Historical Perspectives Vol. 24 2019

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/historical-perspectives

Part of the History Commons

Recommended Citation

Available at: https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/historical-perspectives/vol24/iss1/1

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Historical Perspectives: Santa Clara University Undergraduate Journal of History, Series II by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.
Cover:
Naum Pavlovich Karpovsky, "Glory to the Soviet Troops, Hoisted the Banner of Victory Over Berlin!" 1945
The *Historical Perspectives* Peer Review Process

*Historical Perspectives* is a peer-reviewed publication of the History Department at Santa Clara University. It showcases student work that is selected for innovative research, theoretical sophistication, and elegant writing. Consequently, the caliber of submissions must be high to qualify for publication. Each year, two student editors and two faculty advisors evaluate the submissions.

Assessment is conducted in several stages. An initial reading of submissions by the four editors and advisors establishes a short-list of top papers. The assessment criteria in this process, as stated above, focus on the papers’ level of research innovation, theoretical sophistication, and elegance of presentation. No one category is privileged over the others and strengths in one can be considered corrective for deficiencies in another. The complete panel of four editors and advisors then votes on the final selections. Occasionally, as needed, authors may be asked to shorten or edit their original submissions for re-submission.
# Table of Contents

**Introduction** ................................................................. i

**Acknowledgments** .......................................................... iii

**Hadrian’s Divinity: Overcompensating in Athens**  
Brandon Schultz ............................................................... 1

**“To hell with the Constitution!”: How Theodore Roosevelt Acting Abroad Undermined Progressive Reforms at Home**  
Liam Byrnes ................................................................. 16

**A Bubble of the American Dream: Experiences of Asian students at key universities in the midst of racist movements in Progressive-Era California**  
Chang Woo Lee ............................................................... 40

**Shifting Perceptions of Americanization: Progressive Era Press Coverage of Italian Immigration**  
Phillip Barber ............................................................... 59

**Racism and Radicalism: Minority Responses to the Conflation of “Immigrant” with “Radical” in The Progressive Era**  
Marie Fagetti ............................................................... 74

**Medicine Infected by Politics: The American Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934**  
Cooper Scherr .............................................................. 91

**Eleanor Roosevelt, Setting the Stage for the Future**  
Haley Butler ............................................................... 123

**The People’s War: A Chronological Look at the Great Patriotic War Through the Lens of Soviet Propaganda**  
Nick Ellis ................................................................. 136

**Leaders and Players: The Role of Jazz Artists as Civil Rights Activists**  
Jonathan Claridad .......................................................... 153

*Historical Perspectives, Series II, Volume XXIII, 2018*
“Women Supporting Women”: How San Jose Became the Feminist Capital of the World
Maggie Oys.-----------------------------------------------163
Introduction

Santa Clara University’s Phi Alpha Theta chapter publishes a carefully selected group of essays annually for the History Department’s journal, *Historical Perspectives*. These papers are written and edited by students, with the help and advice of the History Department staff and professors, as products of advanced seminars and student conducted original research, representing the highest levels of achievement in the department. This journal reflects the rigor, ingenuity, creativity, and commitment to academic pursuits and the examination of history from varying perspectives by Santa Clara University’s students and the History Department. We received many excellent research paper submissions this year and would like to thank all who submitted papers for review and the faculty members that assisted students with their work. We are very pleased to present to you the 2019 edition of *Historical Perspectives*.

This year’s edition contains predominantly politically focused articles, reflective of the interests and passions of Santa Clara students among an increasingly politically polarizing environment and history courses and seminars offered within the last year, such as Protest and Activism, The Soviet Experiment, and the Progressive Era. Within the theme of politics; however, the essays vary in their focus. Some center on political protest and propaganda while others home in on key historical figures and their political and social effect on history across time and continents. Students analyzed the United States’ history of immigration through varying perspectives and contexts, the intersection of music and civil rights, and the historical politicization of medicine. The papers in this journal range across the political and historical timeline from the careful political examinations of the former Roman emperor, Hadrian, who ruled in the 2nd century AD, to the equally critical and detailed research and analysis of 20th century American political figures, Theodore and Eleanor Roosevelt. The papers presented address elements of *
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race, gender, religion and especially, identity, throughout various examples of the human experience that we as historians study and examine. While also spanning many countries and time periods, a majority of the articles display a connection between key events in history and current political events and discussions.

Due to the overarching theme of politics included in this edition’s papers, we felt that the cover art for this year’s journal should reflect these sentiments. The piece we chose is a Soviet propaganda poster from Nick Ellis’ paper, “The People’s War: A Chronological Look at the Great Patriotic War Through the Lens of Soviet Propaganda.” The striking image reflects the undertone of propaganda highlighted in many of the papers in the journal.

This year’s contributions to *Historical Perspectives* demonstrate the critical thinking and analytical skills that our students have developed and polished during their time at Santa Clara University, and their ability to apply these skills to current worldwide issues. Our students recognize and value the connection between the past and the present, understanding the crucial importance of the study of history by analyzing the connections between major events in the past and their current effect, influence and repercussions on the current context. In an age where understanding politics is becoming increasingly critical to engaging with both the past and present, this year’s submissions illustrate the political and historical consciousness that Santa Clara University student’s possess and are constantly striving to improve through their continuous education and exploration of the past, in order to better understand the present.
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Hadrian’s Divinity: Overcompensating in Athens

Brandon Schultz

“You don’t give me good advice, my friends...when you don’t allow me to believe the man who possesses thirty legions to be more learned than anyone else!” once remarked the prominent rhetorician Favorinus after his friends chided him for conceding to Hadrian.¹ Keen to flex his intellectual prowess, Hadrian had criticized a word Favorinus used, and rather than defend himself against this charge—as his friends wished—Favorinus simply capitulated, acknowledging Hadrian’s unimpeachably supreme status in the process. In fact, in his remark to his friends, Favorinus highlighted how Hadrian’s military power granted him primacy in most matters—even those outside the typical purview of military and political affairs. Serving as emperor from 117 to 138 CE,² Hadrian relished and, most importantly, maximized his preeminence to overhaul the Roman Empire. However, despite his worldly supremacy, the realm of the divine continued to outrank him. While Roman emperors traditionally enjoyed a deified status after death, leaders like Hadrian needed to maintain divisions between their mortal rule and the trappings of full divinity in order to avoid dreaded monarchical associations—a fact that clashed with Hadrian’s Hellenistic obsessions. Fortunately, Hadrian found the ideal outlet for his Hellenism and divine pretensions in the Greek city of Athens. With his massive building programs throughout the empire, Hadrian managed to replicate the grandeur of the Hellenistic leaders he admired, and particularly in Athens, his building programs allowed him to pursue his divine self-styling while simultaneously spreading and consolidating Roman influence. Specifically, Hadrian’s divine pretensions and hunger

² Ibid., 61-83.
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for supremacy led him to renovate Athens, spread his own ruler
cult, and strengthen the entire Roman empire.

