipher and examine the discourse thoroughly and decide for themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baptist, Edward. "'Cuffy,' 'Fancy Maids,' and 'One-Eyed Men': Rape, Commodification, and the Domestic Slave Trade in the United States", *American Historical Association*, 2001, 1619-1650.

Blassingame, John. Black New Orleans, University of Chicago Press: Chicago Illinois, 1973.

³⁶ Spear, Race, Sex and Social Order, 205.

³⁷ Thompson, Exiles at Home, 163.

³⁸ Ibid.

- Clark, Emily. *The Strange History of the American Quadroon: Free Women of Color in the Revolutionary Atlantic World*, University of North Carolina Press Books, 2013.
- Gomez, Michael. *Reversing Sail: A History of the African Diaspora*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Guillory, Monique Some Enchanted Evening on the Auction Block The Cultural Legacy of the New Orleans Quadroon Balls, PhD diss, New York University, 1999.
- Halcomb, Lisa "Autonomy in Abuse: Glimpse of Freedom in New Orleans", *Oshkosh Scholar*, University of Wisconsin, 2006, 69-82.
- Thompson, Shirley. Exiles at Home-The Struggle to Become American in Creole New Orleans, Harvard University Press: Boston, 2009.
- Spear, Jennifer. *Race, Sex and Social Order in Early New Orleans*, John Hopkins University, 2009.
- Winters, Lisa Z. *The Mulatto Concubine: Terror, Intimacy, Freedom, and Desire in the Black Atlantic,* University of Georgia Press, 2016.

The Manipulation of Race: Black Racial Politics in the 2002 Newark Mayoral Campaign

CRAIG EPSTEIN

In 2002, Newark, New Jersey was thrust into the national spotlight as the city's mayoral campaign became a battleground between competing conceptions of race and different ideas about the place for racial rhetoric in black politics. The mayoral race pitted incumbent Sharpe James, a beloved local career politician, against a young and idealistic city councilman, Cory Booker. Booker was permitted to run against his fellow Democrat in this open election and was able to demonstrate clear differences between his and his opponent's platforms despite their similar political orientations. Booker was initially written off by James and other black community leaders who did not see him as a potential threat, but as he gained momentum, James and his supporters dramatically shifted the tone of their campaign and began hurling outrageous racial attacks against the councilman to discredit him. Although Booker and James were both black and Baptist, the incumbent's campaign focused its strategy on alleging that Booker was neither black nor Baptist, and, rather, that he was actually white or Jewish. This focus on race and racial stereotypes in political attacks is commonly referred to as racial politics, and James unique utilization of such a strategy allowed him to persuade many African American residents of Newark to vote for him instead of his challenger. James' re-election through the use of racial politics is intriguing as it raises important questions about how the mayor was able to utilize black, anti-white sentiment and ambiguity about racial classification to rewrite the historical narrative of the civil rights movement, and use "Jew" interchangeably with "white" to discredit Cory Booker in the predominantly black city of Newark.² Although the rhetoric of the James campaign seemed to arbitrarily accuse Booker of being white or Jewish in order to distract voters from more relevant political issues, the attacks actually played on nuanced understandings of race and complex historically rooted feelings toward racial "others" among many in the black community to cast Booker as an enemy alien in the diverse city of Newark, who would actively subvert the best interests of its black residents.

As the Newark mayoral race became more competitive, and as it became clear that Cory Booker was a formidable challenger, Harvard University politics professor Dr. Martin Kilson wrote a letter to the National Urban League³ disparaging Cory Booker and urging the black community to stand against his candidacy. The letter, featured in the May 8, 2002 issue of *The Black Commentator*, is entitled "How to Spot a Black Trojan Horse" and contains lines of attack

¹ For an example of the use of this phrase, see Francis Wilkinson's June 24, 2015 article in the *Bloomberg View* entitled "Racial Politics Will Never Be the Same," accessed May 2, 2016.

http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2015-06-24/after-charleston-racial-politics-will-never-be-the-same.

² According to the United States Census Bureau's Fact Finder website, Newark had an African American population of 53.5% in the year 2000.

https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_00_SF1_DP1&prodTy pe=table, accessed March 4, 2017.

³ According to the mission statement on their website, "The National Urban League is a historic civil rights organization dedicated to economic empowerment in order to elevate the standard of living in historically underserved urban communities." http://nul.iamempowered.com/who-we-are, accessed April 17, 2016.

that laid the groundwork for the more vitriolic racial allegations made by the James campaign and his supporters. The letter referred to a column written by a right-wing political activist who praised Booker, and stressed that this kind of endorsement not only called Booker's liberal credentials into question but that it cast serious doubt on his proclaimed loyalty to the black community of Newark. Dr. Kilson used vivid, divisive language to make his claims and said, "When you put together the appearance of George Will's celebratory column on Cory Booker and Booker's address at the Manhattan Institute, the only conclusion to make, Lee [leader of National Urban League] is that Booker is a 'Black Trojan Horse' for the Republican rightwing."⁴ Although Dr. Kilson's lack of substantive support for such a claim is striking, the paranoid idea that Booker was somehow conspiring with an "alien" group to implement policies that would be harmful to the black community of Newark stands out in his letter. Labeling Booker a "Black Trojan Horse" and insisting that, "he's functioning as an errand boy Black politician for conservative Republican power-class penetration of governing control of Black Newark," was meant to discredit Booker by raising questions about his political and racial allegiances. This kind of discourse proved very effective, and it set the tone for the kinds of attacks that became central to James' campaign strategy.

Marshall Curry's *Street Fight* documents the 2002 mayoral race in Newark through film and acts as a collection of primary sources to illustrate the most shocking extensions of Kilson's lines of attack. The film follows the two Democratic candidates (incumbent Sharpe James and challenger Cory Booker) and contrasts both teams' tactics, placing them within the larger context of black politics in America. Curry explored the important methods used by James and his supporters to manipulate ideas of race, and cast Booker as some kind of racial "other" in the predominantly black city of Newark. Allegations that Booker was white and Jewish seemed to gain the most traction and allowed James to appeal to some black voters' distrust of these groups. This kind of rhetoric proved central to the strategy of the James campaign, and caused many voters to doubt Booker's credentials and priorities despite the fact that he is a black Baptist. The campaign thus shed light on some of the major issues within Newark's black political establishment, and the thirty-fifth minute through the forty-fourth minute of the film demonstrate how lingering problems with racial classification complicated the struggle between racial and de-racialized politics in Newark.

The film begins to address the racial attacks against Booker at about the thirty-fifth minute, and the following ten minutes demonstrate the different attitudes toward racial politics of the campaigns. The scene describes some of the attacks used against Booker at a James campaign barbecue. It shows a woman who attended the barbecue reporting to the Booker campaign that James, "called Cory a white Republican, yes he did." This is a pivotal moment in the film as it is the first time viewers see this kind of rhetoric, and it sets up a major portion of the film dealing with racial attacks. The next scenes feature some of James' most poignant racial attacks against Booker. The film shows footage of a national interview with James where he outright says, "He's [Booker] Jewish," and it shows an image of important quotes from a flier handed out at a James campaign event that alleged that Booker, "was proud to be a black Jew!"

⁴ Dr. Martin Kilson, "How to Spot a Black Trojan Horse," *The Black Commentator*, May 8, 2002, accessed April 17, 2016, http://www.blackcommentator.com/harvard.html.

⁵ Kilson, "How to Spot a Black Trojan Horse," May 8, 2002.

⁶ Marshall Curry, *Street Fight*, Documentary, directed by Marshall Curry (Marshall Curry Productions, 2005.), iTunes, 35:23, accessed April 1, 2016.

⁷ Ibid., 37:09.

⁸ Ibid., 43:29.

and that he was conspiring with the Jews to conquer Newark. The film also displays quotes from interviews with various print sources where James said (about Booker), "you have to learn to be African American! And we don't have time to train you all night." James also made a series of unfounded accusations that Booker was, "a faggot white boy. And telling audiences that he [Booker] takes money from the Ku Klux Klan." Although this specific quote combined racial and sexual attacks, its purpose was consistent with James' efforts to cast doubt on Booker's character by insisting that he was not a "real" member of the black community of Newark.

The methods and rhetoric of the James team highlight the way racial politics took shape in the campaign. The inconsistent language that James used to reclassify Cory Booker's race is noteworthy. The fact that he was able to call Booker "white" and a "black Jew" seems perplexingly contradictory, yet the film did not seem to question this arbitrary use of "black" and "white". James simply played on the ideas of discrimination and deeply rooted distrust to deceive voters and convince them, without good reason, that either Booker was not "fully black" or that he was completely white, and that therefore he could not represent the interests of the black community as mayor. This is intriguing for a number of reasons. The fact that James' attacks were able to convince many black voters reflects the complex history of anti-white and anti-Jewish sentiment among many African Americans, as well as the unique ambiguity of racial classification that exists in certain predominantly black communities. James and his supporters were able to cast Booker as a racial "other" based on his Ivy League education, white friends and colleagues, and upper middle-class upbringing. A Booker aide expresses the campaign's particular frustration with this line of attack and suggests in the film, "We ask our black children to get educated. And when they do, we call them white!" This is an important historical phenomenon, and it speaks to larger questions about the merits of racial and de-racialized politics in the black community. James used racial politics to his advantage, and many black voters allowed themselves to mistakenly become convinced that voting for James was truly in their best interest because he, unlike Booker, was black and had been working his entire career to usher in a so-called renaissance of the city of Newark.

The perplexing nature of what was going on in Newark received significant attention from the national media at the time and thrust the campaign into the forefront of American black politics. Articles in newspapers around the country began exploring the dynamics of the mayoral race and the strategy of the James campaign. Writers became increasingly intrigued by Booker and his ability to remain focused on the issues amid vitriolic racial attacks. Dale Russakoff's article entitled "In Newark Race, Black Political Visions Collide," which appeared in the *Washington Post*, summarized the highlights of the campaign for a national audience. Russakoff mentioned the racial attacks against Booker and quoted black Rutgers historian Clement Price to help account for their success. Price explained that, "Sharpe's generation see themselves as representatives of the passion and anguish of black people," and that they were, therefore, more suspicious of perceived outsiders from more privileged backgrounds.

Jonathan D. Tepperman's article in the *New York Times* entitled "Complicating the Race" further explored the complexities of the campaign by contrasting the two candidates' messages, and it delved into the ambiguity with which James was able to reclassify Booker as white and

⁹ Ibid., 37:17.

¹⁰ Ibid., 36:57.

¹¹ Ibid., 37:28.

 $^{^{12}}$ Dale Russakoff, "In Newark Race, Black Political Visions Collide," *The Washington Post*, May 14, 2002, accessed April 9, 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2002/05/14/in-newark-race-black-political-visions-collide/9b4f2176-f560-420d-859c-76beebe23700/.

Jewish. Tepperman discussed Booker's upper middle-class background and record as city councilman, as well as described the nonpartisan platform that he adopted throughout his political career. He then posited that this kind of record allowed James' outrageous questions about Booker's race to circulate among black traditionalists in Newark, and that they, "Point to the way this battle between two black politicians has in some ways become a struggle over competing definitions of race." ¹³ Tepperman interviewed a number of black scholars who weighed in on this struggle and insisted that James' tactics were rooted in the complex history of racial classification in America. He quoted Booker's friend from Stanford, Omar Wasow, who echoed the consensus among some black academics and said, "James is trying to take advantage of an old story in the black community -- that the kid who does well in school is acting 'white.' It is an incredible insult -- to suggest that if you're a well-educated, accomplished African-American you have to turn in your black membership card." This statement illuminates the frustration felt by the Booker team: that his high level of education -- something they hoped would be considered an asset and an admirable achievement among the urban population of Newark -- was being touted as a betraval of the black community by James and his spokespeople. The analysis featured in both articles helps clarify the thinking behind the James campaign strategy and the mindset of the supporters who bought in to his message. While, on the surface, the allegations that Booker is white and Jewish appeared to be mere rhetoric aimed to shift the focus of the mayoral race from issues to something more superficial, they actually were a part of a well-calculated racial political strategy that played on manipulations of race and historically rooted nuanced understandings of what it means to be black (according to some in the black community).

The ability of the James campaign to discredit Booker, in the minds of some, by labeling him "a Jew" has roots in the complex history of Black-Jewish relations in the United States. It was not until the post Civil Rights era that Jews were reclassified as definitively "white" in certain black communities, which fueled the kind of racial hostilities that played a central role in the James campaign strategy. In the struggle for black civil rights, American Jews and African Americans found themselves in an unlikely partnership against the white establishment. The evolution of this relationship is explored in Peter Rose's "Blacks and Jews: The Strained Alliance." He illustrates some of the early interactions between blacks and Jews after the Great Migration and shows how both groups managed to find common ground. Many northern Jews were able to relate to the history of blacks in the United States as they, "learned of black suffering through the Yiddush press, which began to draw comparisons between their own experiences- as slaves in Egypt, as ghettoized pariahs in the Middle Ages, and as victims of the Spanish Inquisition and of Czarist pogroms- and the painful history of Afro-Americans."¹⁵ Conversely, the Jewish community was admired by many in the black community, as the Jews were able assimilate into American culture and politics while retaining their strong cultural identity. Rose writes that from the perspective of many northern African Americans, "The Jews were often seen as models, exemplars of success, as allies in the struggle, even benefactors."¹⁶

¹³ Jonathan D. Tepperman, "Complicating the Race," *New York Times*, April 28, 2002, accessed April 9, 2016, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/04/28/magazine/complicating-the-race.html?pagewanted=all.

¹⁴ Tepperman, "Complicating the Race," April 28, 2002.

¹⁵ Peter I. Rose, "Blacks and Jews: The Strained Alliance," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Vol. 454, America as a Multicultural Society* (Mar.,1981): 58.

¹⁶ Rose, "Blacks and Jews," 60.

This mutual respect led to a very cooperative relationship early on and helped mobilize activists from both groups to organize and advocate for the goal of black civil rights.

Hasia Diner's book "In the Almost Promised Land: American Jews and Blacks, 1915-1935" expands on this historically cooperative relationship by studying early Jewish involvement in various civil rights groups and demonstrating how ending racial discrimination was a shared interest of blacks and Jews. She highlights how Jews held many leadership positions within the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and often donated large sums of money to fund major events. She argues that Jews were involved on multiple fronts and made invaluable contributions funding programs, leading groups of advocates and providing legal counsel for members who were convicted of violating unjust laws. Diner also delves into some of the unique ways in which American Jews fought to redefine race and disprove scientific rationale for racism. She discusses the efforts of Franz Boaz, who was a prominent Jewish anthropologist with strong ties to the NAACP, to undermine the widely accepted anthropological premise at the time that blacks were inherently inferior. Boaz wrote an article in 1925, which is credited for changing racial scientific discourse that stressed the revolutionary idea that, "The behavior of an individual is determined not by his racial affiliation, but by the character of his ancestry and his cultural environment. We may judge the mental characteristics of families and individuals, but not of races." Diner explains that Boaz was one of the many early Jewish contributors to the Civil Rights Movement who understood the, "link between Jewish identity and an interest in destroying the foundations of racism," 18 and who helped pave the way for continued cooperation between the two groups during later civil rights efforts.

Although many African Americans cherished their partnership with Jewish progressives throughout the twentieth century, the nature of the relationship changed as the Civil Rights movement began to change, paving the way for the resentful and hostile attitudes toward Jews that were exploited in the rhetoric of the James campaign. Peter Rose posits that this change in the United States began to take shape in 1966. He highlights how the two groups deviated from each other politically after the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1964, and reached a point where cooperation on a large scale to promote a common political agenda became more difficult. Rose demonstrates how,

the polarization was occurring against a backdrop of rapid changes on both the national and international scene. At home it was the Black Power revolt, the growing resentment against the war in Vietnam, and the various counterculture movements that were causing profound alternations in social and political relations. Abroad there were many matters of significance, not least the Six-Day War in Israel.¹⁹

The different priorities of blacks and Jews on domestic and international issues often conflicted, and Rose argues that by 1966, "Many blacks did begin to see Jews as too white." This new outlook among many in the black community was pivotal in the history of black-Jewish relations as it reclassified Jews and definitively placed them in the racial category, which founded some of the repressive institutions that blacks had fought against throughout American history. Defining Jews as unquestionably "white" in the late 1960s allowed many African Americans to dismiss

¹⁷ Hasia R. Diner, *In The Almost Promised Land: American Jews and Blacks, 1915-1935* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1977), 144.

¹⁸ Diner, In The Almost Promised Land, 144.

¹⁹ Rose, "Blacks and Jews," 63.

²⁰ Ibid., 64.

the mostly positive relationship the two groups enjoyed earlier, and fostered the hostility toward Jews as an extension of the white race that Sharpe James channeled in the 2002 mayoral campaign.

Ronald Tadao Tsukashima explores the evolution of black anti-semitism in his article entitled "Selective Black Hostility Toward Jewish and Non-Jewish Whites" and asserts that the classification of Jews as white led to the high levels of black anti-semitism in the 1970s. Tsukashima uses a survey that he conducted of African Americans around the country and in the "black belt", as the basis for his claims. He reports that after asking probing questions about race relations in the United States and about black opinions of whites and Jews, "a clear majority of blacks did not differentiate their anti-white prejudice on the basis of ethnicity. Of those who did, however, 16% scored low on anti-semitism but high on anti-white attitudes. Conversely, 22% scored in the reverse direction, suggesting the presence of a selective aggression factor reserved for Jews."²² While the results of Tsukashima's survey yielded some mixed results that complicated the narrative that black anti-semitism is simply a byproduct of blacks viewing Jews as definitively white, it nonetheless points to how important anti-white attitudes were in the evolution of black anti-semitism. Tsukashima explains that many of the African Americans who felt a unique hatred toward Jews seemed to be resentful of perceived Jewish socio-economic status more than anything else. However, his major takeaway from the survey is consistent with the idea that lingering black anti-semitism stemmed from anti-white sentiment. Levels of antisemitism in the black community continued to rise throughout the late twentieth century, and a November 1998 Anti-Defamation League survey highlighted just how widespread it was in the years leading up to the 2002 mayoral race. The survey showed that 34 percent of African Americans felt hostility toward Jews and that, "blacks (34%) are nearly four times as likely as whites (9%) to fall into the most anti-Semitic category."²³ These data and Tsukashima's conclusion help clarify Sharpe James' tactics. He played on the complex historical relationship between members of the black community and Jews as extensions of the white establishment and flung attacks that would reclassify Booker as a member of these "enemy" racial groups.

The reason James' attacks were able to stick, and why some members of the black community of Newark were suspicious of Cory Booker's allegiances and racial identity, are also rooted in complex historical ambiguity and are seemingly related to the ways that notions of "darkness" and "lightness" have affected the status and outlook of African Americans. Edward H. Ransford's "Skin Color, Life Chances, and Anti-white Attitudes" looks at how, even after the Civil Rights Movement, African Americans with lighter complexions were generally more widely accepted by the white establishment and able to earn higher incomes than their "darker" counterparts. Ransford studies relevant statistical data and conducts interviews with members of the black community, and concludes that, "dark Negroes face more job and income discrimination from white society than light Negroes. That is, regardless of training and skill, skin color *per se* structures opportunity."²⁴ Such a finding is striking, as it not only illuminates

²¹ The "Black Belt" refers to areas in the southern states where, before the Civil War, large plantations were located. After the Civil War, the region became known for high rural African American population. For more information on the Black Belt see http://southernspaces.org/2004/black-belt. Accessed April 24, 2016.

²² Ronald Tadao Tsukashima, "Selective Black Hostility Toward Jewish and Non-Jewish Whites," *Contemporary Jewry Vol. 4*, *No. 2* (Spring/Summer 1978): 58, accessed April 24, 2016,

²³ Mitchell G. Bard, "Black-Jewish Relations: ADL Survey Finds Anti-Semitism High in Black Community," *Jewish Virtual Library*, November, 1998, accessed April 24, 2016, https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/anti-semitism/black98.html.

²⁴ Edward H. Ransford, "Skin Color, Life Chances, and Anti-white Attitudes," Social Problems

the ambiguous relationship between skin color and success in the United States, but it helps understand the frustration of some in the black community and their mindsets. This conclusion, taken with the observations about certain black hostility toward Jews and whites, helps explain why some African Americans in the largely working class city of Newark may have been hostile to Cory Booker, a "lighter skinned" black man from a privileged background. From the beginning, some of James' supporters may have been hostile toward Booker because of his complexion, and were therefore more easily convinced that he was in fact a member of the white or Jewish establishment. It is fair to say that even the voters who did not fully believe the allegations about Booker's racial identity could have been influenced by this important disparity, which could have subsequently caused them to doubt his credentials and loyalties. This additional factor highlights further complications with racial classification in some black communities and adds a dimension to Sharpe James' strategy of casting Booker as an outsider and an enemy of black Newark residents.

While Sharpe James' allegations that Cory Booker was white or Jewish were completely unfounded, the successful way in which he was able to use this kind of racial rhetoric, and the appeal of such attacks to many black voters in Newark, shed light on the unique ambiguity of racial classification in certain black communities and on important persisting historical elements of anti-white and anti-Jewish sentiment among many African Americans. James was able to disparage his opponent by playing on deeply rooted and nuanced prejudices held by many in the black community, and by using a racial political strategy that discredited Booker by focusing on aspects of his personal life and questions about his racial identity, which ultimately cast him as an outsider and a member of an enemy political establishment. The language used by James and other black leaders, and the national conversations about such tactics during the course of the campaign were, in many ways, reflections of the complex history of post-Civil Rights race relations in the United States. The success of this racial political strategy in Newark in 2002 had important implications for the city's political landscape, and validated some of the divisive tactics that defined James' reelection campaign for mayor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Bard, Mitchell G. "Black-Jewish Relations: ADL Survey Finds Anti-Semitism High in Black Community." Jewish Virtual Library. November 1998. Accessed March 26, 2016. https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/anti-semitism/black98.html.
- Kilson, Dr. Martin. "A Letter from Harvard: 'How to Spot a 'Black Trojan Horse.'." *The Black Commentator*, May 8, 2002. Accessed March 26, 2016. http://www.blackcommentator.com/harvard.html.
- "Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000 Census." U.S. Census Bureau. Accessed March 4, 2017. https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_00_SF1_DP1&prodType=table.

Russakoff, Dale. "In Newark Race, Black Political Visions Collide." The Washington Post, May

- 14, 2002. Accessed April 9, 2016. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2002/05/14/in-newark-race-black-political-visions-collide/9b4f2176-f560-420d-859c-76beebe23700/.
- Tepperman, Jonathan D. "Complicating The Race." *New York Times*, April 28, 2002. Accessed April 9, 2016. http://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/2002/04/28/678767.html?pageNumber=517.
- Street Fight. Directed by Marshall Curry. Marshall Curry Productions, 2005. PBS, 2005. "Who We Are." National Urban League. Accessed April 17, 2016. http://nul.iamempowered.com/who-we-are.

Secondary Sources

- Diner, Hasia R. "'A Covenant Kept': Jews in the Black Civil Rights Movement." In *In the Almost Promised Land: American Jews and Blacks, 1915-1935*, 118-63. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977.
- Ransford, H. Edward. 1970. "Skin Color, Life Chances, and Anti-white Attitudes". *Social Problems* 18 (2). [Oxford University Press, Society for the Study of Social Problems]: 164–79.
- Rose, Peter I. 1981. "Blacks and Jews: The Strained Alliance". *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 454. [Sage Publications, Inc., American Academy of Political and Social Science]: 55–69. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1044245.
- Tsukashima, Ronald Tadao. 1978. "Selective Black Hostility Toward Jewish and Non-Jewish Whites". *Contemporary Jewry* 4 (2). Springer: 51–59. Http://www.jstor.org/stable/43549765.
- Tullos, Allen. "The Black Belt." Southern Spaces. April 19, 2004. Accessed April 24, 2016. http://southernspaces.org/2004/black-belt.
- Wilkinson, Francis. "Racial Politics Will Never Be the Same." *Bloomberg View*, June 24, 2015. Accessed May 2, 2016. http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2015-06-24/after-charleston-racial-politics-will-never-be-the-same

Growing Iowa: How The State Fair Impacted The Growth And Reputation Of Iowa From 1854-1904

BRITTA GIGLIOTTI

On December 28, 1846, sixteen years before the Homestead Act encouraged westward movement en masse, and twenty-three years before the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad, Iowa officially joined the Union as the 29th state, if only in name. With under two hundred thousand citizens, ¹ Iowa lacked not only population density, but also industry, technology, and pride. It was a state deficient in identity beyond the brushstrokes of cartographers. One thing Iowa did have, however, was farmers. On October 13, 1853, the board of directors of the Jefferson County Agricultural Society filed a motion to "take immediate steps" to establish a state-wide agricultural society and hold their first annual exhibition the following year.² Thus the First Annual Fair of the Iowa State Agricultural Society, later known as the Iowa State Fair, was born. Through clever partnerships with the press, railroad industry, and local businesses, the Iowa State Agricultural Society (Society) cultivated an official image of Iowa and a greater sense of what it meant to be Iowan. However, as both the Iowa State Fair (Fair) and state matured, the agrarianism of the Fair organizers conflicted with the vibrancy of an advancing populace, driving organizers to tighten their grasp on an idealized past and perpetuate an image of Iowa that was no longer true to its population. The first fifty years of the Iowa State Fair were consequently characterized by shifting tensions between tradition and modernity, Temperance and Spectacle, and rural and urban sensibilities.

