

Alpata:
A journal of history

Volume XIII, Fall 2016

A publication of the University of Florida

Managing Editor

Brent Cornett

Book Review Editor

Madison Cates

Editors

Chelsey Hendry

Luke Jeske

Guest Editor

Alec Carver

Faculty Advisor

Dr. Jack Davis

Design

Brent Cornett

Underwriting Partner

Kelly History Fund

Contents

Editorial Section on Revolutions in Print

Revolutions in Print: An Introduction

Brent Cornett.....5

Paper Crown and Bloody Sword: Emperor Faustin Soulouque in the Political Caricature of Honoré Daumier

Chelsey Hendry.....7

Soviet Speak?: Reforming and Spreading the Rus- sian Language in the Soviet Union

Luke Jeske.....17

Featured Articles

- The Island of Affliction: Robben Island’s Leper
Asylum at the Turn of the Twentieth Century
Chelsey Hendry.....24
- Westoxification: A Conceptual History
Onur F. Muftugil.....41
- “The Blame and Shame of It”: Samuel Sewall’s Re-
pentance
Lauren Amos.....69
- Rebels With a Cause: The Rebels, Raiders, Patriots,
and Gators of Escambia High School
Brad Woods.....98

Book Reviews

R.S. Deese. *We Are Amphibians: Julian and Aldous Huxley on the Future of Our Species*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2015.

Ryan Thompson.....119

Adrienne Monteith Petty. *Standing Their Ground: Small Farmers in North Carolina Since the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Madison W. Cates.....122

Lawrence Wright. *In the New World: Growing Up With America, From the Sixties to the Eighties*. New York: Vintage, 1987.

Holland Hall.....126

Carl A. Zimring. *Clean and White: A History of Environmental Racism in the United States*. New York University Press, 2015.

Tim Blanton.....130

David La Vere. *The Tuscarora War: Indians, Settlers, and the Fight for the Carolina Colonies*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Jessica Taylor.....133

A Note on the Contributors136

Editorials

Revolutions in Print : An Introduction

Brent Cornett

The drastic decline in paper format newspapers and magazines ushers the discussion of whether there is a looming end for printed media. Newspapers may become only a nostalgic interest in the future but online media poses as a phoenix for the scope of disseminated information. The expansion, and subsequent repressions, of online social media has influenced revolutions in many modern countries. The Egyptian revolution at Tahrir Square in 2011 was led by an online media presence, between like minded individuals, discovering cultural dissent against long standing oppression.

Similarly, Chelsey Hendry analyzes the mid-1840s events leading to the Haitian revolution. Focusing on the caricatures printed by Honore Daumier, popular French artist and political revolutionist. Hendry shows a greater depth to Daumier's lithographs than their surface suggests. In the wake of Napoleon III's rise to power, the presses were censored for any political dissent. Hendry explores why the subject of Haiti became the focus of French political revolutionaries like Daumier and expectedly led to the Haitian revolution.

Luke Jeske would be the first to refute that the reformation of the press is a maleficent act however. Jeske reviews the world of the political press in a revolutionized Russia. In 1924, Stalin was attempting to unite one of the largest nations in world history but was unable to reach a largely illiterate populace. The effort of “Russification” mandated Russian printers to print in only one language, reducing the complexity of their printed language and unifying a new nation. Jeske reveals that the loss of many minor languages was the result of Stalin’s efforts but the future of Russian education was greater because of it.

These two events in history reverberate in our modern society and can be seen in our modern media. The modern street art of Banksey and the countless memes circulating around the internet, can easily be related to the form of lithography produced by French revolutionists living in a world, they also felt, was repressive. If anything, the presence and pervasiveness of social media and internet news, has met Stalin’s dream of unifying a common people. Now the words of revolution, and also those of progress, can live free of their former paper bodies.

Paper Crown and Bloody Sword: Emperor Faustin Soulouque in the Political Caricature of Honoré Daumier

Chelsey Hendry

Four decades after the independence of the French colony of Saint Domingue, the new nation of Haiti had been ruled by a governor-general, three presidents, one king, and an emperor. In 1843, the twenty-five-year rule of President Jean-Pierre Boyer came to an abrupt end as he was forced into exile by a military coup enacted by Charles Rivière-Hérard. The next four years saw four new presidents, chosen by the mulatto Boyerist ruling class, who were pushed out of power or died within a year of their presidency. After the death of Jean-Baptiste Riché in 1847, the ruling elite selected the unassuming Faustin-Élie Soulouque as the next president of the nation. Soulouque, formerly the captain of the Presidential Guard, was a former slave and career military officer with no political experience and seemed the perfect candidate to continue the puppet-regime controlled by the senate. Within a year of his appointment to the office of president, Soulouque would have a large portion of his own senate and cabinet executed as well as any others who opposed

his rule. The April 1848 Cabinet Purge would mark the beginning of a decade-long authoritarian rule.¹

Soulouque's rise to power was concomitant to the popularization of political caricature as a means of personal expression and political dissent. Soulouque became known throughout Europe and the Americas as a despotic ruler and was the subject of a significant number of political cartoon caricatures during and after his reign. One of the most well-known and prolific caricaturists of nineteenth-century France, Honoré Daumier, made Soulouque the focus of over twenty of his lithographs. Fifteen years before Soulouque's presidency began, Daumier was imprisoned by the French government for his depiction of King Louis-Philippe as Gargantua, from François Rabelais's sixteenth-century tale *Gargantua et Pantagruel*. Gargantua, known for his insatiable appetite and gluttony, famously required the milk of 17,913 cows to feed him during his infancy. Drawing on the fictional character, Daumier's caricature vulgarly displays an enormous Louis-Philippe seated on a *chaise percée* being fed coins provided by the emaciated masses, while dispensing papers labeled "prefecture," "nomination of peers," and "military commission" to the clamoring

¹ A more thorough treatment of Soulouque's rise to power can be found in John E. Baur, "Faustin Soulouque, Emperor of Haiti His Character and His Reign." *The Americas* 6, no. 2 (1949)

² The equivalent of a "night stool." A chair with an opening in the seat meant to be placed over a chamberpot.

ministers beneath his chair.²³ After Daumier's imprisonment, his work showed a greater degree of subtlety when criticizing the French government. While on their face, Daumier's caricatures of Soulouque might have been racist criticisms of a dictatorial ruler in a faraway country, closer scrutiny reveals that Daumier's depictions of Soulouque serve a dual purpose as a means to bypass press censorship laws in France during the Second Empire; Daumier, eager to avoid another six-month prison sentence, opted to utilize Emperor Soulouque as a substitute for Emperor Napoleon III.

Daumier's first lithograph featuring Soulouque, published in *Le Charivari* in June of 1850, displays the newly crowned Haitian Emperor dipping a European journalist into a boiling cauldron. The subtitle reads: "The Emperor Soulouque having heard that a European journalist criticized some procedures of his administration, succeeded in catching the guilty fellow and plunged him into a bowl of boiling tar." The subtitle also facetiously encourages the French government to enact the same method for "suppressing different opinions."²⁴ The caricature seems to be a direct response to the seizure of a republican magazine, *La Siècle*'s, May 1850 issue by order of the president, then Louis-Napoleon Bo-

²³ Elizabeth Childs, "Big Trouble: Daumier, Gargantua, and the Censorship of Political Caricature," *Art Journal* 51, no. 1 (1992): 26-37.

²⁴ Honoré Daumier, "L'Empereur Soulouque ayant appris qu'un journaliste européen s'était permis de critiquer quelques uns des actes de son administration..." Cartoon. In *Le Charivari*. (Paris : Charles Philippon, 1850)

naparte. Louis-Napoleon was only one year away from enacting a military coup to establish himself as emperor, much as Soulouque has only a few years before, and taking on the name Emperor Napoleon III. Only months after his coup on February 17, 1852, Napoleon III enacted a set of strict laws concerning the press. Newspapers dealing with political or social issues required the permission of the government, press offenses were expanded, fines for noncompliance were increased, and newspapers or journals could be disbanded by the government after three offenses.⁵ Daumier's predictive caricature foreshadowed that the liberal press promised by the Second Republic would not be long-lasting, and inaugurated Soulouque as the French Press's official stand-in for Napoleon III.

Soulouque's first coronation in 1849 was carried out without a proper crown; the senate provided a gilded cardboard headdress affixed with costume jewels to serve for the occasion. Soulouque then commissioned a replica of Napoleon I's coronation attire for a second ceremony in 1852. Ermine and gold were imported from France and the proceedings replicated that of Bonaparte's fifty years earlier.⁶ Despite Soulouque's attempted replication of Napoleonic practice, French visitors noted that the cap-badges of his imperial guard, which were

⁵ Alfred Cobban, *A History of Modern France*. Vol. 2 (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1957), 159.

⁶ Robert Debs Heinl and Nancy Gordon Heinl, *Written in Blood: The Story of the Haitian People, 1492-1995*, 3rd ed (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2005) 203-205.

reportedly imported at great expense, were simply fashioned from the lid of a sardine can, an apt metaphor for Soulouque's mimicry of Napoleonic style.⁷ Soulouque lived in a "constant masquerade of imperial glory," making him the perfect parallel to Napoleon III's attempts at restoring the grandeur of the First Empire.⁸ Anti-Bonapartists utilized the epithet "Soulouque" as a stand-in for Napoleon's despotic actions and imperial aspirations. In *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, Karl Marx drew a comparison between the two empires, and wrote that "At the court, in the ministries, at the head of the administration and the army, a gang of blokes of whom the best that can be said is that one does not know whence they come—these noisy, disreputable, rapacious bohemians who crawl into gallooned coats with the same grotesque dignity as the high dignitaries of Soulouque – elbow their way forward."⁹ Victor Hugo, at the time exiled in Belgium, also compared Napoleon III to Soulouque. In his criticism-laden pamphlet *Napoleon Le Petit*, Hugo wrote that "Europe smiled when, glancing at Haiti, she saw this white Soulouque appear."¹⁰

Daumier utilized these parallels to critique the Second Empire, while simultaneously skirting around heavy press censorship. When Napoleon

⁷ Paul Dhormoys, *Une visite chez Soulouque* (Paris, 1864), as noted by Hienl and Hienl, *Written in Blood*, 209.

⁸ Elizabeth C. Childs, *Daumier and Exoticism: Satirizing the French and the Foreign*. (New York: Peter Lang, 2004) 112.

⁹ Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," *Die Revolution*, 1852.

¹⁰ Victor Hugo, *Napoléon Le Petit*, (Paris: Paris Nelson, 1852)

III's government ordered an issue of *La Siècle* to be confiscated, Soulouque was shown dipping journalists into boiling cauldrons. When Napoleon led France into the Crimean War in 1854, Soulouque appeared clad in the iconic Napoleonic bicorn and military finery. In a lithograph from 1855, Daumier utilizes both Soulouque and legendary Swiss bailiff Albrecht Gessler. In the Swiss folk tale, Gessler placed his hat on a pole in the center of town and ordered all the townspeople to bow to it. William Tell refused to bow to Gessler's hat, causing the bailiff to issue an ultimatum: Tell would shoot an apple off of his own child's head, or be executed. Daumier's lithograph displays a gleeful Soulouque turning the tables on Gessler. The bicorn hat that is normally drawn atop his head rests on a pole in the background, as Soulouque pulls Gessler's hat from his head.¹¹ Soulouque, and thus Napoleon III, take Gessler's place in the tale. Daumier satirizes Napoleon by depicting his analogue as a tyrant doomed for his hubris just as William Tell assassinated Gessler. The tale of William Tell resurged in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe as a symbol of resistance to tyranny and oppression. By drawing Soulouque as Gessler, and Gessler as Tell, Daumier implies that Napoleon III was even more tyrannical than Gessler.

What is perhaps most interesting is Daumier's depiction of Soulouque after his downfall. Nicolas Geffard led his deposition in January 1859 and

¹¹ Honoré Daumier, "A Haiti-Plaisanterie renouvelée de Gessler." Cartoon. In *Le Charivari*. (Paris : Charles Philippon, 1855)

restored the presidency to Haiti. At this point, the path of the historical Soulouque and Daumier's caricature diverge considerably. The historical Soulouque fled Haiti aboard a British ship bound for Kingston, Jamaica.¹² Daumier's Soulouque conveniently traveled to France where Daumier delighted in depicting the former Haitian emperor's opinion of Paris. In February 1859, Daumier drew Soulouque, still clad in his Napoleonic garb, dashing away from a faceless crowd of peasants and carrying a bag under each arm; the caption read "*Sauvant la caisse!*" or "Saving the cash!"¹³ This lithograph was Daumier's last depiction of Soulouque with a hint of reality. Soulouque had reportedly plundered the national coffers to pay 50,000 francs for a British ship to take himself and his family to Kingston.¹⁴ Daumier was also referencing one of his earlier caricatures, in which Louis-Napoleon flees to England after the Revolution of 1848, declaring, "*Tout est perdu, fors la caisse!*" or "All is lost, save the cash!"¹⁵ After this lithograph, in March of 1859, Daumier's Soulouque appears downtrodden, sitting on a pier after arriving in France. Unsure of what to do, he asks a Frenchman, who replies that since he is wearing such a good costume, he could become a

¹² John E. Baur, "Faustin Soulouque, Emperor of Haiti His Character and His Reign." *The Americas* 6, no. 2 (1949): 159-60.

¹³ Honoré Daumier, "Sauvant La Caisse!" Cartoon. In *Le Charivari*. (Paris : Charles Philipon, 1859)

¹⁴ Baur, "Faustin Soulouque," 160.

¹⁵ Childs, Daumier and Exoticism, 118.

cologne salesman.¹⁶ Such begins a series of lithographs in which Daumier lampoons Soulouque, and, by extension, Napoleon III.

In another such lithograph from April 1859, Soulouque is searching the streets of Paris with his wife, only to find that the rental housing in the city is too expensive.¹⁷ On its face, the joke implies that the former, now bankrupt, emperor is too poor to afford housing in Paris; however the real commentary seems to be on the effect that Baron Haussmann's renovation of the city had on housing prices. Haussmann's changes to Paris's infrastructure were heralded as the beginning of a new, more progressive era. In reality, the renovations tore down much of the old, affordable housing in the city, broadened the roads, and produced upscale housing that many could not afford. These civic-improvement projects were sponsored by Napoleon III as a way of improving the city, but angered the displaced poorer population.¹⁸ Daumier's caricature was not pointing out the personal poverty of one individual, but the increased cost of living in Paris as a whole. A lithograph published in March 1859 shows Soulouque happily gazing through a pair of binoculars at a group of scantily clad women, captioned "*Commençant à rendre justice aux blanches,*" or

¹⁶ Honoré Daumier, "Eh! mon gaillard..., vous voilà en France... mais qu'est-ce que vous allez faire?" Cartoon. In *Le Charivari*. (Paris : Charles Philipon, 1859)

¹⁷ Honoré Daumier, "Soulouque trouvant qu'à Paris, la location des cases est beaucoup trop chère." Cartoon. In *Le Charivari*. (Paris : Charles Philipon, 1859)

¹⁸ Childs, Daumier and Exoticism, 118.

“Beginning to render justice to white women.”¹⁹ Here Daumier plays on European expectations about black men’s sexuality, but is more likely referencing Napoleon III’s notorious womanizing tactics. As historian David Baguley states, Napoleon III “took his women . . . rather as he took his food, quickly, routinely, and without fuss.”²⁰

Daumier’s ceased his drawings of Soulouque around 1860, and departed *Le Charivari* in 1863 to dedicate time to painting and sculpting, his lesser known talents. In 1871, he refused to be decorated by the Empire for his services to the French. Instead, Daumier spent his final years as a member of the leftist Paris Commune until his death in 1878.²¹ Daumier remains one of the central figures in the history of political caricature, as well as one of the most prolific. Daumier’s lithographs featuring Haitian Emperor Faustin Soulouque might appear on the surface to be racist depictions of a despotic Caribbean ruler, but upon closer inspection are revealed to be a clever means of bypassing press censorship in Napoleon III’s Second Empire. Certainly Daumier’s depictions of Soulouque do play on prevalent Eurocentric stereotypes, but the greater

¹⁹ Honoré Daumier, "Commençant à rendre justice aux blanches." Cartoon. In *Le Charivari*. (Paris : Charles Philippon, 1859)

²⁰ David Baguley, *Napoleon III and His Regime: An Extravaganza*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000) 243.

²¹ Jean Adhémar, "Honoré Daumier." Encyclopedia Britannica Online. March 14, 2016. <http://www.britannica.com/biography/Honore-Daumier>.

implication of these caricatures is the criticism and condemnation of French Emperor Napoleon III. His portrayal of Soulouque provides an insightful example, not only into anti-Bonapartist sentiment during the Second Empire, but also the ways in which those with contentious political opinions have challenged and manipulated the press to their advantage. Daumier's lithographs served as a successful challenge to censorship of the press, and should continue to inform the practices of those laboring under repressive censorship laws.

Soviet Speak?: Reforming and Spreading the Russian Language in the Soviet Union

Luke Jeske

When the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917, they had lofty goals that required education and expertise largely absent among the peasant masses of tsarist Russia. Their overarching goal – to create a modern, industrialized nation – required new technologies and a literate workforce. Language and technology advanced side by side during the Soviet period and the Russian language took center stage. From the October Revolution until Vladimir Lenin’s death in 1924, the Soviet government supported use of non-Russian languages (e.g. languages of the nationalities) throughout the country at the same time that it reformed Russian orthography and grammar. Newspapers and public speakers spread these reforms rapidly. Stalin then began a Russification campaign and centralized control of printing presses.²² This helped foster a uniquely “Soviet Tongue” from the bureaucratic, technical jargon used in mass print.²³ Stalin’s successors brought his

²² For an overview of these changes see Lenore A Grenoble. *Language policy in the Soviet Union* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).no period after the title, and proper capitalization in book title required.

²³ I borrow the term “Soviet Tongue” from Michael S Gorham, *Speaking in Soviet tongues: language culture and the politics of voice in revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003). Do not follow graphic style of press with book titles. Use proper capitalization.

Russification policies and literary campaigns to completion. Mass communication technology, particularly printing presses, enabled Soviet leaders to combat illiteracy, spread ideology and language reform and, inadvertently, produce a distinct Soviet language.

The importance of printing presses in spreading language reform in Russia began long before the Bolsheviks seized power. The first monumental changes to modern Russian began in the early eighteenth century when Peter the Great instructed his government to import European words (to accompany his new European-style bureaucracy), delineate modern written Russian from Church Slavonic, and increase the publication and circulation of secular writings. Later in the same century, writer Nikolai Karamzin spearheaded literary modernization by mimicking French and European prose and poetic styles. Soon, bitter disagreements between Archaists (those who wanted to preserve a language more akin to Church Slavonic) and Karamzin's followers erupted in the early nineteenth century.²⁴ The modernizers won out: several outdated letters were dropped from the Russian alphabet, and words were imported wholesale from other languages, particularly French.²⁵ Later, in the

²⁴ Michael S Gorham, *Speaking in Soviet tongues: language culture and the politics of voice in revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb, Ill: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003), 7–9. Now use an abbreviated citation here since Gorham is cited in FN 2.

²⁵ For example, compare the Russian word for wallet портфель (pronounced port-fell) with the French portefeuille (pronounced port-fuy).

first decade of the nineteenth century, the massive demographic and sociocultural changes brought about by industrialization significantly opened up the potential pool of readers and writers. It was upon this segment of society that the Bolsheviks focused their print campaigns.

In fact, the Bolsheviks were acutely aware of the close connection between language, literacy, and technology before and directly after the October Revolution. When the Provisional Government fell in 1917, the literacy rate in Russia hovered around 28 percent.²⁶ Other parts of the former Russian Empire – Georgian, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, etc. – suffered from similarly dismal education rates. While Lenin and his comrades strove to educate citizens in their native language (at least initially), they also recognized that Russian, the native language of nearly half of the Soviet citizenry, would reach the most people. However, Russian needed to be modernized first. The Bolsheviks eliminated several characters from the alphabet,²⁷ simplified spelling and grammatical rules and implemented their changes across the country on January 1, 1918, only two months after they had taken power.²⁸ They made these reforms swiftly and seriously.

In the decade directly following the Revolution, the Bolsheviks spread their language reforms

²⁶ Lenore A Grenoble, *Language policy in the Soviet Union* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003), 35.