Hadrian’s Hellenism
Crucially, Hadrian’s fascination with Greek studies and
Hellenistic beliefs informed his divine pretensions and
construction pursuits as emperor. As a young boy, Hadrian,
according to biographer Aelius Spartianus, “immersed himself
rather enthusiastically in Greek studies—in fact he was so attracted
in this direction that some people used to call him ‘little Greek.’”
Hadrian’s passion for Greek culture became such a defining
feature of his character that he earned a memorable nickname to
commemorate his interest in the subject. Before his military and
political career even properly began, he zealously studied and
absorbed information regarding the Hellenistic period, where
influential Greek culture reigned dominant and people worshipped
their rulers. Tracing the effects of this early enchantment with
Hellenism in the relics from Hadrian’s rule, historian and
archaeologist Anthony Richard Birley noted that

> a bronze statue of Hadrian, slightly over life size, has been
found [in Syria Palestina]...the torso may, indeed, have been
reused and could once have belonged to a statue of a
Hellenistic king—it would have been peculiarly appropriate
if the head replaced by that of Hadrian had been that of
Antiochus Epiphanes.

Rather than simply imitate Hellenistic design, this large
construction apparently relied on the actual figure from an older
statue of a king from that period, so the addition of Hadrian’s face
to the project literalized Hadrian’s obsession with and desire to
replicate Hellenistic culture. Moreover, Birley’s speculation that

---

3 Ibid, 57.
the initial statue depicted Antiochus Epiphanes, who sought to unite an Asiatic empire on a foundation of Greek ideals,\(^5\) further illuminated Hadrian’s similar aspirations. Ultimately, Hadrian exhibited a fierce devotion to Hellenistic stylings that continued through the constructions of his imperial reign.

Of course, Hadrian’s Hellenism not only satisfied his stylistic preferences—it also encapsulated his sweeping vision for both the empire and his rule. As historian W. Den Boer asserted in his analysis of Hadrian’s Hellenistic inspirations, Hadrian’s “passion [for imitation] was not just arbitrary; it was consciously made to serve his ideal of consolidation of ideas and customs, forms and contents, and of welding together the nations of the unified empire which he ruled.”\(^6\) For Den Boer, Hadrian emulated—and, in some cases, reused—Hellenistic art because it reflected his dreams of unifying the empire in the style of the older kings and the Greek cultures he studied and admired. By imposing a cohesive approach to design and thought throughout the empire, Hadrian could fulfill his almost divine aspiration to mold the vast empire in accordance with his own Hellenistic vision.

Exposing a darker interpretation of these plans for the Roman Empire, classical scholar Francis R. Walton pointed to historian W. Weber, who concluded that Hadrian’s “despotic striving towards the divine in all the world, the self-enhancement of his mysterious power, its setting forth for show in the image of the highest god of the Greeks and Romans, tokens of his intoxicating illusionism.”\(^7\) While Weber’s debatable characterization of Hadrian’s Hellenistically inspired actions portrayed the emperor as primarily narcissistic and tyrannical, it most notably highlighted the divine pretensions evident in Hadrian’s religiously infused building


\(^7\) Francis R. Walton, “Religious Thought in the Age of Hadrian,” *Numen* 4, no. 3 (1957): 165-66.
projects and designs. In pursuing upgrades inspired by his Hellenism, Hadrian displayed a belief that he, like a deity, could consolidate the empire with a shared culture that virtuously strove toward self-improvement and the divine, prompting him to seek construction opportunities to express his divine self-stylings.

**Roman Emperors: Walking the Line Between Ruler and God**

However, Hadrian’s efforts to operate like the divine in his building projects conflicted with the nature of the imperial office and the post-death deification process. In his historical account of Severus’s death in his *History of the Empire*, Herodian described this process: “it is normal Roman practice to deify emperors who die leaving behind them children as their successors. The name they give to this ceremony is apotheosis.”

Traditionally, Roman emperors—assuming a decent rule—became deified upon death, and intriguingly, the Romans called this process apotheosis. This name indicated that emperors only achieved their highest status after death, when they could finally receive worship and godlike treatment from the people. Further describing the deification ceremony, Herodian related that “then from the highest and topmost storey an eagle is released, as if from a battlement, and soars up into the sky with the flames, taking the soul of the emperor from earth to heaven, the Romans believe. After that he is worshipped with the rest of the gods.”

Evidently, an emperor’s deification ceremony featured enrapturing pyrotechnics and potent symbolism, with the eagle representing the movement of the emperor’s soul from the mortal realm to that of the divine. The nature of this tradition also cemented the idea that emperors achieved their divine statuses only after their deaths. For an emperor like Hadrian, who enjoyed his primacy and also enthusiastically studied the divinely worshipped Hellenistic rulers, this unfortunate relationship between death and deification

---


9 Ibid., 383.
inhibited his divine pretensions. To accomplish his sweeping vision for the empire, Hadrian needed to leverage the godlike power of his office while living.

Unfortunately for Hadrian, the Roman people maintained a high level of distrust for rulers who associated themselves too closely with the gods. Detailing this phenomenon, Paul Zanker, an expert in Roman art and archaeology, explained that “for the Romans, the gods were used like poetic epithets, an intellectualized formulation of virtues, not, as in Hellenistic art, as the direct realization of the divinely inspired ruler.”10 In terms of imagery, emperors needed to appear as virtuous and mortal citizens—not gods on earth—and Hellenistic art clashed with these values, encouraging ruler cults and portraying rulers as possessing divine characteristics. For Romans devoted to avoiding the tyranny of a self-deified autocrat, rulers with overt connections to the gods, such as those created through Hellenistic art, posed a threat. For example, in his description of Caligula’s decline, historian Suetonius noted a dangerous transformation in the emperor’s public appearance, revealing that Caligula “even dressed up as Venus, and long before his expedition he wore the uniform of a triumphant general, often embellished with the breastplate which he had stolen from the tomb of Alexander the Great.”11 Beyond posing as a deity, Caligula also wore Alexander the Great’s armor, recalling the divinity of both Alexander and the later Hellenistic rulers. These public actions exposed Caligula’s divine self-stylings, encouraging rebellions against him and exacerbating his downfall. Emperors who overplayed their Hellenism and divine pretensions repudiated tradition and thus met violent fates, so inspired rulers like Hadrian needed to carefully implement their visions.

Despite the public’s animosity toward rulers with divine pretensions, Hadrian and the other emperors, as rulers, benefited from some divine associations, distinguishing themselves amongst the population. As historian P. A. Brunt noted in his discussion of the emperor’s divinity, “the assertion that he was divine did not, however, exclude the possibility that he was also inspired, protected or chosen to rule by the gods, or by Jupiter in particular.” Naturally, given the tremendous power of the imperial office in Roman society, the emperor relied on some form of religious authority in order to rule, so he enjoyed implicit benefits from divine approval. That said, the emperor could also intentionally leverage these associations to boost his own power—a technique Augustus perfected. When Phraates returned the standards to avoid conflict with Rome, Augustus, according to Dio, “took great pride in the settlement” and “gave orders that sacrifices should be voted in honour of his success and that a temple for Mars Ultor, in which the standards were to be dedicated, should be built on the Capitol in imitation of that of Jupiter Feretrius.” Strategically, Augustus transformed the celebration of the recovered standards into an opportunity to praise his rule and appreciate his associations with the gods. In addition to housing the standards in a new temple, Augustus ensured that the public associated their religiously significant retrieval to his abilities as a ruler, so that when people thought or witnessed the standards, they would also consider Augustus’s divine achievement in reclaiming them. This strategy boosted Augustus’s power and influence, demonstrating to Hadrian how rulers could meticulously manipulate divine associations to maximize their authority—a technique he would employ in his Eastern building programs to further unite the empire under his divinely styled rule.