As a newly minted state, there was a potent craving among Iowans to stand up to the older and more established states in the Union. In 1850, two thirds of the working male population of Iowa were farmers.³ The Fair was therefore an annual chance to not only encourage citizens to improve upon their counties, but to also publically declare to the rest of the country that, even without developed industry, Iowa was a proud and worthy addition to the growing Union. As a local newspaper, the *Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye*, proclaimed in 1874, on the 20th anniversary of the Fair:

There is Iowa in everything, and no matter what adjacent or remote States may have sent to compete for the rewards we have offered for industry's triumphs, Iowa has something of the same kind, and something of her own, beside it, struggling with the work of older States, equaling it always, and surpassing it often. It will make any patriotic Iowan proud of his State to attend the fair, not only to see what is there, but where it comes from; to notice that in every branch of industry the Hawk-Eye State is keeping pace with its elder

¹ The territory of Iowa had a population of 43,112 in the 1840 census, which grew to 192,214 in 1850. University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center, "Historical Census Browser," retrieved December 18, 2016, http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/collections/.

² Iowa State Agricultural Society, "History and Proceedings of the First Fair of the Iowa State Agricultural Society, held at Fairfield, October 25, 1854," in *Report of the Iowa State Agricultural Society for the Year* 1874 (Des Moines: E. P. Clarkson, 1875), compiled by John R. Shaffer, 485.

³ J. D. B. DeBow, "Statistics of Iowa: Table X—Professions, Occupations, and Trades of the Male Population," *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850* (Washington, Robert Armstrong, 1853), 954.

sisters, that it is, year by year, depending less and less on outside industry to supply its wants, and is even supplying the needs of less progressive States. This is the lesson that the State Fair teaches, self reliance; dependence on and the fullest development of our own resources.⁴

The author of this article paints a shining portrait of Iowa: the youthful sibling to an elegant country who by sheer will and hard work alone surpassed the triumphs of its kin, rising from needy to needed swiftly and successfully. The language makes it easy to forget that less than thirty years earlier Iowa did not yet exist. Indeed, by 1900, Iowan farms were amongst the most lucrative in the country, with a total, statewide farm value of \$271,844,034, second only to Texas. However, when accounting for the difference in total farm acreage, Iowa averaged \$7.86 per acre while Texas came in at \$2.28 per acre. Additionally, 45.3% of Iowa farms had a value of products not fed to livestock of over \$1,000 while only 10.4% of Texas farms could say the same. 5 In other words, while much larger Texas produced a higher value of farm products than Iowa, Iowa farms were more profitable. Moreover, from 1860-1900 Iowa experienced a 44% increase in total farm value while Texas had only a 31% increase. 6 If, like the Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye proclaimed, the



Figure 1: Cedar Rapids Times (Cedar Rapids, Iowa), September 13. 1871.

lesson of the Fair truly was "self reliance" and "dependence on and the fullest development of our own resources," it was a lesson Iowa learned and surpassed.

However, when Iowa came into statehood in 1846, the Iowa pioneers, few and far between, had little more than land to unite them. Westward movement was not yet fashionable, and would not be for several decades. With the establishment of the Annual Fair of the Iowa State Agricultural Society, young Iowa unearthed a means to attain the legitimacy that it deeply craved, as shown in a document circulated to stimulate interest in the forthcoming Society:

There is no free state in the Union save Iowa, in which there is not a State Agricultural Society... Is it not time for the farmers of Iowa to be aroused to the importance of such an organization in this State? Shall we be laggards in the race of improvement? Shall the resources of other States be developed, their wealth increased and their people elevated in the scale of intellectual being, and ours stand still?⁸

⁴ Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "The State Fair," September 24, 1874.

⁵ The total value of Texas farms was \$286,227,984. The average value per acre was calculated by dividing the total value of state farms by the total farm acreage (Iowa: 34,574,337 farm acres; Texas: 125,807,017 farm acres). The percent of all farms with a value of products not fed to livestock combines the two highest income brackets ("1,000 and under 2,500" and "2,500 and above"). U.S. Department of the Interior: Census Office, Census Reports, Volume V: Twelfth Census of the United States, taken in the Year 1900, Agriculture Part I: Farms, Livestock, and Animal Products (Washington, United States Census Office: 1902), prepared by William R. Merriam.

⁶ This value was calculated by using the total farm values from each state in the 1860 and 1900 agricultural censuses. U.S. Department of the Interior: Census Office, Agriculture of the United States in 1860: Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eight Census (Washington, Government Printing Office: 1864), under direction of Joseph C. G. Kennedy; U.S. Department of the Interior, Cencus Reports, Volume V: Twelfth Census of the United States.

⁷ Since the Iowa State Fair was not the only agricultural fair that happened in the state, with counties holding their own, smaller events, this paper has decided to capitalize "Fair" in order to differentiate. As one clipping states, "This is a State Fair with a big F." Intelligencer (Ames, Iowa), "With a Big F," September 10, 1880.

⁸ Iowa State Agricultural Society, "History and Proceedings of the First Fair of the Iowa State Agricultural Society," 493.

The Fair was a way of advancing the state, developing not only its resources but also its reputation.

Taking the first crucial step towards developing the Fair (and by extension, the State), the State Agricultural Society slipped into bed with the press—a relationship that would prove to be mutually beneficial. In an address "to the Friends of Agriculture in the State of Iowa" serving as reminder of the forthcoming Fair, J. M. Schaffer, the secretary of the Society, praised the press, "Among all these evidences of the Society's advancements," he began, "should be mentioned, the interest, the zeal, which is manifested by the newspaper press of Iowa... in behalf of the general cause of Agriculture...The promptness of the press to keep the public informed of the movements of the Society is above all praise." The same sentiment was repeated in internal documents, "...to the efforts of the press we are mainly indebted for the truly brilliant display at the First State Fair." The press was unrelenting in their publicity for the Fair, consistently pleading to their local readers to attend and present, then offering hearty praise when they did. For example, one newspaper, the *Muscatine Evening Journal*, urged their readers to display at the Fair in order to redeem the county's reputation:

That this county has the element to make the best fair in the State none will deny—that all that is necessary is for the patrons to will it and it will surely be done. Let all jealousies and prejudices be cast aside and let all determine that this county shall no longer be the subject of gibes and jeers of those that have been more successful in the past. 11

The Fair was a time for counties to flex their muscles, to show their worth to their state and country. The press urged citizens to show that their farmers could grow the best produce and raise the best animals, that their women could create the most beautiful crafts and most delicious jams. Decorated counties were pressed to keep up their reputations and underdogs were rallied to do better, to realize their potential. Businesses publicized their premiums (prizes) in advertisements for years after their win as an assurance of quality. Individual winners were likewise glorified in their hometown newspapers, creating not just pressure, but incentive, to perform.



Figure 2: Advertisement boasting their win at the 1876 fair. *Cedar Rapids Times* (Cedar Rapids, Iowa), January 29, 1880.

Local newspapers would cover the Fair down to the most minute details, including: advertisements, itemized agendas for the Society's annual January meeting; premium lists; upcoming schedules; Fair previews; overviews of each day on the fairgrounds; long lists of prize winners; and specific names of individuals as they left for and returned from the Fair. Official press tents were erected on the state fairgrounds, and after newspapers complained that the "Reporter's Gallery" was too far away from the racetrack, not only was it moved closer, but in addition, updated accommodations were made "for the

⁹ J. M. Schaffer, "Address to the Friends of Agriculture in the State of Iowa," *Fairfield Ledger* (Fairfield, Iowa), August 31, 1854.

¹⁰ Iowa State Agricultural Society, "History and Proceedings of the First Fair of the Iowa State Agricultural Society," 523.

¹¹ Muscatine Evening Journal (Muscatine, Iowa), "The County Agricultural Society," February 2, 1872. It must be noted that source is not specifically talking about the State Fair, but about growing their county's agricultural society in general.

headquarters of visiting editors and reporters, which they can meet, prepare their reports, exchange civilities and have a good time generally." Perhaps due to the strong ties between Society and press, it is difficult to find critical accounts of the Fair apart from laments about undesirable weather. The fledgling newspapers were given content and readership while the Society gained a conduit through which to publicize their Fair and shape public perception of Iowa.

In addition to making friends with the press, the game makers at the Iowa State Agricultural Society cleverly partnered with the railroad industry, hotels, and other local businesses in efforts to avoid exploitation of visitors and ensure that the Fair would be accessible to all. Iowa, the Fair, and the railroad lines all grew up parallel to one another, each entangled in

the growth of the other. The annual Fair gave rural citizens a reason to travel, promoting the concept of interstate tourism. To gently push farmers and people of limited means into train cars, special Fair deals were struck each year. Fares were generally reduced by half, often including free freight for exhibition materials. In addition to being cheaper than normal, trains also ran more frequently, creating a skewed, yet convincing, impression of everyday convenience. As people learned to travel by train, new lines were added. Later, shorter, electric train tracks were constructed to shuttle people from the city of Des Moines to the permanent fairgrounds. 13 Additionally, it was not only trains but technology in general that was improved for the sake of the annual Fair. Roads were paved and widened, cutting down on the annoyance of dusty air on dry summer days and smoothing the process of traveling to and from the Fair. ¹⁴ On the suggestion of the press, gas lighting, followed by electricity, was added along the route and throughout the Fair to allow festivities to continue past sundown. 15 Like the railroads, hotelkeepers agreed to



Figure 3: Fair advertising the train reductions and accommodations. *Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye* (Burlington, Iowa), August

keep their prices low and those who broke these agreements were publically shamed.¹⁶ Local

¹² Complaints can be found in "The Hawk-Eye at the State Fair," September 23, 1874. The quote is from: *Ames Intelligencer* (Ames, Iowa), "The State Fairgrounds: What Des Moines People Are Doing and Going to Do to Make Them Attractive and Convenient: Judges and Reporters' Stands," February 7, 1879.

¹³ The permanent fairgrounds were purchased in Des Moines in 1878. Prior to that date, the Fair was in various cities for two to three year stretches. One 1890 account mentions the electric trains, "The state fair grounds are accessible at all times. The Rock Island railway has a double track to within a few feet of the south main entrance gate and will run trains every fifteen minutes from their city depots to ground In addition to above the electric street railway whose line extends to all parts of the city, will put on a number of cars running directly to the fair grounds so that passengers will not be delayed at any time in reaching the fair." *Anita Tribune* (Anita, Iowa), "The Iowa State Fair: To Be Held at Des Moines Aug. 29-Sept. 5," July 31, 1890.

¹⁴ Dust was a big problem on the fairgrounds, and if the rain had not settled the earth, newspapers were sure to mention the uncomfortable atmosphere, "The dust was terrific. There is not doubt that those who stay the week out will swallow their full quota of dirt." *Cedar Falls Gazette* (Cedar Falls, Iowa), September 15, 1871.

¹⁵ For one such example: "We would suggest to the city authorities the propriety of lighting the streets with gas during the State Fair. The nights will be dark, and the convenience of illuminated streets will be very great to the public." *Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye* (Burlington, Iowa), September 23, 1864.

¹⁶ For example, the Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye published the resolutions adopted at the September 30, 1864

homes took in guests for a dollar or two, forming a pre-internet room sharing network. Furthermore, camping grounds equipped with water wells were opened free of charge (with the price of admission) to make sure that even those of the littlest means could come visit—and stay at—the fairgrounds.¹⁷ These tactics were so successful that on at least one occasion the crowd swelled to such a mass that accommodations were drastically inadequate and visitors were forced to sleep in train stations and hotel hallways.¹⁸

While the number of individuals who rode on the cheap trains and made use of the hotel accommodations increased, not all of them even attended the Fair—and those who did were by no means just exhibitors, farmers, and their families. In addition to the contractual agreements with the State Agricultural Society, local businesses took advantage of the increased tourism to advertise Fair week specials and discounts. Various associations across the state would chose Des Moines as the location of meetings and events, making use of the decreased prices without ever visiting the fairgrounds. In response, fingers were pointed at the city for not doing their part to ensure that the Fair would be the singular attraction during its scheduled calendar slot, but the city was making money either way. Additionally, many of those who did make it to the fairgrounds were more interested in being shocked and entertained than learning about high-yielding seeds or improvements to butter-making technology. That is not to say that folks interested in learning these things did not also attend, but to show that Fair growth meant losing the singular agricultural focus originally intended by the Society.

While urban visitors began to outnumber rural families, ²⁰ newspapers underlined the educational nature of the event and framed it as a display of the virtues of agriculture to one's children, selling rural life to the new generation and culling what they saw as a crisis of urbanization. The Fair was "worthy [of] the support of a moral and intelligent people, and to such a hearty invitation to come and enjoy a week of instruction," wrote the *Burlington Daily Gazette*, characterizing both the Fair and its attendees in a way that was by then out of touch with

meeting of the Board of Directors of the State Agricultural Society. One resolution reads, "Whereas, The proprietors of the Barret House, Whitman House and McCutcheon House, did last winter, prior to the location of the Fair, propose and guarantee, in writing that they would keep and entertain visitors during the exhibition at stated prices per day. And, whereas, complaints have been made to us that the agreements have not been complied with, but the proprietors of said houses have charged and are charging from fifty to one hundred per cent., if not more, than said agreement... Resolved... the course pursed by all all the landlords of the principal hotels in Burlington, with the single exception of the Teederick House, towards the visitors is without parallel in the history of our society, and meets our most hearty condemnation, and that justice to the Society, and the Fair demands that we should thus publicly make this exposition, that the blame and censure may fall where it truly and actually belongs." Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "The Fair," October 5, 1864.

¹⁷ Burlington Weekly Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "The Iowa State Fair: The Hawkeye Corresponded Describes the Buildings," September 6, 1888.

¹⁸ Burlington Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "No Place to Sleep: Thousands of State Fair Visitors Walk the Streets at Night: Hotels Fail to Accommodate: Capacity of Every Des Moines Hostelry Overtaxed and Hordes of People Sleep Out of Doors," August 29, 1903.

¹⁹ "There seems to be a pretty general opinion that the city of Des Moines has not done her fully duty by the society. In the first place by the too general non-attendance of the people of Des Moines at the fair. In the second place by getting up or allowing to many counter attractions... And, again, a great many societies throughout the State fix upon State Fair week for holding their annual gathering to get the benefit of the low rates." *Waterloo Courier* (Waterloo, Iowa), "The State Fair," January 23, 1895.

²⁰ Newspapers around the turn of the century began to cite this phenomenon. While these statements are not backed by any data, since the phenomenon generally goes against the rhetoric of their publications, there is no reason to believe they are blatantly lying. For example, "On every hand today the city people where in the majority." *Des Moines Daily News* (Des Moines, Iowa), August 30, 1900.

the reality of the exposition.²¹ "We need hardly repeat what we have so often said before in relation to the importance of attendance by the farmers of the state," starts *The Homestead*, "...the fair is an educator which in this age no farmer who desires to be well up in his calling can afford to neglect."²² This quote reveals that, while the author still believes the significance of the Fair lies in its agricultural instruction and comradery, farmers needed to be convinced that the Fair was worth their while. In his opening address to the 31st Fair in 1885, the Society's president noticed the troublesome trend of urbanization:

Our cities must vomit or our country will pass through a siege of moral gibes...I feel that I cannot argue too strongly upon our fathers and mothers the importance of rendering farm life attractive to the young...It is not that the young dislike the labor of their lives, but its monotony becomes tiresome. The farmer who has a surplus will make more in the end by sending his son across the state to an occasion, such as this, than he will by keeping him at home to drive an additional steer into his pasture, and the daughter who comes here and enjoys a vacation, will return home feeling that she has passed through a spot of sunlight, that will reflect far out into her life.²³

The Fair was becoming undeniably less agricultural but the Society, protector of a rural, agricultural lifestyle, was not ready to release their grasp. The press, which by now had strong ties to the Fair, described the farmers as the salvation of the state, serving as protection against the supposed immorality of urban life. The Society and press were unwilling to let go of the image of Iowa that they had so carefully cultivated.

According to those speaking at and chronicling the Fair throughout its first fifty years, Iowa was primarily a state of agriculturalists.²⁴ While the state was, in fact, primarily agricultural throughout the 19th Century, that does not necessarily mean that all citizens—nor even all farmers—proscribed to the ideals of agrarianism. The meaning infused into the term "agriculturalist," the connotations and expectations, were fabricated and refined by the Society. As agriculturalists, Iowans supposedly felt a dignity and divine grace in farming. "Agriculture," begins Society President Peter Melendy quoting Socrates in his 1866 Fair opening address:

is an employment most worthy of the application of man—the most ancient, and the most suitable to his nature. It is the common nurse of all persons in every age and condition of life, it is the source of health, strength, plenty, richness, and of a thousand sober delights and honest pleasures; it is the mistress and school of sobriety, temperance, justice, religion, and, in short, of all virtues.' If this is true, and who can dispute it? Agriculture is a profession of dignity... Agriculture was the first step in primitive civilization, and the condition of agriculture in a nation is the best standard by which to judge of its progress. Where tillage begins, the other arts follow. Farmers, therefore, are the founders of human civilization, and on their intelligence and virtue rest the pillars of Freedom's temple. ²⁵

²¹ Burlington Daily Gazette (Burlington, Iowa), "The State Fair," July 27, 1888.

²² The Homestead (Des Moines, Iowa), "The State Fair," September 6, 1895.

²³ Wm. T. Smith, "The Iowa State Fair: Annual Address of Hon. Wm. T. Smith: President of the State Agricultural Society," September 18, 1855.

²⁴ For an example of one such reference, "And so we are here again, dear hearers, upon the banks of the Father of Waters—at the beautiful city of Burlington, with her liberal-hearted citizens—to pass a week in social communion; to receive renewed evidences of kindness, and to revive and perpetuate the pleasant and instructive fraternal intercourse which ought pre-eminently to characterize a community of agriculturalists." Peter Melendy, "Iowa State Fair: Thirteenth Annual Exhibition of the Iowa Sate Agricultural Society: Opening Address of the Hon. Peter Melendy, President," *Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye* (Burlington, Iowa), September 20, 1866.

²⁵ Peter Melendy, "Iowa State Fair."

As farmers, the people of Iowa were supposedly the lifeblood of the country, holding up the "pillars of Freedom's temple." They were painted as hardworking, sober, and devout Christians, intelligent and dignified by nature. As such they were allegedly the gatekeepers of health and prosperity; a burden they gladly bore as they selflessly toiled in the earth. Each year at the Fair was another opportunity for the Society, aided by the press, to underline these purportedly undisputable truths. Yet there is a difference between farming by necessity and farming by a moral or religious vocation, a fact that is blurred by these ideological accounts of farming. Farming is incredibly hard work. It is stressful, physically exhausting, dangerous, and at the mercy of the elements. It is unreasonable to believe that every farmer in 1866 chose their profession in accordance with a virtuous calling. At least some farmed just because they had to.

In addition, as a part of a growing Union and advancing world, Iowa—and its Fair—did not exist in a vacuum. The portrait the Society painted of Iowa was not displayed without challenge. The Fair quickly became the single biggest event in the state, and it is unsurprising that such a uniquely grand assembly of people would attract individuals with something other than agricultural betterment in mind. One newspaper estimated attendance at the first Fair to be around 7,000-8,000 people, a number which at the time made the *Fairfield Ledger* announce, "Such a concourse of people [has] never before assembled in Iowa." By 1884, the attendance for one day only was estimated between 50,000-70,000 people, the attendance each year surpassing the year before. While there were farmers and agriculturally-minded folk present explicitly to learn from the many demonstrations, lectures, and displays of new technologies found throughout the Fair, there were also attendees who saw the Fair as a social event. It was a time to relax, to be entertained, and to communicate with more people than some would otherwise come across in a year.

However, as more people traveled to the Fair, the customary attractions like the annual plowing match and man versus horse race (the horse always won) were crowded by what one journalist termed "charitable nuisances." Showmen, beggars, sideshows, and:

musical cripples... squatted all over the grounds, in the carriage drives, out in the sun, in the pathways, wherever there was the greatest danger of being run over, and wherever they were most in everybody's way, there the crippled beggars were grinding hand organs, sawing fiddles, or torturing accordions, and there was always a crowd around them. A good natured crowd it was, too; drinking a little beer once in a while...not given to trying its luck very much at the various games of chance.²⁹

²⁶ Fairfield Ledger (Fairfield, IA), "The State Fair," November 2, 1854.

²⁷ Algona Republican (Algona, IA), "Iowa State Fair," September 10, 1884.

²⁸ Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "The State Fair: Third Day and at Attendance 14,000: The Fair to Be a Great Financial Success," September 11, 1873.

²⁹ Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "The State Fair," September 24, 1874.

Like flies to honey, the unsavory entertainment attracted by the crowds were seen as an inevitable part of holding a Fair. Interestingly, even though drinking and gambling were condoned for the time being, the author of this article tries to downplay that fact by asserting that the crowd was not partaking in excess, displaying an attitude toward alcohol that foreshadows its eventual ban. Around this same time, the traveling circus, with the guidance of P.T. Barnum, was becoming a larger part of American culture, and the Fair lineup shifted to reflect that development. In 1880, during the 26th Fair, new chariot races entertained adrenaline junkies in the grandstands while the morbidly curious paid a visit to the "two headed, two bodied lady... one of the few attractions that Barnum has been unable to capture."³⁰ Spectacle was pulling the Fair away from its foundational ideology, but to make things more interesting, the second wave of a rival force was also beginning also to swell: the Temperance movement. Consequently, "Owing to the energetic action taken by the society, no gambling or liquor was allowed upon the ground; the one beer salon which was smuggled away in a tent in an obscure corner and surreptitiously patronized, being promptly bounced by the cadets."³¹ While originally permitted, alcohol was an easy victim in the Temperance efforts to reign the Fair back in,



Figure 4: partial advertisement for P.T. Barnum's "Greatest Show on Earth" coming to Iowa in 1881. *Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye* (Burlington, Iowa), September 10, 1881.

so that it accurately reflected the virtuous rhetoric used to describe it. Spectacle and Temperance were engaged in a long battle of tug-of-war; just as victory seemed imminent for one, the other side exerted another burst of energy.

Despite this Temperance pushback, the desire to make money proved to be an admirable adversary to the virtues of agriculture. When sensational attractions were pitted against inebriation, the prior was seen as the lesser of two evils. So while alcohol and gambling remained banned from the fairgrounds, sensational attractions were permitted in efforts to draw the city crowds the Society desperately needed to fill their echoing coffers. It was a noticeable diversion from the Fair's agricultural origins, but it was necessary for the longevity of the institution. Staged "sham" battles provided a thrilling and "interesting exhibition of what the reality of war is really like," while Roman races entertained those with rose-tinted conceptions of history. For individuals who did not fancy any of those options, there were also death-defying stunts in which:

the aeronaut [placed] himself and parachute in a cannon and be carried up 6,000 feet when the cannon will be discharged and he will sail earthward. If no accidents happen he will again take his place in a torpedo attached to his balloon and sail into the air again. This time the torpedo will explode and he will sail down again. There will also be high diving... A man will dive from a tower eighty feet high into a tank of forty inches of

³⁰ Chariton Patriot (Chariton, Iowa), "State Fair," August 25, 1880.

³¹ Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye (Burlington, Iowa), "The Iowa State Fair," September 17, 1880.

³² Burlington Gazette (Burlington, Iowa), The sources are respectively: "State Fair Prospects," August 10, 1895; Des Moines Daily News (Des Moines, Iowa), "Many Attractions: State Fair Management Preparing to Entertain the Crowds," August 21, 1896.

water...A contract has also been closed with a man who rides a bicycle on a wire stretched across the track. The wire is charged with electricity, and many incandescent lamps in his wheels are illuminated during the performance.³³

There was a noticeable pressure each year to expand, which meant raising premiums, adding novel attractions, erecting new buildings, and updating technology, all of which required increasingly larger budgets. That is to say, carnival-esque attractions were here to stay, however hesitantly and begrudgingly permitted.

The Fair organizers were stuck in a difficult position. They needed the money that sensational entertainment was able to draw in, but they still wanted to preserve their ideological view of the Iowan farmer. In 1899, in the 45th year of the Fair, the Iowa State Agricultural Society morphed into the Iowa Department of Agriculture and their annual report from the year 1900 demonstrates this tension between economic need and ideological protection:

...while [fairgoers] are willing to spend some time in looking at fine stock and inspecting improved labor saving devices. They also wish to spend some time in being properly entertained and amused...here is where the side show and merry-go-round come in. The side show, with bally hoo stage, where noise is gratuitously furnished, helps wonderfully to make a successful fair. Noise and bustle you must have if you wish to keep an average crowd happy... Of course it is necessary that you insist upon all shows being clean and decent...And now a word against what is not needed on any fair ground. The sale of intoxicating drinks in any form should be prohibited... Shows for men only, disgusting exhibitions of snake shows, immoral dancing shows, freak shows, especially of the human race, should be barred. In fact any and all things not conductive to good morals should be refused space on the grounds of any fair association. Charge for all business done on the grounds of the society by anyone other than exhibitors.³⁴

The success of the Fair was paradoxically its biggest problem. The continual need to grow in size also meant that it was required to adapt to a new demographic of fairgoers, a body of people who more accurately represented the state of Iowa. Alcohol remained barred, but clean entertainment was permitted as a necessary departure from agricultural intent. The Society needed to welcome sideshows and charge for the right to operate on the fairgrounds. However, they were not yet ready to relinquish all moral obligations. They could stomach losing some agricultural focus, but they could not bear to erase their virtuous depiction of Iowa and its farmers.

By the Fair's fiftieth anniversary, in 1904, Iowa had become an industrialized state. Still, the Iowa Department of Agriculture (the institution that emerged out of the Iowa State Agricultural Society), alongside their old friends in the press, stuck to the official image of Iowa that they had painstakingly cultivated and tended. Even as the reality of life in Iowa continued to change, newspapers declared that "Family groups [at the Fair] were the rule—husbands and wives with their children; men and women who love and honor each other and respect themselves and who dwell together as equals, bringing up their children to fear God and obey his and their country's laws." If newspaper accounts are to be believed, the sideshow attractions and panhandlers moved on, the illegal alcohol vendors and their patrons thought better than to show, and single adults found familial chaperones for their wholesome outing. Only the smiling,

³⁴ Iowa Department of Agriculture, The Iowa Year Book of Agriculture: Issued by the Iowa Department of Agriculture, Succeeding the Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the Iowa State Agricultural Society (Des Moines, B. Murphy: 1901), edited by G. H. Van Houten, 114.