²⁷ For example, they replaced ъ, ѳ, and ѱ with е, ф and и, respectively.

²⁸ Grenoble, *Language Policy in the Soviet Union* 67.

with the combined powers of massively distributed newspapers and human mouthpieces. The government sponsored training in public speech and performance, an embodiment of the new “living language” movement. Training schools offered programs in oratory, pedagogy, and literature. Soviet citizens learned the most effective techniques for expounding the state’s ideologies in the newly modified written and spoken forms of Russian. A stunning example of these new cultural-technological combinations, called the “living newspaper,” sprung up around the USSR. Newspapers were sent to cities and provinces where literate local party men read the papers aloud to huge crowds of passerby.²⁹ While the printing press had existed for centuries, it was put to new use by the Bolsheviks, combined with the age-old power of human narration in order to deliver news and ideas to the illiterate masses.

However, distributing newspapers in the 1920s became a serious problem for the Bolsheviks. The First World War and the subsequent Civil War (1918–1922) destroyed significant amounts of Russian resources and technologies, including printing presses. Shortages plagued Russians struggling to live beyond those violent years. Milk, bread, and meat could hardly be found. Paper only mattered if it could be burned during the cold winters. The printing and distribution of newspapers concerned only the most politically active. This, in fact, greatly aided the Bolsheviks. Lenin’s New Economic Poli-

²⁹ Gorham, *Speaking in Soviet Tongues* 11–13.

cy (NEP, 192–1924), which allowed for some for-profit trade to meet the people’s demands for food and goods, streamlined newspapers. Only the most loyal supporters received copies. Over the next several years, even as NEP faded away, the “central rationing of information” only increased.³⁰

Stalin took advantage of the centralized information system to make Russian the de facto language of the Soviet Union. Since the beginning of communist rule in 1917, the ideologues of the party worked tirelessly to create a New Soviet Man. The citizens of the Soviet Union would become these New Men, but they had to be able to communicate with one another in a Soviet language. Under Stalin, Russian became that Soviet language. However, Stalin and the government also had practical reasons for emphasizing Russian above other languages. First and foremost, the government could print more material in Russian and minimize the number of books, newspapers, and articles that it had to translate. Secondly, the more that Soviet students studied Russian, the easier it became to make minority groups adopt the Cyrillic alphabet for their native language. This reduced the number of different printing presses that the government had to op-

³⁰ Matthew Lenoe, “NEP Newspapers and the Origins of Soviet Information Rationing” *The Russian Review* 62 (4) 2003. [Wiley, Editors and Board of Trustees of the Russian Review]: 614–36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3664792>.

erate.³¹ Furthermore, Russian became a window on-to the West. Words and phrases – particularly technical and scientific jargon – were first adapted into Russian and then into other languages. This process produced many words that completely violated spelling rules in Georgian, Tajik, and other languages. Minorities had to either accept these arbitrary twists in language or commit to studying Russian. Thus, technology facilitated the spread of Russian in form – Cyrillic characters, Russian books – and in content – foreign terminology.³²

The Soviet language that these technologies helped create remained abstract and, often, incomprehensible to the average Russian. The defining features of Soviet speak included “an array of neologisms, acronyms, stump-compounds, and loan-words, extant Russian words with changed meanings, and an odd stylistic mixture of bureaucratese, nonstandard slang, and high Marxist rhetoric.”³³ Newspapers, books, fliers, political pamphlets, and literature disseminated this new language throughout the Soviet Union making it a more common, but also distinctly government language.

After World War II, the leaders of the Soviet Union advanced the policy of Russification even

³¹ Briefly, the government experimented with using Latin characters for some Central Asian and Turkic languages and thus had to operate presses formatted differently than ones used for printing Russian language texts.

³² Grenoble, *Language Policy in the Soviet Union* 51–54, 194.

³³ Gorham, *Speaking in Soviet Tongues* 16.

further. Significant changes in population dynamics and distributions made this process even easier and, one might argue, more necessary than in the past. Stalin deported entire ethnic enclaves, such as the Tartars, on trains, buses, and even on foot from their native region to far-flung outposts in Siberia. Millions of Soviet citizens died during the war and low birthrates did little to ease the country's recovery. The financial resources and ideological impetus to promote minority languages faded. As the Soviet Union began to rebuild, it needed a unified workforce and Russification was one way for leaders to ensure that a Ukrainian architect could explain his blueprints to a Caucasian contractor. By the time the Soviet Union fell in 1991, most ethnic minorities reported at least a 50 percent fluency rate in Russian.³⁴ The technological resources and the political will of Soviet leaders produced widespread literacy and widespread competency in Russian.

Thus, over the course of the Soviet Union's existence, print technologies inundated several generations with communist ideology and helped educate millions of Soviet citizens, mainly in Russian. With the future of print technologies increasingly uncertain, it is important to note how powerfully they shaped the history of the twentieth century, particularly in Russia and the former Soviet Union. Today, the modern Russian alphabet and large international community of Russian speakers stand as testaments to the ways in which technology transformed language and culture for millions of people.

³⁴ Grenoble, *Language Policy in the Soviet Union* 57–62, 195.

Featured Articles

The Island of Affliction: Robben Island's Leper Asylum at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

Chelsey Hendry

Between the 1880s and 1940s, efforts to contain sufferers of leprosy in the Cape Region of South Africa were entrenched in social stigmas against leprosy as well as racially motivated ideology. South Africa was the only place on the African continent and one of the only places in the world where compulsory segregation of lepers was enforced. Furthermore, it was one of the only regions where leprosaria were maintained by civil servants rather than missionary workers.³⁵ The effects of compulsory segregation were substantial; the fear and panic of being imprisoned and separated from family and friends were enough to drive many into hiding when the first signs of their disease manifested itself. The reputation of institutions like the Robben Island leprosarium were abysmal, and many reports indicate that these government-run

³⁵ *Act to Check the Spread of the Disease Known as Leprosy*: Act No. 8 of 1884 (Cape of Good Hope: Provincial Council, 1884).

hospitals were not fit to care for any illness, let alone leprosy. This paper will endeavor to explore the conditions present in the Robben Island leper asylum, as well as the dialogue between the government and workers within the asylum concerning complaints about these conditions, with special attention to the difference in experiences between “European” and “native” patients in these institutions.

Leprosy as a Social and Medical Condition

Leprosy, alternately referred to as Hansen’s disease since the mid-tewentieth century, has been recorded in human populations as early as 600 BCE. Arguably, leprosy and Hansen’s disease (HD) are two distinct phenomena, the former carrying the stigma of thousands of years of fear and misunderstanding, and the latter being characterized by an attempted separation from previous stigmas and a more empirical understanding of the disease. The cultural impact of historical attitudes towards sufferers of leprosy is still present in many societies. As medical historian Lois Magner states, “more than any other disease, leprosy demonstrates the difference between the biological nature of illness and the attributes ascribed to the sick.”³⁶ Traditionally, people suffering from leprosy were regarded as physically and morally unclean, requiring them to be isolated from society. In medieval Europe, leprosy was assumed to be caused by immoral sexual acts, breastfeeding, spoiled food or drink, or simple con-

³⁶ Lois N Magner. *A History of Medicine* (New York: M. Dekker, 1992), 122.

tact with an afflicted person.³⁷ Because of its physical evidence on the body, leprosy has a unique psycho-social impact, as it “deforms and disables, but seldom kills, so those it has crippled live on, getting steadily worse, their deformities visible to all the community.”³⁸

As a disease, leprosy affects the skin, peripheral nerves, upper respiratory tract, and the eyes. Persons affected by leprosy develop noticeable skin lesions or rashes and loss of sensation, which makes them susceptible to repeated injury and extremity-loss. Comorbidity with respiratory and eye disease is relatively high, and many leprosy victims suffer complications from ocular degeneration and blindness as well as diseases like tuberculosis. It is now known that leprosy is spread through nasal droplets, but is not highly contagious.³⁹ During the late nineteenth century, doctors were coming to a consensus that leprosy was not caused by environment, contaminated food, or heredity factors, but was caused by bacteria, *Mycobacterium leprae*, discovered by Gerhard Armauer Hansen in 1873. This new knowledge led to an increased impetus for the isolation of lepers from the population in order to prevent the spread of the disease. While it was generally understood that the disease was communicable between humans, the actual method

³⁷ Ibid., 123.

³⁸ Anthony Bryceson and Roy E. Pfaltzgraff. *Leprosy*. 2d ed. (Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1979), 3.

³⁹ "Leprosy," World Health Organization. May 1, 2015, Accessed November 15, 2015. <http://www.who.int/media-centre/factsheets/fs101/en/>.

and frequency of transmission were not. Therefore, medical professionals of the time viewed isolation as the only method of containing the disease. Sequestration prevailed as the main method of stopping the spread of leprosy until the discovery of the effectiveness of the antibiotic dapsone as a treatment option in the 1940s.

Living Conditions in the Robben Island Leper Asylum

In an exposé appearing in an 1889 edition of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, an anonymous author described his experience at the Robben Island leper asylum, and lamented the absence of a figure to bring attention to the plight of the South African leper, as Father Damien did in Hawai'i.⁴⁰ The author recalled his experience of being carried on the shoulders of a convict through the water, as "the Cape government ha[d] declined the to incur the expense of the simplest jetty."⁴¹ He goes on to describe the atmosphere of "torpor" and "gloomy despair" which permeated the compound, which he further portrayed as being "decrepit outside, ruinous within, deficient in the commonest furniture and fittings [with] fourteen beds . . . crowded into a totally insufficient space . . . the very ground [was] destitute of boards, and consist[ed] of bare earth trampled into hollows, over which . . . loathsome

⁴⁰ Anonymous, "Lepers at the Cape: Wanted, A Father Damien," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (September, 1889), 293-99.

⁴¹ Anon., "Lepers at the Cape." 294.

snakes crawl at night in search of mice.”⁴² With no books, newspapers, games, or any other forms of distraction, patients had little choice but to lie in their soiled beds, in insufficient housing, with inadequate food and water. This anonymous author’s claims were not unique for this location or time period. Even the official report of the Select Committee on Robben Island reported in 1909 that “the hospital accommodation on the Island is absolutely inadequate; in fact, there is no hospital at all worthy of the name. Nor are there any qualified nurses or trained attendants beyond the matron.”⁴³ The island itself proved unfit to house large numbers of ill people, as its climate alternated between damp and dry, hot and cold, and sea winds caused patients to complain about chest pains. The groundwater was brackish, and the island’s soil was white and chalky, making it unfit to grow foliage and creating a glare from the sun which exacerbated patients’ eye disease.⁴⁴ Each of these complaints are echoed in a number of different documents, both official and unofficial.

Aside from the abject living conditions present in Leprosaria, isolation from family and friends had their own effect on patients as well as the region as a whole. The 1909 Report of the Select Committee contains a transcript of an interview with Dr. Robert Forsyth in which the chairman of

⁴² Anon, “Lepers of the Cape,” 297.

⁴³ *Report of the Select Committee on Robben Island Leper Asylums* (Cape Town: Cape Times Limited, Government Printers, 1909), 3.

⁴⁴ *Report of the Select Committee*, vi.

the committee questioned him on why he had taken an interest in leprosy as a disease. Forsyth's response was that a leprosy patient he was treating was hidden away from him by friends and family out of fear that he would be taken to Robben Island, and that since that time, he had "taken some interest in the conditions under which the lepers are living on the Island."⁴⁵ When asked why there would be objections to patients being sent to Robben Island, Forsyth simply replied, "People think it means imprisonment for life."⁴⁶ People suffering from very mild cases of leprosy were treated in the same manner as very advanced cases. Patients in leprosaria, especially black Africans, often had very little chance of returning home once they had been quarantined. Rarely, a patient would be sent for "home quarantine," but by 1927, only ten percent of white lepers and very few black lepers were allowed to return to their homes under the policy of home quarantine. Health officials stated that "all cleanly, intelligent, and reasonably reliable patients possessing the necessary accommodation and facilities [were] allowed to segregate themselves at home."⁴⁷ "Coloureds and natives," as well as "poor whites" rarely were deemed to have the character qualities or appropriate housing facilities to be discharged from the asylum to return to their homes for supervi-

⁴⁵ *Report of the Select Committee*, 1-2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Harriet Deacon, "Landscapes of Exile and Healing: Climate and Gardens on Robben Island," *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 55 (2000): 152.

sion.⁴⁸ Those whites who did not qualify for home segregation were moved to better facilities on the island, while black patients remained in the same decrepit buildings described by Anonymous in the aforementioned edition of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1889.

The Effect of Compulsory Segregation on the Family

Because the South African leprosy patient had such a small chance of returning home, the perception among the population was indeed that admission into a leper asylum meant “imprisonment for life.” Official opinion on the disease held that “every leper is a danger to those around him . . . every leper is especially dangerous to his family and fellow workers” because of their close living proximity and contact. Not only were sufferers of leprosy separated from their families, but children of lepers were separated from their parents as soon as they were weaned, and placed under observation until it could be determined that the child had not contracted the disease.⁴⁹ The quarantining of lepers and suspected lepers disrupted family units, which led to considerable emotional and economic stress for both the asylum patient and their families who were left behind. Accounts of lepers in asylums frequently mentioned the emotional pain of being sep-

⁴⁸ “Robben Island 1927, Report of Public Health for 1926-1927”, Union Parliamentary Papers, UG35-1927.

⁴⁹ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 3.

arated from spouses and children for years at a time, with little hope of reunion. In fact, when asked by the Select Commission in 1909, doctors, chaplains, and other workers unanimously reported that the most pressing complaint of the island's lepers was their separation from friends and family as well as their wish to be moved to a facility on the mainland in order for their relatives to visit them more easily.⁵⁰ In a 1904 article published by the *Atlanta Constitution*, the author describes the case of a carpenter from Southampton, England who traveled to Kimberley in the Northern Cape for work and subsequently contracted a mild case of leprosy. The man was "dragged off to the leper island . . . as if he were doing a life term of penal servitude" despite the fact that his symptoms subsided within a few months. The article also claims that his family, whom he had not seen since his confinement, were dependent upon his 15-year-old son for income.⁵¹

The families of those quarantined in leper asylums were targeted and monitored as the result of "contact tracing" policies which collected family and personal histories in order to track down potential infections. These contact tracing methods were seen as a better alternative to prior methods of identifying infection risks, such as police investigation. Outright surveillance of family members was only prevented due to colonial authorities' apparent confusion over what constituted a "nuclear family" in

⁵⁰ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 21-22, 35, 43, 45.

⁵¹ "Horrors Thick on Leper Island: Gruesome Stories Told of the South African Unfortunates," *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 16, 1904.

an African context, thus preventing them from being able to accurately identify targets for investigation.⁵² Even if these family members had not contracted the disease, as they most often did not, they still faced institutional and personal discrimination. Beginning in the 1880s, families of known lepers began to find it difficult to secure and maintain employment and many were evicted from their homes. Black patients with leukoderma, a skin disease whose lesions appear similar to leprous lesions, had to receive an official medical certificate to exempt themselves and their families from the rigorous testing and monitoring policies that suspected lepers were forced to undergo.⁵³

While family and friends were permitted to visit patients on Robben Island, for many these trips were prohibitively expensive for a family which was often already struggling with the loss of a wage-earning family member.⁵⁴ While train tickets to Cape Town and ferry rides to the island were paid for by the government, many did not live within walking distance of a rail station. Securing transportation was difficult for those living outside the

⁵² Ulrike Kistner, "The Walls Without and the Walls Within—Leprosy and Social Control in South Africa," *Berichte Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte Ber. Wissenschaftsgesch.*, no. 21 (1998): 241.

⁵³ Harriet Deacon, "The Medical Institutions," in *The Island: A History of Robben Island, 1488-1990*, ed. Harriet Deacon (Cape Town: Mayibuye Books, University of the Western Cape, 1996), 70.

⁵⁴ Friends and family from the Cape Town region were permitted one visit per month, all others were permitted four visits per year. *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 27

Cape Town area, and the journey to the island could take several days depending on their travel arrangements. Additionally, even if the tickets were paid, the opportunity cost of forgoing several days of work was not something many poor families could afford. Some opted to send letters and packages to loved ones in lieu of visiting, but problems plagued this aspect of life on the island as well. Most patients in the asylum came from poor, uneducated backgrounds, and were thus illiterate. The lepers relied on the few literate patients who were employed by the government as letter-writers to compose letters and read those they received. Presumably because of linguistic or personal differences, or perhaps because the letter-writers were often too sick to work, as with other patients who were employed by the government, patients bitterly complained that no one was willing to write letters for them.⁵⁵ Likewise, complaints emerged in the early twentieth century that when family members attempted to send packages and letters to asylum patients, they were opened by workers without the consent of the patient, searched, and often their contents rearranged or “rendered practically useless,” much to the ire of their intended recipients.⁵⁶

Those family and friends who did travel for visitation were not permitted to be alone with the patients out of fear of infection. Husbands and wives were closely monitored to ensure that no con-

⁵⁵ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 21.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, viii.

jugal visits occurred.⁵⁷ Relationships between patients were highly discouraged; the living quarters for female patients were located a half mile from the male quarters with guards posted night and day to prevent “immoral activity.” In 1892, as part of a campaign for better conditions within the asylum, a group of male lepers led by a black leper named Franz Jacobs demanded better visitation terms as well as items like napkins, beer, and sugar. The group threatened to rape the female nurses present on the island if they were not allowed to freely intermingle with the female lepers.⁵⁸ Rather than unrestricted access to the female quarters, the island received several new guards to patrol the space between the male and female compounds. Despite these provisions, an average of five to twelve children were born each year on Robben Island to female lepers.⁵⁹ This became a humanitarian issue which greatly interested the clergy present on the island, who generally believed that the lepers should be able to marry amongst themselves and live in family units. In their eyes, all should be able to participate in the sacrament of marriage, especially if it prevented illicit sexual encounters between patients.⁶⁰ Father H. P. Bull, an Anglican clergyman who frequently visited the island in the first decade of the twentieth century, argued that there was no reason for the patients to be treated like the convicts with whom they shared the island. He proposed that

⁵⁷ Ibid., 28.

⁵⁸ Deacon, *The Island*, 70.

⁵⁹ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 18,22,42.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 53, 61.

Robben Island be modeled after Molokai, the Hawaiian asylum, where people were so contented that they refused to leave even after being discharged as healthy and “where people would be able to make a home, and feel it is a home, not a prison.”⁶¹ The principal issue with marriage between lepers, was that should they have a child, their child was required to be taken off the island and put in the care of a friend or family member. The 1909 head of the medical staff of the island, Dr. E. F. W. Moon, stated that it would be cruel to allow leprosy patients to marry, only to take their children away and cause “great hardship on patients . . . and also on friends.”⁶²

Racialized Aspects of Quarantine

While the vast majority of patients within the Robben Island asylum were black, most new funding for housing, clothing, food, etc. seems to have been directed toward the white, European population.⁶³ Citizens of the Cape, members of the government, and some medical professionals believed that indigenous black populations were more susceptible, more contagious, and had more severe forms of leprosy, despite the fact that there were no differences in infection rates between whites and blacks. As such, racial hysteria gripped the white

⁶¹ Ibid., 63.

⁶² Ibid., 43.

⁶³ In 1909 it was reported that out of approximately 550 patients, 60 were white men, 30 were white women, and the rest were “native.” Ibid., 25.

population of urban areas. When the topic arose of allowing patients with arrested cases of leprosy to reintegrate back into the mainland, whites flooded official channels and local newspapers with complaints that expressed great concern for their own safety. One such complaint in the *Cape Argus* stated that “the fact that these lepers are allowed to go where they like, to sit in bioscopes and trams, and mix with the general community, is not particularly pleasing to the public generally.”⁶⁴ The official response from the secretary to the minder of the interior was that “the average white person who is naturally very careful and cleanly is not likely to be infected.”⁶⁵ Whites in the Cape became increasingly suspicious of black live-in employees, whom they thought were the unmarked perpetrators of the disease. These racialized notions of cleanliness and disease pitted the “uncivilized native race” against the European population, which only served to increase racial discrimination.⁶⁶

Practices on the island mirrored popular opinion on the Cape. Patients were permitted to pay for better accommodations, either apart from the main compounds of the Island, or in their own homes on the mainland, but overwhelmingly the only patients who could afford and were permitted this luxury were white.⁶⁷ Black patients were not only

⁶⁴ Cape Argus, January, 20, 1924. SAB-GES 415/41, vol. 2457.