Like Augustus, Hadrian recognized the inherent divinity of the imperial office. Analyzing the godliness of the emperor, archaeologist and Ancient Rome specialist Paul Veyne revealed that “the word ‘god’ did not have the same meaning in pagan antiquity as for Christians; to pagans it meant a being on a higher plane than mortals, but not transcendent like the giant Being of the monotheisms...Therefore calling a man a god was hyperbole but not nonsense.” According to Veyne, in antiquity, the term god could simply refer to someone elevated above mortals, and since the emperor clearly enjoyed a higher authority and status than most mortals, the ancient definition of god seemed fitting. In the mold of Augustus before him, Hadrian understood the tremendous power of his position, thus he grappled with the fact that, practically, he functioned as a godlike figure in Roman society, especially in terms of concentration of power. This followed the advice given to Augustus that Dio attributed to Maecenas: “while any distinctions which you grant to others do honour to them, nothing that is voted to you can give you a higher rank than you already possess, and it would be hard to dissociate a suspicion of falsity from the very act of bestowing it.” The emperor enjoyed the highest status available to mortals, so—as Maecenas cautioned—an emperor groveling for further distinctions would appear petty and needlessly indulgent. This advice helped Augustus expand his concept of the imperial office, prompting him to maintain the necessary divisions between the mortal and divine realms while simultaneously wielding an unprecedented, virtually godlike amount of power. In this regard, both Hadrian and Augustus learned to embrace the natural supremacy of their position to fulfill their visions for bettering the empire. Consequently, by leveraging the full authority of his monumental office, Hadrian could dramatically transform the empire with a power akin to that of a deity.

Building Programs as Coded Expressions of Divinity

Although his nuanced understanding of the imperial office led him to leverage the implicit authority of his position, Hadrian still sought to pursue his Hellenistic plans for the empire and his reign, prompting him, like Augustus, to enact several large-scale building programs. As Walton noted, “Augustus, too, as is well known, in his attempt to revive Roman religion had relied heavily on the psychological effect of restoring the ruined temples of the long-neglected gods. Here Hadrian carried on the policy established by Augustus.”16 Charting the similarities between the two emperors, Walton highlighted how Hadrian adopted Augustus’s policy of spreading Roman influence through the restoration of ruins. By revitalizing and embracing the deities of older time periods and foreign lands, Augustus and Hadrian ingratiated themselves, and the Roman empire, with new communities, thus boosting Rome’s prominence and clout. According to classical scholar Mary T. Boatwright, a core component of Hadrian’s building programs involved his work on remodeling distinguished Hellenistic temples, which gained sufficient donations because they related “to the Roman proclivity for large-scale projects...and to Hadrian’s own architectural interests,” leading to designs that “plainly [recalled] temples planned by Hermogenes and other Hellenistic architects.”17 For Hadrian in particular, these building programs offered the ideal opportunity for him to pursue and propagate his Hellenistic interests throughout the empire. Moreover, through the act of commissioning new construction in a decidedly Hellenistic mold, Hadrian managed to work toward satisfying his vision of consolidating the empire under his own personal stylistic preferences and ideals. Befitting his singular status, Hadrian—through his building programs—literally shaped the empire’s landscape.

Naturally, Hadrian’s building programs and Hellenistic ideals converged at Athens, where the emperor found himself directly interacting with a principal site of the culture he so greatly admired. Describing Hadrian’s storied relationship with the Greek city, Birley reported that “Hadrian liked Athens,” and “Athens, in turn, liked Hadrian. He was invited to become an Athenian citizen, and, when the offer was accepted, was made a member of the deme Besa.”\footnote{Birley, \textit{Hadrian}, 63-64.} Apparently, the Athenians reciprocated Hadrian’s enthusiasm for their culture with citizenship and neighborhood membership. Furthermore, in Athens in 112 CE, “Hadrian was then elected \textit{archon eponymus}—in other words, was to hold the ancient chief magistracy, and the Athenian year would take his name.”\footnote{Ibid., 64.} So, by the time Hadrian became emperor, he had already fostered noteworthy connections with Athens. In fact, the prestigious honorifics he received, such as the chief magistracy position, indicated that Hadrian actually improved the quality of life for the Athenians, making them especially susceptible to his later building program.

Pointing to another reason why the city marked the ideal site for Hadrian’s Hellenistic building efforts, archaeological scholar T. Leslie Shear Jr. referenced Athens’s pre-Hadrian depression, asserting that “when Hadrian’s extensive building program at Athens is set against the background of century-long depression…the enormous outlay of imperial funds for lavish buildings takes on its proper proportion as a truly staggering reversal in the city’s fortunes.”\footnote{T. Leslie Shear Jr., “Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town,” \textit{Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens} 50, no. 4 (1981): 372-73.} Given Athens’s painfully long depression, Hadrian’s grand decision to utilize the empire’s funds to rejuvenate the city certainly enhanced his status among the Athenian community. Like the Hellenistic kings that intrigued him, Hadrian mobilized his considerable economic power to rebuild and renovate the depressed Athens in hopes of restoring the city to its
former glory. Through this construction, Hadrian managed to both enhance the empire’s influence in the eastern territories and entertain divine pretensions by realizing his Hellenistic aspirations.

One crucial aspect of Hadrian’s building program in Athens involved the measured introduction of Roman design elements into the Greek cityscape. Noting the emperor’s devotion to Greek culture, Shear reflected that Hadrian’s “architects adorned the city with the most Roman of Athenian buildings...There is here at work the eclectic spirit which could fuse together disparate elements of the two classical cultures and through that fusion could produce the distinctive cultural amalgam of the High Empire.”21 Despite Hadrian’s Hellenistic obsessions, Shear found that the emperor’s building programs bore significant evidence of unquestionably Roman design. Of course, Hadrian’s ability to blend the distinct cultures of his empire and his favorite subject of study accorded with his Hellenistically inspired ideals of consolidating and unifying the land he controlled. By blending cultural designs, Hadrian spread Roman influence while respecting the original culture, further ingratiating himself in Athens.

In addition to the mixture of styles, the building program also emphasized the decadence of Hellenistic art. The geographer Pausanias, who visited the city during his travels, described how “Hadrian constructed other buildings also for the Athenians...most famous of all, a hundred pillars of Phrygian marble...And there are rooms there adorned with a gilded roof and with alabaster stone, as well as with statues and paintings. In them are kept books.”22 Through this account, Pausanias provided a basis for comprehending the scope and grandeur of the building program in Athens; his description of the fine, luxury materials that composed this library and other buildings captured the likely costliness of the project. Ostensibly, Athens allowed Hadrian to indulge his Hellenistic self-stylings as an unequaled and massively influential...

21 Ibid., 377.
ruler through the construction of extravagant edifices and public facilities. Through these lavish Athenian building programs, the powerful Hadrian, like a deity, dramatically altered life in Athens while implementing the unifying effect of his Hellenistic vision, bringing the empire further under his control.