³³ Ibid

³⁵ The Homestead (Des Moines, Iowa), "The Iowa State Fair Celebrates Its Golden Jubilee," September 1, 1904.

God-fearing, hardworking, American patriots convened at the celebration of this most noble institution. In reality, it was Spectacle that had succeeded in transforming the landscape of the Fair. In their preoccupation with the ways the Fair would fulfill their narrow dreams for Iowa, the organizers missed how fantastically they had succeeded in growing the state.

On its hundredth anniversary, in 1954, President Dwight Eisenhower and former President Herbert Hoover paid a special visit to the Iowa State Fair. The Fair had been a flytrap for local politicians since its inception, but this dual-presidential visit solidified the event's status as *the* place for anyone seeking to curry favor in Iowa. Every presidential election cycle since, candidates have stopped by to pay their dues.

The Fair that exists today, boasting a 600-pound butter cow, star-studded musical performances, and various contests, may be unrecognizable to its founders, but it holds within its history a major role in fostering a newborn state's transition into adulthood. The triumphs and trials of a growing state found a stage in the Fair, building pride in its people. The Fair, an ambitious event conjured up by an agricultural society representing a county of about 10,000 people, ³⁶ asserted the legitimacy of Iowa, becoming the state's most well-known institution for 162 years and counting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Algona Republican. "Iowa State Fair." September 10, 1884.
Ames Intelligencer. "With a Big F". September 10, 1880.
"The State Fairgrounds: What Des Moines People Are Doing and Going to Do to Make Them Attractive and Convenient: Judges and Reporters' Stands." February 7, 1879.
Anita Tribune. "The Iowa State Fair: To Be Held at Des Moines Aug. 29 - Sept. 5." July 31, 1890.
Burlington Daily Gazette. "The State Fair." July 27, 1888.
Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye. "The Fair," October 5, 1864.
September 23, 1864.
"The State Fair." September 24, 1874.
——. "The State Fair: Third Day and at Attendance 14,000: The Fair to Be a Great Financial Success." September 11, 1873.
"The Iowa State Fair." September 17, 1880.
Burlington Gazette. "State Fair Prospects." August 10, 1895.
Burlington Hawk-Eye. "No Place to Sleep: Thousands of State Fair Visitors Walk the Streets at

³⁶ The population of Jefferson County was 9,904 in the 1850 census. DeBow, "Statistics of Iowa," 943.

Night: Hotels Fail to Accommodate: Capacity of Every Des Moines Hostelry Overtaxed and Hordes of People Sleep Out of Doors." August 29, 1903.

Burlington Weekly Hawk-Eye. "The Hawk-Eye at the State Fair." September 23, 1874.

—. "The Iowa State Fair: The Hawkeye Corresponded Describes the Buildings." September 6, 1888. Cedar Falls Gazette. September 15, 1871. Chariton Patriot. "State Fair." August 25, 1880. DeBow, J. D. B. "Statistics of Iowa: Table X—Professions, Occupations, and Trades of the Male Population." In The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850, 954-5. Washington, Robert Armstrong, 1853. Des Moines Daily News. "Many Attractions: State Fair Management Preparing to Entertain the Crowds." August 21, 1896. ——. "Stair Fair Moguls Set Inside the Track Today." September 2, 1896. —. "Women Displeased: Don't Like Sensational Attractions at the State Fair." September 8, 1897. ——. August 30, 1900. Fairfield Ledger. "Iowa State Fair." September 8, 1870. Homestead. "The State Fair," September 6, 1895. Iowa Department of Agriculture, The Iowa Year Book of Agriculture: Issued by the Iowa Department of Agriculture, Succeeding the Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the Iowa State Agricultural Society (Des Moines, B. Murphy: 1901), edited by G. H. Van Houten. . "The Iowa State Fair Celebrates Its Golden Jubilee." September 1, 1904. Iowa State Agricultural Society. "History and Proceedings of the First Fair of the Iowa State Agricultural Society, held at Fairfield, October 25, 1854," In Report of the Iowa State Agricultural Society for the Year 1874, 485-581, compiled by John R. Shaffer. Des Moines: E. P. Clarkson, 1875.

Melendy, Peter. "Iowa State Fair: Thirteenth Annual Exhibition of the Iowa Sate Agricultural Society: Opening Address of the Hon. Peter Melendy, President." *Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye*. September 20, 1866.

Iowa State Fair. "What is Your Iowa State IQ?," accessed December 15, 2016,

https://www.iowastatefair.org/about/trivia/.

- Muscatine Evening Journal. "The County Agricultural Society." February 2, 1872.
- University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center. "Historical Census Browser." Retrieved December 18, 2016, http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/collections/
- U.S. Department of the Interior: Census Office. *Agriculture of the United States in 1860:*Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eight Census. Under direction of Joseph C. G. Kennedy. Washington, Government Printing Office: 1864.
- ———. Census Reports, Volume V: Twelfth Census of the United States, taken in the Year 1900, Agriculture Part I: Farms, Livestock, and Animal Product. Prepared by William R. Merriam. Washington, United States Census Office: 1902.
- Schaffer, J. M. "Address to the Friends of Agriculture in the State of Iowa." *Fairfield Ledger*. August 31, 1854.
- Smith, Wm. T. "The Iowa State Fair: Annual Address of Hon. Wm. T. Smith: President of the State Agricultural Society." *Laurens Sun.* September 18, 1855. *Waterloo Courier.* "The State Fair." January 23, 1895.

Images

- Figure 1: Cedar Rapids Times. September 13, 1871.
- Figure 2: Cedar Rapids Times. January 29, 1880.
- Figure 3: Burlington Daily Hawk-Eye. August 29, 1866.

The Environmental Performance of the People's Republic of China during the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment

LOLA JUSIDMAN

Diplomacy is a continuation of war by other means.—Zhou Enlai¹

The turn of the 1970s saw not only a confluence but a critical juncture in the histories of Chinese foreign relations and environmental governance. When the People's Republic of China made its late entry onto the international diplomatic stage, the stage happened to be set for the formal and full-force initiation of international environmental governance. On this stage, the PRC combined environmental performance with the advancement of its military-diplomatic goals, although this synthesis bore some inconsistencies with the shifts in alliances that were concurrently at play.

In the late 1960s, following a period of marked isolation that peaked with the Cultural Revolution, the PRC began a cascade of new and renewed diplomatic relationships with foreign nations, most notably with the United States, after the famous courtship known as "ping-pong diplomacy." This flurry of recognition led a majority of the UN General Assembly's member states to support the PRC's bid for UN membership, which was granted on October 25, 1971. Concurrently, the General Assembly had moved in 1968 to organize an international conference on the human environment. Prior to this decision, intergovernmental environmental questions were handled as secondary concerns by bodies like the WHO, UNESCO, and the FAO, as well as a handful of issue-specific treaties. But as the 1960s came to a close, international concern for the environment as a global system was soaring and domestic environmental protection was rapidly expanding in Western countries. In preparation for the conference, states began to form their own unique views on global environmental problems. The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm from June 5 to June 16, 1972, gave rise to a framework, a leadership, and a discrete UN agency in global environmental governance that have remained the backbone of the UN's environmental programs to this day.

The extensively publicized Stockholm Conference became, therefore, the first opportunity for the PRC to launch both its environmental performance and to relaunch its "performance" on the international stage. The two denote, in most cases, very different activities and metrics for success. Environmental performance is a relatively new notion; it typically involves third-party assessments of a country's or firm's "environmental integrity"—its direct measurable impact on the environment as a system—and at its most consummate involves quantitative monitoring. In the West, the notion of a "national environmental performance" emerged out of the environmental movement of the 1960s and 1970s, both in civil society and in

¹. As quoted by Edgar Snow, "Red China's gentleman hatchet man," Saturday Evening Post 226, (March 27, 1954):24.

². Wade Rowland, The Plot to save the World: The Life and Times of the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, Toronto, Canada: Clarke, Irwin, and Co, 1973: 3-4

the academe, and its monitoring would eventually become one of the functions of the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), Earthwatch, and the domestic environmental agencies that emerged as a result of, or in anticipation, to the Stockholm Conference.³ Under the PRC, preexisting domestic pressure to apply policies or technologies to nature did not follow this new rubric of holistic environmental performance. Indeed, it was only after the announcement of the conference that the world began asking the country: "How is pollution in China?"

Performance on the international stage, on the other hand, combines diplomacy and public relations, and has been practiced by statesmen and diplomats as a means to certain military-diplomatic goals: to attain certain statuses, to strengthen and project alliances, to cooperatively advance common international goals, to project and disseminate one's programs and views, to advance arms proliferation and support arms procurement, to turn public opinion against one's enemies, and to satisfy domestic constituents.

This analysis observes a convergence of environmental "performance" and "performance on the international stage" in the case of the PRC during the turn of the 1970s. It finds that, despite the rapprochement between the US and China that was occurring beyond the conference floor, environmental and international performance became, for the PRC, a new site for political struggle with the United States. It attributes this convergence to three primary factors. One is that the PRC displayed very high ideological militancy, and that it possessed both the motivation and the means to utilize discursive media—the press and the floor of the United Nations—to advance the Maoist ideological project, one which criticized the American political and economic model. The realm of the environment, which had begun to take on a moral and political dimension, was a natural battleground for the advancement of this ideological project. Second, the Stockholm Conference happened to be the first setting for the PRC to perform its reentry onto the international stage, and therefore to pursue the abovementioned military-diplomatic goals: to attain the status of leader for the Third World; to strengthen its third-world alliances; to advance common environmental goals in a spirit of cooperation; to disseminate its Maoist perspective; to advance arms proliferation and support arms procurement; to turn public opinion against the superpowers; and to satisfy its domestic constituents. Third is the absence during that period of a well-publicized third-party monitoring of Chinese environmental performance for domestic and international observers to rely on; the Western academe, for example, was limited to a small pool of sources and information that was mostly controlled by the PRC,⁵ and thus it tended to draw conclusions on Chinese environmental performance from products of Chinese international performance. This monopoly allowed the PRC to maximize the benefits environmental reporting offered for its international public image.

The PRC's participation had an enormous, disruptive, unexpected, and unrivaled impact on the Stockholm Conference and the resulting Declaration. At the conference, the PRC was able to take charge as the foremost champion of the developing countries. And, within the Declaration, the Chinese delegates were able to insert distinctly anthropocentric, developmentalist, and at times outright Maoist language—sometimes verbatim—from the text

³. Elena Aronova, "Environmental Monitoring in the Making: From Surveying Nature's Resources to Monitoring Nature's Change," *Historical Social Research* 40 (2015): 222-3.

^{4.} Chi Wei, "Turning the Harmful into the Beneficial," Peking Review 4, January 28 1972.

⁵. James Chu, "Gathering News About China," Gazette 33 (1984): 87-106.

⁶. See William Kapp, "'Recycling' In Contemporary China," *Kyklos* 27, no. 2 (June 1974): 286; Samuel S Kim, "China and World Order," *Alternatives* 3, no. 4 (1978): 555-587; Yi-Fu Tuan, "Views: Our Treatment of the Environment in Ideal and Actuality: A geographer observes man's effect on nature in China and in the pagan and Christian West," *American Scientist* 58, no. 3 (1970): 247-249.

the PRC had prepared.

The events at Stockholm also had a lasting effect on China. Beyond the institutional and cultural attention that flowed to the environment soon before and long after the conference, which occurred in some capacity for every party-state, the conference marked the definite establishment of a long and growing relationship between the PRC and Maurice Strong, the Conference's illustrious chairman. The seeds of this relationship predate the Conference's conception and demand more attention than this paper can afford them. The preexisting personal relationships linking Maurice Strong and the PRC remain intriguing but obscure, while the ideological affinity between the two would have likely been patent to anyone, even before Strong's appointment to the chairmanship of the conference.

Major histories of the PRC's foreign policy neglect the importance of the Stockholm Conference and the realm of the environment in the nation's reentry into international diplomacy. Scholarship on the PRC's environmental performance in this period neglects to sufficiently account for its convergence with international performance and for the complex relationship this performance had to *realpolitik*. The present paper fills this lacuna with the support of a few secondary sources and the accounts of Maurice Strong. It will do so by analyzing the language of the Stockholm Declaration and contemporaneous articles about the environment in the *Peking Review*, one of the PRC's most circulated English-language weeklies.

Historical Background

Between 1950 and 1970, the United States encouraged its allies to sever diplomatic relations with the PRC as part of its containment policy. This manifested additionally as pressure to keep the PRC out of the United Nations. 8 After the Cultural Revolution and in the context of the Sino-Soviet split, the PRC's anxieties about armed conflict with the USSR led it, in the late 1960s, to pursue covert overtures to the United States, which were reciprocated. On February 21, 1972, Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger arrived in Beijing for a 7-day meeting with Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai, ending twenty years of near-absolute diplomatic estrangement between the two countries. According to one account, during Nixon's visit, "Mao and Zhou both urged the Americans to ignore the militant propaganda they saw displayed around them, and look instead at China's actions. The militant propaganda, Kissinger concluded, was for purposes of domestic control." In publicizing the meeting, Mao suggested foregoing the tradition and formality of a communiqué that would delicately avoid any confrontation. Instead, the Shanghai Communiqué frankly outlined the differences between American and Chinese views regarding Taiwan, but also centered on their points of consensus: their opposition to "hegemony," with the USSR as a common enemy implied therein, and their "respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and noninterference." This firm and open establishment of difference, but consensus on a single and mutually beneficial set of principles, prefigured the behavior of both parties during the Stockholm Conference.

By 1970 it was nevertheless apparent to many that China was also "keen to build friendships with Third World countries...and even to encourage the independence of nations or group(s?) of

⁷. See John W. Garver, China's Quest: The History of the Foreign Relations of the People's Republic of China. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016; and J. D. Armstrong, Revolutionary diplomacy: Chinese foreign policy and the united front doctrine, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).

^{8.} Garver, China's Quest, 305.

^{9.} Ibid.

^{10.} Ibid., 300.

nations that are likely to counter-balance the power of the 'big' two." That year, it allocated \$700 million in foreign aid. This support would also find its continuation in the PRC's performance during the Conference.

Preparations for the Conference

Meanwhile, intensive preparation for the Stockholm Conference was in full effect. In response to worldwide pressure, its purpose was expanded from providing a forum for "comprehensive consideration" and directing the "attention" of governments and the public to the environment, to serving "as a practical means to encourage and provide guidelines for action by governments and international organizations." On December 7, 1970, at the suggestion of the Swedish ambassador to the UN, Maurice Strong was appointed as the Conference's chairman. He was a millionaire and former oil executive, and his background and political capital were essential to the success of the Conference:

I had a long interest in the [environment], and I also had a strong interest in development. I was head at the stage of the Canadian International Development Agency; and I had very good relations with developing countries. Developing countries were very suspicious of the environment issue. They were very concerned about this conference because maybe it would take attention away from their principal interests which were to relieve poverty and to increase development. ¹³

Strong's serious understanding of the imperative to balance development and the environment, and his attention to the concerns of developing countries, led him to treat the PRC as not only a strategically important element for the Conference's success, but also one with which he had ideological affinities. His consistent attention to the PRC and its delegation began soon after his appointment:

His first decision on taking the UN job was to be one of the most important: he dispatched Chester Ronning, a seasoned Canadian diplomatic troubleshooter, to Peking, to convince Premier Chou Enlai that China should attend the conference. Influenced in no small measure by Strong's personal integrity and commitment (and perhaps by the fact that he could claim a distant relationship to Anna Louise Strong, an American left-wing journalist and friend of the Chinese revolution), the Chinese accepted the invitation, thereby immediately and immeasurably bolstering the prestige of the Stockholm gathering.¹⁴

There have been many indirect or unspecified allusions to Strong's previous personal connections to the PRC, from Strong himself, as well as from scholars and the right-wing American press. Anna Louise Strong was a dear friend to Zhou and Mao, but there appears to be

^{11.} Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, Department of Political Affairs, Asia-Oceania. 'State of the Chinese Question after Canada and Italy's Recognition of Beijing and After the UN Discussion'." History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France (December 30, 1970).

^{12.} Rowland, The Plot to save the World, 35.

^{13.} Maurice Strong, "World Environment Features Maurice Strong," Interviewed by Jia Feng.

^{14.} Rowland, The Plot to Save the World, 37.

no unequivocal and reliable evidence of her relationship to Maurice Strong. According to Strong's own account, he had "managed to open an informal channel of communication with Premier Chou En-lai, even before China's entry into the UN in the autumn of 1971." Clearer evidence as to the nature of this informal channel could shed light on the reasons for Strong's close relationship to the PRC and the Chinese delegation at the conference, and even perhaps on the reasons behind Strong's appointment to its chairmanship.

Meanwhile, a draft document for the Stockholm Declaration had been under preparation by a Working Group, led mostly by Sweden, the United States, and Canada, but also including the Soviet bloc, starting in March of 1971. The draft declaration was expected to pass a vote at Stockholm without major alterations. The result of a a "fragile consensus," the document's 5-point preamble and 23 nonbinding principles described man as "free from time immemorial to transcend and transform wild nature" but cautioned that, "wrongly or heedlessly applied," man's technological capabilities could bring "incalculable harm to human beings and the human environment."

The Working Group's draft also contained the more ecocentric language of first-world environmentalists, which called upon man to improve the environment "in collaboration with nature." One point of the preamble, and one of the principles, also recommended the consideration of population control policies. Absent from the draft declaration was any explicit differentiation between the conditions and responsibilities of developed and developing countries, although it did prescribe "accelerated development" as the solution to environmental deficiencies caused by under-development and natural disasters. ¹⁷ Generally, the declaration was a tempered call for responsibility and awareness of the importance of the "human environment" to human well- being, and for the sustainable management of resources. ¹⁸

Because East Germany was not permitted to attend the Conference, the USSR and its client states decided soon before to boycott it, although they would participate in approving the final declaration at the convocation of the General Assembly that followed the Conference. The absence of the "Second World" reduced the Conference's attendance from one of "three worlds" to one of two: the developed and the developing countries. This may have led the PRC to refocus its targets towards the United States and neglect polemicizing against the USSR during the Conference.

In order to avert an additional mass boycott or under-participation by the developing countries, Strong convened a conference in Founex, Switzerland in June of 1971, where scientists and development experts from these countries could formulate a report in order to advance a third-world perspective on the environment. The resulting Founex Report stated that the environmental problems of the developed and developing world were "of a different kind," and that in the case of the developing world, "development becomes essentially a cure" for environmental ills. ¹⁹ This was somewhat in tension with the language of the more "hard-line" environmentalist academics and scientists who had been commissioned by Strong to write a report called "Only One Earth." Their discourse focused on the finitude and delicacy of the Earth's capacity to sustain human and other forms of life. ²⁰ Finally, a speech prepared by the

^{15. &}quot;The Founex Conference." Maurice Strong.net.

^{16.} Ibid

^{17.} Rowland, The Plot to Save the World.

^{18.} Louis B. Sohn, "The Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment," *Harvard International Law Journal* 14, no. 3 (Summer 1973): 423-515.

¹⁹. Rowland, *The Plot to Save the World*.

²⁰. Barbara Ward and Rene J. Dubos, Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet. New

World Bank's president expressed optimism about the free market's ability to solve environmental problems, but could only apply this logic to cases where a profit incentive could be exploited. Stockholm was slated to be the site of serious debate on the viability of exponential economic growth on the part of the developed world, and a reevaluation of material productivity's status as the sole indicator and generator of human welfare.

Despite efforts by Strong to maintain communication with China even before its entry into the UN, and to elevate the participation of the developing countries in formal preparation for the Conference, China joined the UN months after the Founex Conference and the creation of the Working Group for the draft declaration. This exclusion from the preparation explains, in part, China's outsized role during the Conference proper.

China's Performance at the Conference

With the international public as its audience, the PRC pursued an environmental discourse consistent in its promotion of Maoism and of the PRC's international objectives to discredit the superpowers. The Maoist discourse was also distinct from the third-world and hardline environmentalist views primarily in that it was especially *enthusiastic* and *optimistic* about humanity's abilities to collaboratively manage environmental problems. A marked anthropocentrism accompanied this ardent faith in humanity. Additionally, according to Maoist thought, the permissibility of environmental harm depends primarily on who commits it, for what reasons, and under what circumstances. The importance of these is determined according to Mao's "Three Worlds Theory," which bears a strong resemblance to dependency theory, and which distinguished between the "plunder" of natural resources by imperialist powers, and their "development" on the part of Third World nations. In this view, competition for resources between these rival forces formed part of the zero-sum tension between Third World sovereignty and First World imperialism.

The PRC's activism began as soon as the conference began. Defying expectations of a routine, uneventful consensus on the readymade declaration, the PRC's delegation declared general support for the draft text, but requested on the first day of the Conference to reopen the document to amendment, against the resistance of the European countries and the United States. In a plenary speech, the head of the Chinese delegation, Tang Ke, condemned the environmentally destructive effects of the American war in Vietnam:

Innumerable houses have been razed to the ground, great stretches of fertile land have been reduced to bomb craters, rivers and water resources have been polluted, forests and agricultural crops destroyed and certain biological species are faced with the danger of extinction. This shocking atrocity committed by U.S. imperialism cannot but arouse the utmost indignation of the people throughout the world, as well as all those who are engaged in the work of protecting the human environment.²²

He also criticized the fiscal policies of the superpowers, doing much to reveal the hypocrisy of their delegates at the Conference in the context of their countries' prioritization of military incentives: "They do not hesitate to spend huge sums of money each year on arms race [sic], but

York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

²¹. Samuel S Kim, "China and World Order," 583.

^{22.} "U.N. Stockholm Conference Closes: Chinese Delegation Makes Statement on 'Declaration on Human Environment,'" *Peking Review* 25, (June 23rd, 1972): 8-9.

are unwilling to spare the minimum funds for the conservation and improvement of the environment in their own countries or compensate for the loss of other sovereign states subjected to their pollution and damage."²³ The United States delegation privately expressed its concern that the Chinese were "out to wreck the declaration." And, in what was interpreted by some as "forced" or a coup,²⁴ the Chinese delegation called for and won a vote on the formation of a working group to field changes on the declaration. On June 11, it presented a 10-point proposal within the working group, which departed significantly from the draft declaration.

The proposal advanced all of the PRC's abovementioned diplomatic goals. It strengthened China's leadership as a militant and firm advocate of third-world interests, provided a Maoist interpretation of the fundamental environmental questions under consideration, and reserved strong criticism for the superpowers. The first two objectives had a profound impact on the final text of the Declaration. The sections that advanced the third would intensify as the Conference progressed, but were predictably vetoed by the United States and its allies.

Much of the proposal discussed the need to differentiate between the First and Third Worlds. Its first point stressed that "a distinction must be made" between the developing countries and "a few highly developed countries." The fourth read: "we resolutely oppose the plundering of resources in the developing countries by the highly developed countries." The sixth, seventh, and eighth further advocated for economic and environmental justice for the developing countries, in the form of an environmental fund contributed to by developed countries, the avoidance of "monopolization" of relevant science by "one or two countries," and the duty of the "corporate states" to compensate "victim states" for pollution. Ultimately, these issues brought forward by China would materialize as a discrete and new section in the preamble, and in a few principles. ²⁵

The final section would shed the more accusatory language and would also draw on the main findings of the Founex report:

In the developing countries most of the environmental problems are caused by under- development...Therefore, the developing countries must direct their efforts to development, bearing in mind their priorities and the need to safeguard and improve the environment. For the same purpose, the industrialized countries should make efforts to reduce the gap themselves and the developing countries. In the industrialized countries, environmental problems are generally related to industrialization and technological development.²⁶

Here the PRC could claim its desired status as the champion of the third-world struggle for justice and sovereignty. It also fulfilled the intentions of Maurice Strong in convening the Founex conference and commissioning its report.

The PRC also met concerns of overpopulation with optimism and anthropocentrism. The second point of the Chinese proposal read:

"Of all things in the world, people are the most precious. It is people who bring about social progress, create social wealth, develop science and technology, and, through their own industrious labour, continuously transform the human environment. It is wholly groundless to hold a pessimistic view in respect to the relationship between population growth and

49

²³. "China's Stand on the Question of the Human Environment," *Peking Review* 24 (June 16th, 1972).

²⁴ Rowland, *The Plot to Save the World*, 93. Strangely, the proposal delivered at the working group was significantly different from and shorter than the one published in the *Peking Review*. See China's Ten Cardinal Principles on Amending 'Declaration on Human Environment,'" *Peking Review* 25 (June 23rd, 1972).

²⁵. Sohn, "The Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment," 443.

^{26.} Ibid.

environment conservation...such problems can be solved if a government truly takes the interests of its people to heart and adopts...rational planning for the distribution of urban and rural population...and popularization of family planning.²⁷

The first two of these phrases, containing a famous maxim of Mao's, were adopted verbatim in the fifth section of the preamble of the Stockholm Declaration. It took its somewhat awkward position following a more pessimistic opening to the section, which discussed the threat of overpopulation. It was here that the PRC left its most immediately recognizable imprint on the text of the declaration.

The second section of the final preamble was also largely crafted according to the Chinese proposal. While the draft produced by the Working Group was reluctant to confer general duties to governments, the injection of Chinese enthusiasm into the final Declaration resulted in a section which provided that the protection and improvement of the environment "is the urgent desire of the peoples of the whole world and the duty of all Governments." The third section of the final preamble also bore the distinctive mark of word-for-word Maoism: "Man has constantly to sum up experience and go on discovering, inventing, creating, and advancing." Although this did not appear in the delegations' ten-point proposal, it is easy to find this language in Chinese publications at the time. It also conveys indirectly Mao's preference for the worker's experience over that of technocratic science.