⁶⁵ Kistner, “The Walls Without and the Walls Within,” 243-44.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 244.

⁶⁷ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 44.

too poor to afford better accommodations; they were also made to work on the island in order to send remittances back to their families on the mainland. In many cases, the government would simply compensate a white family for the loss of its primary worker with no requirement of the patient to work. When white patients were employed as laborers on the island, they were more likely to be supervising black workers in projects like tree planting, rather than performing physical labor themselves.⁶⁸ Additionally, as Father H. P. Bull noted, the government paid these workers substandard wages. Bull claimed that he knew of “two [coloured] leper carpenters on the island who earn[ed] 3 shillings, sixpence a day under the Government” and that “these men would earn 15 shillings to 1 pound on the mainland.”⁶⁹

Nearly all funding for improved living conditions and leisure went to white patients in both the leprosaria and the mental asylum with which it shared the island. White lepers and “lunatics” enjoyed an aviary, a vine trellis, a new summer house, and a flower garden by 1891.⁷⁰ Meanwhile, the black population had only secured the right to be buried in a coffin and receive new clothing from the island’s general store rather than second-hand items from the white patients a few years before.⁷¹ Medical workers prioritized segregating living quarters first by race, and then by severity of illness, choos-

⁶⁸ Deacon, “Landscapes of Exile and Healing,” 152.

⁶⁹ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 60.

⁷⁰ Deacon, “Landscapes of Exile and Healing,” 151.

⁷¹ Deacon, *The Island*, 67.

ing to allow patients with severe cases of leprosy to receive the same quarters and care as patients with mild cases in order to keep the races separate.⁷² In 1898, differential diets were introduced for black patients which consisted mainly of simple porridge, causing scurvy outbreaks. The logic for the new diets was that “blacks generally ate a poorer diet than whites” outside the asylum, and thus would be accustomed to malnourishment.⁷³

Medical Director of the island in 1909, Dr. E. F. W. Moon claims that during Saturday sporting and leisure events, “European[s] and coloured[s] . . . ha[d] little football and cricket matches amongst themselves,” which brought both groups “a good deal of enjoyment.”⁷⁴ Yet, in 1904, just five years before Moon’s statement, the white patients placed a formal request for “a stone wall [to be] built across the compound so as to keep the coloured people quite separate . . . high enough to prevent the coloured people from seeing over.”⁷⁵ In 1892, the Inspector of Asylums for the colony remarked that “While colour should not be a dividing line in medicine, and every effort should be made to render happy coloured as well as white, I do not think it right that these two races should mix as they often have

⁷² Deacon, *The Island*, 72.

⁷³ Harriet Deacon, “Racial Segregation and Medical Discourse in Nineteenth Century Cape Town,” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 22 (1996): 305-06.

⁷⁴ *Report of the Select Committee 1909*, 39-40.

⁷⁵ Commissioner to UCS, 1 June 1904, CA, Health Branch, Lepers 1904-1908, CO 8053; Deacon, “Racial Segregation and Medical Discourse,” 305.

to do at present.”⁷⁶ Whether Moon’s claims of patients happily playing cricket together on the weekends are a distortion of the truth or an outright lie, one cannot say. What can be said is that far more evidence points to the fact that both white authorities and patients were pushing for segregated medical facilities at the turn of the century. The racialized discussion surrounding hygiene and disease were part of a larger discourse taking place at the end of the nineteenth century about race in the Cape Colony. While the government might have found the discussion of segregation in an urban environment to be problematic, segregation within a medical context was only logical due to the perceived “scientific” differences between blacks and whites.

Conclusion

The Robben Island leper asylum was eventually closed and its charges transferred to the Valkenberg asylum in 1931, with the increasing expenditures required to run the facility cited as the cause.⁷⁷ By that time, the South African state had imposed significant segregationist and discriminatory practices against blacks mirroring those which had already taken place on the island decades before. During its time as a leper asylum, Robben Island was severely underequipped to handle the care of the chronically ill, both in environment and policy. The

⁷⁶ Quoted from Deacon, "Racial Segregation and Medical Discourse," 308.

⁷⁷ Deacon, *The Island*, 74.

physical and emotional distance between patients and their loved ones proved to be the largest complaint for those on the island. This physical distance paralleled white anxieties about the black population and represented some of the first attempts for institutional racial segregation. The island itself would continue to serve as a bastion of colonial and Apartheid-era thought as it went on to serve as a political prison for anti-apartheid activists, such as Nelson Mandela, Kgalema Motlanthe, and Jacob Zuma, during the twentieth-century National Party regime.

Westoxification: A Conceptual History

Onur F. Muftugil

A curious word has been coined in Iran to describe modernity: “westoxification” (*gharbzadegi*). Many Iranian intellectuals and statesmen used this term revealing their take on modernity as a disease generating devastating material and moral afflictions. This essay follows some influential uses of the term westoxification. It shows how the use of the term changed in ways reflecting changes in Iranian politics. It also shows how the concept evoked by the term helped bring about some of these changes. I argue here, then, that westoxification has constituted one major linguistic/conceptual medium through which social and political thought and action take place in modern Iran.

Westoxification in a Nutshell

The term westoxification was popularized by Jalal Al-e Ahmad (1923-69). He used the term as the title of his influential monograph (1962). In that monograph, Al-e Ahmad fluently criticized Iran’s economic subordination to the West.⁷⁸ “They take away your oil and give you whatever you want in return—from soup to nuts, even grains,” he said.

⁷⁸ Jalal Al-e Ahmad, *Occidentosis: A Plague from the West*, trans. R. Campbell (Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1984), 81, 92, 94 and 98.

Westerners produced the machines and Iranians merely consumed them, he protested. Iranians, he lamented, eagerly imitated Western life forms “like an ass going about in a lion’s skin.” They became licentious, effeminate, and comfort-loving, he observed.

It is clear from these remarks that Al-e Ahmad used the term westoxification to critique Iranian modernization from a secular (economic-cultural) lens. Later, however, the term—and the concept it brings into focus—acquired religious connotations. This is the fundamental finding of the conceptual history of westoxification pursued in this essay. Religion replaced economy and culture as the medium through which globalizing modernity was critiqued. That replacement started with the efforts of Ali Shariati (1933-1977). It continued with the revolutionary activism of Ayatollah Khomeini (1902-1989). Especially through the efforts of the latter, westoxification talk helped to bring about the Islamic Revolution.

Westoxification continues to influence Iranian politics today. Interestingly, this influence now exists in an agonistic spirit. There are thinkers who subject the term to critique. Among these critiques the efforts of contemporary prominent philosopher and public intellectual Abdolkarim Soroush are noteworthy. Soroush is a figure of opposition to the current theocratic government in Iran. As a part of his program of opposition, he criticized the worldview reflected in westoxification talk. He defended a more sympathetic engagement with values generally associated with Western modernity. This essay

does not assess the degree to which Soroush and his supporters entrenched their alternative view in Iranian public. It simply notes that the contemporary opposition in Iran is partially formed *in opposition* to westoxification talk. This brief note, however, suffices to constitute a conspicuous link between my conceptual history and the contemporary struggle for political power in Iran.

Conceptual History: Insights from Koselleck and Skinner

Before the details with regard to the conceptual history of westoxification, some general methodological remarks on conceptual history and brief implications to my case at hand are in order. Conceptual history studies concepts over time. As Reinhart Koselleck suggestively explained, conceptual history treats a concept as “a navigational instrument of historical movement.”⁷⁹ History moves with the push of concepts- alongside the push of needs, desires and institutions. Concepts, in turn, change as history moves. The moment the term westoxification became part of the vocabulary of a religious world-view is roughly simultaneous with the moment it helped bring about the social mobilization necessary for the Islamic Revolution.

Concepts become so fundamental to social and political change because they help citizens recollect and reflect on their experiences. Koselleck is again helpful in elucidating this point. He observes,

⁷⁹ Reinhart Koselleck, “Time and Revolutionary Language,” *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 9 (2), 117-27, 124.

“even if language may-in part- have been only secondary in the enactment of doings and sufferings, as soon as an event has become past, language becomes the primary factor without which no recollection and no scientific transposition of this recollection is possible.”⁸⁰ Experiences would be mere past happenings if concepts were not called forth to recollect them and reflect on them. How does this point relate to Iranian modernity?

As suggested above, many Iranians approached their dread and deprivation associated with modernity using the term westoxification. Westoxification thus came to evoke a concept representing a kind of historical experience. Iranians, we can imagine, tackled with difficult and anxiety-ridden questions as they started becoming modern: What went wrong? Why do we feel sick and down-trodden even though we are trying to produce and consume like the prosperous Westerners? What is the remedy for our ailment? What happened ‘there and then’ in our past that we arrived at the ‘here and now’? It is their particular answers to these sorts of questions which led them to mobilize against the Pahlavi rulers and make a revolution.

Concepts do more work than just promote recollection and reflection. They also prepare citizens for transformative action. The work of Quentin Skinner is instructive in this regard. Skinner sees concepts as *strategic* instruments for political action. Political life, he argues, sets the main problems

⁸⁰ Reinhart Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing, History, Spacing Concepts*, trans. Todd Samuel Preisner (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 27.

for political theorists, including the lay citizen-theorists who form their audience. Political agents meet and tackle their new problems by means of conceptual innovation. They, for example, set to change 'the nature and range of criteria' for the application of the concept. Alternatively, they tamper with 'its range of reference,' or the 'range of attitudes' toward it.⁸¹

Here are some intimations with regard to how all this theoretical discussion relates to westoxification. As we will see in this essay, with the interventions of Shariati and especially Khomeini, for example, westoxification started to excite more passionate, hostile and revolutionary reactions than mere reflection on cultural assimilation. The Islamic Revolution revealed this attitudinal change strikingly. Iranians built a new regime to cast off westoxification. And now in contemporary Iran, to give another example, the critiques of the post-revolutionary regime are in pains to forestall the westoxification talk. They try to argue, as we will note in more depth, that those who talk of westoxification are themselves struck with an intellectual disease of essentialism.

Westoxification: From Culture to Religious Ideology

Al-e Ahmad, as we have seen, was the thinker who popularized the term. Al-e Ahmad ad-

⁸¹ Quentin Skinner, *Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Vol. I. The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 11.

mitted that he borrowed the term from Ahmad Fardid and Fakhroddin Shadman. Fardid had earlier written a book on the philosophy of history⁸² arguing that history of the world has been a constant struggle between idolatry and monotheism. Since ancient Greece, Fardid claimed, the aspiration of human beings to act like God(s) or idolatry has characterized Western civilization. Such Western ideas as modern humanism and liberal constitutionalism reinforced the belief that human beings could organize their ethical and political lives without divine guidance. Fardid lamented the fact that Iranians succumbed to these ideas in the early 20th century during the Constitutional Revolution. Shadman, on the other hand, crafted no such grand narrative about Western civilization. Yet, he too scathingly criticized a shallow, uncritical and apish imitation of Western cultural traditions using the term westoxification.⁸³ Neither Fardid nor Shadman, however, managed to popularize the term as successfully as Al-e Ahmad.

Al-e Ahmad was more successful because he employed, as we saw, concrete economic and political arguments as opposed to a grand discourse about civilizations. Al-e Ahmad captured popular discontent in the Pahlavi Iran, in other words. His work incited political activism against the Shah. Consider the simple and earthy quality of Al-e Ahmad's critique:

⁸² Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi, *Islam and Dissent in Post-revolutionary Iran* (New York: Tauris, 2008), 180.

⁸³ Ghamari-Tabrizi, *Islam and Dissent*, 180.

“A starveling who has had a lifetime diet of bread and buttermilk in the village can fill up on sandwiches in the city and go find first a hairdresser and a tailor, then a shoe-shiner, then a whorehouse. Political parties and societies being prohibited (and what can one say of our so-called cultural clubs?), and mosque and *mihrab* forgotten or remembered only during Muharram and *Ramazan*, the movie house replaces them all, as do television and the magazines that everyday inspire thousands of our proud citizens to copy the features and gestures of some film star.”⁸⁴

Urban life of 1960s, Al-e Ahmad says here, displaced traditional symbols and modes of living offering cheap pleasures and imitation of Western models. Culture discouraged political engagement. The movie house drained citizens’ intellect. Citizens became less concerned with improving their conditions than imitating a Western movie star. These observations likely resonated with those Iranians who felt out of place in the Shah’s regime.

Al-e Ahmad, it is crucial to note here, did not endorse a turn to the village. Neither did he oppose technology and the demands of modern economic life as such. In fact, in a later essay, he explicitly admitted that Iranians should borrow tech-

⁸⁴ Al-e Ahmad, *Occidentotis*, 67.

nology and the scientific method from the West: “We need to take certain things from the West. But not everything. . . . From the West, or in the West, we are looking for technology. That (in itself) is not Western; it is universal.”⁸⁵ While he embraced the import of technology and the scientific method, he urged Iranians to resist unreflective assimilation to Western cultural norms. He, in other words, opposed the superficial nature of Iran’s Westernization and the apathy of Iranians, especially westoxified intellectuals, toward their authentic cultural resources and the real roots of their political problems.

Al-e Ahmad’s ideas made great impact. They brought about a new kind of opposition to the Shah. The prominent historian of Iran Hamid Dabashi writes, “Al-e Ahmad’s *Westoxification* was read and discussed in high schools and universities as the first bibliographical item on a hidden syllabus with which the Iranian youth of the 1960’s came to political self-consciousness. You were accepted into cliques of political activists by virtue of your ability to quote passages from the text verbatim.”⁸⁶ Westoxication became part of the repertoire of political opposition.

Let me reinforce: Westoxication talk changed the nature of opposition leading to the displacement of Marxism. Stated otherwise, Al-e Ahmad drew the Iranian youth away from Marxism, an

⁸⁵ Hamid Dabashi, *Theology of Discontent: The Ideological Foundation of the Islamic Revolution in Iran* (New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2008), 62.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 76.

alternative ideology that could have been used to critique the Shah. When nested in the narrative of westoxification, Marxism would simply be another manifestation of Western materialism: it would help divide the economic pie more fairly but would not question the real predicament of Iran: the cultural and spiritual loss accompanying materialist and in-authentic consumerism.

Ali Shariati (1933-1977), the influential sociologist, ideologue and orator, took up from where Al-e Ahmad had left off. He continued the endorsement of cultural authenticity, which he conveyed with the idea of “return to the self” (*bazgasht beh khishtan*). If Al-e Ahmad shaped the intellectual and political landscape of Iran in the 1960’s, so did Shariati in the 1970s. Shariati and Al-e Ahmad did not study together. In fact, they met only twice. Yet, the two men deeply shared the same concern with cultural authenticity. Not surprisingly, after they met in Mashad in 1968, Al-e Ahmad noted: “I am happy that we travel the same road with respect to these matters.” Shariati wrote of Al-Ahmad, “Al-e Ahmad was an intellectual, but he did not yet know himself. He did not know how he should operate and only in the last few years did he begin to practice returning to his self.”⁸⁷ Shariati had in mind Al-e Ahmad’s increasing sensitivity to the resources in Shiite Islam in his last few years. Shariati, unlike Ahmad, *always* took Islam as his point of personal and national determination.

⁸⁷ This exchange is quoted in Mehrzad Boroujerdi, *Iranian Intellectuals and the West: The Tormented Triumph of Nativism* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1996), 106.

In one of his popular lectures at the *Husayniya Irshad Institute*, Shariati referred to Al-e Ahmad's *Westoxification* and argued that "people must be saved so that our younger generation and our intellectuals will not be led by observing such lopsided realities to run away from religion and, in the process of escaping, fall in the trap of *West-struck* hunters and monkey-like imitators."⁸⁸ Yet, his diagnosis of how Iranians became west-struck/westoxified differed from Al-e Ahmad's. He found the root of the disease in Iran's alienation from *revolutionary Islam*. He claimed that ignorant, superfluous and hypocritical conservative clerics precipitated the flight of young Iranians from Islam to Western ideologies and culture.

Shariati never rested content with the reduction of religion to a set of moral and legal rules the observance of which leads to (individual) salvation. He radically criticized the way Islam historically unfolded, especially how it has been used by political and clerical authorities to pacify and stupefy the masses. He pronounced the historically neglected rational and political dimensions of Islam, especially its call for the study of God-given natural and social norms and patterns and endorsement of active involvement in *this* world. He wanted to turn Islam into an instrument for the struggle for the rights of the oppressed masses. In fact, Shariati was very conscious of and outspoken about his project with regard to Islam. In response to a colleague's ques-

⁸⁸ Ali Shariati, *What is to be Done*, ed. Farhang Rajee (New Jersey: Islamic Publications International, 1986), 61.

tion about his most significant accomplishment, Shariati said, “in one sentence: the transformation of Islam from a *culture* to an *ideology*.” Along with that transformation, we can easily observe, he shifted the westoxification talk to the plane of Islam understood as ideology. Against westoxification he posited what he took to be an ideological and enlightened “return to self.”

Shariati’s thesis of “return to self” rested on his essentialist understanding of culture. He thought that each society had a particular ontological character, an essence, “a prevalent spirit that governs the body of knowledge, characteristics, feelings, traditions, outlooks and ideals of the people.”⁸⁹ To know this common spirit, that is culture of a society is to know “its inner truth, its inner sensitivities and its inner feelings.”⁹⁰ Ancient Greece, for example, has a philosophical culture; India a spiritualistic one, Rome a militaristic and artistic one. Modern Western culture is one of hedonism, nihilism and worldliness (*zendegi-ye donyavi*) according to which “all human beings must become consumer animals and all nations must get stripped of their authenticity.”⁹¹ Note Shariati’s castigation of the Western culture. Consumers of the West, Shariati wrote, perceive the world as a haven of pleasure; they have no faith in lofty ideals and do not believe in sacrifice for higher goods.

⁸⁹ Ali Shariati, *What is to be Done*, 18-19.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁹¹ Quoted in Mirsepassi, *Intellectual Discourse*, 122.

Muslims, Shariati insisted, had to know their place in the cultural taxonomy. Islamic culture is unique: it is neither totally spiritual, nor totally mystical, nor completely philosophical, nor entirely materialistic and technological but is “a mixture of faith, idealism and spirituality, and yet full of life and energy with a dominant spirit of equality and justice.” Islam endorses constant striving (*jihad*) and justice (*adalet*); it pays attention to bread and active life in the world; its God respects human dignity and responsibility; and its messenger is armed. Further, Islam recognizes people or the masses (*al-nass*) as the primary agents of social reform. Shariati emphasized this last point:

“Islam is the first school of social thought that recognizes the masses as the basis, the fundamental and conscious factor in determining history and society-not the elect as Nietzsche thought, not the aristocracy and nobility as Plato claimed, not the great potentialities as Carlyle and Emerson believed, not those of pure blood as Alexis Carrel imagined, not the priests or intellectuals, but the masses (*al-nass*).”⁹²

Islamic culture, Shariati insists here among many other places, assigns a revolutionary role to people and condemns pacifism.

⁹² Ali Shariati, *Sociology of Islam*, trans. Hamid Algar (New York: Mizan Press, 1979), 49.