Building Hadrian’s Godhood in Athens

Beyond the conspicuous luxury of his buildings like the library, Hadrian’s emphasis on revitalizing religious constructions contributed to his growing influence as a practical god in the Eastern, Hellenistically inspired regions of the empire. In particular, the Arch of Hadrian, another critical piece of construction, revealed the emperor’s deepening religious relationship with the city. On the subject of the Arch’s inscriptions, historian Alison Adams asserted that “on the architrave of the east and west facades...the usual translation is: on the west—(a) This is Athens the ancient city of Theseus; and on the east—(b) This is the city of Hadrian and not of Theseus.”23 According to Adams, the Arch’s inscriptions simultaneously honored Athens’s original dedication to Theseus and commemorated Hadrian’s newfound ownership of the city. Most notably, the inscriptions also placed the mortal Hadrian beside the classical hero Theseus, further solidifying Hadrian’s proximity to the divine. Moreover, in her analysis of the significance of the Arch’s inscriptions, Boatwright suggested that since “east of the arch no new Hadrianic “city” or city quarter has been discerned, and west of the arch the “ancient” city bore Hadrian’s imprint,” then “the inscriptions make a fallacious distinction: Hadrian’s Athens is inseparable from what came before.”24 Supporting Adams’ interpretation of the meaning of the Arch’s inscriptions, Boatwright further illuminated the comprehensive scope of Hadrian’s building program, for he rebuilt the city while respecting the original design, making his Athens

24 Boatwright, Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire, 147.
“inseparable” from its predecessor. Once again, Hadrian—in his divine-like striving toward unity—preserved as much of the original culture as possible while imposing his own sensibilities through the building program.

Despite the Arch of Hadrian’s evidence of the emperor’s Hellenistic achievement, the Olympieion, a massive temple for Zeus, was perhaps the most religiously potent project for Hadrian in the entire Athens building program. According to classical archaeologist R. E. Wycherley, construction on the temple began roughly 650 years before Hadrian,25 who began finishing the remaining work around 124/5 CE and finally dedicated the entire construct in 131/2 CE.26 Due to this extremely lengthy construction period, Hadrian’s completion of the project signified a long-unrealized goal for the Athenians, enhancing his already imposing stature in the city. During his visit to the site, Pausanias described the temple and its statue as “one worth seeing, which in size exceeds all other statues save the colossi at Rhodes and Rome, and is made of ivory and gold with an artistic skill which is remarkable when the size is taken into account.”27 The immense temple impressed even the well-traveled Pausanias with its sheer size and rich materials, and Pausanias also recorded Hadrian’s noticeable connection to the temple, reporting that “before the entrance...stand statues of Hadrian, two of Thasian stone, two of Egyptian.”28 Evidently, Hadrian’s contribution to the Olympieion merited commemorative statues of fine material to honor the Roman emperor and the impetus he provided to finally finish the project. In response to these figures and other dedications, Wycherley argued that “the Athenian response, shown by innumerable dedications on this site and elsewhere, was not mere sycophancy. Many Athenians must have felt a truly pious pride

---

26 Ibid., 173.
28 Ibid.
and pleasure in seeing the age-old debt to Zeus at last so fully and handsomely paid.”\textsuperscript{29} Avoiding more obligatory and passionless dedications, Hadrian seemingly won the hearts of the Athenians through his building project—especially at the Olympieion—prompting the Athenians to celebrate him with a sincere affection.

While the completion of the Olympieion greatly endeared Hadrian to the Athenians, the temple also possessed dramatic implications for Hadrian’s own divinity and power. In his analysis of religion during Hadrian’s reign, Walton acknowledged that “after completing the Olympieion at Athens [Hadrian] even assumed, or accepted, titles appropriate to Zeus, and was styled Olympios, Panhellenios, and Panionios.”\textsuperscript{30} Removed from the shifty animosity toward divine rulers in Italy, Hadrian seemed to embrace a decidedly divine status in the wake of the Olympieion’s dedication. Abandoning his pretenses to simply associate with the gods, Hadrian freely accepted the divine titles the people of Athens lavished upon him for rebuilding their city. In fact, after exploring the nature of Hadrian’s other temples to Zeus, historian Barbara Burrell revealed that Hadrian “diverted worship offered to himself into cults of Zeus” and that he “was worshipped in those places neither with nor as Zeus: the enormous temples...were all dedicated to the worship of Hadrian himself, who showed no undue modesty in accepting such tributes.”\textsuperscript{31} According to Burrell, Hadrian attempted to disguise worship of himself—especially in the East, where such practices occurred with greater frequency—through the worship of Zeus. While Hadrian associated himself with Zeus throughout his reign, Burrell asserted that Hadrian relied on Zeus merely as a front for his own ruler cults to worship him as divine. This information matched Walton’s description of how Hadrian accepted divine titles after the construction of the Olympieion, indicating that Hadrian’s renovation of that temple also fit into his

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{29} Wycherley, “The Olympieion at Athens,” 174-75.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Walton, “Religious Thought in the Age of Hadrian,” 168.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
larger pattern of using temples dedicated to Zeus to satisfy his divine pretensions. Astoundingly, Wycherley also found evidence of this scheme, quoting Edward W. Bodnar, who claimed “so great was Hadrian’s achievement that the claim of Zeus to the building faded long before the emperor’s.”  

32 This detail further cements Hadrian’s exploitation of Zeus’s temples for himself. While Hadrian pursued Hellenistic designs in his building programs, he also craved the worship administered to divine kings, and away from the Italian peninsula in the comfort of his recently rebuilt Athens, Hadrian embraced his divine pretentions.

However, by transforming Athens into a Greek center for his own worship through the building program, Hadrian also strengthened the empire. Classical scholar Anna S. Benjamin found that “under Hadrian the cult of the emperor in the Greek world was closely associated with the emperor's program of Panhellenism...and Hadrian's willingness to accept divine honors and his encouragement of Panhellenism have, among many complex motives, the common purpose of the consolidation of the empire.”  

34 By pursuing self-aggrandizement through massive spending and construction projects, Hadrian elevated Athens, and—most notably—strengthened the Athenians’ connection to the empire by making himself a figure of intense admiration and even worship due to his public works. As a result of building programs including his work in Athens, Hadrian further bolstered the empire in accordance with his unifying, Hellenistically inspired ideals and divine longings.

Ultimately, Hadrian’s desire for supremacy and his divine pretensions led him to renovate Athens, spread his own ruler cult, and strengthen the empire. As the emperor, Hadrian already

enjoyed tremendous, virtually unparalleled power, but, as his enthusiastic Greek studies revealed, other rulers, such as the Hellenistic kings, had benefited from superior, divine connections, which Hadrian could not fully leverage until after the deification process at his funeral. For Hadrian, these Hellenistic rulers served as models, informing his personal visions of unifying the empire under his consolidating ideals. Of course, Roman emperors needed to avoid overt displays of Hellenistic connections to the divine, but strategic rulers like Augustus—and Hadrian—learned to maximize the implicit authority and supremacy of the imperial office to enact their agendas while also benefiting from mere associations with the gods. In this mode, both Augustus and Hadrian relied on building projects to boost support for their rule and for the empire itself. With his enthusiasm for Hellenism, Hadrian’s building project in Athens became particularly noteworthy. Rescuing the city from a century-long depression, Hadrian began spending lavish money on impressive and inspiring buildings made of fine materials. Crucially, these new constructions blended Roman styles with the original Greek designs, satisfying the native tastes while also expanding the Athenians’ familiarity with the empire. Hadrian also staked his claim to the city with the Arch of Hadrian and the completion of the Olympieion. The Arch of Hadrian declared that Athens now belonged to Hadrian, and the Olympieion, a massive temple for Zeus, served as an immense source of pride for the Athenians and as an opportunity for them to shower Hadrian with adoration, divine titles, and even worship—which Hadrian accepted. In the East, Hadrian seemed to embrace his divine pretensions, spreading his ruler cult and thus further consolidating the empire under his reign.
“To hell with the Constitution!”\(^1\)

How Theodore Roosevelt Acting Abroad Undermined Progressive Reforms at Home

Liam Byrnes

Theodore Roosevelt is remembered fondly as one of the greatest American presidents. He stepped into office as the youngest president in American history in the first year of a new century. Exuding youth and ingenuity, he brought hope to the American people. Extremely opinionated, bombastic, and fixated on ideals, Roosevelt garnered America’s attention, becoming the “first president to be treated as a media personality,” although such is all too familiar today.\(^2\) The power residing in the Oval Office had been mostly silent in the previous half century and Roosevelt’s youth and character brought new energy and grandeur to the office. In Roosevelt, the United States had not only a President, but a celebrity.