Ideological attacks on the United States and the superpowers also made an appearance in the Chinese proposal. Its ninth point warned that the intergovernmental body which would be formed as a result of the convention "must be free of control by the super powers." The third point read:

We hold that the major social root cause of environmental pollution is capitalism, which has developed into a state of imperialism, monopoly, colonialism, and neocolonialism—seeking high profits, not concerned with the life or death of people, and discharging poisons at will. It is the policies of the super powers that have resulted in the most serious harm to the environment. The United States has committed serious abuses in Vietnam, killing and wounding many of its inhabitants...³⁰

As one would expect, this section failed to reach the final text of the Stockholm Declaration. But it is curious to consider this attack on the United States in light of Henry Kissinger's interpretation, allegedly encouraged by Mao, of this sort of language as "propaganda" designed for "domestic control," or in this case, international public relations. It is uncertain whether we may interpret this clash as bracketed ideological sportsmanship comparable to the famous pingpong games that united the two countries, or to the Shanghai communiqué issued after the Mao-Nixon meetings, given the *realpolitik*-driven rapprochement that was actually at play. Conversely, it may have been the PRC's perspective that the rapprochement and not the ideological warfare was a parenthetical break from the state of struggle against capitalism.

Another dramatic iteration of this clash occurred during the last hours of the drafting session

²⁷. "China's Ten Cardinal Principles."

²⁸ Sohn, "The Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment."

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

over the question of nuclear weapons. The United States wanted the Declaration to call for a stop on atmospheric nuclear testing, which the PRC was pursuing, while the PRC conditioned its abatement of testing on international disarmament (particularly by the superpowers), and preferred a provision which called for the elimination and destruction of all nuclear weapons.

The working group's chairman began to ignore the PRC's interventions, and the American delegation "seemed extremely pleased and began approaching other delegates to tell them that the Chinese were intent on wrecking the declaration." The American delegation encouraged deferring the completion of the declaration to the General Assembly. In order to avoid this, Maurice Strong shut off the interpreting device of the working group's chairman, and initiated an informal discussion in order to appease the United States and the PRC. This allowed the Chinese delegation to accept the United States' proposed principle, but to restate its condemnation of the United States and the superpowers' monopolization of nuclear arms in the final plenary session.

Despite the political struggle and the American victory over the nuclear provision, the PRC had a dramatic impact on the Stockholm Declaration. It moved the language of the Declaration towards a recognition of the differentiated conditions and responsibilities of developed and developing countries. It also brought some environmentalist fervor to a relatively tepid draft declaration. This leadership is especially remarkable given that this was the PRC's first stab at participating in an intergovernmental conference of such importance.

The Chinese delegation's defamation of the superpowers was not necessarily accompanied by dissimulation of its own domestic challenges, although Tang Ke noted in his plenary speech that the PRC had, "for many years," promoted afforestation and managed pollution.³² Amid high interest among academics in its environmental performance, one delegate reported that the PRC "still had much work to do" by way of pollution control.³³ Strong recalled that "[the] Chinese with their characteristic modesty are quick to point out the deficiencies of their own experience, but nevertheless their experience has dramatized the degree to which the environment issue must be seen as an integral part of the whole development process."³⁴ His admiration for China only grew in the aftermath of the Conference: "The Chinese paid great attention, but because it was their first conference they were not so experienced. So every morning I met with Chinese delegation. That was the beginning of my cooperation with China on environment."³⁵ Strong would eventually move to China and become a high-level environmental and foreign relations advisor to the PRC until his death in 2015.

Chinese Performance in its Press

Along with diplomacy, the PRC viewed the press as another branch of political struggle.³⁶ During the turn of the 1970s, the *Peking Review*, its only English-language weekly intended for foreign audiences, elaborated on the Maoist perspective on the environment, reported on the Stockholm conference, advertised environmental progress within China, and criticized the superpowers, especially the United States. These activities intensified in the year 1972. Because it was controlled by the PRC, the *Review* is a good source for an analysis of the government's priorities in its communications to the international community. At the time, the *Review*'s main subjects of interest included technological advances, growth in productivity,

^{31.} Rowland, The Plot to Save the World, 97.

³². "U.N. Stockholm Conference Closes: Chinese Delegation Makes Statement on 'Declaration on Human Environment,'" *Peking Review* 25, (June 23rd, 1972): 8-9.

^{33. &}quot;Much Pollution work for China, Official Says," The Globe and Mail, Toronto, (June 6, 1972).

³⁴. Maurice Strong, "World Environment Features Maurice Strong." Interviewed by Jia Feng.

^{35.} Ibid.

^{36.} James Chu, "Gathering News About China," Gazette 33 (1984): 89.

Maoist thought and study, foreign diplomacy breakthroughs, revolutionary activity on the international stage, and criticism of the superpowers. This did not mean that its content entirely obfuscated environmental problems and deficiencies in China, but the realm of the environment became a particularly fertile ground for political and ideological struggle.

In December of 1970, likely before the PRC had engaged in any environmental-diplomatic contact, a section in the *Review* titled "Socialist China in Progress," reported great advances in afforestation. However, it did not seem to be motivated by an increased concern for the environment in itself. Rather, the activity was "guided by our great leader Chairman Mao's great principle 'Be prepared against war, be prepared against natural disasters, and do everything for the people." ³⁷

This changed after many "foreign friends" became "very concerned" about the question: "How is pollution in China?" Problems more closely linked to the environment began to receive extensive attention in 1972, peaking during the summer months in which the Conference took place. In January of that year, an article titled "Turning the Harmful into the Beneficial" inaugurated the Chinese differentiation between the gravity of environmental problems in the capitalist and developed, and socialist and underdeveloped countries: "because the capitalists seek high profits and production is in a state of anarchy, [industrial wastes have become] an insoluble social problem in the capitalist world." It presented "multi-purpose use," i.e. recycling, as an essentially socialist practice which had been implemented by Mao since 1956, but had been impeded previously by capitalism. It made a case for the superior environmental performance of Maoist socialism:

During the Great Cultural Revolution, [a] plant's revolutionary committee organized all its staff members and workers to study Chairman Mao's teachings and mercilessly criticize the revisionist line, including trash like "making great efforts to do what is most profitable, less efforts to do what is less profitable and no efforts to do what is unprofitable" and "putting profits in command,"...They saw the question of whether or not to remove phenol as a question of "for whom?" which is a matter of principle... After reaching unity in their thinking and pooling their collective wisdom and strength, they quickly made a device for removing phenol from waste-water, thus turning the harmful into the beneficial.³⁹

The article, while discrediting the same free-market rhetoric that would be employed at Stockholm by the World Bank's president, also offered what may be a retort to the "limits to growth" discourse, proclaiming that there is "no limit to people's ability to know and transform the objective world. Thus there is no limit to utilizing the 'three wastes.'" Both this and another article in this issue, titled "Widespread Use of Micro-Organisms" which would be taken up by Western scholars, did not laud recycling and the use of organic processes for their environmental virtue *per se*, but for their resourcefulness and their benefit to the people—even though the use of organic processes in industry and agriculture would be revered as environmentally sound worldwide and would coincidentally harmonize with the eventual Stockholm Declaration principle of working "in collaboration with nature." Instead, the two articles dramatized these issues within the conflict between the revolution and revisionists. In both articles, Liu Shaoqui, whom Mao had cast as a bourgeois traitor, was blamed for obstruction to "multi-purpose use"

³⁷. "Cover the Country with Trees," Peking Review 52, December 25, 1970.

³⁸. Chi Wei, "Turning the Harmful into the Beneficial," *Peking Review* 24, January 28 1972.

³⁹. Ibid.

and "the use of microorganism," which were later triumphantly restored by the revolution. 40

By June 9, while devoting articles to family planning, population control, sovereignty over natural resources, and ecologically sound bamboo cultivation, the *Review* was reporting new successes in the PRC and the Chinese peoples' pursuit of pollution control: "Measures taken in Peking and Shanghai over the past six months have put an end in about a thousand big chimneys to black smoke, bringing about improved environmental hygiene, reduced air pollution and a drop in coal consumption." Much like the articles discussed above, it also detailed the initiative of factory workers to devise creative solutions on their own. The June 16 edition reprinted Tang Ke's plenary speech and described rather impartially the occurrences on the floor of the conference regarding the PRC's wish for revisions and the positions of other delegations.

One June 23, the *Review* announced Zhou Enlai's meetings with Lê Đức Thọ and other Vietnamese revolutionaries, followed immediately by the arrival of Henry Kissinger only three days after the Conference's dramatic conclusion. Until the day of the paper's distribution, Kissinger was meeting with Chinese leaders "to further the normalization of relations between the People's Republic of China and the United States and continue to exchange views on issues of common interest." Meanwhile, Zhou Enlai also met with American academics such as historian John K. Fairbank, and members of the Federation of American Scientists, an organization that advocated for nuclear disarmament. This issue also reprinted the ten-point proposal offered by the Chinese Delegation midway through the Conference.

Finally, an article in the July 7 edition confirmed the dualistic Maoist understanding of environmental degradation in the capitalist and socialist world, reporting a total breakdown of the United States' environment. It was titled "Serious Environmental Pollution in the United States" and stated that this serious pollution had "posed a threat to the public, as the U.S. monopoly capitalists, interested only in superprofits, have indiscriminately allowed filthy waste from industrial plants to pollute the environment." It offered a grim vista of the state of American rivers:

All the 52 major rivers in the country are polluted to a lesser or greater extent, varying from dirty, dirtier, to dirtiest. They also vary in colour. Thus, one section of the Potomac River turned bright red and bluish green...river water in the south became milky white...the petroleum industry turned the Delaware River black...⁴³

While most assertions in this article can be confirmed by American sources, other descriptions seem hyperbolic.⁴⁴ The article criticized the unrealistic promises of the Senate to reduce industrial pollution to zero within a decade. It was dominated by bleak numerical figures resulting from American quantitative environmental monitoring, which were absent from articles on the Chinese environment because of underdeveloped monitoring programs.

Conclusion

The turn of the 1970s called on Maoism to directly address environmental questions, producing a particular worldview on the issue. This analysis has explored how the PRC

⁴⁰. "Reducing Air Pollution–Initial Successes," *Peking Review* 23, June 9, 1972.

^{41.} Peking Review 25, June 23rd, 1972.

⁴² Ibid

^{43. &}quot;Serious Environmental Pollution in the United States." Peking Review 27, July 7, 1972.

⁴⁴. For instance, "American supermarkets are now flooded with chemically processed products, including meat, vegetables, bread, cakes and drinks. They have become such a horror that some people have tried to live on a diet of honey, cereals and coffee, but even this is not safe."

leveraged its new position in the United Nations to advance its own objectives, the needs of developing countries, and the common project of environmental protection. It also demonstrated how Maoism staked out its unique position in the conversation between hardline environmentalists, the standard developmentalist discourse, the World Bank's confidence in the free market, and the United States on the question of the environment. By publicizing its environmental performance and deepening the democratic procedures at the Stockholm Conference, the PRC began to claim positive public relations vis-à-vis the environment during the turn of the 1970s.

The question remains: both in its intergovernmental diplomacy and in its press, what is the meaning of the PRC's continued attacks on the United States as the perpetrator of ecocidal capitalism and imperialism, and its neglect to direct its environmental vitriol in equal amounts against the USSR, given the Sino-Soviet split and the American rapprochement? Was the PRC playing two different games, one in multilateral diplomacy and one in bilateral diplomacy? Was one less important than the other? Were the PRC's intentions in its anti-U.S. environmental rhetoric reducible to "propaganda for domestic (and international) control," in complete dissonance with its real diplomatic alliances? This analysis suggests that that the mix of the PRC's objectives and constraints was complex, and to some extent related to the substantive items in the Declaration, such as nuclear testing, as well as a nascent but fierce ideological contest for environmental legitimacy. Therefore, no clear and coherent set of motivations and priorities can be extracted from the evidence available to Western audiences at the time. In the absence of environmental monitoring and transparency, it is difficult to parse public relations and lip service from a sincere commitment to environmental progress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Broadbent, Kieran. "The Environment and Rural Policy in China." *International Relations* 5, no. 2 (November 1975): 865-875.

Wei, Chi. "Turning the Harmful into the Beneficial" *Peking Review* 4, January 28 1972.

"China's Ten Cardinal Principles on Amending 'Declaration on Human Environment." *Peking Review* 25, June 23rd, 1972.

"China's Stand on the Question of the Human Environment." *Peking Review* 24, June 16th, 1972.

"Cover the Country with Trees." *Peking Review* 52, December 25, 1970.

Joyner, Christopher C. "Stockholm in Retrospect: in The International Law of Environment." *World Affairs* 137, no. 1 (Summer 1974): 347.

Kapp, K. William. "'Recycling' In Contemporary China." *Kyklos* 27, no. 2 (June 1974): 286.

Kim, Samuel S. "China and World Order." *Altetnatives* 3, no. 4 (May 1978): 555-587. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, Department of Political Affairs, Asia-Oceania. "State of the Chinese Question after Canada and Italy's Recognition of Beijing and After the UN Discussion." History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France (December 30, 1970).

"Reducing Air Pollution–Initial Successes" *Peking Review* 23, June 9, 1972. "Serious Environmental Pollution in the United States." *Peking Review* 27, July 7, 1972.

Sohn, Louis B. "The Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment." *Harvard International Law Journal* 14, no. 3 (Summer 1973): 423-515.

Strong, Maurice. "World Environment Features Maurice Strong." Interviewed by Jia Feng. Accessed on mauricestrong.net.

--. "Stockholm–A Year Later." Interviewed by Sally Jacobsen. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 29 no. 6 (June 1973): 35-40.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. "Views: Our Treatment of the Environment in Ideal and Actuality: A geographer observes man's effect on nature in China and in the pagan and Christian West." *American Scientist* 58, no. 3 (May-June 1970): 247-249.

"U.N. Stockholm Conference Closes: Chinese Delegation Makes Statement on 'Declaration on the Human Environment." *Peking Review* 25, June 23rd, 1972.

Ward, Barbara, and René J. Dubos. *Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

Secondary Sources

Aronova, Elena. "Environmental Monitoring in the Making: From Surveying Nature's Resources to Monitoring Nature's Change." *Historical Social Research* 40 (2015): 222-245.

Chu, James. "Gathering News About China." *Gazette* 33 (1984): 87-106. Garver, John W. *China's Quest: The History of the Foreign Relations of the People's Republic of China*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

"The Founex Conference." Maurice Strong.net.

http://www.mauricestrong.net/index.php/founex-conference?showall=&limitstart=

Rowland, Wade. *The Plot to save the World: The Life and Times of the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment.* Toronto, Canada: Clarke, Irwin, and Co, 1973.

Promiscuous Boy, Promiscuous Girl: The Road to Sterilization in Virginia's Progressive Era

SHIRA MOGIL

On March 20, 1924, at the height of the Eugenics Movement in the United States, the Virginia General Assembly passed the Sterilization Act. This policy manifested Virginia's intent to maintain, protect, and secure the supposed purity of the white race. The Sterilization Act allowed for the compulsory sterilization of those "afflicted with hereditary forms of insanity" such as "idiocy, imbecility, feeble-mindedness or epilepsy." While the Sterilization Act promoted the sterilization of both men and women, most cases of sterilization were performed on poor white women and women of color. In this way, Virginia hoped to eradicate the further procreation of the "less-fit," in an attempt to conceive, not only the strongest white American race, but also to promote the "welfare" of society as a whole. This legislation advocated for greater state control over bodies and sexual activity through the regulation of both procreation and marriage.

This paper addresses the growing institutionalization and sterilization of Virginia's "feebleminded" population, referring to those considered mentally deficient. Prostitutes, unwed mothers, oversexed black males and criminals were premier candidates for sterilization in Virginia, for both sexual and criminal deviancies were believed to be hereditary mental deficiencies. With the growing industrialization of the South, institutions for those deemed mentally defective were founded in increasing numbers. Separating the feebleminded population, specifically feebleminded women during child bearing years, was essential in the prevention of feeblemindedness. Yet, with the increasing costs and the economic burden these institutions placed on the state, sterilization of the institutions' patients seemed far more effective in inhibiting future feebleminded offspring. In 1924, the Sterilization Act passed in the General Assembly with flying colors. Three years later in the historic Supreme Court case, *Buck v. Bell*, compulsory sterilization was legalized in the United States.

In the attempt to regulate sex and control the bodies of its population, Virginia inflicted mass suffering upon its most marginalized communities. While the Sterilization Act was implemented in the name of progress and the betterment of the population's future, this legislation was also the legal manifestation of fear and desire of power. This paper argues that, as morality and sexuality were determined to be the inherent genetic characteristics of the white and economically sound, societal welfare depended on both the procreation of this moral, white population, and the stagnation of the degenerative, colored population.

Definitions and Classifications: Feeblemindedness and the Corruption of a Social Order

In the wake of the Civil War, the old, agrarian South was newly urbanized and

¹ The Sterilization Act, Acts and Joint Resolutions (Amending the Constitution) of the General Assembly of the State of Virginia (Richmond: Davis Bottom, Superintendent of Public Printing, 1924), 569.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

undergoing industrialization. Historian Steven Noll writes, "the move to institutionalize feebleminded people in the South in the first decades of the twentieth century took place in the political arena. It formed part of an attempt to grapple with the vast economic and demographic changes that swept across the South during this period." Thus, physicians, legislators, and philanthropists sought to segregate and sterilize the criminal, prostitute, and mentally defective. This was a power move. Noll, quoting sociologists Stanley Cohen and Andrew Scull, explains, "what became recognized is that matters of crime, deviancy, delinquency, illness, and madness don't just every now and then touch on wider issues of politics, economics, and power. They are intimately related and, indeed, these very categories are politically defined." ⁵ Science was used to justify the segregation and sterilization of thousands, yet it was power and politics that drove these legislations and allowed them to pass. Michel Foucalt wrote, "Through the various discourses, legal sanctions against minor perversions were multiplied." ⁶ He continued, "sexual irregularity was annexed to mental illness...pedagogical controls and medical treatments were organized; around the least fantasies, moralists, but especially doctors, brandished the whole emphatic vocabulary of abomination." Along this line of thought, this paper, thus, illustrates the way physicians drove legislatures, philanthropists, and politicians to implement the compulsory sterilization of individuals in Virginia. As morality was linked to biology, science catapulted the state's sexual control of its citizens in the name of progress, protection, and prevention.

As feeblemindedness was believed to be hereditary, those deemed feebleminded posed two threats to society. First, they were termed "menaces" to society due to their lack of selfcontrol and inherent criminal and sexual nature. Second, the possibility that they would produce more feebleminded offspring was a great fear among Virginia's elite. It was believed that an increase in the feebleminded population would both destroy society's moral order and pose an economic burden on the state. The Third Annual Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections to the Governor of Virginia, published in 1911, defined a feebleminded person as "one who permanently lacks normal mental capacity." Additionally, the report distinguished feebleminded persons from those suffering from insanity: "feeble-mindedness, as a rule, is inherited," the report explained, "while a predisposition to insanity is hereditary, insanity is not inherited." Thus, due to the hereditary nature of feeblemindedness it was deemed impossible to correct the mental status of those suffering from this mental deficit. The report stated, "A child is born an imbecile and neither the best of nutrition, the most scrupulous cleanliness, the purest air and sunshine, nor the best of mental and physical training will make anything else out of him." In this way, it was irresponsible to require these persons to abide by laws, for their behavior was predestined based on their heredity. In order to control both the behavior and procreation of the feebleminded, then, it was necessary to segregate them from the rest of society.

While feeblemindedness was divided into three categories, the idiot, imbecile, and moron, the moron, which composed the highest or most functioning of the classes, was thought

⁴ Steven Noll, *Feeble-Minded in Our Midst: Institutions for the Mentally Retarded in the South, 1900-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 8.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 36.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections," Third Annual Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections to the Governor of Virginia for the Year Ending September 30, 1911 (October 7, 1911): 11.

⁹ Ibid., 12.

¹⁰ Ibid.

to pose the greatest threat to society. The term menace was often employed to refer to the moron, as well as in reference to the hypersexual black male and female. In his article, "Feeble-minded Children," in the *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly*, Dr. L.S. Foster expressed that the moron required a great amount of state funds and caretakers, for her or she made up most of the population of prostitutes and those in jail and, in this way, could not make a living in an "honest way." The moron is, "a menace to public health as well as its morals," he concluded. Yet, the "high grade imbecile" was also thought to possess a great danger to societal welfare. The moron and the imbecile threatened to contaminate the rest of the population, for the feebleminded individual could "multiply his kind" and "corrupt the community." Essentially, the greatest danger posed by morons and high-grade imbeciles was their normal appearance, which acted as a sort of false exterior.

My Poor Baby: Prostitution, Morality, and the Defective Delinquent

The hereditary nature of feeblemindedness was directly correlated with the supposed hereditary nature of morality. Those deemed feebleminded were categorized as "defective delinquents" and were doomed to a life of criminal behavior and sexual immorality. ¹⁴ The *Third Annual Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections to the Governor of Virginia* published one case of research on the New Jersey Training School that recorded the great number of children that feebleminded woman produced. Referred to as prostitutes, these feebleminded women were believed to be a hindrance to societal welfare and public health. The report referred to these woman as "slaves of passion" and, in this sense, it was due to their feebleminded nature and their inability to exercise self-control that caused them to succumb to the woes of sex and prostitution. ¹⁵ Furthermore, a woman who bore many children was often thought to be of low birth and social ranking and thus, she was perceived as sexually loose and immoral. ¹⁶

Similar to the perception of the hereditary sexual nature of the black man and woman, the feebleminded woman, in this case, was at a hereditary disadvantage. Historian Martha Hodes writes, "dominant ideas about poor white women included convictions about their promiscuity and debauchery." ¹⁷ Quoting Nell Irvin Painter, Hodes states, "the stereotypes are centuries old and have their origins in European typecasting of both the poor and the black, for sex is the main theme associated with poverty and with blackness." ¹⁸ Thus, the poor, defective delinquent and the black male and female were typecast by their supposed inherent sexual natures. They were societal defectives and would destroy the moral and white purity of Virginia's social order.

This sexual nature was seen as out of control due to the number of children that the feebleminded woman conceived. Thus, the prostitute was determined to be feebleminded for, she too, was seen as a person who possessed inherently wary morals. The report stated that, "The moral imbecile cannot resist the temptations that are common lot of mankind, cannot exercise

¹¹ L.S. Foster, "Feeble-Minded Children," Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly 17 (January 10, 1913): 471-472.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections," 13.

¹⁴ Ibid., 18.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Martha Hodes, White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South (Yale University Press: New Haven, 1997), 5.

¹⁸ Ibid.

ordinary prudence and foresight necessary to provide for the future." In this way, the feebleminded woman was seen as both a threat to herself and to society at large. She could not exercise proper birth control, thus, it was up to the state to provide such measures. The report of the state board of corrections and charities chronicled that a great amount of the imbecile women in almshouses already had children. It goes on to saying: "In one of these institutions there is an incorrigible woman thirty-four years old. She goes away from the almshouse periodically and is usually found in the county jail. She has had three children; one is dead, one has been placed in a family home, the other is with its mother. Of course, these children are low grade mentally." This was both a moral and public health issue. Thus, morality and sexual promiscuity were innately linked to medicine and state affairs. In this way, a solution would be one of a medical and biological nature, while also taking root in the language of proper morals, sexual hygiene, and hereditary characteristics.

The Sins of the Father, Grandfather, and Great-Grandfather: Causes of Feeblemindedness

While feeblemindedness was believed to be hereditary, it was also commonly thought that sexually transmitted diseases (such as syphilis), intoxication, and anything deemed morally reprehensible could, in fact, produce a feebleminded child. Charles V. Carrington, a prominent physician at the University of Virginia held that, "syphilis is directly responsible for epilepsy, insanity in many instances, feeblemindedness, and all of the ills that follow in its train."²² He then quoted the bible, stating, "The sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations." ²³ In this case, the moral deeds of parents or grandparents were connected to the physical and mental abnormalities of their future offspring. Unbridled sex led to the unbridled delinquent. In a similar vain, Foster wrote of the connection between alcoholism and feeblemindedness. While a mother who consumed an abundant amount of alcohol during pregnancy would harm the development of the fetus, Foster held that "intoxication or perverted mental states in either parent at the time of conception must be regarded as causes [of feeblemindedness]."²⁴ For Foster, then, a moral mental state played a large role in the breeding process of fit and unfit children, thus providing a further connection between what people believed to be moral and the propagation of biologically superior people. "Young man,' said Diogenes to a feeble-minded boy, 'thy father must have been very drunk when thy mother conceived thee." Foster wrote. 25 This sentiment was furthered in the "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections": "in our investigations, the permitting of imbeciles to propagate their kind, the cohabitation of persons nearly related, and alcoholism have shown up as the principal causes of the increase of feeble-mindedness in Virginia."²⁶ Yet, this also illustrates the accountability of both men and women in the cause of feeblemindedness. In this sense, it was the sexual nature and inebriation of both mother and father that caused the mental incapacities of their children.

Carrington noted the double standard of moral sexual behavior. The man, he explained,

¹⁹ "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections," 18.

²⁰ Ibid., 19.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Charles V. Carrington, "Keep the Race Pure," Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly 18 (December 12, 1913): 434.

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Foster, "Feeble-Minded Children," 470.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections," 19.

was often not held responsible for past sexual transgressions, while the woman was disgraced. Yet, it was the sexual behavior of both that affected the physical and mental strengths of future children. While the South held onto its notion of white female purity, Carrington, in some ways, hoped to incorporate the idea of white male purity. According to Carrington, it was imperative to dismantle the double standard of sexuality that existed at the time. This was for the health of the future, the propagation of a pure race, and the welfare of society.