When Shariati spoke of “return to self,” he meant a *reawakening* and *recreation* of the unique (but historically obscured) Islamic culture through the extraction (*estekhraj*) and refinement (*tasfiyeh*) of available resources.⁹³ Return actually meant recreation, Shariati suggested:

“I wish there was no portrait of the past, so ugly, metamorphosing and loathsome, so we could simply and logically carve our past upon *tabula rasa* minds. The Westerners, unlike what they did to Africans, did not negate our past, they metamorphosed it. And when we looked at our own new portrait, we hated it. Consequently, we began to run towards our metamorphosed past and religion, as well as towards European schools and culture.”⁹⁴

Shariati’s contribution to the westoxification talk, therefore, consisted in his call to resist Westernization and the Shah’s corrupt regime by instilling a progressive and revolutionary Islamic ideology on *tabula rasa* minds through re-interpretation of available cultural resources. His young listeners took his call enthusiastically and became the chief mass force in the events which led to the Islamic Revolution. “The people (*al-nass*),” in other words, met his

⁹³ Ali Shariati, *Man and Islam*, trans. Dr. Fatollah Marjani (Houston: Free Islamic Lit., 1974), 29.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

revolutionary demands. His revolutionary imagination, Hamid Dabashi writes, released “the guiding force of the Revolution Shariati all but launched, all but witnessed.”⁹⁵

Notably, from Al-e Ahmad to Shariati, the range, salience and the meaning of westoxification change. The term and the concept it evokes get submerged into a larger narrative of world-alienation, that is, alienation from an authentic revolutionary world-view. westoxification becomes just one symptom of a more historical and fundamental loss which is the reduction of religion to culture. The Pahlavi regime, Shariati indirectly suggests, finds an ally in traditional clerics who command pacifism. Together, these forces create an easily governable society, a society devoid of an ideology of opposition. When evaluating the impact of Shariati’s intervention in Iranian intellectual life, one is reminded of Koselleck’s idea that concepts help citizens re-collect and reevaluate their experiences of deprivation and suffering. When Shariati talked about westoxification Iranian citizens were invited to reflect on the historical roots of their passive attitudes in political life. In his discourse, blind imitation of Western life-styles was cast as a mere instance of a more general and historically deeper forgetfulness of Islam as a total revolutionary world-view.

Westoxification and the Islamic Republic

⁹⁵ Hamid Dabashi, *Theology of Discontent*, 145.

While Shariati's thoughts mobilized the masses for the revolution, his anti-clerical, democratic and progressive vision did not materialize in the constitution of the post-revolutionary political regime, which he would most probably never approve of had he lived a couple more years and seen it taking shape. In fact, the clerics who became the leaders of the 1979 revolution had always remained apprehensive about Shariati's non-traditional and anti-clerical discourse. A prominent clerical figure and a trustee of Ayatollah Khomeini, Ayatollah Morteza Motahhari, for example, had tried painstakingly to impose restrictions on Shariati's lectures at *Hosseyniyeh*. In the winter of 1970-71, he called Shariati to a series of meetings with the disciples of Khomeini. In these meetings, the future leaders of the Islamic Republic, including Mohammad Beheshti, Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Mohammad Bahonar and Musavi-Ardebili had accused Shariati of prompting hostility towards the clergy and Safavid Shi'ism.⁹⁶

Against this background, it should come as no surprise that Shariati's ideas did not take root in the revolutionary republic. Khomeini effectively subordinated the masses to the rule of jurists. To this end, he crafted the principle of "the guardianship of the jurist" (*velayet-e faqih*). Jurists, according to this principle, would decide on the level of taxation, the education curriculum, the military draft, women's visibility in public life and other issues with political salience. The term westoxification had a role to play in this development.

⁹⁶ See Ghamari-Tabrizi, *Islam and Dissent*, 171.

As hinted above, Khomeini's efforts became decisive in setting the course of the Islamic Revolution. In the words of Ali Khamenei, the first president of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Khomeini's successor as the Supreme Leader, "The Islamic Revolution was begun presently with the far-reaching and not-to-be silenced cry of Imam Khomeini."⁹⁷ Khomeini's revolutionary rhetoric targeted the "West." In fact, Khomeini explicitly invoked the term westoxification. In his best-known work *Islamic Government* which originated in a series of lectures given at Najaf between January 21 and February 8, 1970, and recorded and transcribed by a student and published in book form, he addressed Iranian public,

"Know that it is your duty to establish an Islamic government. Have confidence in yourselves and know that you are capable of fulfilling this task. The imperialists began laying their plans three or four centuries ago; they started out with nothing, but see where they are now! We too will begin with nothing, and we will pay no attention to the uproar created by a few *westoxified* and devoted servants of imperialism."⁹⁸

⁹⁷ See Sayyid Ali Khamenei's introduction to Khomeini's collected speeches and proclamations, *Sahifeh-ye Nur*, vol. 1, quoted in Hamid Dabashi, *Theology of Discontent*, 415.

⁹⁸ Imam Ruhullah Al-Musavi Al-Khomeini, *Islam and Revolution: Writings and Declarations of Imam Khomeini*, (trans.) Hamid Algar (New Jersey: Mizan Press, 1981), 38.

Khomeini poignantly instructs here Iranians to counter westoxification with the establishment of an Islamic government. This is a crucial moment in my conceptual history: the term westoxification becomes used to justify an Islamic government. Khomeini further pursued this strategy when he suggested that the separation of Islam and politics itself symptomizes westoxification:

“[You have the duty] to present Islam to the people in its true form, so that our youth do not picture the *akhunds* [religious scholars] as sitting in some corner in Najaf or Qum, studying the questions of menstruation and parturition instead of concerning themselves with politics, and draw the conclusion that religion must be separate from politics. This slogan of the separation of religion and politics and the demand that Islamic scholars not intervene in social and political affairs have been formulated and propagated by the imperialists: it is only the irreligious who support them. Were religion and politics separate in the time of the Prophet (peace and blessing be upon him)?”⁹⁹

⁹⁹ Ibid., 38.

The imperialists want Muslims to shun politics, Khomeini argued in this long passage, because they fear the resistance which might stem from Islam. Alluding to the British officer who thought that *azan* (Muslim call to prayer) did not harm British foreign policy in Iraq, Khomeini said, "Pray as much as you like; it is your oil that they are after-why should they worry about your prayers?"¹⁰⁰ Framing the issue as an economic one, Khomeini somewhat reverted back to Al-e Ahmad's anti-imperialism. He continued in this regard: "[Britons] worry only when people rise up to them, as true human beings should do." They do not want us to be true human beings, for they are afraid of true human beings. Even if only one true human being appears, they fear him, because others will follow him and he will have an impact that can destroy the whole foundation of tyranny, imperialism, and government by puppets."¹⁰¹ Note how heartening Khomeini sounds here. Iranians only have to remember their humanity to shake off westoxification and defeat tyranny and imperialism.

Khomeini, unlike Al-e Ahmad and even Shariati however, promptly turned to Islamic governance. He offered a theory of government which would replace westoxified regimes. He named this an Islamic government which he depicted as "like no other government."¹⁰² He wrote,

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 39.

¹⁰² Ibid., 55.

“Islamic government is neither tyrannical nor absolute, but constitutional. It is not constitutional in the current sense of the word, i.e., based on the approval of laws in accordance with the opinion of the majority. It is constitutional in the sense that the rulers are subject to a certain set of conditions in governing and administering the country, conditions that are set forth in the noble Quran and the Sunna of the Most Noble Messenger.”¹⁰³

The idea of rule by divine law characterizes Khomeini’s idea of “Islamic government.” As a result, the majority of citizens do not take part in legislation: they merely convey their needs and administer the divine law interpreted by the jurists who are distinguished by their knowledge of the divine law and justice. Jurists thus have authority over the rulers in accordance with the principle *velayet-e faqih* (guardianship of the jurist), “if the ruler adheres to Islam, he must necessarily submit to the *faqih* (jurist) asking him about the laws and ordinances of Islam in order to implement them. This being the case, the true rulers are the *fuqaha* (jurists) themselves.”¹⁰⁴ With Khomeini’s intervention, then, the term westoxification became a factor in citizens’ surrender of political judgment to clerics. This was an outcome neither Al-e Ahmad nor Shariati would wish for.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 60.

Westoxification and Political Opposition in Iran

With this background in mind, we can better understand why the contemporary opponents of the post-revolutionary regime try to change Iranians' attitude toward the term westoxification. They have realized, we can conclude, that the metaphoric, rhetorical and world-making power of westoxification has to be countered for the legitimacy of the rule by clerics to be questioned by the public.

To illustrate this realization and its impact, it is important to focus in depth on the thought of Abdolkarim Soroush as one influential representative and theoretical architect of oppositional thought in Iran. Soroush was born in Tehran in 1945 and studied pharmacology at the University of Tehran. He took his doctorate in the History and Philosophy of Science from the Department of Philosophy of Science at University of London in 1979. At the outbreak of the revolution, he returned to Iran. Imam Khomeini took notice of his intellectual potential after he read his thesis on Molla Sadra and offered him a position in the Cultural Revolution Council (CRC) of the new Islamic Republic. In his short tenure at CRC, Soroush directed his efforts to refuting Marxism, then still an influential ideology in Iran.

In May 1988, Soroush published very influential philosophical essays in the daily newspaper *Kayhan-e Farhangi*. From May 1988 to March 1990, in a four-part essay in that newspaper titled *The Theoretical Contraction and Expansion of the*

Shariah,¹⁰⁵ Soroush highlighted the contingent and temporal nature of religious knowledge. He argued that although religion is revealed by God, the moment it entered human subjectivity, it assumes a culturally and historically contingent character. Accordingly, religious knowledge is shaped and enriched by human understanding and knowledge, for example, by the emergence of new types of knowledge and approaches such as modern ethics, sociology of religion, hermeneutics, study of tradition and ideology and so on. Religious knowledge contracts and expands in accordance with secular knowledge. Due to the contingent and evolving nature of religious knowledge and jurisprudence, religion has an enigmatic, mysterious, flexible and adaptive character. It reveals its exact meanings to humans when they equip themselves with new ways of knowing as history progresses. When religion becomes a tool in the hands of ideology and state, however, religion loses its enigmatic complexity, gets simplified and instrumentalized in the service of political power. Religion, Soroush concluded, is “loftier than ideology.” Therefore, rather than an Islamic Government which regards itself as the sole bearer of the true interpretation of religion, Soroush advocated an open society in which the interactions be-

¹⁰⁵ Abdolkarim Soroush, *Qabz va bast-e teorik-e shari'at (The Theoretical Contraction and Expansion of the Shariah)*, (Tehran: Serat, 1995). Most of the arguments in this essay has been reproduced in English in Abdolkarim Soroush, *Reason, Freedom and Democracy in Islam: Essential Writings of Abdolkarim Soroush*, trans. Mahmoud Sadri and Ahmad Sadri, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

tween divine revelation and evolving and advancing human knowledge can be freely pursued.

The leading clerics perceived these ideas of Soroush as threats to the regime. In December 1991, the Central Office of the Honorable Leader's Representatives in the Universities declared that 'the spread of thoughts which consider religion to be a dependent variable of other human sciences is dangerous and it negates the legitimacy of the Islamic state.'¹⁰⁶ Ayatollah Mesbah Yazdi protested, "We should cut out the tongue of those who speak of multiple interpretations of the Quran."¹⁰⁷ Despite these pronouncements, university students and reformist public showed considerable interest in him. In the spring of 1995, Isfahan University students invited him to speak about the legacy of Ali Shariati- note here another instance of connection between the thinkers discussed in this conceptual history. Some pressure groups which used the generic name *Hezbollah* warned the president of the university that they would not allow the university to engage in anti-Islamic propaganda. After the administration canceled the talk, the students had invited Soroush to speak in a lecture hall outside the campus. Soon after Soroush uttered his first words, however, about twenty thugs entered the lecture hall breaking the windows, throwing chairs at the audience which exceed thousand enthusiasts and at Soroush. Soroush received several punches and his shirt got ripped off.

¹⁰⁶ Quoted in Ghamari-Tabrizi, *Islam and Dissent*, 217.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

In the fall of 1995, the Islamic Student Association of the College of Engineering at Tehran University invited Soroush to lecture on “Mysticism in Rumi’s *Mathnavi*.” Three days before his lecture, the soldiers of an organization called *Ansaar-e Hezbollah* demanded an opportunity to debate Soroush. On the lecture day, they tried to block entrance to the auditorium and sabotaged the meeting. Despite Soroush’s repeated letters to President Rafsanjani asking for protection and support, the threats of *Ansaar* exacerbated. Members of *Ansaar* themselves wrote to Rafsanjani: “Soroush intends to become Galileo of your Excellency’s medieval regime. By raising the fear in you of looking like the European priests of the Middle Ages, he wants to create an arena for himself.” Even the election of his friend and reformist ally Mohammad Khatami to the presidency in 1997 did not bring Soroush safety as he kept receiving continuous threats by pressure groups. He went to Harvard for a fellowship in 2000 and then visited Princeton, *Wissenschaftskolleg* in Berlin and Cambridge publishing controversial books and achieving a global reputation.¹⁰⁸

Notably, Soroush intervened in the westoxification talk as he carried out his agenda. He reminded those who talked of westoxification that “the West is not an entity, or a unified *Geist* embedded in all Westerners.” He asked them “where they drew the boundaries of the West or if moral de-

¹⁰⁸ See Ghamari-Tabrizi, *Islam and Dissent*, 217-222. For a full account of Soroush’s reception in Iran and the world.

cline is present wherever there is the West.”¹⁰⁹ Contra them, he endorsed learning from others, including Western philosophers, and rectifying one’s identity as a result of learning. He was personally inspired by Karl Popper’s notion of an open society as an alternative to the total world-view represented by the Islamic Republic. Open societies, he argued, promote rational administration alongside the freedom of citizens to understand and experiment with their inherited beliefs.

As we have seen, Ali Shariati’s understanding of westoxification had rested on an essentialist understanding of the Western culture. Soroush, we can already see, corrected this essentialism. He advocated a dynamic and evolving view of culture and cultural identity. He wrote, “Is learning from others necessarily bad? Is it possible to return to past? Does every turning to the other wipe out one’s identity? Does every return to the past restore our true character? Do “self” and “other” in cultures substitute for right and wrong? Did Arabs who persisted in their ancestral and ethnic pagan heritage and ignored the call of the Prophet to monotheism choose the right path?”¹¹⁰ Soroush argued then that a self-complacent, isolated and static understanding of culture hinders growth and progress. After all, he further insisted, “rebellion against oneself is also a part of one’s self. Rectifying one’s identity is part of one’s identity. Becoming is also a part of

¹⁰⁹ This is quoted in Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi, *Islam and Dis-sent*, 213.

¹¹⁰ Abdolkarim Soroush, *Reason, Freedom and Democracy in Islam*, 163.

Being.”¹¹¹ One can change/improve one’s identity or culture by way of rebellion. Rebellion can be productive.

The point about learning from other cultures is noteworthy in Soroush’s thought. When cultures encounter foreign elements, Soroush advised, they should engage in critical selection. Mature cultures can embark on the path of cultural selection as they are able to avoid both a self-complacent nativism and wholesale imitation. For example, Muslims, Soroush said, should embrace the language of rights which has become predominant in modern Western culture. The language of rights, that is, rights to speak, learn, work, benefits religious consciousness making it more humane: “our view of God has changed, for now we feel that it is our right to worship Him and show our love to Him freely. . . . The traditional notion of God was almost a tyrannical one: God for us was a supreme being who demanded our devotion and love at all costs.”¹¹² He also applauds liberal and secular modernity for undermining the claims of people to act as God-like potentate with unlimited powers and claims of governments to be extensions of the divine power within human society. This development is consistent with Islam which forbids people from assuming a God-like character and commits them to serving God.

But, Soroush also suggested, Muslims can revise this liberal language of rights through their

¹¹¹ Ibid., 163.

¹¹² Farish A. Noor, “Interview with Abdolkarim Soroush,” in *Commentary: International Movement for a Just World*, 37 (June, 2000), 10-11.

own conceptual and cultural tools. They can, for example, privilege what he calls internal freedom as much as external freedom, unlike Western societies which have bravely battled against the oppression from without, from kings, church, nobility, unfair taxation, and arbitrary rule and achieved external freedom but forgot the internal struggle against the prisons of desires and inner compulsions. The Islamic concept of *jihad* has both of these internal and external dimensions. Muslims can take “external freedoms” from the West refining them by way of their own repertoire of internal freedoms.

With Soroush, to return to our conceptual history, the term westoxification itself became the object of criticism. Before him, as we saw, the term was used to criticize cultural assimilation, alienation from religious activism and imperialism. In contrast to these earlier thinkers, Soroush criticizes the history and politics (partially) *produced* by the term westoxification. Consider, then, that westoxification, even as it comes under critique, continues to play an important role in political life. It continues to operate both as an instrument of re-collection and reflection on history and time (in the sense of Koselleck) and strategic action (in the sense of Skinner). It, for example, becomes the “constitutive outside” of a growing political opposition. It enables the opposition to reflect on the (revolutionary) history, learn lessons from it and propose alternatives.

Conclusion: Possible Alternatives

When the Iranian public read Al-e Ahmad's *Westoxification* and some agreed with his diagnosis, when underprivileged Marxist university students found something appealing in Islam and in the idea of a "return to self" for the first time in their lives after listening to Shariati's effective lectures, when an enthusiastic crowd recognized Khomeini upon his return from exile in the late 1970's as their revolutionary *Imam* confronting the "imperialist West," when Soroush confronted the Iranian ruling class on the status of the West and Islamic polity in widely read journals, in all of these instances, communicative work and linguistic mediation facilitated- and continues to facilitate- social events and shape political consequences. The term westoxification becomes central to this facilitation. Whether as a tool of social critique, mass mobilization or regime building, the term shapes Iranian politics.

Westoxification started out as evoking a secular concept but soon became tied to religion. Shariati and Khomeini were, in different ways, responsible for this change. We also saw that westoxification did more than indicate social and political change: it (partially) constituted it. It is possible, then, that the critique of westoxification talk undertaken by the opposition in Iran will lead to political change too. Perhaps, inter-cultural synthesis, cultural eclecticism or experimentalism will replace westoxification as the more appropriate terms and concepts with which Iranians evaluate their experience of modernity. As their concepts will change, so will the way Iranians re-collect and re-frame their sufferings. Conceptual histories, it should be admitted,

cannot predict future outcomes in politics. But, they can point to possibilities on the basis of the material presented by the past. The conceptual history of westoxification has always been accompanied by social criticism, historical contingency and political intervention. Further (critical) reflection on the concept is likely to influence Iranian politics.

“The Blame and Shame of It”: Samuel Sewall’s Repentance

Lauren Amos

When the governor of Massachusetts, William Phips, shut down the Court of Oyer and Terminer in late 1692, he was responding to massive disapproval pouring in from all over the Massachusetts Bay colony. Yet in the face of relentless criticism, many involved in the Salem Witch Trials defended their actions and supported the decisions made. Phips instituted a ban on media coverage of the trials, censoring all criticism of the judges and the government.¹¹³ The conviction of the court was so strong that the chief justice, William Stoughton, tried to continue the trials despite Phips’s warnings to halt, signing the warrant for eight more executions. Stoughton’s attitude reflected the vast majority of government officials involved in the infamous trials. Most would go to their graves unrepentant and firmly upholding, at least in public, the opinion that the court was justified.

However, one judge would emerge from the trials wracked with self-doubt and guilt. Operating at the opposite extreme of Stoughton, Samuel Sewall expressed misgivings almost immediately after the trial in his diary and to his close friends. He would wrestle with the guilt of Salem for years,

¹¹³ Emerson W. Baker, *A Storm of Witchcraft: The Salem Trials and the American Experience* (Oxford University Press, 2016), 194.

eventually culminating in a public apology. Sewall took “the blame and shame” of the witch trials on himself, admitting that there was a grave miscarriage of justice and begging the pardon of men and God.¹¹⁴ Although a few others, such as 12 jurors and one accuser, came forward with public apologies, Sewall would remain the only judge and government figure to issue a public apology.¹¹⁵ In fact, some government officials such as Stoughton condemned Sewall’s actions and snubbed him.¹¹⁶ Sewall’s status as the only repentant judge leads to a multitude of questions. Why did one judge reverse his attitude toward the trials? What compelled Sewall to apologize and no one else? What was different about this man that drove him to do what no other government official would? The answer to Sewall’s uniqueness is best explored in comparison with his ideological opposite: William Stoughton. Stoughton would defend the sanctity of the trials all his life, and upon hearing Sewall’s confession, reiterated that the trials had been conducted with “the fear of God” and to the “best of his understanding.”¹¹⁷ Stoughton provides a foil to the repentant Sewall. He was conspicuous for his ruthlessness at the trials,¹¹⁸ and his harsh treatment of Sewall’s repent-

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Cedric B. Cowing, *The Saving Remnant: Religion and the Settling of New England* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1995), 92.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ John Farmer, “Memoirs of Ministers,” *American Quarterly Register* 8 (1835): Accessed Oct. 2015.