The aftermath of the Gilded Age gave necessary rise to the Progressive Era, in which historians revere Roosevelt as a champion. Progressive politics demanded new instruments like commissions and regulations to protect people from the unbridled industry of the modern age. Roosevelt wielded these Progressive instruments as extensions of his office, adding unprecedented powers to the executive branch. These powers would not be limited to domestic politics, as the United States emerged as a new global industrial force with untested international power and influence. Theodore Roosevelt’s unbridled popularity allowed him to revolutionize the American presidency and significantly pursue an international agenda in direct conflict with contemporary American Progressivism. Americans today, as those in the past, ignore such contradictions at their own peril.

---
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A celebrity in his ‘bully pulpit’, Roosevelt led an internationally immature and tentative nation into an unstable global arena in pursuit of adventure. To turn his words against him, one cannot “by insisting on the impossible, put off the day when the possible can be accomplished.” Roosevelt chased an impossible world peace while neglecting domestic social issues that, with his attention, might have been solved. In neglecting necessary domestic progressive reforms he put off a higher quality of life for the common Americans as well as the pursuit of civic peace, a goal to which he ironically referred as “our bounden duty.”

Such policy would lead Senator Bob La Follette (R-WI) to stipulate at the looming of the first World War, “under a pretext of carrying democracy to the rest of the world, we have done more to undermine and destroy democracy in the United States than it will be possible for us as a Nation to repair in a generation of time.” Yet, new power, immense popularity, and a Republican dominated Congress gave Roosevelt free rein over the nation’s new position of growing international influence. As he expanded executive power, he ignored Congress. The United States had been acting gingerly abroad for nearly a decade when Roosevelt set a new course: his own. In that previous decade, Grover Cleveland, with Congressional approval, had strengthened American coastlines but yielded when Congress pulled the reins. William McKinley timidly exercised the Monroe Doctrine in “splendid little wars” that met opposition. A structured international system seemed to be on the horizon but juvenile America knew it was not yet ready.

4 Ibid.
In 1896, Lord Salisbury mildly ventured, “a system of arbitration is an entirely novel arrangement... it would be wise to commence with a modest beginning, and not to hazard the success of the principle by adventuring it upon doubtful ground.”

Even a modest beginning proved to be too much. Despite support from Cleveland and McKinley, Congress rejected the Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty put forward in 1897 that would bring the United States into European affairs. Executives and their administrations pushed but “opinion was not yet ready at that time to go as far as Secretary Olney was anxious to go,” and opposition held, for the time.

The only opinions forty-two-year-old Roosevelt cared for were those holding him in high regard. Roosevelt’s charisma and immense popularity put him above much criticism. He truly was a celebrity. That status, combined with bombastic confidence, led him to venture well onto doubtful ground and “brush aside the isolationist tradition” that his predecessors had respected.

As an accidental president following the assassination of President McKinley, Roosevelt started slowly in his ventures and, originally, kept at least one eye on public opinion. One year into his presidency, Roosevelt was asked to arbitrate the Venezuela Crisis. The public responded vehemently within days: Senator Shelby Moore Cullom (R-IL), Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, brought to Congress “a large number of telegrams” in “emphatic protest” of arbitration. According to The New York Times, the opposition was “based mainly on the apprehension that some contingency might arise which would seriously involve the United States in the case the President should become arbiter.”
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affair, public opinion maintained overriding influence on the forty-two year old Bull Moose. Isolationism held as tradition for a bit longer.

Imperialist debates were not merely of political concern, but were widespread in elite social circles, popular newspapers, and the common people’s church. As overseas economic opportunity tempted big business, the debate was riddled with questions concerning morality and the undermining of American values. Both sides argued that international action either promoted or denounced American ideologies. Imperialists asserted that involvement was necessary for the good of humanity. In the words of Roosevelt, “No triumph in peace is quite so great as the supreme triumph of war.” Anti-Imperialists, however, denounced the “the bleeding ulcer in the Philippines” to which the United States had contributed.14 Mark Twain declared that Philippine intervention had “stained the flag” while William Jennings Bryan “would not exchange the glory of this Republic for the glory of all the empires.” 15

TR’s popularity grew as he settled into the presidency. Americans held him in high esteem for a multitude of reasons: he claimed to be a northern, a southerner, a westerner, and proudly an American. He was a statesman, a gentleman, and a frontiersman, “like Paul Bunyan, a folk hero, the quintessential American.”16 TR possessed the public trust and respect in unrivaled fashion (image A). Proud and aggressive, he exuded demi-god status in every situation — domestic and international — and he absolutely loved being the center of attention.

Roosevelt was elected in his own right in 1904 with the greatest popular vote in American history.17 Believing the victory spoke for itself, Roosevelt no longer yielded to Congress (image

---

B). Future endeavors occurred without Congressional consultation or approval. Roosevelt acted and Congress followed, or so he thought. Swept up in Roosevelt’s grandeur and hope for American prominence on the international stage the people looked on in awe. Like their president, they ignored Progressive failures affecting daily domestic life. As Samuel J. Tilden put it, Roosevelt promised “a situation to vindicate our reputation and interests,” eclipsing the true Progressive movements. Though Roosevelt revered the “strenuous life” he turned away from the most difficult domestic challenges and sought international adventure wherein he abandoned Progressive values of democracy and liberty.

Armed with four more years and national celebrity status, the confident TR set out, beginning with the Panama Affair. In seeking an Isthmian canal for the benefit of American trade and naval movement, TR undermined the Colombian sovereignty that the United States had promised to uphold in the Bidlack Treaty of 1846. Without consulting Congress, Roosevelt ordered the United States Navy to prevent Colombian forces from landing troops to quash the rebellion. This rebellion, aided by Roosevelt, established the independent nation of Panama. Without consulting Congress, Roosevelt immediately recognized Panama as a sovereign nation. In return, Panama gave the United States full control over the construction of the Isthmian Canal. The Monroe Doctrine was intended as an instrument of protection for South American neighbors from European manipulation. Yet as soon as policy removed European influence, Roosevelt’s America stepped in to fill the void. Progressivism intended to celebrate democracy for all, yet Roosevelt applied this maxim only to “civilized nations of the world.” In South America, the United States did as he pleased (image D).
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Roosevelt asserted that the United States “scrupulously respected the rights of all other peoples” acting “in a spirit of genuine disinterestedness, of genuine and single minded purpose.”21 Senator David B. Hill (D-NY), however, cited the “lawlessness… displayed in the Panama Affair” in which Roosevelt “did violate plain treaty obligations, plain international usages, and the Constitution of the United States.”22 The Monroe Doctrine and Roosevelt’s Big Stick Diplomacy simply put a new face on the bully of “uncivilized nations” (image E). Charged with taking “Panama without consulting the Cabinet”, Roosevelt later attempted to explain his actions to his cabinet members.23 When he asked if he had defended himself, Secretary of War Elihu Root responded, “You certainly have. You have shown that you were accused of seduction and you have conclusively proved that you were guilty of rape.”24