A Probable Solution, Part I: In Holy Matrimony

Attempting to promote a probable solution to inhibit the growth of the feebleminded population in Virginia, both physicians and religious figures sought to implement the medical supervision of marriages within the state. Before two individuals were able to obtain a marriage license they would undergo a background check in order to ensure that they would not produce feebleminded offspring. The proposed medical supervision of marriages looked to control marriage and regulate sex as a means of eliminating unwanted defective offspring. Fearing a growing number of feebleminded individuals inhabiting Virginia and the possible effects of their potential to reproduce. Carrington desired to stop their ability to reproduce through the denial of marriage licenses. Carrington wrote, "We physicians should unhesitatingly do everything in our power to aid in this movement...and only then, will we begin to stem the tide of criminal, degenerate, feeble-minded, epileptic and insane, which is so surely polluting and threatening extermination of our race."²⁷ The movement to promote the medical supervision of marriages was again part of the larger eugenics movement as Carrington explained, "the real eugenic marriage would mean not only singling out the cases coming within the scope of the resolutions, but all mental, moral, and physical imperfections would debar candidates," in an effort to, once again, create a perfect human race.²⁸

This act, furthermore, was intended to promote public health and help to rid the community of disease and sexual wariness. In his article, "Medical Supervision of Matrimony," A. Einer wrote that that the application of a marriage act would limit the spreading of hereditary diseases and control the procreation of those who are diseased. Furthermore, it was due to the "errors in matrimony" that were seen to cause "certain mental or physical disorders not amenable to treatment." ²⁹ Marriage control was thus promoted in an effort to eradicate societal disease that was deemed hereditary. The marriage between those who possessed feebleminded traits was seen as a potential threat to the production of the best and ablest race.

Employing religious officials of the Episcopalian Church, Foster and Carrington further emphasized the necessity of the medical supervision of marriages. Connecting morality to health, both the sciences and men of god backed the crusade to halt the births of defective offspring. Rev. Dr. Sumner of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral of St. Peter and Paul of Chicago announced: "'After Easter, no person will be married at the Cathedral unless they present a certificate of health from a reputable physician to the effect that they are normal physically and mentally, and have neither an incurable or a communicable disease.""³⁰ Medical fitness, then, was tied to one's religious institution in order to control marriage and ultimately one's ability to conceive children. "If all the clergy and others who can perform the ceremony would adopt the

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid., 437.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Quoted in Foster, "Feeble-Minded Children," 472.

edict of Dr. Sumner, more than half the battle would be won," Foster added.³¹ Quoting the Episcopal Diocesan Council of Virginia, Carrington tied immorality to disease, "knowing that immorality in men leads to physical disease," he stated it was imperative to halt the transmission of these diseases to pure and innocent women.³² He further called for a "new crusade" to prevent "physical tragedies." In this way, immorality thought to be in the realm of religion was joined with disease. By connecting the church to issues of medicine, Foster and Carrington made the issue of defective offspring a cause for everyone to care about. The Catholic Church, however, did not partake in this crusade, for the importance of life and the sanctity of procreation were crucial components of the Church.

Implementing medical supervision of marriages would, furthermore, reduce the economic burden that feebleminded offspring placed on society. Because those who were feebleminded were believed to be irresponsible, the accountability of their actions was placed on the government. Thus, Einer argued that it would make the most sense to, "eliminate the defectives by denying the marriage privilege to those who, for obvious reasons, should not be permitted to marry and propagate their species, and an essential step will have been toward genealogic improvement." In later years Foster explained that the United States contained 3,000,000 "abnormal persons," whose care cost an estimated \$20,000,000,000 per year. Therefore, adopting and enforcing both physical and intelligence tests before a couple was married was seen as a way to protect the government from large cost expenditures, prevent suffering, and improve the race. As the call of prevention rang throughout Foster's article, he suggested that each state should have its own sterilization statute. Sterilization, he concluded, was the greatest form of prevention, for it ensured that the feebleminded would be unable to reproduce no matter their marriage status.

A Probable Solution, Part II: Segregation and the Creation of State Institutions

Segregation of the mentally deficient was a way to prevent the procreation of defective offspring and to help promote societal progress. Segregation of blacks from whites, in a similar vain, was meant to prevent the amalgamation of blacks and whites, and therefore help produce what the Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America called the ablest and progressive white race. The fear of those deemed sexually deviant, both black men and women, and feebleminded men and women, led to the creation of state institutions to house the feebleminded and promote sterilization laws. If the defective could no longer reproduce, then the mentally deficient population would decrease and would thus no longer pose as great a threat to society. Historian Steven Noll writes that, while all seven southern states housed institutions for individuals who were called insane, there were no designated facilities for people labeled feebleminded. During the second decade of the twentieth century, with the influence of Woodrow Wilson and the societal changes after World War I, the South directly began to focus on societal ills and issues related to feeblemindedness. "The demands of organizing the war effort," Noll writes, "led many southern governors to ask for help from social service philanthropies and foundations." Additionally, Noll mentions that

³¹ Foster, "Feeble-Minded Children," 472.

 $^{^{\}rm 32}$ Quoted in Carrington, "Keep the Race Pure," 437.

³³ Quoted in Carrington, "Keep the Race Pure," 437.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Foster, "Feeble-Minded Children," 472.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

the Southern institutions received funding from Northern philanthropists and that, "money and personnel from the National Committee for Mental Hygiene (funded by the Rockefeller Foundation) and the Russell Sage Foundation provided the groundwork and rationale for the opening of many of the South's institutions for the feebleminded." While institutions were publicized as helping their inmates, they first served to protect the society from these same inmates.

In an effort to aid the current feebleminded population, eliminate the production of mentally defective offspring, and protect the society from those deemed mentally flawed, the 1913 "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections" promoted the implementation of state institutions for feebleminded individuals. The report detailed the economic burden that the feebleminded population placed on Virginia, and explained the benefits that state institutions would provide to feebleminded individuals. The report sought to segregate feebleminded children from "normal children" as it explained, "a normal child is in great danger from the uncontrolled acts of a feeble-minded child. The sexual danger is especially great." ³⁹ It was the duty of the state to help the feebleminded in order to train them, "to be happy and useful citizens. This much is due to them—due them just as truly as a public school education is due a normal child." 40 State institutions, in this sense, were publicized as the rights of citizens. The right to a free education, in this way, was parallel to the right of free mental assistance. To curb this state burden, feebleminded women were placed in institutions during childbearing years in the hopes of preventing the further procreation of feebleminded peoples. The report explained that if the state did not provide institutions for the feebleminded, this would, "add the spread of disease, the extension of feeble-mindedness, the decrease in productive power of those who must use time and strength in taking care of these weak ones, and the loss through the crime, the expense of trial and imprisonment of the twenty per cent of feeble-minded who are delinquents."⁴¹ Furthermore, the State Institution could train its occupants and help them become "selfsupporting," prevent procreation through "custodial care," and, therefore, decrease the State's future burden.⁴²

Virginia, as a leader in the sterilization movement, upheld its duty in providing for its feebleminded and degenerate people. Alexander Johnson, secretary of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections advised, "there should be safe, permanent, custodial care of all those who are so far degenerate that their unhindered natural increase would result in lowering the average quality of manhood and womanhood of the State." ⁴³ The creation of state institutions was, in this way, the optimal implantation for all citizens. The report referred to Virginia as "the mother of presidents" and "the mother of states" and it was, therefore, the duty of the Commonwealth to serve, love, and protect its "helpless" and "irresponsible innocents." Thus, philanthropists and those looking to do good promoted the creation of institutions as a humanitarian act.

In the hopes of creating an ideal state, segregation and the implementation of state institutions was a way to halt the production of offspring. This was the age of prevention. Charles Davenport, the director of the Carnegie Station for Experimental Evolution, and secretary of the

³⁸ Noll, Feeble-Minded in Our Midst, 9.

³⁹ Ibid., 21.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid., 25.

⁴² Ibid., 26.

⁴³ Ibid., 30.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

eugenics section of the American Breeders' Association, "believe[d] that if all of the weak-minded of reproductive age were segregated for a period of thirty years, feeble-mindedness would become nearly extinct." The state institutions, however, were not a final solution. State institutions were very costly, and therefore it was necessary that the production of feebleminded offspring be prevented. Quoting Davenport, the "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections" explained that if the State segregated the feebleminded and deported defective immigrants, "at the end of the thirty years there would be practically no use for such institutions," which would also save the save the state a substantial amount of money. This was an ideal situation and it tied the issue of immigration into the larger eugenic cause.

As the creation of state institutions cost the state a great deal of money, it was impossible to place all those deemed mentally defective in a state facility. Thus, sterilizing certain defectives was done in an effort to, "check entirely the procreation of criminals and defectives." ⁴⁷ This sterilization, as Foster explained, was, "vasectomy or castration in the male, and litigation of the tubes in the female in those cases that cannot be colonized." ⁴⁸ In this sense, it would ultimately prevent the procreation of defective offspring through the state control of bodies deemed deviant and dangerous.

A Probable Solution, Part III: Stop the Breed

Segregating the feebleminded and defective individuals of the state was not an ideal solution for the elimination of delinquent offspring. Sterilizing state institution inmates, however, would allow defective individuals to be reincorporated into society. Historian Gregory Dorr notes that, while Indiana is given credit for being the first state to implement sterilization legislation, physicians within Virginia were the first to perform extralegal sterilizations. As feeblemindedness was believed to be hereditary, sterilizing inmates was promoted as the most efficient method to prevent feebleminded offspring. The article, "Reducing the Number of Feeble-Minded" explained: "When the whole subject is viewed from a practical point of view the arguments for sterilization of the mentally defective seem greatly to outweigh the sentimental reasons advanced against it." As it promoted the combined usage of segregation and sterilization to implement the ultimate prevention of feebleminded offspring, the article delineated the benefits of sterilization over segregation through the means of state institutions:

many inmates of institutions for the feeble-minded could be kept safely at their homes and at least help to earn their own living were it not for the opportunity to reproduce their own kind which such liberty would give them. Although segregation of this class during the whole of the reproductive period is effective in its results, it carries with it a financial burden which seems unnecessarily large. Considered in all its various aspects, it would appear that the most practical plan for the elimination of the feeble-minded strains should judiciously combine the methods of segregation and sterilization. ⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Ibid., 26.

⁴⁶ Quoted in "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections," 26.

⁴⁷ "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections," 30.

⁴⁸ Foster, "Feeble-Minded Children," 472.

⁴⁹ "Reducing the Number of the Feeble-Minded," *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 17 (January 10, 1913): 491. ⁵⁰ Ibid.

Sterilization, then, was the most efficient and cost effective tool in hopes of reducing the feebleminded population. Employing the works of articles published in the *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly*, this section highlights the promoted sterilization of the black male and habitual criminal who were deemed prime candidates for sterilization due to their inherent sexual appetites.

Since black men were perceived to be inherently immoral and sexually deviant, Bernard Barrow, a prominent physician in Virginia, promoted the vasectomy of black males in the hopes of eliminating their further procreation. Barrow wrote, "The negro, as a savage race, cannot solve his social and sanitary problems," however, "he should not be blamed for it; it is a responsibility which rests on the shoulders of the stronger race—the white man." According to Barrow, then, black men, by nature, were both inherently lesser than whites and could do nothing about their natural savage state. Barrow argued that incessant breeding, strong and able bodies, coupled with "little mental and no moral development," led to the rapid procreation of the black population and the fear that the black race would soon take over the population: "The most prominent type of the defective negro is rather numerous, and probably since the Civil War, has been on the increase." After the Civil War and the abolition of slavery, the black man was the most dangerous individual; it was the free person who was no longer under the bonds of white Southern society who posed the greatest threat. Thus, Barrow asserted a natural danger onto black men in an effort to reassert previous power dynamics.

The power to oppress black men and halt the procreation of black peoples that Borrow held, laid in the hands of the physician, for he possessed the power to physically inhibit individuals from their ability to have children. Thus, it was Barrow's duty to eradicate the "vicious and disease-bearing portion of our population." The procedure, Barrow explained, allowed the man to continue to engage normally in sexual activity; the vasectomy, was appealing to men, particularly black men, for it still allowed them to experience sexual pleasure, while also serving as an ironclad form of birth control. These results, as Barrow explained, were the responsibilities that included providing for potential offspring. Furthermore, Barrow promoted the procedure since the patient would not suffer much inconvenience and could return to work quickly. He explained that, later on, if the man so wished, the procedure could be reversed and he could once again father children. "It will be so popular among this defective class of negroes," Barrow wrote, "that within a few generations its effect will be so far reaching that it will go a long way towards solving the negro problem by eliminating the vicious, criminally inclined, disease-bearing portion of the race." For females, however, the operation was slightly more complicated, "but if skillfully done no more hazardous." Additionally, when a woman was sterilized the process could never be reversed. Thus, the so-called ease of the procedure was drastically different for men and women.⁵⁷ In this way, the notions of ease and a quick recovery could not be used as promotional tools for female sterilization.

While Carrington also spoke of the ease of sterilization procedure, he made it clear in his article, "Sterilization and the Habitual Criminal," that the sterilization of individuals is for "only

⁵¹ Bernard Barrow, "Vasectomy for the Defective Negro with His Consent," *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 15 (August 26, 1910): 226-227.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

habitual criminals, third termers, and those guilty or heinous and revolting crimes, degenerates and such like." Criminality, Carrington held, was hereditary. Thus, it was the duty of the state to stop the production of such individuals through the implementation of a sterilization law. Carrington said: "stop the breed is the whole proposition," and, "prevention is the cry of the age—or to put it better, of the ages." Carrington, therefore, drafted a law for the sterilization of criminal men and explained that several states including Indiana, California, Connecticut, and Utah already passed sterilization laws. He believed that criminal cases would largely decrease fifteen or twenty years after the enactment of a sterilization statute. Writing about his experience as a surgeon in the penitentiary, Carrington explained that, over the course of ten years, he had seen grandfathers, fathers, and sons enter the prison. He emphasized the hereditary nature of crime in an effort to further promote the sterilization of criminals:

I have been [a] surgeon for to the penitentiary for over ten years, a long enough time to see father and then sons come to the prison, and by looking back over the records I learned that the grandfather had also been an inmate. Now this hideous reproduction of criminals, from father to son and to grandson, should be stopped; it is right and proper that it should be, and it will be in time—in a very short time, too—if you doctors of Virginia will awaken to the importance of this proposition as a crime preventer, and tell your Representatives in the House and Senate that from a medical and surgical standpoint it is a good measure. ⁶⁰

This was a societal issue that could be solved through the help of physicians. Furthermore, Carrington wrote that a criminal, "forfeited the rights of citizenship...[and] if he is a rapist, murderer, burglar, or guilty of arson or train-wrecking, he should be prevented from reproducing his species." ⁶¹ In this way, sterilization was also seen as a justified punishment for the crimes individuals committed.

Linking criminality to a hypersexual nature, Carrington highlighted the incessant masturbating of the criminals he sterilized. In the first case, Carrington wrote, "this poor creature was most dangerously homicidal, and was the wildest, fiercest, most consistent masturbator I have ever seen. I sterilized him." ⁶² Carrington stated that, once sterilized, the criminal improved both mentally and physically: "now he is a sleek, fat, docile, intelligent fellow—a trusty about the yard—cured by sterilization." ⁶³ Again, in a second case Carrington spoke of the "degenerate" who was a "masturbator and sodomist." ⁶⁴ After the sterilization, Carrington described the patient as, "a strapping, healthy-looking young buck." ⁶⁵ Sexuality, according to Carrington, was deemed criminal if considered excessive or performed in ways deemed inappropriate, as illustrated in the case of the criminal who engaged in sodomy. The believed uncontrolled, and therefore, criminal, sexual behavior of these individuals prompted the state to

⁵⁸ Charles V. Carrington, "Sterilization and the Habitual Criminal," *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 14 (December 24, 1909): 422.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

A Call for Legislative Action: The Work of Harry Laughlin and Implementing Sterilization in Virginia

Harry H. Laughlin, prominent eugenicist and Superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office from 1910 until its closing in 1939, sought to implement compulsory sterilization legislation within the United States. Drafting a model sterilization law, Laughlin created the guidelines for states to devise sterilization policies. In his work, Eugenical Sterilization in the *United States*, Laughlin likened eugenic sterilization to vaccines; both vaccines and sterilization, he proposed, were preventative measures and efforts to protect society from disease and destitution. Similarly, the invasion of immigrants on U.S. soil threatened to taint the American population with degenerative offspring. Thus, he advised, that the federal government implement quotas to halt the amount of immigrants allowed past the borders. Chief Judge Harry Olsen, of the Municipal Court of Chicago, wrote in the introduction to Laughlin's work that, "America needs to protect herself against indiscriminate immigration, criminal degenerates, and race suicide." Olsen explained the need for laws to protect society from criminals and noted the hereditary nature of crime and degeneracy. "The courts have special functions to perform in the suppression of crime," and make known the duty of the judge to publicize, "the relationship between degeneracy and crime and their relationship to heredity." ⁶⁸ Laughlin's work was intended to help legislators and administrators create eugenic policies. In this way, the law helped forge the perception of the feebleminded as defective people and possessors of criminal behavior. Olsen explained that segregation was a means to protect the present generation, while sterilization was a way to ensure a better future generation.⁶⁹

Laughlin, thus, urged for the segregation and sterilization of the feebleminded and noted that, although this would strip individuals of their personal liberty, it would be done to protect society from deviants, and to ultimately help deviants rehabilitate. While, "both segregation and eugenical sterilization involve the taking away of the personal liberty without the element of punishment...both in commitment and sterilization the principal motive is the protection of society, the secondary motive the protection of the particular individual." Laughlin asserted that the segregation and sterilization of individuals, however, required due process of law, yet, in most states the segregation and sterilization of people received cooperation from families. "The enforcement of the law," he added, "has been greatly supported by the voluntary element on the part of the persons directly affected. If in each case the individual resisted as in the case of punishment for crime, these social, therapeutic and eugenical remedies would not have such a bright outlook, nor would their present effectiveness be very great." In this instance, Laughlin refers to eugenical sterilization as a part of "therapeutic and eugenical remedies." Sterilization, then, was promoted for the wellbeing of the patient undergoing the procedure. Dr. Albert Priddy,

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Harry Olsen, introduction to Harry H. Laughlin's Eugenical Sterilization in the United States (Chicago: Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922), v-vi.

⁶⁸ İbid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Harry H. Laughlin, *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* (Chicago: Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922), 350.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

superintendent of the Lynchburg hospital in Virginia, also employed the term "therapeutic" when referring to the sterilization of women he had diagnosed with pelvic disease.⁷³

One of the ways to cure pelvic inflammatory disease, Dorr notes, was through tubule ligation, or sterilization. In this way, Priddy was able to mask eugenic sterilization as a therapeutic procedure, which focused solely on women. Thus, "the lack of a male analog for pelvic disease and the paucity of evidence documenting the therapeutic benefits of vasectomy marked the procedure as eugenic rather than therapeutic, making it hard to see his motives." While eugenic sterilization was initially performed on both men and women, Priddy's use of curing pelvic inflammatory disease made the targets of his eugenic sterilization primarily women. Additionally, Priddy documented the women he sterilized as belonging to he moron category (the highest class of defectives), and, thus, deemed them the most dangerous to society. In this way, Priddy dismantled the reproductive agency of these women in order to protect society from their potentially harmful offspring.

Priddy, as one of the chief lobbyists of the passing of the Sterilization Act in 1924, alongside Joseph DeJarnette (the superintendent of the Western state hospital), sought the help of legislator Aubrey Strode to draft eugenic legislations in Virginia. Strode aided in the passing of segregation, marriage, and sterilization statues. Strode's language, Dorr suggests, was broad, which provided Priddy and DeJarnette adequate excuses in performing, "extralegal sterilization of patients as a consequence of 'medical necessity.'"⁷⁵ The General Assembly passed the Sterilization Act in 1924 through the help of physicians, lobbyists, philanthropists, and legislators (namely Strode, who employed Laughlin's model sterilization statute). Concerned with the legality of the statute, Strode's article, "Sterilization of Defectives," stated that, "while this statute has a eugenical motive, sterilization can in no case be ordered under its authority unless it shall have been first judicially ascertained that the welfare of the inmate also be promoted thereby."⁷⁶ Distinguishing Virginia's Sterilization Act from that of other states, Strode highlighted the importance of the welfare of the patient and the process of hearings that were held before a patient was sterilized. Echoing Laughlin's language, Strode stressed that, when patients (due to their state of mental defectives) become wards of the state, they, "are incapable of deciding what is best for themselves."⁷⁷ The Virginia statue, Strode argued, required support and additional findings in an effort to argue that sterilization was indeed the best action proposed to promote public and patient welfare. Eugenic sterilization, at least in the state of Virginia, then, was performed for the welfare of the patient and greater Virginian society.

The sterilization bill passed in the Senate 30 to 0 and in the House 75 to 2, illustrating the just how vast and deep seeded eugenical views ran. These overwhelming numbers of support for sterilization displayed the success of "Virginia's eugenical propagandists," who, Dorr writes, "transformed public opinion" in such a way that the bill "hardly merited newspaper coverage and elicited no editorial protest." Yet, only those able to pay for a lawyer could challenge a sterilization hearing. Dorr explains that professionals, such as the board of directors and the superintendent of the institutions, possessed a disproportionate amount of power, depicting the

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Dorr, Segregation's Science, 125-126.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 122.

⁷⁶ Aubrey Strode, "Sterilization of Defectives," Virginia Law Review 11 (1924-1925): 301.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Gregory Michael Dorr, Introduction to Segregation's Science: Eugenics and Society in Virginia (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 129.

segregation of classes and power dynamics at play.⁷⁹ Thus, overwhelmingly those who were sterilized were among the poor and low classes.

Aftermath and Conclusion

In order to continue making strides, Priddy and DeJarnette decided to test the sterilization statute in courts. Dorr writes that the, "affirmation of the law would cement the state's right to 'adjust' the quality of its population, protecting the American race and empowering physicians like Priddy and DeJarnette with unprecedented power." Using Carrie Buck as a test case, the trial was brought to the Supreme Court in *Buck v. Bell* in 1927, which legalized the compulsory sterilization of tens of thousands of people in the United States. Buck, a native of Charlottesville, was a daughter of a woman who was institutionalized. When the nephew of her foster parents raped her and she became pregnant, Buck was institutionalized in Lynchburg as well. As feeblemindedness was tied to the hereditary nature of sexual immorality, Buck, who was pregnant out of wedlock, became a prime candidate for sterilization. At the court's decision to uphold the constitutionality of eugenic sterilization, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes infamously announced, "being swamped with incompetence . . . Three generations of imbeciles are enough." Thus, he deemed it necessary to sterilize Carry Buck in an effort to rid the world of her hereditary defectiveness. Holmes' words reinforce the propagation of the hereditary nature of feeblemindedness, criminality, and sexual immorality.

This was a progressive Supreme Court, which legalized the suffering of thousands and deprived thousands of their right and choice to procreate, while enacting violence upon the body. Additionally, as Buck, a victim of sexual assault, was stripped of her sexual rights, the man who raped her walked away free. The Progressive Era is marked as a time of societal betterment. Women received the right to vote in 1920. Yet, with this, political suffrage came suffering. As women sought political and, in many ways, sexual equality, they also saw an increase in the desire for the state to control their bodies. This bears resemblance to the political suffrage of the black male and the increase in the number of lynchings, and in some cases castrations, of black men for the supposed commitment of sexual crimes. Power, then, as Foucalt explained, manifested itself through the sexual control of citizens.

The history of compulsory sterilization in the United States often stays untold. Steven Noll writes, "Institutions for the mentally retarded are hardly the stuff of summer vacations for history buffs," for, "they are not on the list of heavily tourist destinations such as Gettysburg and Williamsburg." This is a history that cannot be romanticized and deemed a triumph of good over evil, yet it is a necessary history to be told, studied, and analyzed. Eugenicists successfully altered American law for much of the twentieth century and their residue continues to play a part in the way case and reproductive rights are defined today. We are, "enmeshed in national debates about inherited intelligence, restrictions on immigration, and the links between race and inherited propensities to crime." ⁸³ History has created the context within which we operate in the present, thus it is not something to be swept under the rug.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 128.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 129.

⁸¹ Chicago-Kent College of Law at Illinois Tech. "Buck v. Bell." Oyez. https://www.oyez.org/cases/1900-1940/274us200 (accessed April 1, 2016).

⁸² Noll, "The Public Face of Southern Institutions for the 'Feeble-Minded," 40.

⁸³ Lombardo, "Medicine, Eugenics, and the Supreme Court: From Coercive Sterilization to Reproductive Freedom," 25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Barrow, Bernard. "Vasectomy for the Defective Negro with His Consent." *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 15 (August 26, 1910): 226-228.
- Carrington, Charles V. "Sterilization and the Habitual Criminal." *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 14 (December 24, 1909): 421-422.
- Carrington, Charles V. "Keep the Race Pure." *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 17 (December 12, 1913): 434–38.
- Chicago-Kent College of Law at Illinois Tech. "Buck v. Bell." Oyez. https://www.oyez.org/cases/1900-1940/274us200. Accessed April 1, 2016.
- Einer, A. "Medical Supervision of Matrimony." *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 9 (February 10, 1905): 489-492.
- Foster, L.S. "Feeble-Minded Children." *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 17 (January 10, 1913): 469-474.
- Laughlin, Harry H. *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States*. Chicago: Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922.
- "Reducing the Number of the Feeble-Minded." *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly* 17 (January 10, 1913): 491.
- "Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections." *Third Annual Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections to the Governor of Virginia for the Year Ending September* 30, 1911 (October 7, 1911).
- Strode, Aubrey. "Sterilization of Defectives." Virginia Law Review 11 (1924-1925): 296-301.
- The Sterilization Act. In *Acts and Joint Resolutions (Amending the Constitution) of the General Assembly of the State of Virginia*. Richmond: Davis Bottom, Superintendent of Public Printing, 1924. 569.