¹¹⁸ Cowing, *The Saving Remnant*, 93.

ance “probably kept more people from following Sewall’s example.”¹¹⁹ Sewall, on the other hand, continued his repentance to his death, wearing a hair shirt and observing a yearly fast day.¹²⁰ The root difference between the two seems to have been how they approached religion. Multiple differences such as family background, influential ministers, and individual piety all stem from religion, and acted as key forces shaping both men’s lives.

To begin with, both drew the very foundation of their religion from two different camps. Historian Cedric Cowing explains that those with roots in Northwest Britain were a minority in Boston and Salem, and “were predisposed to believe, because of their traditions, that they could know the immediacy of the other world.”¹²¹ This firm belief that they could “feel, taste, and savor God’s presence”¹²² often put them at odds with those in power, whose roots were in Southeast Britain. Northwesterners believed that Southeasterners had lost the ability to communicate with God, and were “falling away.”¹²³ The ideological divide between Northwesterners and Southeasterners traveled with the Puritans over to the Massachusetts Bay colony. Government officials and religious authorities tended to be of Southeast origins, while Northwesterners were “poor and

¹¹⁹ Baker, *A Storm of Witchcraft*, 224.

¹²⁰ Eve LaPlante, *Salem Witch Judge: The Life and Repentance of Samuel Sewall* (New York: HarperOne, 2007), 221.

¹²¹ Cowing, *The Saving Remnant*, 73.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid., 74.

powerless like the places they had come from.”¹²⁴ Orthodox Puritan leaders from Southeast England were suspicious of Northwesterners, and feared the “religious confusion and political anarchy” they might bring. This was fueled by the Northwesterners’ sympathies to religious heterodoxy and pluralism, women, and Native Americans.¹²⁵ This small, vocal minority frequently challenged the Southeast Orthodox power structure.

Part of this penchant for causing trouble was because Northwesterners lacked deference and respect for the Southeastern Orthodox views, and were seen as “spiritually restless and troublesome.”¹²⁶ They were outspoken in their opposition to Southeastern Orthodox Puritans, and spurned the formal court system in favor of “informal consultation or arbitration in church.”¹²⁷ They distrusted the courts, and saw them as impersonal and easily corrupted.¹²⁸ Northwesterners’ outspokenness, nonorthodox beliefs, and lack of political power left them vulnerable to “charges of heresy, including latent Catholicism and Anglicanism, Quakerism, sectarianism, or at the extreme, witchcraft.”¹²⁹ Thus, Cowing writes, the fact that “a majority of [Salem Witch Trial] judges were from the Southeast and a majority of the accused from the Northwest was a

¹²⁴ Ibid., 83.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 73-75.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 84.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 83.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

natural development.”¹³⁰ The “majority of those who actually served on the special court [of Oyer and Terminer] had Southeast origins. They represented the Puritan oligarchy on the defensive against what seemed to them a mysterious upsurge of evil.”¹³¹ William Stoughton was of Southeast heritage, and embodied its traits. Stoughton and the rest of the Southeast contingent “reflected the commercial, political, and religious establishment of Massachusetts.”¹³² Sewall and two others judges, on the other hand, made up the small Northwest minority in the judge pool. The difference in opinion between the two camps was small but crucial. Puritans who originated in the Northwest firmly believed in the immediacy of God and the spiritual realm, and because of this believed they were vulnerable to prophecy and possession. They also “knew from experience that the Devil could take shape without their consent.”¹³³ This would become a main point of contention in the witch trials. Accusers, accused, bystanders, and judges were not arguing about the existence of witches or the devil. Such a belief was conventional, and not commonly contested. However, a critical divergence developed over the belief of whether the devil could take the shape of an innocent person. Stoughton and most Southeasterners were of the opinion that the devil could not take the shape of an innocent person. However, Northwesterners could “accept more readily the theory that

¹³⁰ Ibid., 91.

¹³¹ Ibid., 90.

¹³² Ibid., 91.

¹³³ Ibid., 83.

the Devil could take on the shape of an innocent person.”¹³⁴ Sewall and the other Northwesterners’s political beliefs were not radically different from Stoughton and the Southeasterners’s, as clearly they were orthodox enough to obtain land and power. However, Cowing concludes that the Northwest minority “had more doubts about the trial proceedings than the others,” and were more inclined to combine “piety with skepticism about legal proceedings.”¹³⁵ By virtue of ancestry, Stoughton was automatically more inclined to approach the trials harshly and Sewall skeptically.

This knowledge of religious background lays important groundwork for Stoughton and Sewall’s actions. Stoughton was a “literate, rational, orthodox individual.”¹³⁶ He embodied the Southeast Puritan support of the Calvinistic concept of consent and covenant. It was therefore “consistent for Stoughton to take the position that the Devil could only assume the shape of those who had covenanted with him.”¹³⁷ He would maintain this belief even in the face of “contrary advice,” and “may have persuaded other magistrates to do the same.”¹³⁸ Stoughton was steeped in the Southeast Orthodox religion, and his upbringing would incline him to be suspicious towards the Northwesterners accused. Sewall on the other hand, was closer religiously to

¹³⁴ Ibid., 92.

¹³⁵ Ibid

¹³⁶ Ibid., 93.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 94.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

the accused than to most of the other judges. He had been raised in a religious environment that differed from the Orthodox norms espoused by the government, and it was this religious environment that would render him more inclined to believe the devil could take the shape of an innocent person. His status as a Northwesterner would have put him at ideological odds with the majority of the special court, and could have laid the seeds of his second-guessing. Although a variety of factors undoubtedly came into play during the trials, on a deeply unconscious level Stoughton and Sewall were influenced by their religious heritage.

While religious backgrounds laid the foundation for Sewall and Stoughton's beliefs, individual beliefs widened the gap in thinking. Stoughton's actions, and contemporary opinion of him, show that he personally valued power over religion. When England invalidated the Massachusetts charter in 1686 and put a new Anglican government in place, Stoughton did not voice opposition but rather became intimate with Edmund Andros, the new governor. Stoughton entertained Andros at his home,¹³⁹ and soon was sitting at his right hand in the General Court.¹⁴⁰ Despite the Anglican nature of the new government, Stoughton was willing to curry favor to advance his own political position. Stoughton was well known for his willingness to switch sides and after the charter was revoked, many were suspicious of his loyalties. When he re-

¹³⁹ Sewall, Samuel, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, Harvey Wish ed. (New York: Putnam, 1967), 169.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

ceived the confidence of the British monarchy and was appointed deputy-president, this “confirmed the opinion of those who were disposed to believe that, like his friend Joseph Dudley, he had in Europe been less active in defending colonial rights than in conciliating court favor.”¹⁴¹ His appointment was widely regarded as a reward for turning against the colony, and “he was considered as one of those politicians who change their principles with time, and shift their sails so as to catch every favorable breeze.”¹⁴² Even Edward Randolph, a Crown agent being aided by Stoughton, admitted Stoughton’s willingness to play both sides. He noted that he “is inclined to the Non-conformist [Puritan] ministers, yet stands right to his Majesty’s interests.”¹⁴³ The clearest display of his religious infidelity was Stoughton attending the funeral of Captain Hamilton, commander of the *Kingfisher* and a member of the Royal Navy. Sewall writes in his diary that “Mr. Dudley, Mr. Stoughton, and many others [were] at the Common Prayer and Sermon” part of the funeral.¹⁴⁴ This would not be noteworthy, except for the fact that the funeral was “preached by the Fisher’s Chaplain,”¹⁴⁵ an Anglican. The funeral would have been Anglican as well, and to Sewall and other Puritans the use of the Common Prayer or Common

¹⁴¹ Josiah Quincy, *The History of Harvard University* (Cambridge: John Owen, 1840), 174.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 175.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 177.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

Prayer liturgy was “heresy.”¹⁴⁶ Writer Eve LaPlante explains that the founders of Massachusetts opposed the *Book of Common Prayer* and all it represented, specifically “mass, a liturgical calendar and set list of readings, requiems, evensong, and holy days.”¹⁴⁷ Stoughton ignored religious differences and attended an Anglican service in order to gain favor from government officials, signaling politics as his top priority.

Sewall, in contrast, held religion as the most important driving force in his life. Throughout his diary he constantly prayed and asked God for guidance. He was rooted in the belief that God caused every event to occur, and consistently tried to find God’s meaning for his tragedies. He strove to embody humility like Christ, chastising those who wore wigs¹⁴⁸ and constantly asking God to “humble me kindly in respect of all my Enmity against Him.”¹⁴⁹ He believed that “submitting to God’s providence”¹⁵⁰ was the most important thing a man could do, and his actions reflect his loyalty to God over man. As a devout Puritan, he disapproved of the Anglican government and everything it stood for. When the charter was revoked and Randolph arrived in 1686 with the royal commission for the new government, Sewall noted that “people were angry.” He went to talk about the matter with friends “over drinks at a pub,” all of whom showed

¹⁴⁶ Eve LaPlante, *Salem Witch Judge*, 59.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 102.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 113.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 176.

clear disapproval.¹⁵¹ The next day, he proved his loyalty to the old government. He wrote in his diary that when the General Court sat, “The Old [Puritan] Government draws to the North-side, Mr. Addington, Captain Smith and I sit at the table.”¹⁵² Sewall signaled his loyalty to the old Puritan government by sitting with them on the north side, while the new president, Dudley, Stoughton, and a few others signaled their shifting loyalty to the new Anglican government by sitting on the left side.¹⁵³

In addition to this first act of defiance, Sewall also declined to manage a school for Andros¹⁵⁴ and supported the ministers when they refused to let Anglicans use the Boston meetinghouses as churches.¹⁵⁵ When confronted by Randolph and the primary Anglican minister Robert Ratcliffe, he remained adamant and would not even consider building an Anglican church.¹⁵⁶ Sewall considered the new Anglican government a plague on New England and a threat to God’s city on a hill. After Dudley ascended to presidency, Sewall and a few others stayed behind in the meeting house to gossip. They lamented the turn of events, Sewall himself stating, “The foundations being destroyed, what can the righteous do?”¹⁵⁷ Even when Sewall reluctantly took a position in the new government, he refused

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 138.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 165.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 162.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 207.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 139.

to cater to the new Anglican government, taking his oath in the distinct New England fashion. Instead of kissing the Bible, he put his left hand on the Bible and his right hand in the air. This fashion was favored by Puritans, including Sewall's minister Samuel Willard, but irked the Anglican governor Andros.¹⁵⁸

However, the most blatant display of choosing religion over politics was when Sewall quit his position in the artillery training over a theological disagreement. Anglicans favored putting the King George's Cross, an embellished cross, on all shields, armor, and flags. However, Sewall thought this Anglican tradition was too close to idolatry, and "was in great exercise [distress] about the Cross to be put into the Colours, and afraid if I should have a hand in it whether it may not hinder my Entrance into the Holy Land."¹⁵⁹ Sewall believed this so wholeheartedly that he told his superiors he would be unable to hold the position any longer, and quit.¹⁶⁰ Sewall's religious nature ran deep enough to stay loyal to the Puritan faith, even when doing so put him at odds with the new government. He was not willing to compromise his beliefs to curry political favor. Clearly religion was the driving factor in his life, as he was willing to risk political trouble for the sake of upholding his beliefs. Stoughton's actions before the trials show he was politically driven, while Sewall's actions prior to the trial reveal his motivations were driven by religion.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 143.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 147.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 148.

Stoughton's and Sewall's opposing priorities were influenced and strengthened by each man's minister. Stoughton attended the North Church, or Second Church, where Cotton Mather was the primary minister. Mather mirrored Stoughton in his tendency to value political power over religious fidelity. Even before the witch trials, Cotton Mather and his father Increase Mather were deeply embedded in the Bay colony's politics. When the colony and its government were first established, most of the standing body was "hand-picked" by Increase. Their election sermons were powerful political tools that swayed the public opinion, and before the trials they were the brokers between the government and the people.¹⁶¹ Stoughton had an intimate relationship with the Mather's that operated beyond church. In fact it was Increase who nominated Stoughton for his position in the new government, and Stoughton was "indebted for this elevation to the assurance given by Cotton Mather, that [Stoughton] was 'ready to make amends for all his miscarriages.'"¹⁶² The miscarriages being referred to are Stoughton's aforementioned habits of being too "compliant" with the Anglican government.¹⁶³ Stoughton and Mather's interests were intertwined, and the two worked together to achieve power in the colony. Mather was willing to put religious differences aside and work with Stoughton despite his cooperation with the hated Anglicans. In doing so,

¹⁶¹ Baker, *A Storm of Witchcraft*, 206.

¹⁶² Quincy, *The History of Harvard University*, 77.

¹⁶³ Farmer, "Memoirs of Ministers," 338.

Mather reveals that he is willing to look past religious differences to gain political power.

In contrast, Sewall's minister Willard concentrated his attention on religion, and his main focus seems to have genuinely been following God's path. When the Massachusetts charter was revoked and Andros arrived with the new Anglican form of government, Sewall notes that Willard "prayed not for the Governor or Government, as before; but spake so as implied it to be changed or changing."¹⁶⁴ Willard did not support the Anglican government, instead he prayed that it would not last long. Willard's disapproval of the new government contributed to Sewall's defiance, both explicitly and by example. He encouraged Sewall to refuse to wear the King George Cross on his colors,¹⁶⁵ and approved of Sewall taking his oath in the Puritan New England fashion rather than the Anglican fashion.¹⁶⁶ When the Anglicans invaded the Town-House, or central government building, Sewall writes the quick note in his diary, "Mr. Willard not seeing cause to go to the Town-House to pray." Willard outright avoided the Anglicans, and refused to be in the same building as them or pray near them. Sewall followed his example and avoided the town house as well, writing, "I who was to speak to [Reverend Willard] refrain also."¹⁶⁷ Willard was unwilling to engage with the Anglicans in any sort of capacity, even if it meant staying away from the

¹⁶⁴ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 138.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 147.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 143.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 139.

hub of political activity. Before the trials even started, Willard made clear his priority was religion, not politics. This straightforward concern for religion over everything else influenced Sewall, and inspired him to follow in Willard's footsteps. Stoughton, on the other hand, was in collusion with his minister to gain more political power. The two relied on their ministers for guidance, and were led down two very different paths.

The opposing goals of the two ministers would continue to influence Sewall and Stoughton into the witch trials. Cotton Mather's attitude towards the witch trials was complex and ambivalent. Although he signed the *Return of Several Ministers* with Willard, he was less vocal in his opposition. In fact, one account paints Mather as a crucial part of the executions. Robert Calef's account of trial describes a scene where Cotton Mather directly caused the death of a witch. Calef writes that after George Burroughs successfully recited the Lord's Prayer, there was a pause and indecision about his status as a witch. But "Mr. Cotton Mather, being mounted upon a horse, addressed himself to the people, partly to declare that he [Burroughs] was no ordained minister, and partly to possess the people of his guilt, saying that the devil has often been transformed into an angel of light; and this somewhat appeased the people and the executions went on."¹⁶⁸ Mather urged on the trial, encouraging the judges and supporting their decisions.

¹⁶⁸ Robert Calef, *More Wonders of the Invisible World* (Salem: Reprinted by John D. and T.C. Cushing, Jr., 1823), 213.

Even after the trials ended, Mather continued to voice support. Baker explains that as some ministers like Willard were circulating opposition to the trial, “only Cotton Mather’s *The Wonders of the Invisible World* defended the actions of the government. The book was written quickly and rushed into print to try to buttress the government by endorsing the actions of the judges.”¹⁶⁹ The book was published “by special command,” written specifically at the request of Governor Phips and the government. It was New England’s official defense of the trials, and the only book allowed to be circulated under the publication ban. The six cases Mather used, one of which he was specifically instructed by officials to include,¹⁷⁰ were deliberately chosen “with great care as part of an effort to defend the use of spectral evidence.”¹⁷¹ The book was an “intellectual and moral sham,” showing that Mather was “willing to compromise his beliefs because he had become convinced that the fate of the Puritan colony itself was at stake.”¹⁷²

The younger Mather walked a careful line with his book. He did not outright defend the concept of spectral evidence. Instead, he claimed that “while some of the judges’s methods might have been disputed ... there was clear precedent for their actions.”¹⁷³ Beyond precedents, Mather claimed that

¹⁶⁹ Baker, *A Storm of Witchcraft*, 199.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 199.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

spectral evidence had not been the deciding factor in the trials. The six cases he picked reflected that assertion. He focused on early trials that used spectral evidence to bolster other evidence such as eye witnesses or touch tests. He avoided bringing up controversial cases where spectral evidence was the deciding factor, such as Rebecca Nurse or Mary Eastey. Mather praised the wisdom and actions of the judges, thanking them for making the right and just decisions. While Willard outright criticized the government and its actions, refusing to be censured or soften his language, Mather tacitly approved of government actions by participating in the massive cover-up. Stoughton's actions make sense when viewed in relation to his religious role model, Mather. If Stoughton was seeking religious guidance, the role model he would have been following was defending the witch trials, making it logical why Stoughton would do the same. He had no minister nagging him to repent or consider his actions. Instead, his minister was working with him to maintain political power and cover-up the witch trials.

Like Mather, political motives were most likely “uppermost with Stoughton in 1692. He needed to reaffirm loyalty to the New England way His collaboration with the swashbuckling Andros could be forgotten more quickly if he were the leader in the reassertion of Puritan political authority. Trying and executing witches offered such an opportunity, and he was used to taking decisive action.”¹⁷⁴ Stoughton was already unpopular for his friendship with the Anglican government and his

¹⁷⁴ Cowing, *The Saving Remnant*, 93.

reputation for switching sides. He had no moral figure equivalent to Willard to encourage him that religious gain was more important than political gain. A desperate desire to reassert political power combined with no moral conscious led to unequalled determination to hunt witches. Stoughton was regarded by spectators as “particularly loquacious”¹⁷⁵ during the trials, and was “conspicuous for his severity.”¹⁷⁶ Contemporaries wrote that Stoughton was “foremost in [the witches’s] condemnation,”¹⁷⁷ and at certain points he seems to have single-handedly run the Court. Robert Calef wrote about the trial of Rebecca Nurse, which the jury brought back a verdict of “not guilty.” In response:

“The chief judges [Stoughton] said he would not impose upon the jury; but intimated as if they had not well considered one expression of the prisoner when she was upon trial, viz that when one Hobbs, who had confessed herself to be a witch, was brought into the court to witness against her, the prisoner, turning her head to her, said, *What, do you bring her? She is one of us*, or to that effect; this, together with the clamours of the accusers, induced the jury to

¹⁷⁵ LaPlante, *Salem Witch Judge*, 153.

¹⁷⁶ Cowing, *The Saving Remnant*, 93.

¹⁷⁷ Farmer, “Memoirs of Ministers,” 339.

go out again, after their verdict, not guilty.”¹⁷⁸

After Stoughton rejected Nurse’s acquittal, the jury reconvened and changed the verdict to guilty. Rebecca Nurse was hung, almost solely on the word of William Stoughton. Even after the trials were over and Governor Phips declared that the Court “must fall,” Stoughton continued to prosecute with vigor. LaPlante writes that nearly “every leader of Massachusetts welcomed Phips’s decision to halt the witchcraft trials. The notable exceptions were Cotton Mather, William Stoughton, and John Hathorne.”¹⁷⁹ Stoughton signed the death warrant for eight more executions, despite Phips halting the trials. When Phips overturned the execution warrants, Stoughton was “enraged and filled with passionate anger, and refused to sit upon the bench in a Superior Court.”¹⁸⁰ Stoughton stormed out of the court and quit his position when Phips refused to continue executing witches. He was driven to extremes by his desire to regain political favor. Mather’s endorsement of the trial removed any hesitation or doubt Stoughton may have had, and allowed his political ambitions to run rampant.

However, Sewall’s change of heart shows the impact a minister could have a constituent. By the time of the Salem incident, Willard already had

¹⁷⁸ Calef, *More Wonders of the Invisible World*, 211.

¹⁷⁹ LaPlante, *Salem Witch Judge*, 177.