The United States desired an Isthmian canal but wanted it attained in a democratic fashion, not as the product of a breached treaty and an aided revolution that setting precedents for, in Congress’ mind, unconstitutional, undemocratic intervention. Desire for the Canal came mostly from big businesses that sought access to global markets for their surplus goods. Economic motivation is a legitimate reason for naval bases and trade protection but can’t justify the great increase in battle cruisers amidst a lack of growth among the merchant marines, which exists solely to protect American commerce.25 There is undeniable correlation between these Naval expenditures and Roosevelt’s status as former Secretary of the Navy. Naval expenditures rose from $22 million to $139 million in twenty-four years while
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domestic Progressivism struggled for funding and support (image F).

This growing naval strength led Indiana Republican Senator Beveridge to pronounce, “We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient” where limitless markets lay. America would do so by declaring “the Philippines are ours forever.” He justified his blatant rejection of constitutional values on the basis that the Filipinos “are not of a self-governing race” and that white westerners were by God’s decree “master organizers of the world.” Roosevelt shared a similar sentiment. Senator Bob La Follette, however, regarded the affair disdainfully with steadfast progressive concern: “If the Lord would only let us out of the Filipino mess... we might in the course of time pay off the own to the black man.”

Debate and question spread beyond the political arena. Even at the height of Roosevelt’s popularity The New York Times questioned if international intervention was “dangerous to our peace and safety?” Americans feared the possible implications and affects that lay ahead should this kind of intervention continue. Senator Hill called the “…executive precedents begun by him [Roosevelt] most inconvenient and damaging to our future democracy.” The international arena was unstable as European imperialism, and the strife that went with it, spanned the globe. Anti-Imperialists viewed intervention as ‘unnecessary as it is unjust.” New England minister Reverend Charles Ames brought imperialist fears to his congregation: “The policy of imperialism threatens to change the temper of our own people, and to put us into a permanent attitude of arrogance, testiness, and defiance towards other nations ... Once we enter the field of international
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conflict as a great military and naval power, we shall be one more bully among bullies. We shall only add one more to the list of oppressors of mankind.”32 Such fears found manifestation in the likes of Senator Beveridge.

Roosevelt crusaded on, ignoring Congress and parading the Colombian affair as a victory. “In Panama we are successfully performing what is to be the greatest engineering feat of the ages, and while we are assuming the whole burden of the work, we have explicitly pledged ourselves that the use is to be free for all mankind.”33 Here Roosevelt begins to ascend his “bully pulpit” to a new level. With a self-aware celebrity status, he knew that, despite some public criticism, he had the nation’s ear and used it to its full extent.

Though he could manipulate the masses with his rhetoric, Congress and prominent Anti-Imperialists continued to raise their voices. They expressed not just disdain or disagreement but real fear of Roosevelt’s trajectory and where it would ultimately lead. “Are we ready to undertake the task of enforcing good behavior on our Latin neighbors to the south in order to guarantee ourselves against undesirable complications with European Powers?” asked The New York Times34 Beyond the Panama Affair, international action meant interaction with European nations that held great economic and military power, yet were greatly inconsistent, hubristic, and reluctant to share power. Roosevelt eagerly stepped onto this stage where lofty ideals were only sporadically applied.35

Public sentiment noted that Roosevelt acted alone and beyond the limits honored by previous presidents. The nation’s founding instilled a wariness of unfettered executive power. TR was setting a new precedent. Put simply, Roosevelt’s character in the White House worried some, and his growing “follow-the-
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leader” attitude didn’t quell those worries. Again, it wasn’t only inside politicians who expressed such concerns. In the first year of his elected term The New York Times urged, “We very much doubt whether the Senate is now prepared to follow the President so far as perhaps he would be ready to go. Mr. McKinley, we think, would have been at pains to make sure that the Senate would accept and support any policy he might have formulated in the pursuance of such a design. If the Senate would not have followed, he himself would have come to a halt. Not so Mr. Roosevelt. He has made the venture alone.”36 Roosevelt took no time to consult or to debate, ignoring the basic tenets of democracy that the Progressive movement aimed to perfect. According to the British statesmen Lord Morely, Roosevelt “‘was America”, yet it was Progressive values that were truly American, values that took the Constitution to heart and sought a “more perfect union,” not an empire.37

Roosevelt was indifferent to such concerns, stating defiantly: “I took the canal zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the canal does also.”38 His tactic proved successful in Panama, but Congress would soon use its check to reign in Roosevelt. In the first months of 1905 Congress stood firmly against the president. Secretary of State John Hay introduced a debt plan for Santo Domingo that the “Senate saw only as a gross violation of the Constitution, an egregious abuse of executive authority.”39 Along with the debt proposal, Roosevelt presented various European arbitration treaties. These treaties were so amended by the Senate that Secretary Hay withdrew them from debate on behalf of Roosevelt, forcing Roosevelt to admit that the United States was unwilling to enter into European treaties.40
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It’s shocking that this rejection of treaties was not the end of Roosevelt’s aggressive efforts in foreign affairs. Alas, the self-proclaimed “Bull Moose” never stayed still long enough to be held accountable (image H). By staying in constant motion he kept Congress where he wanted them—always trying to catch up. Roosevelt took on Russo-Japanese Arbitration, no longer willing to bow to Congress as he had in 1902. His efforts in Russo-Japanese Arbitration culminated in the Portsmouth Treaty, ending the conflict and making him the first American recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. The Prize eclipsed 1905’s arbitration failures and raised Roosevelt from celebrity to demi-god.

His ‘bully pulpit’ never stood stronger and he wielded it well. In a letter penned by Roosevelt and read aloud by Secretary Root to a crowd at Carnegie Hall, Roosevelt espoused a “self-respecting friendship of all republics of this continent” with the goal of “justice and peace throughout the Western Hemisphere.”

Published in the New York Times his message certainly reached the people. And though, “We try to avoid meddling in affairs that our not our concern,” Roosevelt curiously continued to defend American involvements in Mexico, Panama, Cuba, Santa Domingo, and the Philippines. The Nobel Peace Prize brought another arbitration opportunity.

French and German disputes over Morocco in 1906 resulted in the two nations calling upon Roosevelt for arbitration. The settlement totally neglected the sovereignty of Morocco and any respect for the rights of its people that Roosevelt’s public statements claimed to respect. The arbitration not only violated the Progressive values publicly advocated by the President, but constituted further pursuit of an impossible task that “merely gave part of the prologue to a drama which was soon to bring modern civilization almost to the breaking point in the World War.”
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With another arbitration “victory” under his belt, Roosevelt set his sights on a Second Hague Conference. A major aspect of Roosevelt’s popularity among the American people came from a different concern emerging from American entanglement in European affairs. His Nobel Prize was European affirmation of a civilized, genteel, disinterested America. The American peoples’ great concern for European approval added to the grandeur of Roosevelt’s ventures: “‘American Prestige in Europe’… It was a topic too often discussed.” The people loved the respect Roosevelt received which he frequently conveyed to them in his propagandist speeches.