Secondary Sources

- Davis, Chelyen. "Bill Proposes Compensation for Forced Sterilization Victims in Virginia." *The Free Lance-Star.* January 23, 2013.
- Dorr, Gregory Michael. *Segregation's Science: Eugenics and Society in Virginia*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.
- Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality. New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- Hodes, Martha. White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Lombardo, Paul A. "Medicine, Eugenics, and the Supreme Court: From Coercive Sterilization to Reproductive Freedom." *Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy* 13, (1996): 1–25.
- Noll, Steve. Feeble-Minded in Our Midst: Institutions for the Mentally Retarded in the South, 1900-1940. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Noll, Steven. "The Public Face of Southern Institutions for the 'Feeble-Minded." *The Public Historian* 27 (Spring 2005): 25-41.

Solidarity in the Global South? Reporting of the Smith/Carlos Protest at the Mexico City Olympics

EVAN NEUHAUSEN

The image of John Carlos and Tommie Smith's protest at the 1968 Mexico City Olympics is one of the most iconic of the twentieth century. Due to sustained racial hierarchy in the U.S. society, the image remains charged, bold, and striking. Smith and Carlos, standing on the podium with their respective gold and bronze medals, each wearing a black glove, black socks, and no shoes, turned to face the American flag as "The Star-Spangled Banner" began to play. The athletes then bowed their heads and simultaneously raised their gloved fists in the air. The stadium crowd slowly and increasingly began to boo and jeer. The booing intensified as Smith and Carlos walked off the podium. They answered by again raising their fists.

The protest is connected to many of the threads running through the 1960s U.S. civil rights movement. As Smith explained in a TV interview following the protest:

I wore a black right-hand glove and Carlos wore the left-hand glove of the same pair. My raised right hand stood for the power in black America. Carlos's raised left hand stood for the unity of black America. Together they formed an arch of unity and power. The black scarf around my neck stood for black pride. The black socks with no shoes stood for black poverty in racist America. The totality of our effort was the regaining of black dignity.¹

This act was met with swift condemnation in the United States and, as my research shows, interest and sympathy in Mexico. This paper attempts to ask the question *why* and offer some answers. How could the same event—in which the details are not in question—be reported so radically differently in the United States and Mexico? This paper takes a brief tour through the reactions of various major outlets in the United States and Mexico before highlighting two possible explanations for the radically different receptions to the protest: that Mexico, as demonstrated by its stern stance on barring apartheid South Africa from the Games, possessed a kind of Global South solidarity with oppressed peoples both in the U.S. and South Africa; and that in Mexico the protest was *seen* differently because the cultural script of the radical black militant was unfamiliar. If one of the defining aspects of the Black Power movement was that it looked beyond national borders in its struggle for justice, we owe Smith and Carlos an analysis of how their protest was received internationally.

The 200-meter Finals were high drama. In qualifying heats, Smith tied the Olympic Record of 20.3 seconds, only for Peter Norman to break it hours later with a time of 20.2. Smith then matched Norman's time in the third qualifying heat, setting the stage for the 200-meter final. On primetime television, with approximately four hundred million people watching worldwide, Tommie Smith broke the world record with a time of 19.83. Peter Norman and John Carlos came in second and third place, with times of 20.06 and 20.10, respectively. It was the fastest 200-meter race in Olympic history and would not be broken until the 1984 Los

¹ Harry Edwards, *The Revolt of the Black Athlete* (New York: Free Press, 1969), 104.

² Amy Bass, Not the Triumph but the Struggle (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 2002), 235.

Angeles Olympics.

Smith and Carlos generated interest not just because they were world class athletes. Their involvement with the Olympic Project for Human Rights (OPHR) before the 1968 Games was controversial.³ The OPHR was founded and led by civil rights activist Dr. Harry Edwards to organize an African-American boycott of the 1968 Olympics, whose major goal was to "no longer allow this country to use a few so-called Negroes to point out to the world how much progress she has made in solving her racial problems when the oppression of Afro-Americans is greater than it ever was." The OPHR explicitly articulated itself as part of a larger, global black struggle and attracted vast support amongst both African-American athletes and civil rights leaders. One of their demands was for South Africa and Rhodesia to be disinvited from the Olympics. Tommie Smith was its primary athletic spokesperson and John Carlos, who had attended Malcolm X. rallies as a teenager in Harlem, was an early member.⁵

Bill Russell, Jim Brown, Jackie Robinson, and perhaps most importantly, Martin Luther King all backed the OPHR's boycott. In a meeting with the OPHR, Dr. King told the athletes that if they did boycott, he would be there in Mexico City with as large a contingent as he could gather. He would organize as soon as he finished his work on a garbage strike in Memphis. Dr. King was assassinated shortly after, and the movement for boycott quickly lost momentum, but not before the IOC disinvited South Africa and Rhodesia.

The situation in Mexico City leading up to the Olympics was even more tense. The authoritarian (and oxymoronically named) Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) that had ruled Mexico since the Mexican Revolution in the 1920s were faced with a mass popular movement demanding democratization and civil rights. By September 1968, the student behind the movement were organizing demonstrations with hundreds of thousands of participants. For both the IOC and Mexican government, a mass popular movement during the Olympics and in the host city was unacceptable. In mid-September, IOC President Avery Brundage told Mexican President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz that the Olympics would be halted if the protests spilled into the Games. On October 2nd, just 10 days before the opening ceremony, the Mexican military opened-fire on a movement gathering in Tlatelolco Plaza. It is estimated more than 300 students were murdered in the massacre. Under the IOC's imagination of The Olympics as an apolitical event, the Games could only happen with the brutal suppression of a mass popular movement. From before they evan began, the notion that the Games could be separate from the explosive political moment of '68 was a farce.

In the mainstream U.S. press, the Smith/Carlos protest was met with condemnation, sometimes with sympathy and often without. The *Los Angeles Times* labelled it a "Nazi-like salute" while *Time* magazine played off the Olympics "Higher, Faster, Stronger" motto to describe the protest as "Angrier, Nastier, Uglier." The USOC voiced its condemnation the day

³ Edwards, writing in *Revolt of the Black Athlete*, notes that "Hubert H. Humphrey, then vice-president of the United States and a 1968 presidential candidate, took time out at several news conferences to criticize the Olympic Project for Human Rights" (90).

⁴ Harry Edwards, The Revolt of the Black Athlete, 189.

⁵ John Carlos and Dave Zirin, *The John Carlos Story* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2011), 27.

⁶ Ibid, 81.

⁷ John Rodda, "Prensa, Prensa: A Journalist's Reflections on Mexico," in *Reflections on Mexico* '68, ed. Keith Brewster (New York: Routledge, 2010), 19.

 $^{^8}$ Gary Young, "The man who raised a black power salute at the 1968 Olympic Games", The Guardian, 30 Mar., 2012, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/mar/30/black-power-salute-1968-olympics.

⁹ Time Magazine, Oct. 25, 1968, Vol. 92, No. 17, http://time.com/vault/issue/1968-10-25/page/78/

after the protest and expelled the athletes from the Olympics:

The United States Olympic Committee expresses its profound regrets to the International Olympic Committee, to the Mexican Organizing Committee and to the people of Mexico for the discourtesy displayed by two members of its team in departing from tradition during a Victory Ceremony at the Olympic Stadium on 16th October. The untypical exhibitionism of these athletes also violates the basic standards of sportsmanship and good manners which are so highly regarded in the United States and therefore the two men involved are suspended forthwith from the team and ordered to remove themselves from the Olympic Village. This action is taken in the belief that such immature behaviour is an isolated incident. However if further investigation or subsequent events do not bear out this view, the entire matter will be re-evaluated. A repetition of such incidents by other members of the U.S. team can only be considered a willful disregard of Olympic principles that would warrant the imposition of the severest penalties at the disposal of the United States Olympic Committee.¹⁰

Smith and Carlos received death threats for their actions and were blacklisted from the U.S. track and field community. Unable to find work, they lived in poverty for much of the remainder of their lives. Popular sports broadcaster Brent Musburger called them "Black-Skinned Storm Troopers." In his autobiography, Carlos writes:

Public opinion, when we made it home, was dramatically against us. The editorial boards of the major papers spoke in unison that we were an embarrassment. We were un-American. We disgraced the country my father was shot at fighting for. But no major media gave us the opportunity to speak our minds and articulate why it was exactly that we did what we did. Everything was framed by what they wanted people to think about us. It was about as objective and unbiased as a press release from the Pentagon. It wasn't just our voices that you never heard. You also didn't get an inkling of the support we had throughout the grassroots in America.

Other domestic reactions sympathized with Carlos and Smith but viewed the protest as inappropriate because of the "apolitical" spirit of the Olympics. Arthur Daley of the *New York Times* is representative of this opinion; at the time he wrote that "Smith and Carlos brought their world smack into the Olympic Games, where it did not belong, and created a shattering situation that shook this international sports carnival to its very core." Others were angered that Carlos and Smith refused to soft-pedal racial conflict in the name of the Nation. One letter to the editor in *The New York Times* sums up this sentiment:

The most heartsickening [sic] thing of my life... I have no objections to the black protest, but I am ashamed of any American who cannot look at the flag as it is being raised... I feel that any person who cannot be proud of his flag and country should not be allowed to represent it. If it were not for the fact that they had the opportunity of being an American they might very well not be at the Olympics to win their medals.¹³

¹⁰ Joseph M. Sheehan, "2 Black Power Advocates Ousted From Olympics," *The New York Times*, Oct. 18, 1968, 1. ¹¹ Barry Petchesky, "Should Brent Musburger Apologize For Calling John Carlos and Tommie Smith 'Black-Skinned Storm Troopers' 44 Years Ago?" http://deadspin.com/5916321/should-brent-musburger-apologize-for-calling-john-carlos-and-tommie-smith-black-skinned-storm-troopers-44-years-ago.

¹² Arthur Daley, "The Incident," New York Times, October 20, 1968, S2.

^{18 &}quot;Letter: Black Power and the Olympic Games," New York Times, Oct. 27, 1968, 2.

In Mexico, the Smith/Carlos protest was more a point of interest than a point of outrage. Four of the five major Mexican daily newspapers did not even mention the protest in their initial coverage of the race. ¹⁴ Carlos and Smith's expulsion, however, was front-page news in all of them. Over the course of the next week, the newspapers published endorsements of the athletes protest, sympathizing with their cause and casting the USOC and the IOC decision as overly harsh. The newspapers also published accounts of solidarity with Smith and Carlos from Black athletes of different nationalities. After the straight reporting on the first few days following the protest and the athletes' expulsion, the large Mexico City dailies supported Smith and Carlos, with more reflective and editorial pieces contextualizing their protest in larger movements for civil rights in both the U.S. and around the world.

One article in *Novedades*—the only newspaper that focused on the protest before Carlos and Smith's expulsion—contextualized their protest as "showing the world the unity of black people and the desire to achieve human treatment." The article also emphasized the international solidarity undergirding their protest, writing that "the athletes do not exclusively refer to the treatment they are given inside the United States, but also talking about the problems other people of their race suffer in Africa and many countries." ¹⁶

Post-expulsion, each of the dailies reported on solidarity with Smith and Carlos among other Black athletes. One article in *Novedades* about athletes who left the Games after Smith and Carlos's expulsion heavily quoted the 400-meter champion, Lee Evans, with only cursory quotes from USOC President Douglas Ruby's statement condemning the protest. The paper followed with another article detailing protests by other athletes—including Cubans who dedicated their medals to Smith and Carlos—against the USOC's decision and published American civil rights leader Ralph Abernathy saying that Carlos and Smith's protest demonstrated how "sick our country is." A day later, *Novedades* ran a brief "explainer" on race in the United States, comparing it to South Africa. *El Día*, another of the major daily newspapers, ran a similar piece, asking civil rights activist Calvin Lockridge to explain racism's effect on children in the US.

More generally, the Mexican reaction can be characterized as sympathizing with the athletes' plight: "They protested because they wanted to make known their discomfort with the hostility that their ethnic group suffers." An article in *El Universal* described the protest as "against the racism that they are victims of in their country, The United States." One article in *El Excelsior* represented a trend of Mexican newspapers to link the protest to systemic issues rather than individual character flaws of Smith and Carlos, as was done in the United States, writing that "the hope that such events do not occur again is fundamentally based on hope rather

¹⁴ Daniel Barragan, "Tommie Smith, el Cohete Humano, Corrió los 200 Metros en 19.8", El Día, October 17, 2016.

¹⁵ All translations author's own. Antonio Garza M., "La 'América Negra' Obtuvo dos Medallas", Novedades, October 17, 1968.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Antonio Garza, "Expulsan de la Delegación a los dos Atletas Negros que Protestaron", *Novedades*, October 19, 1968.

¹⁸ Antonio Garza, "Demostración de los Atletas de Color Contra los Dirigentes Olímpicos de EU", Novedades, October 20, 1968.

^{19 &}quot;Protesta Racial en la Olimpiada," Novedades, October 21, 1968.

 $^{^{20}}$ Gordian Troeller and Cande Deffarge, "La Juventud Negra", ${\it El\, Dia},$ October 23, 1968.

²¹ Froylan M. Lopez Narvaez, "Poder Negro: Protesta Olímpica", El Excelsior, October 18, 1968.

²² Yolanda Cabello, "Prometas Atletas de Color Fueron Expulsados de la Olimpíado," *El Universal*, October 19, 1968.

than evidence."²³ An editorial the next day in the same paper made a similar point, writing that "[the protest] was the distant but unmistakable reflection of dissatisfaction and unrest that involves the feelings of millions of people in the United States" while characterizing the decision to expel Smith and Carlos as "throwing more flammable elements into the fire of racial conflict in our northern neighbor."²⁴ In *Excélsior*, a writer proposed that the protest was a manifestation of the global injustice carried out against enslaved people.²⁵ In the United States, the protest was Smith and Carlos selfishly seeking attention; in Mexico, it was a manifestation of a global injustice against black people, both in the diaspora and Africa.

Beyond the media, the Mexican organizing committee gave a clear message of its sympathies by including the Smith and Carlos protest in the official film of the Olympics despite Brundage's objections. ²⁶ The Mexican government offered Smith and Carlos tourists visas if they wished to remain in Mexico City after their expulsion. ²⁷ One student involved in the Mexican student movement stated:

[t]he only thing about the Olympic Games that made them worthwhile was the Black Power bit... By using the victories they won in the Olympics as a political weapon, the black champions made a great impression on the Mexican spectators, and even though it had only an indirect effect, it helped our Movement.²⁸

Why such different reception to the protest in Mexico and in the United States? Simple historical circumstance explains some of it. The extreme racial anxiety that had exploded across American society in 1968 with massive national riots can help explain why mainstream, liberal commentators from the United States reacted with extreme hostility while similarly liberal, mainstream Mexican publications reacted with dispassionate curiosity and sympathy. White American liberals saw a racial order that privileged them falling apart and thus were extra sensitive and combative towards racially charged protest. However, this explanation can only take us so far on its own.

I propose we read Carlos and Smith's protest as a *linguistic fact* rather than an immutable, "real" fact. This allows us to analyze the ways in which an event comes to be known are, in the words of cultural theorist Sharon Marcus, "enabled by narratives, complexes and institutions which derive their strength not from outright, immutable, unbeatable force but rather from their power to structure our lives by imposing cultural scripts." The Smith/Carlos protest was not an event that was seen differently in different places due to different histories, but rather *the event itself* was different because it came be known through different epistemological grids that structure and impose legibility. This approach allows us to unravel the various narratives and stereotype that structure how this event came to be known while exposing what the scripts hide and what they make transparent.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ "Los Negros Ante el Mundo", Editorial, El Excelsior, October 21, 1968.

²⁵ F. Carmoa Nanclares, "Presencia del Tercer Mundo", Excélsior, 28 Oct. 1968.

²⁶ Jules Boykoff, Power Games: A Political History of the Olympics (London: Verso Books 2016), 109.

²⁷ Amy Bass, Not the Triumph but the Struggle, 268.

²⁸ Elena Poniatowski, *Massacre In Mexico*, trans. Helen R. Lane (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1975), 161.

²⁹ Sharon Marcus, "Fighting Bodies, Fighting Words: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention," in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, (New York: Columbia University Academic Commons, 2002).

One frequently cited cultural script in the U.S. reception of the protest was the "good negro" vs. the "bad negro." As media outlets mapped the protest onto the larger civil rights and black power movements, this script emerged. Despite the non-violence of their protest, Smith and Carlos were cast as militants and threats to national security by several American commentators. Recall Brent Musburger's comments of the two as "black-skinned storm troopers," or the *Los Angeles Times* referring to the protest as a "Hitler-type salute." In popular iconography of the Civil Rights Movement, Carlos and Smith's protest is often grouped in the liberal imagination of American history with images of "race riots" and Black Panther members with guns—the "bad negroes" of the late 60s—in comparison to the "good negroes" of the early 60s. As historian Simon Henderson explains:

The black civil rights activist who stood motionless as a policeman beat him for attempting to register to vote received sympathy from many in white America. His contemporary who fought the police in response to discriminatory treatment was looked upon with more suspicion; an angry black man, and a possible danger to society.³¹

Media outlets in the United States often mapped Smith and Carlos's protest onto the latter cultural script rather than the former, as an act of violent, radical disorder, despite the non-violent nature of the protest.

Perhaps the protest registered as violent to U.S. audiences because of a penetration fantasy regarding the domain of sports as "apolitical" that Smith and Carlos violated with their protest. Henderson explains that "the black football player who pummelled white opponents and sacked the opposing quarterback was lauded as a fine sportsman and a credit to his race. Yet, if he stepped off the field and complained of the racial injustices he faced, wearing a black armband or black glove to register his non-violent protest, he was criticised for ingratitude and for perverting the sporting ideal." In the context of the Olympics, the fantasy of sports as apolitical is heightened, as we are told it is the moment when the world "puts aside its differences" in the name of "coming together." Smith and Carlos's protest—the first to explicitly use the Olympics as a forum for political protest "Smith and Carlos's protest—the first to explicitly use the Olympics as a metaphor for the black underclass' defiance of white authority." The protest was mapped onto the cultural script of black defiance of white authority, casting Carlos and Smith as black militants who shared the supposed ideology of rioters and black liberation activists who dared to lay hands on police and property.

Finally, the protest was scandalous because it aired the U.S.'s dirty laundry at *the* quintessential international event. Entrenched racial hierarchy had long been the unspeakable truth that exposed the lie of U.S. world-ordering aspirations. Since World War II, African-American leaders had pointed out the hypocrisy of fighting fascism abroad with a segregated military and civil society.³⁵ As historian Nikhil Singh writes, "to claim to be fighting 'Communist slavery' was not easily reconciled with severe, ongoing, state-sanctioned

³⁰ Amy Bass, Not the Triumph but the Struggle, 274.

³¹ Simon Henderson, "'Nasty Demonstrations by Negroes': The Place of the Smith—Carlos Podium Salute in the Civil Rights Movement", in *Reflections on Mexico* '68, ed. Keith Brewster (New York: Routledge, 2010), 88.
³² Ibid.

³³ Bass, Not the Triumph but the Struggle, 294.

³⁴ Henderson, "Nasty Demonstrations...," 88.

³⁵ Nikhil Pal Singh, "Internationalizing Freedom," in *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2004).

discrimination against the descendants of U.S. slaves."³⁶ Soviet Cold War propaganda often emphasized U.S. racial conflict, while the U.S. itself feared "losing" recently decolonized African nations to the Soviets. Historian Paul Gordon Lauren writes that "as the United States moved increasingly to the forefront of world affairs, assuming the leadership of the West in the emerging Cold War contest, it drew considerable attention to itself, thereby exposing its domestic practices as never before in its history."³⁷ As U.S. leaders began to see solving "the race question" as linked with U.S. world-ordering power, keeping domestic racial conflict out of the international spotlight became increasingly important.

The scripts of black defiance of white authority, the "good negro" vs. the "bad negro," and the history structuring U.S. desire to downplay racial conflict internationally were alien to Mexico. Without these cultural scripts and histories onto which to map the protest, the major Mexico City newspapers simply reported the events, later offering sympathy to the athletes. Their expulsion and the USOC's attempts to cast Smith and Carlos as dangerous black militants did not make sense without the cultural scripts through which the protest became legible to U.S. audiences. This perhaps explains the difference in reception: in Mexico, the protest was a minor, non-violent action superseded by Smith's stunning, world-record setting time; in the United States, the protest was a major, dangerous act of radical disobedience that had to be punished. The two cultures did not *see* the same event.

Can the Mexico City media's sympathies for Carlos and Smith be read as a kind of solidarity—as a realization of a connection between the Civil Rights Movement and the struggle of people in the Global South against imperialism? There is some evidence to support this. Mexico's Olympic Organizing Committee asked the IOC to reconsider its decision to invite apartheid South Africa to participate in the Games. Perhaps the anti-racist sentiment among Mexicans in 1968 extended to solidarity with the U.S. Civil Rights movement, as the aforementioned Mexico City newspapers indicated. However, if this solidarity existed, it had clear limits, and certainly was not viewed as part of a global struggle against imperialism being waged on multiple fronts in South Africa, the urban ghetto in the U.S., and in the Student Movement's struggle to democratize the Mexican state. Had this been the case, the major Mexico City dailies would have reported the Mexican Student Movement with similar sympathy it gave to Carlos and Smith. The student movement was portrayed as greedy, attention-hungry, and illegitimate; similar to Smith and Carlos in the U.S. The Civil Rights Movement, the antiapartheid movement, and Mexicans' solidarity with the Global South were neither consistent nor connected. While the Mexican government and media often spoke in favor of the plight of African nations, historians Keith and Claire Brewster write that "the rhetoric used was more consistent with the egalitarian rhetoric of the Mexican Revolution rather than making specific gestures of solidarity with a particular movement."³⁸ There is no evidence of substantive contact between Mexican Olympic authorities and anti-apartheid or anti-segregation leaders. The Mexican demands that the IOC uninvite South Africa is more persuasively explained by African nations putting "pressure [on] the Mexicans who feared a boycott by many countries because of

-

³⁶ Nikhil Pal Singh, "Racial Formation in an Age of Permanent War," in *Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Daniel Martinez HoSang, Oneka LaBennett, and Laura Pulido (Berkeley: University of California Press 2012).

 ³⁷ Paul Gordon Lauren, "The International Perspective," in Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs 1945-1988 ed. Brenda Gayle Plummer (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 2003), 26.
 ³⁸ Keith Brewster and Claire Brewster, "Mexico City's Hosting of the 1968 Olympic Games," The International Journal of the History of Sport 26, no. 6 (2009), 856.

South Africa's apartheid policy."³⁹ Furthermore, the degree to which the American Civil Rights Movement and the South African anti-apartheid movement were connected is often overstated, as American civil rights leaders were "more focused on the day-to-day discrimination they faced within their own society. All expressions of solidarity, therefore, between leaders in the United States and those who were pressing for independence and dignity within the African continent were a fortune of coinciding circumstances rather than any organized international structure."⁴⁰ If the U.S. Civil Rights Movement and the anti-apartheid movement were not connected beyond anti-racist generalizations and expressions of solidarity, it is hard to argue that the Mexicans' sympathy towards Carlos and Smith are directly connected to its efforts to keep South Africa out of the Games. The Mexican government may have just seen an opportunity to appease domestic leftists, including student protestors, without threatening the ties between the two country's capitalist classes or Mexico's image of stability that undergirded U.S.-Mexican relations at the time—the U.S. ever fearful of the "communist contagion" spreading from Cuba. ⁴¹ Sympathizing with Smith and Carlos would also serve to emphasize Mexican post-revolutionary political rhetoric that preached tolerance and ethnic harmony.

While it would be nice and even inspiring to draw a connection between Smith and Carlos's reception in Mexico City and the Mexican's firm stance against apartheid South Africa's inclusion in the Games as part of a radical, Global South solidarity, this neat narrative eschews a rigorous and substantive solidarity politics. Mexican dailies supported Smith and Carlos's protests for civil rights, but did not do the same when appeals were made by Mexican students. The newspapers accepted official government narratives about both the Mexican student movement and the massacre carried out by the government just ten days before the Olympics. They cast the student movement as attention-hungry militants eager to grab the spotlight from the Olympics, similar to how the U.S. media portrayed Smith and Carlos. There may be a lesson here: while the cultural scripts that define certain activisms do not transcend national boundaries, the category of "dissident" does.

Movements rooted in dissent and social justice will be received differently in different spaces as they become legible through different histories and cultural scripts, yet the category of dissident transcends national space in the reactions against them. Mexican dissidents are despised by organized Mexican power. At the same time, Carlos and Smith were received with sympathy and given a platform in Mexico. These international discontinuities open spaces that can serve solidarity movements; they can expand in ways reaction may be unable to. A substantive solidarity between Smith and Carlos, the Olympic Project for Human Rights, and the Mexican students may have been able to extend the sympathy and platform given to Smith and Carlos but denied to the students.

Until the Tlatelolco Massacre, Smith and Carlos had planned to arrive in Mexico early to speak with the leaders of the Student Movement. They saw similarities in how the Olympics were being used by both the U.S. and Mexico to "create a false vision for a global audience" about black life in America and harmony and stability in Mexico. ⁴³ One of the tragedies of '68

³⁹ John Rodda, "Prensa, Prensa': A Journalist's Reflections on Mexico '68," 22.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Eric Zolov, "Toward an analytical framework for assessing the impact of the 1968 student movement on U.S.-Mexican relations," *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research* 9, no. 2 (2003) 41-68.