¹⁸⁰ William Phips, "Letters of Governor William Phips Relating to the Salem Trials," *UMKC Law*. N.p., n.d. Web. Accessed 14 Oct. 2015.

experience with witch trials. He was the minister in Groton when Elizabeth Knapp started accusing women in the town of being witches. In stark contrast to the Salem trials, Willard, “suspecting the truth” of Knapp’s story,¹⁸¹ called her allegations “contradictory” and shut the accusations down almost immediately. Only three women were accused and none were put on trial.¹⁸² Willard would not commit to whether he thought the Devil was at work in Groton, he only wrote that the case “administers many doubts” and that it was “unanswerable.”¹⁸³ Willard approached the witchcraft case with extreme skepticism, casting doubt on the reliability of the witness and testimony.

Willard’s approach to Salem would be similar. Early in the trial, he was one of several religious leaders who signed the *Return of Several Ministers*, urging caution.¹⁸⁴ He continued to undermine the trials, giving a sermon in June affirming his belief that Satan could take the form of an innocent, fighting for his relatives who were ultimately hung as witches, and was even suspected of helping two accused witches flee from jail.¹⁸⁵ Even after the court was terminated, Willard “refused to let go the tri-

¹⁸¹ Samuel Willard, "A Brief Account of a Strange and Unusual Providence of God Befallen to Elizabeth Knapp of Groton," *Groton in the Witchcraft Times* (Groton: n.p., 1883), 7-21.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Baker, *A Storm of Witchcraft*, 196.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 197.

als.”¹⁸⁶ When Governor Phips placed a media ban on the trials, Willard wrote *Some Miscellaneous Observations Respecting Witchcraft*.¹⁸⁷ Published and printed under pseudonyms referring to convicted witches, the book set up a debate between two characters: S and B. Willard’s opinion was represented by B, short for Boston, who criticizes the special court. S, short for Salem, defends the special court and the decisions made.¹⁸⁸ Although Willard did not directly reference a specific trial or person, the ideas condemned the special court and the spirit of the book deliberately defied Phips’s ban.

Some Miscellaneous Observations lays out Willard’s beliefs, and is one of the most transparent documents from the time period. In it, he admits that both he and Salem believe in witches. However, he methodically lays out the shortcomings of the court. He stresses that confessions must be made by a person who is “in his right mind, and not frightened or forced into it ... extorted confessions are not fair, and compares the methods used by the special court to the Inquisition.”¹⁸⁹ He chastises Salem for not following the two witness rule customary of English courts, claiming that having two witnesses to the event is crucial because “to take away the names and lives of a persons on so easy a

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 207.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 197.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 206.

¹⁸⁹ Samuel Willard, *Some Miscellany Observations on Our Present Debates Respecting Witchcrafts in a Dialogue between S. & B.* (Philadelphia: William Bradford, for Hezekiah Usher 1692)

belief [as one witness] is not so light a matter [If one person were to misspeak,] the mistake doth a mischief irreparable.” Besides not following the two witness rule, he calls into question the validity of the accuser’s testimonies. B claims he “cannot think [the afflicted] to be competent Witnesses,” because “the persons confessing are witches by their own confession: and have therefore abjured God and Christ, and given themselves up to the Devil the Father of Lies; and what Credit is to be given to the Testimony of such against the Lives of others?” He adds, “The things themselves which they testify are liable to many illusion,” and condemns spectral evidence. B explains, “I know you all plead so [that the Devil cannot take the shape of an innocent person]; and tell us that the Devil cannot represent an Innocent person doing mischief, but never proved it; nor can we believe you.” He even disregards the precedents that Cotton Mather claimed justified the court with the passage:

“S: WE have old precedents for the using of such a course.

B: No precedent will justify that which is sinful, the older an error the worse; besides, it was borrowed from Popish Exorcists originally.”

When Salem complains that this will make it difficult to prosecute the wicked, Boston sharply replies, “If it is not carefully followed, there will be no Security for Innocence.” Willard’s overarching opinion is that Salem executed on “Presumptions” in-

stead of proof, and placed far too much emphasis on spectral evidence.

Willard disapproved of the Court of Oyer and Terminer, and his disgust would have a profound impact on Sewall. Sewall valued Willard's opinion highly, and he and Willard were incredibly close. Sewall belong to Willard's church,¹⁹⁰ Willard baptized all of Sewall's children, and he presided over the funerals of those who died. Sewall constantly asked Willard to pray over sick children,¹⁹¹ invited him to dinner, and asked Willard for advice on all matters. Sewall trusted Willard implicitly, and Willard would have been exclusively against the trial.

Even without Willard's influence, Sewall's already had deep misgivings about the proceedings of the Court of Oyer and Terminer. His Northwestern heritage and personal emphasis on religion over politics predisposed him to approach the trials with hesitation. Eve LaPlante explains that Sewall “wrote nothing in his diary during the two weeks prior to his visit to Salem, omitting even his customary mention of his birthday.” Sewall wrote virtually nothing on the trials in his diary. LaPlante notes, “In a typical six-month period his diary writing takes up more than fifteen published pages. During the dramatic six-month period of the witch hunt . . . he filled only six pages - less than half his usual output. Clearly, he did not know what to say.”¹⁹² She attributes this to the fact that he was “tongue-tied,

¹⁹⁰ Baker, *A Storm of Witchcraft*, 196.

¹⁹¹ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 111.

¹⁹² LaPlante, *Salem Witch Judge*, 143.

too uncomfortable with current events to set down a thought. Even after he began to comment on the witch hunt he was tight-lipped.”¹⁹³ What little he did write reveals the doubts creeping into his mind. On November 22 he took a private day of prayer and fasting, writing in his diary, “I prayed that God would pardon all my sinful wanderings, and direct me for the future.”¹⁹⁴ Sewall’s reluctance to write about the trials combined with the persistent influence of Willard, all underscored by Sewall’s background as a Northwesterner, would converge to suggest Sewall questioned the legitimacy of the trials from the beginning. Sewall may have expressed doubt from the inception of the trials, and may have even advocated along with Willard for moderation. However, Sewall’s influence, along with any other judge’s, would have undoubtedly been overwhelmed by Stoughton. Stoughton’s view dominated the court, frequently overriding opposing opinions. He insisted on the value of spectral evidence despite the warnings of several ministers, and was adamant that the court take the stance that Satan could not take the shape of an innocent person.¹⁹⁵ His “elevated position as chief justice, his forceful personality, and his unstated conviction that if not for all of Sir William Phips’s gold and silver he himself would be governor of Massachusetts” gave him authority over the other judges.¹⁹⁶ Wielding the power vested in him by Phips,

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 370.

¹⁹⁵ Cowing, *The Saving Remnant*, 94.

¹⁹⁶ LaPlante, *Salem Witch, Judge* 154.

Stoughton was able to cow the other judges into submission. Even if Sewall had doubts initially, the strength of Stoughton's conviction likely reassured Sewall the righteousness of the court's cause. Sewall likely deferred to Stoughton, trusting his authority and overlooking his misgivings.

While Stoughton is the most likely reason Sewall ignored his doubts, Stoughton's reassurances did not last long after the trial. Sewall's misgivings continued to surface, and he dutifully records his turmoil in his diary. He visited one of the accused witches, Captain Alden, and told him he was “sorry for their Sorrow and Temptations by reason of his Imprisonment, and that way glad of his Restoration.”¹⁹⁷ Even two years after the trials, Sewall wrote in his diary that he “had hoped that seeing God pardoned all Israel's iniquities, he would pardon mine, as being part of Israel.”¹⁹⁸ This theme of repentance is seen frequently in the diary entries after the trials, and Sewall often prayed for forgiveness.

Over the years Sewall's distress and guilt over the trial grew, exacerbated by his drop in political status. In his diary he notes that he fell seven votes since the last election, and tried to find solace in prayer. He prays in his diary, “The Lord advance me in real worth and his esteem.”¹⁹⁹ Sewall still valued religious gain over political gain, but was haunted by guilt. When he was not invited to a prominent wedding, he was upset and wrote that it

¹⁹⁷ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 379.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 419.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 427.

“grieves” him to be spoken ill of, and to “be in such a condition that Colonel Shrimpton shall be under a temptation in defense of Himself to wound me.”²⁰⁰ He prayed,

“Oh most bountiful and gracious
God, who givest liberally and up-
braidest not, admit me humbly to be-
speak an Invitation to the Marriage
of the Lamb, and let thy Grace with
me and in me be sufficient for mak-
ing in myself ready. And out of thy
infinite and unaccountable compas-
sions, place me among those who
shall not be left; but shall be ac-
cepted by thee here, and taken into
glory hereafter. Though I am beyond
conception vile, who may say unto
thee, ‘What doest thou? Thou canst
justify thyself in thy proceedings.
And O, Lord God, forgive all my un-
suitable deportment at thy Table, the
last Sabbath day, that Wedding day;
and if ever I be again invited (invite
me once again) help me entirely to
give up myself to thy Son as to my
most endeared Lord.”

Sewall continued to value the favor of God over men, and was only bothered by his exclusion because it may signal bigger, heavenly dissatisfaction. He worried that men’s anger was representative of God’s anger, and being excluded from an Earthly

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 424.

wedding means he will be excluded from the Marriage of the Lamb. He was terrified of being “left” on Earth, and was desperate to be forgiven of any deportment. Sewall harbored guilt in his heart over the trials, and interpreted every misfortune in his life as punishment for his role in the ordeal. When his son died, he begged God to “Pardon all my Sin, and Wandering and Neglect.”²⁰¹ Sewall noted his perceived fall in political power, writing in June of 1696 that he “strove with all my might that instead of Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday in every week, it might be said third, fifth, and seventh day in every week: but could not prevail, hardly one in the Council would second me, and many spoke against it very earnestly.”²⁰² Sewall felt that people were moving against him, a feeling deepened by an encounter with a man named Melyen. Sewall wrote in his diary that Melyen spoke to him “very smartly about the Salem Witchcraft,”²⁰³ disapproving of the evidence used against George Burroughs. Sewall was convinced by the misfortunes in his life that he was being punished, and he was concerned about whether he angered God.

Willard only nurtured these misgivings. Sewall took special note of a sermon delivered in 1694 where Willard warned, “The Devil shall bear his own blame, and God will punish him for all the malicious practices which he useth against his people. But you must bear your own blame, which is due you for yielding to the temptation. The Devil

²⁰¹ Ibid., 426.

²⁰² Ibid., 428.

²⁰³ Ibid., 431.

can only keep us from a due sense of and sorrow for our own folly which we have acted in it, and thereby hinder our true and soaking repentance.”²⁰⁴ Later in September of 1696, Sewall notes in his diary that “Mr. Willard preached - If God be with us who can be against us - Spoke smartly at last about the Salem Witchcrafts, and that no order had been suffered to come forth by Authority to as God’s pardon.”²⁰⁵ Willard’s criticism of the trial and his treatment of Sewall exacerbated Sewall’s guilt. The very afternoon that Sewall buried his son, Willard excluded him from a prayer meeting at the Willard house. Sewall writes that the Willard family “admit us not: It may be I must never more hear a sermon there.”²⁰⁶ The thought saddened him to the extent that he prayed, “The Lord pardon all my sins of omission and commission, and by his Almighty power make me meet to be partaker of the Inheritance with the saints in light.”²⁰⁷ Months later when another child, Sarah, died, Willard again did not invite Sewall to a prayer meeting at his house. Sewall notes in his diary, “The Lord fit me for his coming in whatsoever way it be. Mr. Willard had the Meeting at his house today, but we had no invitation to be there as is usual.”²⁰⁸ Not only did Willard exclude Sewall from the prayer meeting, but he did not go to Sarah’s funeral. Willard systematically avoided Sewall and excluded him from religious

²⁰⁴ LaPlante, *Salem Witch Judge*, 193.

²⁰⁵ Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 433.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 444.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

matters, as shown by the use of the word “usual” in Sewall’s diary. The combination of Sewall’s own misgivings and Willard’s pressure effectively caused Sewall to crack. Not even two weeks after Willard excluded Sewall and avoided his daughter’s funeral, Sewall gave his public apology to Willard to read in church.²⁰⁹ Sewall’s apology acknowledges the “strokes of God upon himself” and is sensible to the guilt he contracted by participating in the Court of Oyer and Terminer at Salem. He begged the pardon of “men, and especially desiring the prayers that God . . . would pardon that sin and all his other sin . . . and defend himself against all temptations to sin for the future.”²¹⁰

Stoughton and Sewall occupy opposite ends of a spectrum. Stoughton, influenced by his Southeast heritage, personal prioritization of politics over religion, and like-minded minister, would defend the trials with Mather. He would shun Sewall, denouncing his apology and maintaining that the trials had been conducted with “the fear of God” and to the “best of his understanding.”²¹¹ Sewall, driven by his Northwest heritage, personal prioritization of religion over politics, and the urgings of Willard, would completely reverse his decision and apologize for the trials. Stoughton and Sewall showcase the wide variety of influences at play in the trials, and how these different motivations resulted in different attitudes.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 445.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ Farmer, “Memoirs of Ministers.”

More importantly, the two men and their ministers represent two vastly different ways individuals interpret history. Stoughton, intent on gaining political power, refused to admit he was wrong. Such a move would endanger his power and bar him from any future office. Mather had similar fears for his political future, and proceeded on a similar path to Stoughton. He quickly published a book defending the trial he was a large part of, denying any possibility that he was wrong. Both men worried for their political future, and could not allow Salem to ruin their prospects. Rather than contemplate the events in Salem and the validity of their decisions, Stoughton and Mather focused on securing their futures. Any analysis or contemplation was sacrificed in favor of adamantly defending their roles. Stoughton and Mather dismissed the very possibility that moral errors were made, opting instead to maintain the legitimacy of the trials at all costs. In doing so, they forfeited their chance to learn from Salem and improve accordingly.

Sewall and Willard, on the other hand, valued religion and moral development above all. Afraid for his mortal soul, Sewall dug into the past and examined his part in it. He desired heavenly gain, and so was unafraid to admit wrong. He and Willard both valued God's approval more than men, and so were willing to delve into the past and right any wrongs. By questioning the very foundations of the trials and opening himself to the possibility of mistake, Sewall was able to gain a more comprehensive view of what happened in Salem. He engaged with his past rather than mindlessly defending it,

and in doing so matured in a way Stoughton never would. Two men of similar social status and wealth emerged from the trials with two wholly different attitudes. These attitudes and the motivations at play would affect how the men saw the past, and dealt with the future.

Rebels With a Cause: The Rebels, Raiders, Patriots, and Gators of Escambia High School

Brad Woods

Florida evokes sunny beaches and warm weather, a robust economy, and attractions that transformed the state into a tourist trap in the twentieth century.²¹² Often, twentieth-century Florida is remembered as a politically moderate state that triumphed over racism and discrimination with its regional exceptionalism. Racism and discrimination against African Americans, however, were as pronounced in Florida as in southern states known to foster Jim Crow. Florida not only participated in many of the same practices against African Americans—lynching, stonewalling, and disfranchising—it carefully orchestrated its image to maintain its

²¹² Irvin D. S. Winsboro, *Old South, New South, or Down South?: Florida and the Modern Civil Rights Movement*. 1st ed. (West Virginia University Press, 2009), 8.

reputation as the “Sunshine State.”²¹³ Florida has a colorful history of racial tensions and violence, civil rights protests, and discriminatory politics and legal practices against minorities. Floridians usually do not recall these issues because these were problems overshadowed by Deep South states like Alabama and Mississippi. Race relations in Florida changed dramatically by the 1970s, transformed by a new state constitution; but the 1976 race riot at Escambia High School in Pensacola, Florida, the focus of this article, is one of the many examples that forces a reevaluation of race relations in the Sunshine State.

Florida was arguably the first state to introduce Jim Crow—even before the 1896 Supreme Court case *Plessy v. Ferguson*—when it legally separated schools based on race in 1885.²¹⁴ Florida was not a racially moderate state. Its white supremacy “reappeared in measured policies of state government, back-room scheming, and in the guise of the ‘all-American’ Klan and White Citizens’ Councils.”²¹⁵ In other words, the Old South did not disappear altogether. Down South delays in desegregation were clever ways to maintain racist practices outlawed in 1954 by *Brown v. Board of Education* and other federal court cases and legislation. The all-white Escambia High School, for example, did not desegregate until the 1969 court case *Augustus v. School Board of Escambia County, Florida*, ruled that deliberate delay in a unitary school system

²¹³ Ibid., 2.

²¹⁴ Ibid., 4.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 7.

“was no longer tolerable.”²¹⁶ More and more African American students enrolled at Escambia High each year, which forced the community to confront its underlying and explosive tensions. Escambia High’s mascot, the “Rebels,” was condemned by some of the students in the 1970s—but it was not an issue in the 60s. The school’s diversity made it a challenging environment because different racial groups started coming into contact with each other at a growing rate. The explosion came so late, however, because Florida, like many southern states that practiced segregation, used stonewalling, foot-dragging tactics to hinder desegregation: “Although there were voices of philosophical resignation, the region’s predominant [white] attitude was horror and hysterical jeremiad. Governors stood adamant. . . So vigorous was the opposition and so slow were the workings of the justice system that actual change in racial patterns of enrollment came only gradually.”²¹⁷ Florida followed the token integration pattern that many southern states fostered in light of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision when the state had no other option. Likewise, white politicians of North Florida, the state’s conservative stronghold, “opposed racial integration in any form until compelled to yield by homegrown activism or by federal authority. . . . North Florida typified the full range of Jim Crow mentality and measures that

²¹⁶ *Augustus v. School Board of Escambia County*, Florida, Leagle.com. Accessed March 29, 2015.

²¹⁷ Charles T. Clotfelter, *After Brown: The Rise and Retreat of School Segregation* (Princeton: University Press, 2006), 23.

rang throughout Florida.”²¹⁸ It is important to bear in mind that North Florida conservative politicians, known as the Pork-Choppers, dominated the legislature from the time the state’s constitution rendered school separation between African Americans and whites in 1885 legal until the early 1970s.

Escambia High’s racial issues encapsulates Florida’s complicated history with racism in the Sunshine State. The civil rights movement dramatically changed Florida. The New South began to emerge after the landmark case *Brown v. Board of Education*, but as a whole the white political leadership opposed the decision. Moreover, the Old South refers to ideals of white supremacy in the South before the Civil War; the New South refers to social and political illusions of progress to appear “moderate” after the Civil War; and Down South refers to deliberate delays to progressive change toward equality in a final effort to maintain white supremacy in the South after the Civil War.²¹⁹ New South also emphasizes real efforts toward progressive change to modernize the South. For example, Florida witnessed a wave of legislation aimed at changing the Old South’s image of white supremacy toward a new “Golden Age” of equality and tolerance in the 1970s.

Likewise, Irvin D. S. Winsboro’s historical narrative *Old South, New South, Down South?: Florida And The Modern Civil Rights Movement* highlights Florida’s complicated history of segrega-

²¹⁸ Ibid., 23.

²¹⁹ Winsboro, *Old South, New South, or Down South?*, 2-14.

tion, desegregation, and deliberate delays to desegregation. Escambia High was an all-white school forced to desegregate in 1969, and the school was becoming more diverse by the 1970s. The “Rebels” mascot, school song *Dixie*, and the Confederate flag were not symbols of a diverse school, however. They were symbols of the all-white Escambia High of the 1950s and 60s. Keith Hughes, the sixteen-year-old quarterback of Escambia High’s football team, felt that the school should have been able to keep the flag because it had “been like that for a long time . . . [and] the war was a long time ago.”²²⁰ What the vocal teenager said does not acknowledge the flag’s history; it may not have seemed as a symbol of exclusion to some, but it evinced a history of racism and discrimination to others. However, Hughes also said, “all the blacks on the football team, they don’t want to fight, and all the whites on the football team don’t want to fight. . . . They just want to settle it in a good, clean vote.”²²¹ That is what most of the community wanted at the end of the day, but it was not a problem that could be easily solved. The fights were going to happen either way because the mascots were fought over the principles each one symbolized, Old South vs New South, and Florida’s history “was wedded to the Old South both in practice and ideals.”²²² The civil rights movement dramatically changed Florida.

²²⁰ "Pensacola School Closed after 4-hour Racial Riot," *The Tuscaloosa News*, February 6, 1976, Accessed March 28, 2015.

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² Winsboro, *Old South, New South, or Down South?*, 4.