In an address Secretary Root welcomed the people to whom he spoke “as spiritual kindred of those Americans of great heart and clear intelligence who in times past, striving for ordered liberty and the peace of justice in this land, have conferred inestimable benefits upon all mankind…” Roosevelt and his administration resorted to fallacies to coax the people into “abandoning the existing state of very comfortable isolation.” Roosevelt masterfully wove ideals of fortitude, intelligence, and masculinity into his public addresses. This tactic began simply with testaments to “great heart and clear intelligence” but evolved into labeling proponents of the later anti-war movement not only as “cowardly” but as “active agents of the devil.”

Two months before the Hague Conference the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times published articles demonstrating the nation’s unquestioning support of their President. As Roosevelt neared the end of his term the people demanded his future involvement in international politics. A system had been devised that no one could see being perpetuated without the aid of Roosevelt. Truly no one could. Even King Leopold of Belgium,
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famous for his atrocious exploitation of the Congo, kept a signed photograph of Roosevelt framed on his desk.48

The people were told that “it lay in the power of one man to form a League of Peace…” and that the “force of public opinion educated as it is now” was “irresistible” in favor of Roosevelt.49 His administration told the people what to think, encouraged that they were righteous and masculine in those thoughts, and urged how best to manifest those philosophies. Roosevelt posed the problem of world peace, riled up the population, and presented them with the solution- himself. It worked.

One man voiced the sentiment of many: it was “beyond a doubt that President Roosevelt is the choice of the people as his own successor.”50 However, for those respecting precedents regarding a third term, “senator for life” was the recommendation.51 Another recurring suggestion: “If the third term is denied him, the sole purpose should be to place him at the head of the Hague arbitration board, for who else can placate the hostile world?” 52 Even a year earlier in 1906 the Washington Post published “Roosevelt’s Next Task” stating “He will be, we have no doubt, the president of the world’s high court of arbitration…”53

The Second Hague Conference was an utter failure. The conference agreed on little, adopting a few resolutions of no real consequence. In 1905 Professor John Bassett Moore, LLD, a Columbia University professor of diplomacy and international law, anticipated the conference’s failure:

The resort to arbitration is voluntary…the scope and progress of arbitration will depend, not so much upon special devices, or upon general declarations or descriptive exceptions, as upon
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the dispositions of nations—dispositions which, although they are subject to the modifying influence of public opinion, springs primarily from the national feelings, the national interests, and the national ambitions.\textsuperscript{54}

Essentially, arbitration depended upon a nation’s temperament. This reasoning, coupled with the unpredictable state of Europe made arbitration a venture, in Roosevelt’s words, “insisting on the impossible.”\textsuperscript{55} The conference was also far from Roosevelt’s acclaimed Progressive values. It was an international conglomerate of paternalism fueled by idealism, making it the greatest bureaucracy on the face of the earth and as far from progressive ideals as possible. Secretary of Commerce and Labor Oscar Strauss reveled in describing Roosevelt as “the first among presidents, kings, and emperors” (image I).\textsuperscript{56} Such a claim satisfied the American people’s hunger for European approval yet could not have been less American, nor less Progressive.

Just months after Moore’s article was published in \textit{Harper’s Magazine}, \textit{The New York Times} addressed the status of Europe following the end of the Russo-Japanese War (which had earned Roosevelt the Nobel Peace Prize). The article “From the Seed of the Hague” noted:

…all the European Governments of importance have some embarrassing relations to the combatant nations or to the issues involved in the war. France and Britain are allies of Russia and Japan respectively. Germany is an object of certain suspicion as to its ultimate aims with regard to both these nations and to Russia as well. Austria-Hungary is entangled with the possibilities of the Near East as regards Germany and Russia. The other powers are, perhaps, conscious of their modest rank
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and influence, and not anxious to meddle with what may make a disturbance among their more powerful neighbors.  

Is such a state of affairs worthy of a Nobel Peace Prize? Clearly arbitration would not be a viable option, yet Roosevelt pushed for the Second Hague Conference. Despite the United States having their own issues rooted in the Gilded Age, Roosevelt looked to the issues of Europe rooted in centuries of imperialism, which Roosevelt hoped to join. It was an adventure for the “folk hero” and the people loved it. 

Roosevelt’s next wildly expensive and decidedly unprogressive adventure would be the grandest yet. Just two months after the end of the Second Hague Conference, the “Grand Fleet” cast off the Atlantic Coast for a global tour. Lasting from the end of 1907 to 1909, the fleet cost roughly $96,606,000, according to the U.S. Naval Institute. The motive for the trip was pure vanity. The United States had suffered economic downturn yet still funded the “Grand Fleet” at the expense of the people and potential progressive reforms, including civil rights for women and African Americans, workers’ rights and safety, and health crises. Roosevelt’s passion for battleships and foreign respect was unyielding. With the fleet at sea, the people “watched the horizon for signs of foreign admiration” and were fed sanitized stories of fantasy: “in 1908, the public was told a success story matched only by the novels of Horatio Alger.” As was his custom, Roosevelt reported exaggerations and propaganda to please the people and maintain his course.

Roosevelt’s presidency finally ended. One American believed that Roosevelt, as a patriot, could not decline the call of his people to remain in service, yet Roosevelt did decline. Roosevelt had led the nation on a grand adventure of diplomacy
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only to step away from the helm at a vital junction. “Pride was not absent in Senator Henry Cabot Lodge’s statement to Roosevelt: ‘We are putting terrible pressure on Europe, and this pressure may produce war at any time.’”61 This last action heightened international militarism and armament. Through years of arbitration Roosevelt had established himself as a keystone of the international community only to disappear on an African hunting trip after a last splendid stir of the pot.

It’s ironic that Roosevelt would set so many new executive precedents and ignore half-century-old treaties and traditions, yet upheld the oldest executive precedent that applied less to him as he was only elected once. However, he had pledged to do so out of respect for democracy and the nation. Roosevelt, a proud student of history, should have been quite aware that his larger-than-life personality could not be successfully followed by the likes of Taft. Roosevelt, not the President of the United States, had become the settler of international affairs (image J). Once he was gone, arbitration and its hope for peace were too. Arbitration had been hastily extended beyond its natural scope, then abandoned. Roosevelt had often acted alone, making multiple facets of government uniquely dependent upon him.

The unpredictable nature of arbitration might have prevailed had Roosevelt stayed involved. Perhaps Roosevelt’s dynamic personality and popular support could have supported the League of Nations, although in view of Congressional track record on arbitration treaties, neither the world nor the American people were ready. Neither Taft nor Wilson had the ability or gall to stand against Congress, or foreign powers, or to so empathically reach the people.

Upon leaving office Roosevelt stated, “Well, I’m through now. I’ve done my work. People are going to discuss economic questions more and more: the tariff, currency, banks. They are hard questions, and I am not deeply interested in them; my problems are
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moral problems, and my teaching has been plain morality.”

Roosevelt played the people, big business, and the world to teach his morality. It was his world. He boasted, “No other president every enjoyed the presidency as I did.” However, this enjoyment was at the detriment to international stability, American democracy, and the American people.