⁴² Eric Zolov, *Refried Elvis: The Rise of the Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1999), 199-200. Zolov describes the major dailies as "dominated" by the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) at the time.

⁴³ Carlos and Zirin, The John Carlos Story, 107-108.

was that the assassination of Dr. King and the massacre of the Mexican students precluded a potentially electric political moment of cross-border solidarity. We will never know how this kind of solidarity would have worked within the spaces created by the contingencies that structure how political action becomes legible in a given space. After investigating some cultural scripts that structured the legibility of the Smith/Carlos protest, this paper can only suggest that a coordinated action and extension of solidarity between these two movements would have been particularly potent. We can only imagine the political and social forms that would have emerged had the Civil Rights Movement and the Mexican Student Movement had the opportunity to articulate a common political struggle in the international spotlight of the 1968 Mexico City Olympics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bass, Amy. *Not the Triumph but the Struggle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Brewster, Keith and Brewster, Claire. "Mexico City's Hosting of the 1968 Olympic Games." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 6 (2009): 130-156.

Boykoff, Jules. Power Games: A Political History of the Olympics. London: Verso Books, 2016.

Carlos, John and Zirin, Dave. *The John Carlos Story*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2011.

Edward, Harry. The Revolt of the Black Athlete. Free Press: New York, 1969.

Henderson, Simon. "Nasty Demonstrations by Negroes': The Place of the Smith—Carlos Podium Salute in the Civil Rights Movement." In *Reflections on Mexico '68*, edited by Keith Brewster, 78-92. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Lauren, Paul Gordon. "Seen From the Outside: The International Perspective on America's Dilemma." In *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs 1945-1988*, edited by Brenda Gayle Plummer. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Marcus, Sharon. "Fighting Bodies, Fighting Words: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention." In *Feminists Theorize the Political*, edited by Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, 385-404. New York: Columbia University Academic Commons, 2002.

Poniatowski, Elena. *Massacre In Mexico*. Translated by Helen R. Lane. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1975.

Rodda, John. "Prensa Prensa: A Journalist's Reflections on Mexico." In *Reflections on Mexico* '68, edited by Keith Brewster, 1-22. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Singh, Nikhil. "Internationalizing Freedom." In <i>Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy</i> . Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
"Racial Formation in an Age of Permanent War." In <i>Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century</i> . Edited by Daniel Martinez HoSang, Oneka LaBennett, and Laura Pulido. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
Zolov, Eric. <i>Refried Elvis: The Rise of the Mexican Counterculture</i> . Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
——"Toward an analytical framework for assessing the impact of the 1968 student movement on U.SMexican relations." In <i>Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research</i> , 41-68. 2003.

Saint-Domingue: The Slave Revolution That Changed the Course of New World History

CHRISTOPHER VRADIS

Entering the nineteenth century, the New World and three prominent nations were in a period of uncertainty. The United States of America had recently earned independence from Great Britain in 1776 and was becoming a powerful nation on its own. Great Britain was the most dominant nation in the world economically, imperially, and militarily, but their rivalry with powerful France was reaching a turning point. The French Revolution had concluded, and general Napoleon Bonaparte, with a strong distain toward Great Britain, gained power. Equally as crucial, the slave revolution in the French Caribbean colony of Saint-Domingue, which began in 1791, was becoming increasingly difficult for France to control. Napoleon underestimated the difficulty of putting down the rebellion; he assumed his initial, significant investment of soldiers and commanders would quickly regain control. At the same time, Napoleon swiftly acquired the Louisiana territory from Spain in a peaceful exchange. This was an extraordinary move by Napoleon; had both Louisiana and Saint-Domingue been controlled by France for an extended period, the economic value would have been phenomenal. The profits Napoleon could have collected by exploiting the economic potential of these two regions would have been sufficient for him to pursue any military action he chose, including war with the neighboring United States or rival Great Britain. However, Napoleon never controlled both Louisiana and Saint-Domingue, and this prevented the ascending French from pursuing any potential military action against the United States or Great Britain for New World control in North America. The successful fifteen-year revolution that took place in Saint-Domingue was unprecedented, as it is the only successful slave revolution in world history. As the uprisings in Saint-Domingue and changes in French government were taking place, the period from 1800-1803 was extremely critical in the outcome of the slave revolution and French New World presence. The successful Saint-Domingue slave revolution, concluding with independence in 1804, altered the history of the Louisiana territory and the United States by preventing the possibility of American-Franco conflict along the Mississippi River and Napoleonic France gaining long lasting, complete control of North America.

Now, it is important to understand the circumstances surrounding the colony of Saint-Domingue entering the nineteenth century in concluding that the successful Saint-Domingue slave revolution directly impacted the history of Louisiana and the United States. The island was one of the starting points for exploration of the New World when Christopher Columbus arrived in 1492. Beginning in the 1670s, French settlers gained standing on the western third of the island, which was owned by Spain and named Hispaniola at the time, and began developing a plantation-based economy, increasing the need for slave importation from Africa. Spain formally subjugated the entire island until granting France control of the western third in the 1697 Treaty of Ryswick. The French named their territory Saint-Domingue, and Spain renamed its remaining two thirds of the island Santo Domingo. This was France's first New World colony and became its most lucrative. After France expanded its colonial presence throughout North America in the eighteenth century, Great Britain

evicted France from all of North America – with the exception of Saint-Domingue – in the 1763 Treaty of Paris. The French developed Saint-Domingue during the eighteenth century into the most profitable colony in world history; the trade of sugar and coffee grown on slave plantations made it a colony of unprecedented value. Saint-Domingue would hold world production records for sugar and coffee by the end of the eighteenth century. The large profits of Saint-Domingue provided money that funded the French treasury for decades. As the most valuable colony in the world, controlling Saint-Domingue was also a key to controlling the Gulf of Mexico. The saint-Domingue was also a key to controlling the Gulf of Mexico.

France ruled the Saint-Domingue colony with horrific treatment of its slaves, even for the times. The treatment of slaves by plantation owners was so brutal that slaves from other parts of the New World considered deserving of punishment were sent there. The slaves accounted for more than 90% of the population of the entire island, and approximately half of the entire Caribbean slave population. Furthermore, over a third of the slaves brought to Saint-Domingue from 1680-1776 died in their first few years living in the colony, and to compensate for the high mortality rate the French continued the copious importation of slaves. For these reasons, in addition to the general immiseration of enslavement, tension was very high among the slave population in Saint-Domingue.

Starting in 1791, the most significant of Saint-Domingue's slave uprisings began, and the French were quickly in a constant struggle to maintain rule of the colony. Slaves of the colony had a history of small uprisings, dating back to 1522 uprisings against the ruling Spanish. Led by brilliant general Toussaint L'Ouverture, the 1791 slave revolution quickly gained momentum. As the uprising became increasingly out of hand, Spain decided to sell its two thirds of the island to France in 1795. The pace of the revolution picked up around 1800 (simultaneous with Napoleon gaining power in France) as the rebelling slaves increasing used guerilla war tactics. Multiple sources suggest that the French were assisted in their suppression of the rebellion by other imperial powers, who were fearful of a slave-ruled nation triggering uprisings in slave colonies worldwide. The French never lost sight of restoring Saint-Domingue to the metropole until victory became impossible, because of Napoleon's understanding of the value of Saint-Domingue.

The conditions of France and its foreign policy over the course of previous centuries played a critical role in decision making regarding Saint-Domingue and overall foreign policy entering the period from 1800-1803. Historically, the French government's primary desire in colonial conquests was the increase of power and wealth for the mother country. Also, as George Orr, a British Historian who argued in an 1803 essay sent directly to Prime Minister Henry Addington to advise him on the matter, French control of a region meant abusing all resources at whatever cost necessary for the benefit of France, as exemplified in Saint-Domingue. In this text, Orr also explains how France was known throughout all of Europe as an *especially* untrustworthy nation with regards to international affairs, being extremely brutal militarily, and suppressing and oppressing any opposition until they made

³⁰¹ "The Haitian Revolution." Brown University Department of Africana Studies, 27 Oct. 2015. http://library.brown.edu/haitihistory/

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Ibid.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

³⁰⁵ Adam Kloppe, "The Louisiana Purchase and the Haitian Revolution," *History Happens Here: The Missouri History Museum's Blog*, March 5, 2015, http://www.historyhappenshere.org/node/7655.

³⁰⁶ Thomas Fleming, The Louisiana Purchase (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2003), 4.

^{307 &}quot;The Haitian Revolution"

³⁰⁸ George Orr, The possession of Louisiana by the French, considered, as it affects the interests of those nations more

obeisance to France.³⁰⁹ However, maybe the most important factor in French decision making entering the nineteenth century was the rise of Napoleon.

At the conclusion of the French Revolution in 1799, Napoleon Bonaparte gained power. Napoleon rose to power by being an excellent general, a good leader, having organizational skills, his willingness to take risks, and his ruthlessness. 310 He gained authority as one of three consuls entrusted with executive power following the French Revolution, but he was "the only consul that mattered" and had more authority over France than prerevolutionary King Louis XVI ever had.³¹¹ Once in power, Napoleon was adamant on raising the economic value of France, and his aggressiveness assured the world that the French were going to maintain (if not increase) their historically belligerent nature. Napoleon's wonted hostility blindsided many European nations because of the "seductive appearances" from the recently-concluded French Revolution, a rebellion based on doctrines surrounding liberty. With Napoleon in power, these nations now realized they discerned French government policy incorrectly. As a result, these weaker neighboring powers in Europe would soon suffer at the hands of the French, and that is exactly what transpired. Napoleon's aggressive stance on foreign policy is exemplified by his immediate attempt to regain French control in the New World outside of Saint-Domingue, which he successfully accomplished with the remarkable acquisition of Louisiana in 1800.

France acquired Louisiana from Spain in 1800, concomitant with the slave uprisings of Saint-Domingue becoming increasingly difficult to put down. The reason for this purchase was because of the value the Louisiana territory offered France in 1800. France acquired Louisiana by the St. Ildefonso Treaty in 1800, but real control of the territory began the following year. France received the territory in a concord which placed the of the King of Spain's son-in-law as monarch of the newly formed kingdom Etruria, a region located in modern day Italy. Ironically during the acquisition, Napoleon pledged unconditionally to Spain he would never cede Louisiana to a third power, to prove to Spain this was a transaction between allies. And due to the lack of instantaneous communication between nations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this purchase could not be absolutely confirmed by governments of other nations, most importantly Great Britain and the United States.

The history of Louisiana in the previous half-century is a key part in understanding the territory's overall value to Napoleon. As stated before, the 1763 Treaty of Paris ended France's presence in the North American continent, except for its Caribbean colony of Saint-Domingue. It is important to clarify that Great Britain dictated the terms of the treaty, as they awarded themselves the land east of the Mississippi River (soon becoming the United States of America), while awarding Spain control of the land west of the Mississippi River, also known as Louisiana. Great Britain consciously pushed France out largely due to their ongoing rivalry for world supremacy. During Spanish rule of Louisiana, the United States was free to use the port of New Orleans for its own benefit. The idea of 'manifest destiny' had already resonated through American society since its independence in 1776; Americans had their sights on the land west of the Mississippi.

Once Napoleonic France controlled Louisiana, France could benefit from the value of the territory in many ways. Louisiana's value, as a land mass, derived from the abundant fertility of its soil. This made Louisiana a prime location for French expansion of the slave

³⁰⁹ Ibid, 18.

³¹⁰ Flemming, 7.

³¹¹ Ibid.

³¹² Ibid, 9

³¹³ Ibid. 314 Ibid. p. 1.5

plantation farming already established in Saint-Domingue. The territory was known as the most fertile part of North America, and the Mississippi River connected the Gulf of Mexico and southern Canada. In addition, as George Orr proposes, owning the territory meant France could participate in the fur-trade of North America, with the opportunity to expand the industry to Europe. This trade was, as Orr calls it, of "highest consideration" to the French for its substantial economic value. However, these were not the only advantages that made France interested in Louisiana. The French desire for acquiring the territory was directly correlated to France's ownership of Saint-Domingue.

If France controlled both Louisiana and Saint-Domingue, Napoleon would have control of a money-making machine/large center for economic productivity. The French plan, Orr believes, was to use Louisiana as a "granary" for its New World empire while ramping up efforts to take back Saint-Domingue. Louisiana would offer France prosperous farmland to supply and expand the sugar plantations of Saint-Domingue. Previously, the French had to import food and supplies from the United States. The fertile lands of Louisiana could also have allowed France to extend its unprecedented success of sugar and coffee slave plantations to new, fresh farmland that had not been cultivated to the extent of the soil of Saint-Domingue. The combined value of Louisiana and Saint-Domingue would allow France to subjugate much of the economic value of North America. This scenario would have been an incredible opportunity for the French and, as Orr proposes, realizing this economic potential would be the beginning of French dominance, both in the New and Old Worlds.

Napoleon fully understood the correlation of controlling Saint-Domingue and his purchase of Louisiana. Napoleon's pursuit of controlling Louisiana began within the same twelve month period as his increased effort to regain full control of Saint-Domingue. Early in 1801, Napoleon increased efforts to put down the rebellion by sending 20,000 of France's best troops along with decorated general Charles Leclerc. Napoleon assumed the military increase would quickly overwhelm the slaves and regaining control of Saint-Domingue would be an easy process, which he estimated would "require no more than six weeks." Had he regained full control of Saint-Domingue as quickly and easily as he anticipated, the acquisition of Louisiana would have given France the potential to quickly becomes the wealthiest nation in the world. As Orr explains, capitalizing on this opportunity had the potential to impact the balance of power in Europe in France's favor, at the expense of the Portuguese and the Spanish. Napoleon could have utilized this opportunity to fund *any* goal of his.

The only reason this dream economic opportunity did not work out the way Napoleon hoped was because of Napoleon's inability to crush the revolution of the slaves of Saint-Domingue. France purchased Louisiana in 1800 in anticipation of regaining control of Saint-Domingue quickly. But the purchase of Louisiana triggered responses by Great Britain and the United States after hearing of the rumor. France's purchase of the territory, in addition to the responses of the United States and Great Britain, would have had ramifications that could have altered the history of the New World, had France accomplished the "simple" task of putting down the Saint-Domingue Revolution.

Entering 1800, Great Britain had consistently been the one nation that prevented French domination of Europe. The multi-century long conflict between the two powers was especially tense during this era of France and Napoleon's pursuit of maximum global power.

³¹⁵ Orr, The possession of Louisiana by the French....

³¹⁶ Ibid.

³¹⁷ Ibid.

³¹⁸ Kloppe, "The Louisiana Purchase and the Haitian Revolution."

Unfulfilled treaty obligations contributed to this tension.³²⁰ However, the British government was fully aware that Great Britain was considered the main obstacle to French preeminence, and its dominant navy controlled the commerce of the New World.

Great Britain, despite its position as the world's most powerful nation, was unhappy and uneased when hearing rumor of the France's acquisition of Louisiana. This threatened its grasp on European dominance; the British had historically tried to maintain the hierarchy of European nations. The French would alter the European hierarchy with a prosperous economic combination of Louisiana/Saint-Domingue, Multiple European nations would suffer consequences at France's expense. As George Orr explains in his work, it was likely that the Dutch would lose money, Germany would lose military power, the Swiss would lose money and potentially their freedom, Italy would plunder in many facets, Portugal would be forced to suffer the consequences of their forbearance, and Spain would be pressured into alliance with France in the transaction.³²¹ Orr continues, suggesting that British controlled possessions in the Caribbean could be in danger. These British concerns added an international dimension to the already widespread worry within British society of French invasion, an concern that grew in British society in the early 1790s. This scenario would be concerning to the British, and as Orr logically points out throughout his work, the possibility of French expansion, and even war, in both Europe and throughout the New World was deeply troubling for the British.

The United States was likely even more concerned when hearing the rumor of a French controlled Louisiana, despite its growing power entering the critical period from 1800-1803. From 1750-1800, the United States population grew from 1.2 million to 5 million, a sign of growing formidability. From 1793-1801, American export sales *quintupled* to \$70 million per year, and most of these exports were carried on American ships. Banks in the United States were growing rapidly. Only three banks existed nationwide in 1789, and by 1801, 29 banks existed and its capital multiplied six-fold. The financial system established by Alexander Hamilton gave the United States the highest credit rating in the world. The fact that the United States was a rapidly growing power immediately after its independence in 1776 meant it was a nation prosperous enough not to be bullied around by the newly neighboring French. However, while this was reason for optimism, the United States understood it was not yet near the level of power Great Britain and France had worldwide.

Although the two nations were not necessarily allies beforehand, the news of French control of Louisiana negatively impacted the relationship between the United States and France. From 1798-1800, the United States and France fought an undeclared war at sea, originating from the French seizing \$12 million worth in American ships and cargoes, a number equivalent to ~\$200 million in current dollars. The war was a "byproduct of the larger war France was waging with England" and the French were angry at the United States for refusing to honor their Treaty of Alliance signed in 1778. It was a war of enough magnitude that George Washington "emerged from retirement to head the army" because he was "fearful of a French invasion." The United States did not honor the treaty because, in

³²⁰ Ibid, 100.

³²¹ Orr, 26.

³²² Ibid, 28.

³²³ Fleming, 16.

³²⁴ Ibid,18.

³²⁵ Fleming, 18.

³²⁶ Ibid, 19.

³²⁷ Ibid, p.1

³²⁸ Ibid, p.2 329 Ibid, p.1

its eyes, France was a different nation now that King Louis XVI had been beheaded and a new government (Napoleon) was in place. France viewed this as the Americans favoring the British, increasing its dislike for the United States. With tensions high, Americans had legitimate cause for concern about the French sharing a border with them along the Mississippi River, despite their status as a rising world power.

The American reaction to news of France acquiring Louisiana was of much confusion and concern. Americans were deeply unsettled by France acquiring Louisiana because Spain well understood the magnitude of this situation. The United States would be surrounded by French influence once French explorers sailed up the Mississippi River, considering it had lasting influence throughout Canada (via Montreal and Quebec) in addition to the most valuable colony in the Caribbean – it was fairly assumed that the slave rebellion would be suppressed by Napoleon and France. For this reason, publications throughout the United States in 1803 stroked fear and hostility against France and Spain in reaction to the reported acquisition of Louisiana by France. William Duane, a notable American journalist and editor of the leading Philadelphia newspaper Aurora for nearly 25 years, exemplifies the American reaction in a series of letters independently published in 1803 about the French acquisition of Louisiana, going as far as to suggest the possibility of war. 330 Others thought France would be open to the value of mutual commerce and good relations within North America and choose not to close the Mississippi River to the United States. In this scenario – that Duane was a proponent of – France would reap the benefits of good relations with the United States, including a port of New Orleans that could be a gold mine exporting North American goods. As Duane also points out, in response to the widespread worry, Jefferson publicly took the position that conflict was not imminent with France, and that the American government would try and avoid it.³³¹ However, despite this very reasonable scenario for mutual prosperity, the track record of France with neighboring nations says that it would proceed aggressively.

A shared boundary between the French and Americans along the Mississippi River was destined for disaster. The French had recently undone other nations through what Orr called "conduct towards the various weaker and defenseless governments that surround them or came within their reach." As mentioned earlier, despite the United States rapid growth, France was easily the more powerful nation. During Napoleon's military offensive to regain control of Saint-Domingue, he became aware of President Jefferson's opinion that he did not care if the slave rebellion was successful. Napoleon responded by saying he would welcome the President's invitation to subjugate the rebelling colony on his own in his first step to reestablishing a French empire in North America, and Napoleon later told his foreign minister that "Jefferson and (USA) would become another French satellite" like all of those in Europe, and he would rule North America. 333 While Jefferson soon changed his stance on his preferred outcome of the Saint-Domingue revolution, it was still not because of fear of French invasion. It was because he was wary of an independent Saint-Domingue government hosting piracy in Caribbean waters out of the government's necessity for funding the island. The precedent had already been set by North African cities of the time, that were hubs of piracy in the Mediterranean. Napoleon's military record and stated plans are evidence that France's likely course of action, if controlling both Louisiana and Saint-Domingue, would be conflict with the United States.

As George Orr proposes, the United States and Great Britain understood they would

³³⁰ William Duane, The Mississippi question fairly stated, and the views and arguments of those who clamor for war, examined, in seven letters (Philadelphia: Printed by William Duane, 1803).
³³¹ Ibid.

³³² Orr. 18.

³³³ Flamina o

likely be forced into an alliance in an American conflict with France, considering the French and British rivalry as well as the nations' relationship during this time. For multiple reasons, Americans wanted to avoid this potential conflict. In a scenario of American-French conflict along the Mississippi River, the growth of the western states would be forever limited and the agricultural trade of western states – based on access to the Mississippi River and the port of New Orleans – would drastically contract. Also the perception among Americans was that conflict would be detrimental to all citizens. Duane proclaims that such a war would be "unprofitable in every shape" and prove "the source of incalculable afflictions to the western people, that they would be the loser and the government forever disgraced." The United States understood that conflict with France was not in its interests.

Suppressing the slave revolution in Saint-Domingue was the one domino that did not fall for Napoleon in France's pursuit of New World supremacy from 1800-1803. Many factors played into its success. To begin, while Napoleon was drawing out his plans for maximum French power, "defeats of Saint-Domingue (to this point) take up too much of (Napoleon's) present attention to leave him at leisure to execute his meditated plans." As the revolution progressed into a decade long struggle, it began to take its toll on both France and Napoleon himself.

The duration and intensity of the revolution played a huge role in its success. The revolution had destroyed the island's ecology and infrastructure, and the French were progressively losing support from other nations. In 1802, the United States ended its support to France after the rebelling slaves burned down a major port city. The French needed American help for food, which it had provided in the past, but the Americans demanded extremely high prices and would not give any aid to the French. This issue can be traced back to Louisiana, as the French could have set up farming there to fund the army had they acted quickly. Lacking food and supplies for an army attempting to suppress a rebellion proved some French organizational incompetence in the fight for Saint-Domingue rule.

Also, the decade long war made it more taxing on the French in terms of soldiers and overall funding. In early 1803, General Donatien de Rochambeau, the recently appointed commander of the French forces in Saint-Domingue, urgently asked Napoleon for an additional 35,000 soldiers, a sign that the French were in deep trouble. The war became increasingly violent as the years dragged on; French soldiers were legitimately fearful of idea of service in Saint-Domingue, viewing it as a death trap. This is exemplified by records of the French unleashing fifteen hundred "Bloodhounds" to hunt down rebelling slaves, forced to resort to "the most brutal, no-quarter tactics to terrorize" the rebels. This was further reason to believe the French understood they were struggling in 1803.

The persistence and intensity of the revolution in Saint-Domingue forced Napoleon to ponder his options internationally. He understood it would take a huge capital investment to turn the war around and to redevelop the completely destroyed landscape. This would require major funding that the French government did not have. Furthermore, after the attempt to regain control of Saint-Domingue took significantly longer than he expected, Napoleon owned Louisiana at the expense of good relations with the United States. As a result, Napoleon decided it was necessary to fully commit to a vision worthy of his pursuit to rescue not only the fortunes of France's international image, but his own military reputation as well, damaged by the struggle in Saint-Domingue.

³³⁵ Orr. 14.

³³⁴ Duane, 48.

³³⁶ Flemming, 27.

³³⁷ Flemming, 107.

³³⁸ Ibid

³³⁹ Ibid, 108.

Napoleon decided to shift his focus to an invasion of England. This was a vision he could be proud of, and was more 'Bonapartean' than the colonial empire being pushed by one of his advisors, Foreign Minister Charles Maurice de Talleyrand, because Napoleon always hated the established, dominant world power of Great Britain more than any other opponent. However, for the invasion of Great Britain to be possible, he needed to abandon his current New World problems and aspirations. For the invasion he needed to collect great sums of money. This was possible only by selling Louisiana. During this decision-making process, Napoleon discussed his options regarding Louisiana with French Minister of the Navy Denis Decres and French Minister of Finance Francois Barbe-Marbois:

"I can hardly say I cede it to them, for it is not yet in our possession. But if I leave the least time to our enemies, I will transmit only an empty title to those republicans whose friendship I seek. They ask for only one town of Louisiana [New Orleans]; but I consider the whole colony as completely lost, and it seems to me that in the hands of that growing power, it will be more useful to the policy and even the commerce of France than if I should try to keep it."

Napoleon expressed how he believed Louisiana had become a territory with no use for France, and he wanted to avoid keeping it at the expense of friendship with the United States. He concluded that Louisiana was expendable because of his failure to regain control of Saint-Domingue, and he would try to sell the Louisiana territory to the United States. Selling the Louisiana territory to the United States was a risk that hinged on defeating his primary rival militarily while also gambling on his personal imperial legacy. Napoleon told Minister Talleyrand he wanted the negotiation to go as quickly as possible, and to not settle for less than 50 million francs in return. After a short, tense negotiation in Paris between Talleyrand and two Americans, Foreign Minister Robert R. Livingston and Congressional Diplomat James Monroe, an agreement was reached for a total of \$20 million, equivalent to 60 million francs. The three men made the agreement without the consent of American Secretary of State James Madison, but Livingston and Monroe understood the ramifications. They later explained to Madison how decisive the moment was and the question of peace/war was in the balance. A formal treaty confirming the storied transfer of Louisiana to the United States was signed on May 2, 1803.