In 1968, Governor Claude R. Kirk, Jr. introduced a new constitution that restructured race relations in Florida based on “a blue-ribbon committee” recommendation, which is a committee composed of nonpartisan investigators to look into an important governmental issues.²²³ He was the first Republican governor of Florida since Reconstruction, and he paved the way for change in Florida. Before Kirk, the Pork Choppers held most of the political power in Florida from 1885 until the new constitution stifled their power by putting an end to the deliberately malapportioned legislative districts that gave an advantage to white voters.²²⁴ Namely, the Pork Choppers had wrested control for themselves by allocating greater representation to rural areas in northern Florida than more densely populated cities within Florida.

Besides the Pork Choppers demise, Governor LeRoy Collins’ “progressive” tenure in the 60’s actually marked an era of the illusion of improvement for African Americans, the New South. Reubin D. Askew, Florida’s governor in the 1970s, undertook policies more in line with actual New South legislation, such as his proposal of the Sunshine Amendment, which emphasized improving government ethics with better financial management. Florida was changing, and the nationwide civil rights movement significantly impacted the region. Florida witnessed several major protests

²²³ Martin A Dyckman, *Reubin O'D. Askew and the Golden Age of Florida Politics* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011), 9.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

against Jim Crow: Thurgood Marshall's representation of the Groveland Boys in the 1940s, the Tallahassee Bus Boycotts in the 1950s, and the Jacksonville sit-ins in the 1960s. In the 1960s and 70s, African Americans were not asking for equal rights—they were demanding them, and Askew helped create a path toward those rights. He was among the wave of New South governors elected in the early 1970s, including future presidents Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton, and he opposed segregation and laws that hindered African-American votes. Moreover, he told the executive director of the Florida School Boards Association that “we need very much to get off the defensive and on the offensive,” referring to school desegregation in Florida.²²⁵

Askew intended to improve black plight, but he also “foresaw a death spiral of declining enrollment [in public schools] and tax support ‘until only the very poor, both black and white are left . . . and the great American system of public education is reduced to a baby-sitting service run on federal welfare.’”²²⁶ Ultimately, he decided that “the way to end busing is to seek the broader community desegregation which will make it unnecessary. . . . We must decide which is worse—temporary hardship and inconvenience, or continuing inequality and injustice. We must decide if apartheid is what we really want in this country, be it *de facto* or *de jure*.”²²⁷ This “Golden Age” of Florida was happening at the same time Escambia High was confront-

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 93.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*

²²⁷ *Ibid.*

ing its many racial issues. While Askew was governor of Florida, the modern, “moderate” state that we are more familiar with today emerged. Still, more than a hint of truth persisted in the saying the farther north a person goes in Florida the further south he or she really is. The Pork Chop politics were gone after the 1969 reapportionment, but the Old South traditions they represented continued to influence the situation in North Florida communities.

On February 5, 1976, a violent race riot broke out at Escambia High over the failure to reinstate the school’s original mascot in an impromptu election. Twenty-eight people were injured, four of whom were shot, and many were arrested. The school’s original mascot, the “Rebels,” was banned by court order on July 24, 1973, to ease tensions at the newly integrated Escambia High.²²⁸ African Americans confronted Old South symbols from the moment they began enrolling at Escambia High in 1969. The school’s original mascot, flag, and song—“Rebels,” confederate flag, and *Dixie*, respectively—signified a bygone era that did not welcome a new diverse student body: it was a reminder of the Old South, which alienated and offended the new African American students. The Old South promoted discriminatory institutions and practices against African Americans that were supposed to be dismantled in the New South in the wake of the civil rights movement. Escambia High’s four mascots bespeak a history of racial tensions in Florida, especially in North Florida.

²²⁸ "'Rebel's' Flags Banned by Judge," *The Pensacola Journal*, July 24, 1973, Accessed March 15, 2015.

There was an injunction of the “Rebels” mascot on July 24, 1973, as a result of violent integrated fights, protests, and boycotts in the 1972-1973 academic year. A race riot on December 13, 1972, at a home football game sparked the resistance that led to a wave of violence in 1973.²²⁹ The riot started when angry African American students retaliated against their own school band playing the song *Dixie* with the Confederate flag waving in the air.²³⁰ Forty-seven people were arrested in the riot. In February, a few months after the incident, African American students led a string of boycotts, encouraged by the NAACP. These peaceful boycotts turned violent when another riot broke out March 22, 1973. Fifty people were arrested this time, thirty-five of whom were African American and 15 white.²³¹ As a result of the uproars, U.S. District Judge Winston E. Arnow found use of the Confederate flag, *Dixie*, and mascot on school grounds to be “racially irritating” to African American students.²³² Eighteen months later, however, a judge of

²²⁹ “Florida Roundup Racial clash erupts at Escambia High,” *The Miami News*, December 14, 1972, Accessed March 22, 2015.

²³⁰ “Rebel's' Flags Banned by Judge,” *The Pensacola Journal*, July 24, 1973, Accessed March 15, 2015.

²³¹ “More Violence Flares at Escambia High,” *The Pensacola News*, March 22, 1973, Accessed March 22, 2015.

²³² “Rebel's' Flags Banned by Judge,” *The Pensacola Journal*, July 24, 1973, Accessed March 15, 2015. *Augustus v. School Board of Escambia County*, 361 F. Supp. 383, 1973.

the circuit court of appeals overturned Judge Arn-
now's ruling. The judge rebuked the original deci-
sion, saying: "If small minorities know that they can
attain their goals by saying 'do thus and so because
we find your actions offensive to us' and can obtain
a federal injunction if the majority do not bend to
their demands, then federal jurisdiction will have
been structured for beyond its intended constitution-
al limits."²³³ Officials at Escambia High announced
that a new election would be held the following
year to decide the fate of the school's mascot. This
required two-thirds of the students and faculty,
1,175 votes in total, to vote "Rebels" to restore the
former mascot. Otherwise, the mascot would remain
the "Raiders."²³⁴ After failing to secure two-thirds
of the votes, hundreds of white students amassed
outside of school the next day and began to riot.²³⁵

On Thursday, February 5, 1976, white stu-
dents started the riot outside the school, but both
white and African American students became in-
volved. According to Principal Chris Banakas,
three-fourths of the 2,523 students at the school
rioted; he said that "we ended up with a bunch of
whites outside throwing rocks and breaking win-
dows, and a bunch of blacks inside breaking win-

²³³ "Court: 'Rebel' Name a School Board Matter," *The Pensacola Journal*, January 1, 1975, Accessed March 15, 2015; *Augustus v. School Board of Escambia County*, 507 F.2d 152, 1975.

²³⁴ "Escambia High To Remain 'Raiders'; 'Rebels' Sup-
porters Lose by 116 Votes," *The Pensacola Journal*, Feb-
ruary 5, 1976, Accessed March 15, 2015.

²³⁵ Ibid.

dows.”²³⁶ The riot lasted for four hours. Sergeant Jim Edson, who led Escambia sheriff’s department’s thirty-man riot squad, admitted the riot could have ended an hour earlier than it did: “Sure, we could come out here with our night sticks and bust heads, but we don’t want to do that. . . . The way we did it, it lasted one hour longer, but most of the violence stopped.”²³⁷ He also pointed out that the white students had “two truckloads” of knives, chains, sticks, boards, bottles, and other unspecified weapons.²³⁸ Four people were shot and twenty-eight injured as a result of the riot. These teenagers had to confront racial tensions that were neither new to Florida nor peculiar to the Sunshine State, wreaking such havoc in the process that they forced adults to take a step back to reevaluate race relations at the school and local community.

White students outside, fuming over the outcome of the election the day before, were determined to raise the Confederate flag that provoked the riot. The “Rebels” mascot was based on University of Mississippi’s Colonel Rebel, and these students prided themselves with this Old South symbol. One thing that was not going to help get the “Rebels” reinstated was vigilante justice. State representative R.W. Peaden, for example, told the white students during the riot, “if you want our help, act as adults. . . . If you act as you’ve acted this morn-

²³⁶ "Escambia High Closed After 30 Hurt in Nickname Melee," *The Pensacola Journal*, February 6, 1976, Accessed March 15, 2015.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Ibid.

ing, you're liable to not get any help at all."²³⁹ The Escambia community had to find a happy medium, so they invoked committees to improve race relations among the students. Furthermore, the chamber of commerce Task Force on Minority Involvement worked closely with Escambia County's Human Relations Committee to create a list of recommendations for a healthier school environment for all students.

These groups were tasked with forming a plan, but the final decisions ultimately rested with the school board. Betty Nickinson, who was a Task Force on Minority Involvement member, said "this committee should suggest that our legislatures follow the same procedure in asking those responsible to look at the issue without entering into it themselves."²⁴⁰ She wanted to leave the major decisions in the hands of the school board. Another member named M.J. Mengo told the school board to "bite the bullet, reaffirming that the vote has been taken, that the name Raiders will remain, and let this issue pass."²⁴¹ Even committee members were divided over the best way to handle the situation. Without delay, these committees met the day after the riot to offer guidance to school officials. The two committees decided on a plan composed of five recommendations on how school officials should address what happened and move forward "for better race rela-

²³⁹ Ibid.

²⁴⁰ "School Board Told To Stick By Vote, Meet Immediately," *The Pensacola Journal*, February 6, 1976, Accessed March 15, 2015.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

tions in the county.”²⁴² The committees recommended that officials have “a rumor control center”; safe areas for students who “felt threatened”; students identified for property damage “pay for the damages”; “commend other schools without disturbances”; and arrest or remove people “not having pertinent business at school.”²⁴³

The school board tried to approach this issue carefully. From 1972-1976, there had been many incidents of racially charged fights and at least four “major disturbances” at Escambia High. Sixteen-year-old football quarterback Keith Hughes was one of the four victims shot during the riot in 1976, and he summed up the general concern: “it’s killing the school . . . [and] it’s going to be like this for a long time.”²⁴⁴ Another student said “if they name it Rebels there’s going to be fighting . . . if they name it Raiders there’s going to be fighting.”²⁴⁵ One school administrator pointed out, in a large fight that broke out November 15, 1972, that the problem was “purely and simply human relations or the lack of it.”²⁴⁶ The 1976 riot compelled the Pensacola community to reevaluate race relations in ways the court case and appeal had not.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ “Pensacola School Closed after 4-hour Racial Riot,” *The Tuscaloosa News*, February 6, 1976, Accessed March 28, 2015.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ “Escambia Reopens” *The Pensacola Journal*, November 15, 1972. Accessed March 28, 2015.

The committee members experienced the backlash of the school's slow response to the racial tensions simmering before the boiling point of the race riot in 1976. They had their work cut out for them. The "Raiders" now had a reputation as tarnished as the "Rebels" because of all the tensions both had caused by 1976, especially by February and March. February 21, 1976, Teresa Hunt, who was a member of the Pensacola-Escambia Human Relations Committee and the Citizens Advisory Committee, had her house burned down by arsonists suspected of retaliating against her involvement in improving race relations. She told *The Pensacola Journal* that she would "continue to work for better race relations between black and white people."²⁴⁷ Hunt subsequently said something that resonated with many: "The house can be replaced. What I'm really thankful about is that no one has been killed over this racial trouble at Escambia High. . . . I'm strange for Escambia County because I'm not afraid to say that the problems at Escambia High School are not over a flag or nickname [mascot] but black and white problems. . . . [M]y attitude is just not accepted."²⁴⁸ She was not the only victim of arson. State representative Peaden, who reprimanded students during the riot and worked with committees to improve race relations after, had his house deliberately burned down just a few days after Hunt on February 25, 1976. Others who seemed to oppose the "Rebels" by trying to bridge the concerns of

²⁴⁷ "Home Burned, She'll Work for Peace." *The Pensacola Journal*, February 23, 1976. Accessed April 2, 2015.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

African Americans and whites had crosses burned in their yards, a threatening sign of the Ku Klux Klan. “Raiders” and “Rebels” had caused such a divide in Escambia County—black vs white, students vs teachers. For those reasons, the school no longer used the “Raiders” or “Rebels” mascot, and switched to the “Patriots” to end the mascot mayhem.

March 18, 1976, headlines in *The Pensacola Journal* read, “Rebels, Raiders Both Lose; EHS Renamed ‘Patriots.’”²⁴⁹ The name came as a surprise because Escambia High School board member Carl West, a former teacher and principle, who was one of the most adamant about reinstating the “Rebels,” decided against the controversial name and introduced “Patriots” instead.²⁵⁰ He justified his unexpected stance by saying, “I was just afraid of what would happen if we went back to Rebels. . . . I believe anyone who fights against Patriots isn’t a true American.”²⁵¹ In essence, West trumped race with patriotism. He was trying to divert attention away from legitimate concerns about race and respect in Escambia County by using patriotism as a red herring. July 4, 1976, would mark the bicentennial of the American Revolution, so “Patriots” seemed fitting. Not everyone was as sanguine as West, though. School board chairman Peter Gindl doubted the new mascot’s ability to solve the problem. He

²⁴⁹ “Rebels, Raiders Both Lose; EHS Renamed ‘Patriots.’” *The Pensacola Journal*, March 18, 1976,. Accessed April 2. 2015.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

noted that the Escambia High School Board chose the new mascot, not the students. Much like with the change to “Raiders,” there were mixed views among committee members with “Patriots.”

Thursday, March 18, 1976, the first day after changing the mascot from “Raiders” to “Patriots,” there was a massive school boycott on the front lawn at Escambia High. The boycott involved almost 1000 disgruntled white students, to whom Principal Banakas said “go on home. You will not be admitted back into school today.”²⁵² Hundreds of white students signed a petition, refusing to go to their classes until either the “Rebels” was reinstated or another vote was taken. Student-body president John Aldridge told the students boycotting that “Governor Askew’s going to put his foot down and close this damn school” if things kept going the way they were.²⁵³ Askew was not putting “his foot down,” because state officials were trying to keep this issue in the hands of the school board. Race relations had gotten so tense by early 1973 that the NAACP requested the National Guard for the safety of African American students, but Askew was “confident local officials can handle any situation that arises,” refusing to send the National Guard.²⁵⁴ In other words, Askew did not want to bring anymore

²⁵² "Escambia Whites Boycott Classes," *The Pensacola Journal*, March 18, 1976, Accessed April 2, 2015.

²⁵³ "Escambia Whites Boycott Classes," *The Pensacola Journal*, March 18, 1976, Accessed April 2, 2015.

²⁵⁴ "Troubled Escambia County: Askew Turns Down Request To Call Out National Guard," *Sarasota Herald Tribune*, January 13, 1973, Accessed April 4, 2015.

attention to the situation at Escambia High. Most of the news articles on issues at Escambia High managed to stay within Florida, besides Alabama's *The Tuscaloosa News*. If the National Guard had been sent to the school "to restore order," it would have brought the kind of attention to Florida that Governor Askew did not want. February 12, 1976, one week after the riot, the school introduced metal detectors students had to go through in single-file lines before they got inside the school.

The petitions, walkouts, and boycotts after the riot in February made the school board reconsider the "Patriots." The problem with the new mascot, as Chairman Gindl highlighted, is that it did not give students a voice in the matter. Although violence at the school abated, students wanted to choose their own mascot. The school board was concerned that a new election would result in more disturbances. When the students accumulated hundreds of votes and submitted their petition in April, the school board and other officials were more open to a new election for a new mascot. It was not a cut-and-dried decision, though. A bill had to get passed to allow such a vote. Askew, however, threatened to veto any bill on a new election at Escambia High after what happened in February over the "Rebels" and "Raiders." Askew approved an investigation led by state attorney Curtis Golden on the police response during violent outbursts at the school, but he did not want to take legislative measures affecting the school either way.²⁵⁵ Askew had his hands tied:

²⁵⁵ "Askew Orders EHS Probe," *The Pensacola Journal*, February 13, 1973, Accessed April 4, 2015.

on the one hand, he wanted to continue to improve race relations in Florida; on the other hand, he did not want a long, drawn-out conflict to continue any more than it already had.

On June 10, 1977, a bill passed in the legislature that allowed students to vote in a new election. Students would have the opportunity to vote for a new mascot at the beginning of the 1976-1977 school year. Nevertheless, the “Rebels” was nonnegotiable and the students had to follow new school policies and regulations from their newly issued student handbooks, *Student Rights and Responsibilities*. The school board worked closely with the Pensacola-Escambia Human Relations Committee and the local community to create a unitary school system. This would give students a voice while working to quash these race riots, boycotts, and school walkouts once and for all. The students chose the “Gators” for their new mascot. There were grumbles here and there, but the violent and nonviolent protests were coming to an end. The campaign against the latest mascot, “Patriots,” united African Americans and whites in an unexpected way; that is, they could not agree on much, but they could agree that they did not like the school board making such decisions without including them. A lot of the school’s tensions in the 1970s came from African Americans not willing to accept relics of the all-white Escambia High, but white students felt just as powerless in the process. Ironically, the school board thought that bypassing the students in the mascot decision would placate the students when it actually enraged them. In the end, Gators would be

a new start for the school. That was the idea, and a lot of people were ready for this race war to be over. The New South seemed to have prevailed, but that does not mean everything ended happily ever after.

The Ku Klux Klan tried to hold a rally on Escambia High school grounds at the end of the 1976-1977 school year. The group wanted to show its support for the "Rebels," and invited families to join the rally on July 26, 1977, for a "peaceful gathering, for the entire family," according to Klan spokesman John Cohran.²⁵⁶ The Klan intended to show the film *The Birth of A Nation* and have grand wizard of Louisiana David Duke give a speech, but the school board voted against it in a 6-to-1 vote on July 13.²⁵⁷ Racial tensions at Escambia High were defusing by 1977, and it did not make sense to test the waters now. It is also important to bear in mind that many of the students who were caught in the original crossfire between the "Rebels" and "Raiders" were graduating. After all, a lot of the fuss over the mascots started in the 1972-1973 school year. By the 1977-1978 school year, none of the students had attended the school when the "Rebels" was the mascot. In other words, tensions at the school began to diminish over time because a new student body had insubstantial ties with "Rebels" and "Raiders." Also, the school's diversity became more apparent in the late 1970s. That is why, among

²⁵⁶ "Escambia School Board To Mull High School Rally Request," *Ocala Star Banner*, July 12, 1977, Accessed April 4, 2015.

²⁵⁷ "Klan Banned From School," *Lakeland Ledger*, July 14, 1977, Accessed April 12, 2015.

other reasons, the school board voted against having the KKK on campus: its presence would risk re-opening wounds that were just beginning to heal.

Escambia High's mascots each tell a broader history of Florida that is lost in the Sunshine imagine. Florida has been praised for being a moderate state surrounded by Deep South states upholding the Southern Manifesto with vigor. However, the mascots at Escambia High evoke a history of Old South Florida spearheading the Southern Manifesto with the Pork Choppers running the show. They were the "Rebels," "Raiders," and "Patriots." Now, they are the "Gators." The mascots are an apt illustration of the switch from the Old South to New South in Florida. The race riot over the mascot's name change on February 5, 1976, was the height of the racial tensions. There were serious racial tensions that needed to be addressed at Escambia High, or things were only going to get worse. School board chairman Gindl knew students needed to be given a voice; Hughes, the quarterback, knew they needed to quash this by finding some kind of middle ground with a new vote; and race relations committee member Hunt, whose house was burned down by arsonists, was another one who clearly understood the severity of the matter. Once the students became the Gators, the name stuck because the students got to vote on the mascot; the original students involved in the "Rebels" vs "Raiders" mayhem were graduating from the school, and there was a new, increasingly diverse, student body at the school. Basically, enough time had passed to make the mascot issue less relevant.

By the 1980s, most of the coverage on Escambia High focused almost entirely on the school's sports. Future NFL Hall-of-Fame inductee Emmitt Smith was a high school football player at Escambia High who dazzled everyone with his prowess in the 1980s. He eventually moved on to the University of Florida, and he was drafted into the NFL his junior year in 1990.²⁵⁸ His larger-than-life success tells a different kind of story, and he became the pride of Escambia High. His positive story as a successful African American who had a humble background overshadowed the negativity of Escambia High's racial tensions.²⁵⁹ Race relations have improved in the Escambia-Pensacola area, but there are still issues today, most of which involve complaints about racial profiling and discrimination against African Americans.²⁶⁰ Community leader and journalist Robin Reshard summed up a hopeful attitude about the future that echoes back to lessons from which we can learn from Escambia High: "I think Pensacola's going in a great direction. . . . I think that people across ethnic lines are having discussions on race. It makes the government and public officials realize that people are talking and it can help . . . [us] work in a good direction."²⁶¹

²⁵⁸ "Emmitt Smith,." Biography.com. Accessed April 12, 2015.

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

²⁶⁰ Scott Satterwhite, "InWeekly," *Pensacola Independent News*, July 17, 2008, Accessed April 12, 2015.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

Book Reviews

R.S. Deese. *We Are Amphibians: Julian and Aldous Huxley on the Future of Our Species*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2015.

Reviewed by Ryan Thompson

Although this state's economic development (narrowly construed) savants may not know or readily acknowledge it, their favored technocratic panaceas are at the tail end of a train of historical antecedents. Their drive to promote reductionism, from specialization of knowledge to the erasure of biological complexity, goes back much further than the ascendancy of Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) education or the proposed conversion of state parks to a model in which at least some parks would “pay their way” *or else*. To consider our world under the inspiration of the brothers Julian and Aldous Huxley as abundant in paradox and latent with potential is to consider the past as Julian, the older of the pair, came to view a breakthrough

of human social evolution: as consciousness becoming aware of itself.

Julian's view of evolution and the impressions of numerous other subjects that he and his brother recorded in their prolific and public intellectual lives were not fixed frozen in them at birth during the Belle Époque. Unlike Deist naturalists who believed in what R.S. Deese in *We Are Amphibians: Julian and Aldous Huxley on the Future of Our Species* describes as "a Newtonian sense of design and equilibrium in the universe," the Huxleys' ideas of nature were as fluid and instinctive as the movements observed in the protean class of vertebrates mused upon in the passages at the book's epigraph. (93) Deese likewise deftly adopts the same muse, moving through his narrative amphibiously (reaching back in his story to Francis Bacon and Aldous and Julian's grandfather T.H. Huxley and forward to Transhumanism) without being tediously clever.

While Deese is not fatally serious about his subjects – he playfully describes the haughtiness that these sons of the parvenu were prone to – his book yet again tolls the alarm bells warning of the follies of unmitigated human exploitation of the planet. While he states that his mode of telling their story is a combination of biography and cultural history, one of his signal accomplishments is interpreting the sometimes nebulous (for instance, locating signs of environmental ethics in Aldous's early fiction of the 1920s rather than simply acknowledging his more direct articulations in later works from the 1950s and 1960s) significance of their thought in anticipating, as Deese states, "major elements in the

quasi-religion of postwar environmentalism.” (104) The book also pairs well, chronologically and thematically, with other works that finds deeper roots in the phenomenon of “human potential” than conventionally assumed postwar origins, such as Robert Love’s *The Great Oom: The Improbable Birth of Yoga in America*. As such, this book could be categorized under environmental history as much as any other subfield. Yet, perhaps the very inclination to subdivide and label is antithetical to the broad contribution of the Huxleys’ lives and the amphibious way in which Deese tells of them. He establishes that their lives are memorable in part because Julian and Aldous had an “instinctive defiance of specialization,” which is implicitly instructive to readers subject to pressures toward specialization and other centrifugal social/technological forces in the modern age. (38)

Deese subtly demonstrates how the Huxleys’ thought contained contradictions- not only between each other but also within themselves and in dialogue with, for example, their uncle’s vehement separation between biology and morality. Altogether, watching their ideas converge and diverge between and within themselves and in direct contact with overarching patterns such as the dawning awareness of the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the earth’s ecology and the World Wars on the likelihood of utopia and possible technical and spiritual solutions to such problems form a microcosm that gives shape and color to what otherwise could be a slog through the relatively arcane for some readers. “While T.H. Huxley’s vision,” according to Deese

in a passage that highlights the insights that can accrue in character-driven history, especially when documents are plentiful across generations, “of creating a new ecology in an alien landscape reflected the confidence of a colonialist age, the works of his grandsons reflected the anxieties of the late colonial era and even presaged, especially in the case of Aldous, the new anxieties and the new possibilities of the dawning postcolonial age.” (53)

That microcosmic presentation of history, insofar as Deese succeeds in doing so here, allows for a concise (an ideal that constantly poses illusory security to the historian) summary of the intellectual, spiritual, and psychological bases of the environmental crisis and correspondent proposals for emergent relationships between people and other beings.

Adrienne Monteith Petty. *Standing Their Ground: Small Farmers in North Carolina Since the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Reviewed by Madison W. Cates

Although numerous studies of the American South explore the ways that “race trumped class” in the Jim Crow era, historian Adrienne Monteith

Petty's work *Standing Their Ground* explores the linked struggles of small farmers in eastern North Carolina from the Civil War to the present. *Standing Their Ground* differs from other monographs that place the racial barriers to African American farmers' progress at the center of their analyses. Instead, Petty posits that historians should consider how structural forces in the South's political economy undercut small farmers' desire for the "agrarian ideal" of self-sufficiency through land ownership across racial lines (4-6).

In this study, Petty takes a long chronological view in analyzing the lives of eastern North Carolina's rural yeomanry over the past 150 years. Her analytical framework raises important questions for Southern historians by privileging the common struggles of farmers as a class over their racial divisions. To her credit, Petty is proactive in addressing potential critics by stating that her purpose is not to "diminish racism," but instead to suggest that "racism...proved damaging for all American farmers" (6). Thus, *Standing Their Ground* offers trenchant insight into how the experiences of small farmers reveal a series of shared struggles with global shifts in agriculture and capitalism over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Each chapter focuses on key conflicts between the interests of upper-class whites and small farmers after emancipation. For example, Petty shows how large landowners utilized policies such as stock laws to undermine the viability of tenant farmers and small landowners in the late nineteenth century. To complicate the notion that the early

twentieth century represented the “nadir” of race relations, Petty notes that farm ownership increased by around sixty-five percent between 1880 and 1920 (29, 53-54). Instead, “the antidemocratic milieu of Jim Crow” buttressed by New South boosterism wrought drastic, economic consequences for small farmers of all races through exorbitant interest rates and the closing of the “open range” (61, 74, 85). As a result, Petty connects broader trends in the regional political economy with small farmers’ everyday struggles for independence in a compelling way.

Next, *Standing Their Ground* tackles the sweeping changes in twentieth century agricultural life in a concise, yet thorough manner. Petty quickly moves from explaining how the Agricultural Adjustment Act’s (AAA) committee structure and the G.I. Bill promoted the interests of large landowners to the emergence of “factory farming.” As North Carolina industrialized during the 1950s, such efforts at “smokestack chasing” combined with cuts to federal acreage allotments and the rise of capital-intensive agriculture shifted production away from small farms (161-171, 178).

Petty’s argument is most compelling when she utilizes oral histories and letters to local newspapers to depict the indignation and sense of lost autonomy experienced by North Carolina’s class of sharecroppers and small farmers during this time. By also employing copious archival collections and government reports, *Standing Their Ground* helps connect historical trends between the local, state, and national levels. Economic reports from state

and national government agencies and political leaders' correspondence underscore the broader political climate that threatened small farmers' independence. This mix of sources bolsters the interpretation here even as Petty's long temporal lens forces her to consolidate larger discussions into a concise narrative.

The weaknesses of *Standing Their Ground* are few and far between. This vast chronology often gives some chapters a more grassroots focus while others seem more top-down. For example, in many of the early chapters, the author's focus is primarily on local responses and struggles. However, some later chapters, such as the one on the G. I. Bill's effects, emphasize quantitative evidence showing the constraints imposed by larger economic and political forces. Also, the book's examination of Lumbee Indian farmers seems inconsistent. Although this may result from a paucity of available sources, there is too little attention, outside of the Introduction, paid to the trials of this third racial group that made up the class of small farmers in southeastern North Carolina.

Standing Their Ground adds to the growing literature on the agency, resistance, and political struggles of small farmers in the rural South after 1865. This work makes an important contribution to a historiographical shift in Southern History that values the material experiences of everyday people across the color line over arguments about abstract notions of *de jure* versus *de facto* segregation. As a result, this work inserts fresh questions into well-worn conversations about race and class in the Jim

Crow South. The relative merits of this unique analytical framework should spur new research and conversations among scholars and students of Southern History for years to come.

Lawrence Wright. *In the New World: Growing Up With America, From the Sixties to the Eighties*. New York: Vintage, 1987.

Reviewed by Holland Hall

Lawrence Wright, staff writer for *The New Yorker*, admits that his new book, *In the New World: Growing Up With America*, aschews the usual purpose of memoirs to celebrate individuals who accomplish unprecedented feats or navigate particularly challenging circumstances. Rather, Wright uncovers the extraordinary that is inherent in what may initially seem ordinary. One such example is exhibited by an exchange from *the Sixties to the Eighties* “is neither a formal history nor a straightforward memoir, but a half-breed offspring of both genres” (310). His hybrid approach to exploring an era began the author had with his father’s friend—the family doctor—who insisted that he help Wright evade the Vietnam War draft by fabricating his medical reports. Wright later understood that this sort of dialogue was commonplace among those privileged with a route to circumvent the draft,

which he blatantly casts as “a large conspiracy to keep white middle-class kids out of the war” (172).

Through his exposé of an especially turbulent era, Wright emboldens readers to critically engage their own individual and unique histories as he demonstrates that history need not be narrowed to a stringent sequence of events. Rather, Wright demonstrates that history in its most comprehensive sense encapsulates the individual and collective experiences of you, me, and the billions of people who have circled the sun before us. By providing his own unique life experiences and illustrating how national and international events shaped his perspective of the rapidly changing times, Wright paints a political and cultural landscape of this New World—the postwar America that was celebrating much anticipated peace and prosperity. Yet this New World lost its luster in November 1963, in the city where Wright was living at the time: Dallas. As history is usually told through an impersonal perspective, the leisurely reader will indulge in one man’s highly personal recollection of one of twentieth century America’s most defining moments. Likewise, historians interested in how the shifting sociocultural tides influenced the baby boom generation will also be able to utilize this memoir.

With *In the New World*, Wright has put his finger on the pulse of an entire city embroiled in controversy as both international and domestic scrutiny mounted in the wake of John F. Kennedy’s assassination. The author recalls, “It was right after lunch. I was in Algebra” (63). Although a seemingly insignificant recollection, Wright demon-

strates that nearly everyone who was alive during Kennedy's assassination can pinpoint where they were when the news reached them—thus illuminating the impact of an extraordinary event on ordinary people. This nuanced use of personal memory encourages readers to contemplate their own experiences regarding the defining historical moments of their own lifetimes; again one of the most enthralling aspects of his work.

Wright reinforces the argument that the rapid availability of household television sets heavily influenced the public's reception of candidates during the 1960 campaign, and he uses Dallas's populace as a useful example of this trend. Dallas's general consensus regarding Kennedy consisted of an air of loathing according to Wright. He explains that the president's New Frontier administration was indicative of the national schism between "East Coast liberalism" and "the political culture in the South and West," yet the bitterness the city expressed toward the Kennedy celebrity was rather a result of envy and awe in light of the aristocratic and "cultured" nature of the Kennedys (31). And although scholars have debated the motivation behind Kennedy's assassination, Wright explains that many Americans at the time took to the "Dallas-killed-Kennedy argument," which was based on the premise that "the community hated Kennedy so much that Oswald felt licensed to act out our fantasy" (69).

Although the generation that birthed the baby boomers seems to have welcomed this New World, Wright explains that he remembers his com-

ing of age as having the façade of “heaven on earth,” but that this supposed suburban utopia felt more like “living inside a plastic bag” (115). Wright’s ambivalence about this New World, however common, was not universal: baby boomers approached their coming of age with various perspectives. Not all boomers and not all conservative-born Dallasites embraced the New Left with the same enthusiasm as Wright or viewed their society as a suffocating “plastic bag.” Yet the effectiveness of this hybrid between memoir and formal history lies within the author’s ability to use details from his own life experiences to demonstrate how the political and cultural conflicts of this era affected his generation. One of his most poignant assessments of the era explains how even “complications of etiquette” encouraged him to question his own origin and possible destinations in this New World, as demonstrated by “the adolescent white boy on a city bus wondering if he should surrender his seat to an elderly black woman loaded down with arthritis and shopping bags” (36). While Wright is ambiguous as to whether or not this is a personal anecdote, he expresses his awareness that racial tensions went beyond the obvious marches, sit-ins, and protest speeches.

Carl A. Zimring. *Clean and White: A History of Environmental Racism in the United States*. New York University Press, 2015.

Reviewed by Tim Blanton

The image of a raised jug of yellow, lead-filled water in silent protest of Flint, Michigan's water crisis is a powerful symbol. Naturally, in a predominantly African American city such as Flint, the question is whether or not race played a significant role in the current crisis.

In an enlightening new book, *Clean and White: A History of Environmental Racism in the United States*, Carl Zimring offers an explanation for Flint without referring directly to the crisis. Zimring argues that environmental inequalities in the present are historically connected to shifts in white identity. *Clean and White* reconstructs the cultural conflation of whiteness with health, hygiene, and cleanliness in the nineteenth century and shows how such constructions altered patterns of urban settlement and labor in the United States well into the twentieth century. In other words, Flint is not an aberration; it is a pattern.

The core concern of the book is to excavate the cultural and social processes that made environmental racism possible. But what is environmental racism? Zimring endorses a definition that highlights exposure and exclusion. Communities of color, especially African Americans, are deliberately

targeted for the siting of landfills and incinerators, exposed to poisons and pollutants at greater rates, and disproportionately perform jobs in the waste industry. These communities are also frequently excluded from actively shaping the policies that directly affect them.

When it comes to offering a historical explanation for environmental racism, Zimring goes for the long ball. Beginning with Thomas Jefferson's ideal of a clean republic without cities, Zimring argues that the language of scientific racism, combined with the rise of sanitation standards across the United States from 1820-1865, gave birth to the vocabulary of racial "purity." White skin became discursively cleaner and healthier than black skin. The most convincing evidence for this is Zimring's deft use of popular soap advertisements, which claimed the power to turn black skin white. The public's increased confidence in science and methods of public health at the end of the Civil War makes it difficult to deny the basic assumption of the ads: black skin was somehow dirtier, less healthy, and prone to pollution.

The final chapters of *Clean and White* make the case that this cultural belief had profound social consequences. Urbanization and industrialization produced unprecedented amounts of waste in the wake of the Civil War. African-American and immigrant populations performed a majority of waste-oriented tasks such as scrap recycling and garbage collecting. However, by 1920 this situation began to change. The Great Migration brought larger numbers of African Americans to cities like Chicago.

After World War II, immigrant groups such as Jews and Italians, who built successful companies in the waste industry, escaped cities for the anodyne suburbs. These groups achieved whiteness; their success allowed them to escape to cleaner and more natural urban peripheries. Inner cities predominantly populated by African Americans are the results of this process. More vulnerable to policies of industrial zoning and the placement of waste facilities, the brunt of environmental inequalities affects African Americans.

The key argument of *Clean and White* is that shifting cultural constructions of whiteness shaped the social reality we recognize today. And in this regard it does not disappoint. By excavating past cultural constructions, Zimring persuasively highlights how such constructions took new structural forms. With that being said, it would have been nice to see a stronger emphasis and clearer explanation of intersectionality as a concept and method. For example, how do class and race intersect at the crossroads of culture and social form? *Clean and White* does not offer a clear answer.

Overall, *Clean and White* is worth the read for anyone interested in environmental and urban history, as well as the history of race. And the timeliness of *Clean and White* cannot be overstated. Zimring's history brings a disturbing depth to headlines about Flint and the growing list of all-too-similar cities.

David La Vere. *The Tuscarora War: Indians, Settlers, and the Fight for the Carolina Colonies*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Reviewed by Jessica Taylor

David La Vere's *The Tuscarora War* is a long-needed treatment of a conflict which drastically altered Indian politics in the southern Piedmont and nearly destroyed the English colony of North Carolina. Structured as eight overlapping biographies of Tuscarora and European men integral to the unfolding military action between 1710 and 1713, *The Tuscarora War* is a heavily narrative-driven book which explains how South Carolina slavers, North Carolina partisans, and Virginia elites together took on the powerful Tuscarora Indian nation, “a cork blocking North Carolina's expansion west,” to destroy their autonomy, trading status, and diplomatic ties with more powerful nations like the Iroquois (16). At the book's conclusion, after enduring as many as three thousand casualties and losing an unknown number of women and children to enslavement, surviving Indians across the Carolinas learned that “colonial forces were not going to accept any peace or abide by any treaty until their Indian enemies were broken and enslaved. There could never be a peace among equals as Carolinians” (179).

La Vere opens with North Carolina's fractured politics on the eve of the war, and the corresponding land pressures, violent conflicts, and regional instability that caused strife between young Tuscarora warriors and their hesitant, conciliatory leaders. Emerging from a partisan civil conflict between Quakers, old settlers, and "Proprietary men," colonists like Swiss religious leader Christoph Von Graffenried lost everything while Indian slaver James Moore and military leader John Barnwell accrued personal fortunes in the resulting melee through the accumulation of Indian land and Indian slaves (75). In the meantime, young Tuscarora men and Iroquois emissaries from the north realized "There would never be a better time to cut off the North Carolina settlers" and advocated violence, including the famous execution of explorer John Lawson (75). Tuscarora leaders like Tom Blount and King Hancock, pressured by the Iroquois, Virginians, South Carolinians, and their own councils, were forced to choose sides. La Vere thoroughly discusses blow after blow, from the plans for the first Tuscarora attack on Pamlico settlers in 1711 to the final, technologically sophisticated defense of the Tuscarora fort Neoheroke in 1713. The author is at his best when he crosses colonial lines, following the Tuscarora diplomats up to Pennsylvania on their search for sanctuary from the North Carolinians and tracing the Seneca from Pennsylvania into the French territory and New York in their search for weapons and alliances. Such thorough research reveals that the far-reaching networks and resources of native peoples dwarfed the colonists' relatively

provincial, stopgap tactics. The war concluded when English-allied Tuscarora and South Carolina planters enslaved the enemy Tuscarora, destroyed their towns and forts, and annihilated smaller enemy native groups like the Pamlico and Bear River for good measure. The English-allied Tuscarora, its leaders rewarded with Carolinian-backed authority, were forced onto reservation lands as tributary Indians.

Readers looking for a discussion of the racial dynamics implicit in this story, or a historiography in military, colonial, or Native American history, will not find it; instead, La Vere's altogether informal and fast-paced style will draw in students and lay readers beyond academe. For historians, this book serves as an excellent prelude to the Yamasee Wars and an introduction to South Carolina's devastating Indian slave trade, topics of growing importance in the historiography of the early American South. The book also adds to the thin literature about North Carolina and neighboring Indian nations, which is oftentimes lost in the historians' intense focus on South Carolina and Virginia as the progenitors of the antebellum slave system. For all readers, *The Tuscarora War* highlights Tuscarora ingenuity in contrast to the inefficiency, corruption, and weakness of North Carolina's deeply divided government. Its greatest strength is the exciting and tangible evidence—ineffective weaponry, desertion, dithering commanders—military history offers.

Notes On Contributors

Brent Cornett graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in History from the University of Florida. He will be applying to Law Schools throughout the Southeast. He is also expecting his first child in March.

Chelsey Hendry graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in History from the University of Florida in May of 2016. She will be beginning her graduate studies in August of 2016 in the University of Florida's Master of Arts in Latin American Studies program as a Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellow. Her regional focus is on the Caribbean, particularly Haiti. She is particularly interested in the topics of slave demography, race and class, as well as national identity. In her free time, Chelsey enjoys reading, cooking, and practicing chandlery.

Luke Jeske is a senior majoring in history and minoring in Russian as well as Central and Eastern European Studies. He enjoys his involvement with UF's chapter of Phi Alpha Theta History Honor So-

ciety and the internship program provided by UF's Center for European Studies. Luke also participates in UF's triathlon club; he is on track to win the individual title for the Florida Collegiate Triathlon Conference this year. He is particularly interested in Russian history and the themes of social institutions, empires and symbolism in culture.

Onur Muftugil is a student in the PhD program in political science at University of Florida. He focuses on political theory and comparative politics in his studies. His research interests concern the Islamic revival in the post-colonial world, the philosophy of human rights in relation to culture and concepts of diversity and pluralism in contemporary democratic theory.

Lauren Amos is entering her senior year at the University of Florida. She is a History major with a public leadership minor. She hopes to go to law school after she graduates.