Once Louisiana was sold by France to the United States in the summer of 1803, the opportunity for the slaves of Saint-Domingue to successfully finish their rebellion was theirs for the taking. Since the beginning of the revolution, the slaves had rallied around the ideals of the French Revolution and its cries for liberty, equality, and justice. This is extremely ironic, as the *French* Revolution, which led to Napoleon's ascension to the throne, concluded just four years before the Saint-Domingue revolution would end. While the rebelling slaves fought with great desire to defend themselves after centuries of oppression, the most vital reason they were victorious over the French was because of the Yellow Fever rapidly effecting Napoleon's troops. The illness took over the foreign army very quickly beginning in 1802, with "black vomit, yellowing skin, convulsions, and death" while within a day of showing signs of illness, soldiers became too ill to walk, and the death rate among the foreign soldiers reached an astonishing 85%. By the summer of 1803, the rebelling slaves were at a clear advantage over the weakening foreign troops, gaining traction toward victory. All

³⁴² Ibid, 116.

³⁴¹ Ibid.

³⁴³ Ibid, 128.

³⁴⁴ Ibid 01

remaining French troops evacuated the island by December of 1803.³⁴⁵ The revolutionary slaves needed every opportunity they were afforded, and they claimed independence on January 1st, 1804, forming the nation of Haiti.

Acquiring Louisiana was a critical moment in the career of Napoleon, but he was unable to capitalize on the opportunity. He had been given the prize of the Louisiana territory without any bloodshed or capital investment, and the opportunity presented itself to make immense fortune there. The rebellious people of Saint-Domingue were "a crucial factor in upending Napoleon Bonaparte's grand design" for French New World dominance. 346 Napoleon's decision to turn his focus away from New World dominance and aggressively pursue an invasion of Great Britain began with his failure to reconquer the Saint-Domingue. The thesis of this paper takes the position that France would have been aggressive towards the United States for increasing New World supremacy, and the subjugation of more land outside of Louisiana and Saint-Domingue. This stance is supported by the extent of France's aggressive foreign policy. Unsurprisingly, given this aggressive and imperial nature of Napoleon, "every single one of the 60 million francs (received from the United States for Louisiana) went into the preparations for the invasion of England," and within two weeks of the final sale of Louisiana to the United States, France was at war with Great Britain.³⁴⁷ The degree in which Europe and all New World colonies were imperially connected in the late 18th century and early 19th century is exemplified in the history of the Haitian Revolution. Americans, ever since this critical time in the beginning of the nineteenth century, have reaped the benefits of this opportune turning point of New World history in 1803, as a result of the unprecedented successful slave revolution in Saint-Domingue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

George Orr. The possession of Louisiana by the French, considered, as it affects the interests of those nations more immediately concerned, viz. Great Britain, America, Spain, and Portugal. London: Printed for J. Ginger, 1803.

Duane, William. *The Mississippi question fairly stated, and the views and arguments of those who clamor for war, examined, in seven letters.* Phildelphia: Printed by William Duane, 1803.

Flemming, Thomas. *The Louisiana Purchase*. (Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2003.)

"The Haitian Revolution." Brown University Department of Africana Studies, 27 Oct. 2015. http://library.brown.edu/haitihistory/

Adam Kloppe. "The Louisiana Purchase and the Haitian Revolution." *History Happens Here: Missouri History Museum Blog.* March 5, 2015. http://www.historyhappenshere.org/node/7655

^{345 &}quot;The Haitian Revolution."

³⁴⁶ Flemming, 84.

³⁴⁷ Ibid n 100

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance Of 1902 And Its Unintended Consequences

HONGXUAN YANG

The story of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in the dawn of the 20th Century revolved around Britain's effort to maintain the power balance in the Far East where European imperial powers, including Britain itself, had been competing to dominate commercial trades to exploit local markets and resources. The treaty was designed to fence off potential jeopardies by France and Russia on British interests in the region. Ironically, however, it ended up breaking the power balance and severely damaging British status in the area. This paper examines the strategic thinking behind Britain's decision to form an alliance with Japan and how the eventual outcome of this alliance contradicted the Britain's original objectives.

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was first signed in 1902 in London by British Secretary of Foreign Affairs at the time Lord Lansdowne and Japanese minister in London Hayashi Tadasu. The treaty contained two key points: first, both parties agreed to remain neutral if the other party intervened in China or Korea for the sake of national interests; second, the two signatories promised each other military assistance if either signatory went to war with two or more other powers. The specific articles of the treaty were renewed for the first time in 1905, following Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War, and again in 1911. The common perception about the British rationale behind its alliance with Japan is that it wanted to use the regional power of Japan to contain further expansions of France and Russia in the Far East and prevent them from achieving domination. In this way, Britain could protect its interests--both in terms of commercial trade and political privilege--in the area. This alliance, however, had unanticipated impacts, in both the short and long term, on Japan, China, the greater Far East and Britain itself in the 40 years to come.

In order to understand the strategic calculations behind the British government's decision to sign a treaty with Japan, some knowledge of the history of British involvement in East Asia and the rise of Imperial Japan are prerequisites. East Asia--geographically consisting of China, Japan and Korea--had remained a virgin land to a fair extent from the enormous rising tide of Western imperialism in its early stages, although records show that Portuguese settlement in China appeared as early as 1557 in Macau.³⁵¹ The breakthrough for Britain in East Asia came in 1839, when Chinese commissioner Lin Zexu of Canton, arguably motivated by an order from the central imperial government of the Manchurian Qing Dynasty that was extremely worried about the harms of opium to China, attempted to eliminate British opium imports to Canton. Such action provided Britain, who had been coveting the Chinese opium market, with a legitimate reason to intervene militarily, resulting in the First Opium War. During the war, the British expedition force, upholding the free trade principle, crushed the Qing army with their far superior weapons. The war ended with the signing of the Treaty of Nanking, which included the opening of five ports along the east coast of China to British merchants, the annexation of Hong Kong by the British and the

^{1.} P. B. Waite, "Petty-Fitzmaurice, Henry Charles Keith, 5th Marquess of Lansdowne," in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 15, (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003) accessed May 10, 2016, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/petty_fitzmaurice_henry_charles_keith_15E.html

^{2.} Japan Center for Asian Historical Records, "The First Anglo-Japanese Alliance," http://www.jacar.go.jp/nichiro/uk-japan.htm Accessed May 11, 2016.

^{3.} Ian Hill Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese alliance: the diplomacy of two island empires, 1894-1907* (London: Athlone, 1966), 45.

privileged status of British citizens in China. For British imperialists, the order established by the Treaty of Nanking was very desirable because it established China as a member of Britain's informal empire and cemented Britain as "the major commercial and military power in the region".

Britain's dominant status in 1842, however, was bound to be challenged. In 1853, an American expedition flotilla led by Commodore Matthew C. Perry reached Japan to pressure the Japanese Shogun government into establishing trade with the Western world, especially the United States.³⁵⁴ This historical event not only opened Japanese markets to European merchants, but also precipitated a significant change in Japanese history: the Meiji Restoration. Unsatisfied by the Shogun regime's weak stance against foreign encroachment, in 1868, the samurai class in Japan successfully campaigned against the Shogun army to welcome back Emperor Meiji. In subsequent decades, the world witnessed Japan's miraculously fast and successful process of industrialization and modernization under the Meiji to the extent that its military, especially naval power, became almost on par with those of the European imperial powers. This newfound military prowess was to be demonstrated soon enough in the Russo-Japanese War. For Britain, the newly industrialized and militarized Japan was, on the one hand, another competitor in the Far East but, on the other hand, a potential non-European power that could be manipulated against the traditional European imperialist powers in the region to protect British interests.

Japan was not the only country rising to the global stage and joining the contest in East Asia in the second half of the 19th Century. It was accompanied by a unified Germany and the United States, which completed their respective industrialization during roughly the same period and showed a strong desire to participate in the colonial competition in East Asia. The U.S. actively sought to grab a share of the commercial trade as it forced open the Japanese economy. Germany, on the other hand, "put a bid for territory using the excuse of murdered missionary in Shandong", which resulted in the German occupation of Shandong. 355 Exploitation of the tumbling Chinese Empire was also joined by other traditional European imperial powers -- most notably France and Russia. France participated in the Second Opium War with the hope of enhancing its own presence in China while Russia seized every opportunity to encroach on Mongolia and Manchuria. The newly industrialized Japan was determined not to allow potential profits from Chinese territory slip away. In 1895, Japan waged the First Sino-Japanese War after disputes in Korea, effectively crushing the Beiyang Army and Fleet of the Qing Empire, and subsequently demanded occupation of Taiwan. 356 Approaching the twentieth century, China was now becoming the "second Africa," faced with a partition by European powers and Japan. The new comers, namely Germany, Japan and the United States, combined with the traditional powers, mainly France and Tsarist Russia, mounted a serious challenge to Britain's dominant position in the Far East that was established in 1842. Therefore, measures to prevent the loss of its privilege in the region became imperative for the British decision-making class.

From Britain's perspective, the inclination towards a partitioned China was definitely against its interests; should China become partitioned, Britain would lose its paramountcy in China both in terms of market share and political privilege as other imperial powers carve up the benefits originally belonged to Britain. Following the annexations of different parts of China by other powers, a very anxious Salisbury coalition government between the

^{5.} Lawrence James, The Rise and Fall of the British Empire, (London: Little, Brown and Company 1994), 236 & 237.

^{6.} Ibid.

^{7.} Francis L. Hawks, The Perry Expeditions to Japan: 1852-1854, (Big Bite Books, 2016), 28.

^{8.} James, 241.

^{9.} Paine, S.C.M, The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: Perceptions, Power, and Primacy, (Cambridge:

conservatives and the liberals "announced in 1898 that it had leased Wei-Hai Wei on the coast of north China as a naval base" in an attempt to keep holding onto its interests in China. ³⁵⁷ Further measures to avoid confrontations with other imperial powers were undertaken later, which included a reinforcement of the Royal Navy's presence in the Far East to "three battleships and ten cruisers, making it equal to combined Franco-Russian fleets in the area."

It was within these worrisome circumstances that the Salisbury government of the United Kingdom decided to form an alliance with Imperial Japan. The rationale behind the decision was complicated and debatable, but it should be noted that such an alliance was definitely not the most desired option for the United Kingdom at the time because it actually contradicted the "splendid isolation" policy Britain had been upholding since the late 19th Century. The policy, claimed by Foreign Minister Edward Stanley in 1866, states that "it is the duty of the Government of this country, placed as it is with regard to geographical position, to keep itself upon terms of goodwill with all surrounding nations, but not to entangle itself with any single or monopolizing alliance with any one of them." ³⁵⁹ A reasonable explanation of why the alliance came into being puts emphasis on the various conflicts the British Empire had entangled itself in at the turn of the century. At the time, Britain was "embroiled in the conquest of Sudan, was preparing for a showdown with France on the upper Nile, and was on a collision course with the Boer republics in South Africa."³⁶⁰ Britain needed to provide military resources and manpower for all these actions simultaneously, stretching its military capacity thin. Therefore, keeping the aforementioned three battleships and ten cruisers in China became a huge burden for the Empire. However, the growing Russian and French influence in China was something the United Kingdom particularly did not want to see, so the Salisbury government at the time finally opted to align with Japan, the emerging regional power who shared British anxiety about Russia. Britain hoped to utilize Japan's power to contain further Russian encroachment in China.

Lawrence James, in his book The Rise and Fall of the British Empire, suggests an alternative explanation for the alliance, stating that the British rationale behind the signing of the treaty had to do with the rise of a united Germany with an unprecedentedly strong navy. German emperor and King of Prussia, Kaiser Wilhelm II, had revealed in his autobiography My Early Life that he "had a peculiar passion for navy" and wanted to "possess a fine navy as the English."³⁶¹ A larger and stronger navy would fulfill not only the emperor's fantasy, but also Germany's ambition to become a global imperial power. Prior to the creation of airplanes and the emergence of aerial combat, a strong navy was the foundation and guarantee of an empire across the world, as exemplified by the British Empire. Therefore, under Secretary of State for the Navy Tirpitz, Germany passed two successive Naval Laws that dictated the expansion of its navy to a total of 38 battleships and 52 cruisers, making it roughly two thirds as big as the Royal Navy, to be attained by 1920. 362 Such expansionist actions definitely aroused great anxiety in Britain since the Naval Defense Act of 1889 established that the strength of the Royal Navy should be kept in par with the sum total of the second and third strongest navies in the rest of the world combined.³⁶³ Under the growing anxiety and fear of the German navy, Britain needed to initiate its own naval expansion and, more importantly, redistribute its existing ships to counter the new German threat. Compared

10. James, 242.

^{11.} Ibid.

^{12.} John Charmley, introduction to *Splendid Isolation? Britain and the Balance of Power 1874–1914*, (Sceptre, 1999), xi.

^{13.} James, 242.

^{14..} William II, My Early Life, (Germany: George H. Doran Company, 1926)

^{15.} Holger H. Herwig . 'Luxury Fleet', The Imperial German Navy 1888–1918, (London: The Ashfield Press, 1980), 167.

to India, without which Britain "shall drop straightway to a third rate power" according to Lord Curzon in 1901, or Egypt where the Empire's lifeline—the Suez Canal—lies, China was clearly of less importance to the British Empire.³⁶⁴ That being said, Britain definitely didn't't want Russian domination in the Far East; the product of this dilemma became the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.

The fundamental rationale for the United Kingdom to ally with Japan was a "one stone, four birds" situation. First, the alliance made the British battleships and cruisers stationed in the Far East available for redeployment back to the home fleet where the German threat was imminent. Second, Britain would ideally still be able to hold onto its interests in China and the Far East through the alliance, although the binding treaty with Japan conceded that "she could no longer maintain her paramountcy in China singlehandedly." Third, the Japanese military presence in the Far East would ensure that Russian encroachment was contained and a possible Russian domination in the region would be prevented. Last but not the least, because the alliance eliminated the possibility of a potential invasion by Japan, it guaranteed security for dominions in the Empire-Commonwealth, particularly Australia and New Zealand who were directly exposed to the growing power of the Japanese navy. These four points together indeed made the alliance a seemingly ideal and effective path for the Salisbury government and Britain to go down, and how events played out in the short run after the alliance was signed did prove its value. Being able to transfer part of its strength from the Far East to other hotspots ensured that the United Kingdom had sufficient resources and manpower to pull out of the Boer War with a victory later that same year and retain full control of the Suez Canal.

In the long run, however, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance actually contradicted Britain's original objective and, to some extent, backfired on Britain. Lying at the core of these unintended consequences was the unexpected Japanese domination in the Far East. Not long after the alliance came into effect, Japan initiated a pre-emptive attack on the Russian-controlled Port Arthur in the Liaodong Peninsula, which later escalated into a regional war both on land and sea between the Tsarist Russia and Imperial Japan. Territorial disputes between the two powers had existed since the late 19th Century as both parties deemed Korea and Manchuria resourceful and strategically critical; thus, none of the negotiations were able to generate a compromise. The stalemate between the two imperial powers would have been maintained if not for the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. But, when the British Empire, undeniably the strongest force in the contemporary world, became her ally and promised neutrality if Japan were to initiate wars for its interests in Korea and China, Japan gained enough confidence to carry out the Russo-Japanese War. In other words, Britain's entering into an alliance with Japan served as an acquiescence for Japanese expansion in the Far East.

The result of the war was well known: it was the first time in Western history that a European power was defeated by a non-European power. The Tsarist Russia was effectively removed from Korea and Manchuria for a substantial amount of time, leaving Japan the *de facto* dominating power in the region. Britain appeared to have no problem with this specific development in the Far East as it agreed to renew the articles of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. However, when Britain managed to negotiate with Russia through the Anglo-Russian Convention of August 1907 and extract the promise from Russia that it would not jeopardize British interests in the Far East, the strategic value of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance began to decay. Nevertheless, the Alliance stayed in effect even as the First World War, i.e. the Great War, broke out.

Because of the existence of her alliance with Britain, Imperial Japan entered the First

^{17.} Denis Judd, Empire—The British Imperial Experience, From 1765 to the Present, (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1996), 78.

^{18.} James, 243.

World War as one of the Allied powers, participating mainly in fighting German troops in the Far East. In the Siege of Tsingtao, the Imperial Japanese Army fought side by side with British Empire troops to defeat the German occupation force and subsequently took control of the Shandong Peninsula. The Paris Peace Conference at the end of World War I, Imperial Japan demanded that the German pre-war occupied territories including Shandong and several Pacific Islands north of the equator be transferred to its administration. Due to the existence of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, as well as a secret agreement reached by Japan and Britain during the war that promised mutual support on issues of mandate and annexation, Britain was obligated to support the Japanese stance and reject China's request of returning Shandong to China. This decision resulted in greater Japanese influence in the Far East and, more importantly, encouraged Imperial Japan to conduct expansions in the region because the Anglo-Japanese Alliance had allowed it to stretch its territory and fulfill its ambition time and time again without any consequence in the first 20 years of the 20th Century.

Britain's decision during the Paris Peace Conference, driven by its alliance with Japan, to allow Shandong to be transferred to Japan also had a significant impact on the future of China where the feudal Qing Dynasty had already been replaced by the Republic of China by 1919. The rejection by the imperial powers of the return of Shandong provoked an enormous wave of patriotic and nationalist strikes and protests in China—the May Fourth Movement. Instead of attacking the imperial powers, the blame of the loss of Shandong was mainly attributed to the government's weak stance during the peace conference. The protests, therefore, were directed towards the existing regime that was in theory both democratic and republican. 369 The Chinese people, throughout the 19th Century until 1919, had been searching for ways to salvage the tumbling country, particularly in terms of an effective political system. The democratic republic was their first attempt in doing so. However, the outcome of the peace conference resulted in severe skepticism towards such a political system and alternative systems were explored and experimented with, among which was the communist system. The Chinese Communist Party, whose core founders all emerged during the May Fourth Movement, was established in 1921. The party took over China 30 years after the Paris Peace Conference in 1949 and has remained in power to this day.³⁷⁰

Britain, as one of the oldest western democratic countries, would have definitely been more willing to see a China operating on the principles of democracy and republic, particularly given its antagonism against communism. Churchill stated in the House of Commons in 1920: "I yield to no one in my detestation of Bolshevism, and of the revolutionary violence which precedes it." ³⁷¹ The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, therefore, obligated Britain to support the Japanese position in the 1919 Peace Conference, resulting in the nation-wide protests in China that "strangled" a Chinese democratic system in its "cradle" and eventually generated a Communist regime that was fundamentally hostile towards the British political system—an unintended consequence.

By 1923, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was officially terminated because both parties felt that the treaty "[was] not entirely consistent with the letter of that Covenant (of the

^{20. &}quot;Germans lose possessions in China," The Independent. Nov 16, 1914.

https://archive.org/stream/independen79v80newy#page/225/mode/1up Retrieved May 11th, 2016. 21. Russell Fifield, "Japanese Policy toward the Shantung Question at the Paris Peace Conference," The

Journal of Modern History. Vol. 23, No. 3, (The University of Chicago Press, 1951).

^{22.} Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom, "Chinese Students and Anti-Japanese Protests, Past and Present," World Policy Journal, Summer 2005. http://www.worldpolicy.org/journal/articles/wpj05-2/wasserstrom.html Retrieved May 11th, 2016.

^{23.} Werner Draguhn, David S. G. Goodman, China's Communist Revolutions: Fifty Years of the People's Republic of China, (Psychology Press, 2002), 23.

^{24.} Phillip White, "A Leadership Legacy: Happy 138th, Winston, National Churchill Museum,"

League of Nations), which both Governments earnestly desire[d] to respect". 372 During the 21 years when the alliance was in effect, however, it had already been exploited by Imperial Japan sufficiently to achieve domination in the Far East. When Japan marched into and occupied Manchuria in 1931. She was already too strong for any other power in the region to effectively resist its will and ambition. The eventual backfire of the Alliance on Britain came in the Second World War, during which Japanese Army and Navy swept through the entire Pacific Asia with the claim of building "The Great East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere". Britain, once an ally of Japan, ironically became one of the major victims of Japanese offences in the early stages of the war, losing several critical strategic bases including Hong Kong and Singapore to Japan. The Royal Navy also suffered severe losses during its engagements with the Japanese Imperial Navy, among which were battleship HMS Prince of Wales, battle cruiser HMS Repulse and aircraft carrier HMS Hermes. 373 Although Japan was eventually defeated by a combined effort of the Allies, Britain was never able to reclaim its influence in the Far East. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance allowed Japan to grow and expand without limit in the Far East, and this served as a major reason behind Japanese invincibility in the early stages of the war.

This paper is not meant to criticize the decision of the Salisbury government to enter into alliance with Japan, because, from a contemporary perspective, the alliance was actually a wise move that simultaneously allowed Britain to redistribute its naval power, maintain its interests in China, contain Russian aggression and ease the anxiety of losing Australia and New Zealand to a potential Japanese offense. It is, however, in retrospect that we find the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 gave rise to developments in history that contradicted its initial rationale and objectives. Although the alliance prevented Russia from attaining monopoly status in the Far East, it resulted instead in a Japanese monopoly in the region, which was not much different in effect from Russian domination from the British perspective. The alliance, in a subtle way, also drove China to pursue a Communist system that antagonized itself against Britain in later decades.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bongyin, Fung. Macau: A General Introduction. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing, 1999.

Charmley, John. Splendid Isolation? Britain and the Balance of Power 1874–1914. Sceptre, 1999.

Draguhn, Werner, and David S. G. Goodman. *China's Communist Revolutions: Fifty Years of the People's Republic of China*. Psychology Press, 2002.

Fifield, Russell. "Japanese Policy toward the Shantung Question at the Paris Peace Conference," The Journal of Modern History. Vol. 23, No. 3. The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

"Germans lose possessions in China," The Independent. Nov 16, 1914. https://archive.org/stream/independen79v80newy#page/225/mode/1up Retrieved May 11th, 2016.

^{25.} Text of the statement in League of Nations Treaty Series, vol. 1, p. 24.

^{26.} Naval History Net, "British Vessels Lost at Sea in WWII," http://www.naval-

Hawks, Francis L. *The Perry Expeditions to Japan: 1852-1854*. Big Bite Books, 2016. Herwig, Holger H. *'Luxury Fleet', The Imperial German Navy 1888–1918*. London: The Ashfield Press, 1980.

James, Lawrence *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*. London: Little, Brown and Company 1994.

Japan Center for Asian Historical Records. "The First Anglo-Japanese Alliance," http://www.jacar.go.jp/nichiro/uk-japan.htm Accessed May 11, 2016.

Judd, Denis. *Empire—The British Imperial Experience, From 1765 to the Present*. London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1996.

League of Nations Treaty Series, vol. 1.

Naval History Net, "British Vessels Lost at Sea in WWII," http://www.naval-history.net/WW2BritishLosses1Major.htm Retrieved May 11th, 2016.

Nish, Ian H. *The Anglo-Japanese alliance: the diplomacy of two island empires, 1894-1907.* London: Athlone, 1966.

Paine, S.C.M. The Sino-Japanese War of 1894–1895: Perceptions, Power, and Primacy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Sondhaus, Lawrence. Naval Warfare 1815-1914. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge, 2001.

Waite, P.B. "Petty-Fitzmaurice, Henry Charles Keith, 5th Marquess of Lansdowne," in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 15, (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003) accessed May 10, 2016,

http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/petty fitzmaurice henry charles keith 15E.html

Wasserstrom, Jeffrey N. "Chinese Students and Anti-Japanese Protests, Past and Present," World Policy Journal, Summer 2005. http://www.worldpolicy.org/journal/articles/wpj05-2/wasserstrom.html Retrieved May 11th, 2016.

White, Phillip. "A Leadership Legacy: Happy 138th, Winston, National Churchill Museum," https://www.nationalchurchillmuseum.org/12-07-12-leadership-legacy.html Retrieved May 11th, 2016.

William II. My Early Life. Germany: George H. Doran Company, 1926.

CONTRIBUTORS

BAYAN ABUBAKR is a double major in History and Politics with an interest in the intersections between law and society. His paper explores the discriminatory undertones of welfare policies in the United States, which were rooted and based off the stereotypes and common understandings of a welfare recipient. It looks at this through several Supreme Court cases, each of which reinforced the idea that welfare was an *entitlement* not a *benefit*.

SAFWAN AKBAR is

MADELINE BELLO is a history major with an interest in histories of gender and slavery in the Americas.

CRAIG EPSTEIN is a senior studying History, with dual minors in Sociology and Hebrew and Judaic Studies. He will be graduating as a University Honors Scholar in May, and will be attending the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in the fall on a Dean's Merit Scholarship.

BRITTA GIGLIOTTI is a senior in Global Liberal Studies, with minors in Italian and History. Her senior thesis, "Talking with Your Mouth Full," uses the tradition of politicians eating along the campaign trail to reveal how food functions as a system of communication. She originally set out to discover why so many American politicians are photographed eating pork chops, but was quickly consumed by the rich newspaper accounts—tales of tension and triumph—of the young Iowa State Fair.

LOLA JUSIDMAN is a climate activist and student of politics from Mexico.

SHIRA MOGIL graduated from NYU in May 2016 and after spending four years wandering the streets of the West Village, she is now part of a Jewish studies fellowship on the Upper West Side of Manhattan. She is a St. Louis native and an avid Cardinals fan, and loves ice cream, night runs, traveling, and all things concerning the historical importance of nineteenth-century U.S. Reconstruction policy, the creation of race in the Unites States, and gender history. Shira is excited to share her work and hopes it illuminates a sliver of eugenics politics in the U.S. and the way it has helped shape our current political climate.

EVAN NEUHAUSEN is a senior at Gallatin. He is interested in cultural studies and the histories of social movements in the contemporary, particularly in the U.S. and Mexico.

CHRISTOPHER VRADIS is a junior in CAS pursuing a major in History and a minor in Mathematics.

HONGXUAN YANG is currently a junior pursuing a double major in economics and history. Born and raised in China, his primary academic aspiration is to understand the influences of Chinese geopolitical thinking on modern Chinese foreign policies. He is currently working on a research project on the Chinese decision-making process during the Sino-Vietnamese War of 1979 (aka the Third Indochina War).