Many of the Progressive Movement’s greatest achievements came when Roosevelt was out of office and the Senate was able to turn its attention back to legislating, not chasing an imperial president. Some of Progressivism’s greatest failures came in the midst of his presidency. Roosevelt’s second term ignored the Niagara Conference, the Brownsville affair, the Atlanta race riots, the organization of labor unions, railroad reform, and economic depression amidst financing of the Grand Fleet. While Roosevelt arbitrated the Russo-Japanese War and earned the Peace Prize, W.E.B. Du Bois fought for the basic rights of African Americans in the Niagara Conference to no avail. The year of the Algeciras Conference saw the Brownsville Affair and Atlanta Race Riots, which Roosevelt omitted from his autobiography. Roosevelt’s attention to these issues could have brought progress. Roosevelt was unyielding. The issues to which he gave his attention, like environmentalism and trust busting, saw progress. Had his energy gone to issues between the coasts rather than beyond, the Progressive Movement would have been more successful by dealing with domestic issues that still plague the United States.

In the end Roosevelt splintered Republican Party and the Progressive Movement ideologically between “internationalism, isolationism, and self-interested nationalism.” Roosevelt’s agenda allowed that, “progressivism could be embraced both by men whose root concern was the assertion of national power, such as Roosevelt and Beveridge… and men who were concerned with
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the preservation of democratic values,” like La Follette, Cullom, Twain, and Revered Ames.65

Without Roosevelt at the helm the nation went back to isolationist tendencies. Neither the people nor Roosevelt’s successors sought international engagements.66 The ordeal had been a personal crusade permitted by his popularity. Senator La Follette represents a true American Progressive, fighting his entire life, and even dying a Senator in the capital, for a more perfect union. Before the First World War, Senator La Follette highlighted the neglect of domestic affairs that began accumulating under Roosevelt: “Are the people of this country being so well represented in this war movement that we need to go abroad to give other people control of their governments?”67 After the war La Follette refused to be seduced by the empty promises residing in the proposed League of Nations, and stuck to the domestic agenda he had been pushing. With the League up for debate in Congress he saw the reality of the situation: “By ratifying this document… we shall involve this country in the quarrels and dissension of Europe for generations to come… [preventing the U.S. from] turning its energies to the solution of its domestic problems without reference to the bewildering imperialism and diplomacy.”68 Such involvement would burden the lower classes that would struggle to fund and be forced to fight in the army- not to mention African American veterans, who had fought for their country and their rights, only to return home to oppression. The country needed domestic peace and prosperity, livable conditions for all its citizens, and for government to truly represent its people.

Secretary Root defended Roosevelt’s foreign affairs just months before the Second Hague Conference:
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It is natural that the altruistic and humanitarian view, broader and less immediately practical, shall be taken by students, and thinkers, by teachers and philosophers,- by men who, not burdened by the necessity of putting theories into practice, are at liberty to look upon the world as it ought to be and to urge mankind on toward acceptance of their ideals.69

Ridiculing the failures of the past is an easy task, yet this is a feeble excuse for imperialism fueled by vanity, racism, and big business at the expense of democracy. It is particularly tragic that senators, ministers, and newspapers were aware of executive missteps and fighting for progress. The study of the undermining of Progressive politics is vital to the state of the nation, its democracy, and the world – all of which suffer repercussions from this era and beyond as nations learn nothing from the vanity, nationalism, and extortion of the past. Privatization of democracy and perpetuation of the unholy matrimony of big business and politics continue to oppress Americans. The Constitution, its values, and the people protected under it must be government’s sole motivation. The Oval Office is no place for enacting subjective moral teachings or for a vainglorious individual; it is no pulpit.
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\textsuperscript{70} All images from Albert Shaw, \textit{A Cartoon History of Roosevelt’s Career} (New York: The Review of Reviews Company, 1910), 19-23.
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THE MAN BEHIND THE EGG—From the Times (New York)

Image D:

THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT: "Say! What's it about?"—From the Herald (Boston)
(Referring to Mr. Roosevelt's efforts to straighten out the finances of San Domingo.)
Image G: [Cartoon illustration with text: “The News Reaches Bogota—From the Herald (New York).”]

Image H: [Cartoon illustration with text: “The Legislative Sidewalk Snowbound. The President’s Message: “Get busy!”—From the Journal (Minneapolis).”]
Image I:

THE MASTER OF THE WORLD
Pope Roosevelt: “All that lies to the left of this mark comes under the American political sphere—and all on the right belongs to American trade.”
From Lustige Blätter
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THE WORLD’S CONSTABLE
Judge, January 7, 1905
A Bubble of the American Dream: Experiences of Asian students at key universities in the midst of racist movements in Progressive-Era California

Chang Woo Lee

One way of summing up the past two years of the Trump presidency is the fight against immigrants: Trump attempted to end DACA and build a wall along the Mexico border. During his presidency, opportunities for legal immigration and visitation became stricter. California leads the resistance against this rising anti-immigrant sentiment as it strongly associates itself with diversity and immigration. Yet, California during the Progressive Era was a hotbed for extreme racism. An influx of Asians, principally Chinese and Japanese, met a hostile reception. Growing anti-Asian sentiment resulted in the exclusion of future Chinese and Japanese immigrants in addition to segregation and restrictions on existing immigrants. Facing strong anti-Asian sentiment, early Japanese and Chinese immigrants endured racism and violence. However, Japanese and Chinese students who entered California universities did not experience overt violence and discrimination. Between 1890 and 1920, Asian students at Berkeley and Stanford not only faced significantly less prejudice and racism, they also enjoyed many academic opportunities comparable to those available to their fellow white students. Their perceived identity as visiting foreigners, rather than aspiring citizens, and their interactions with the American upper class made them less threatening to the California public. However, even these “Model Asians” ultimately found that their privileged status offered only a veneer of protection against the fundamentally oppressive nature of racism.

Experiences of Asian college students during this era are rare in comparison to the studies on the experiences of younger Asian students and laborers. The most comprehensive books on Asian students in college during this era are *Race, Religion, and Civil* Historical Perspectives, Series II, Volume XXIV, 2019
Rights: Asian Students on the West Coast, 1900-1968 by Stephanie Hinnershitz and Seeking Modernity in China’s Name: Chinese Students in the United States, 1900-1927 by Weili Ye. Hinnershitz provides a detailed account of the structural discrimination these students experienced, but does not cover the full range of their experiences. Ye covers the full range of Chinese students’ experiences in American universities, but only focuses on Chinese students studying on the East Coast. By analyzing life experiences of Japanese and Chinese students at Stanford and Berkeley during the Progressive Era, this paper provides a more comprehensive case study of these students and reveals a deeper understanding of the complexities of the anti-Asian movements.

“Asian American,” now common terminology, did not exist during the Progressive Era, and the experiences of the Chinese and Japanese at large differed. The Japanese students experienced better treatment than the Chinese largely due to the rise of the former nation’s international status, especially after the Russo-Japanese War. The clearest example is the federal government’s efforts to block anti-Japanese legislation. When the San Francisco Board of Education tried to ban Japanese students from the public schools, President Theodore Roosevelt blocked the measure, largely in order to maintain a good diplomatic relationship with Japan.1 In contrast, Chinese students were forced into segregated schools.2 However, everyday violence and discrimination in the city experienced by Japanese and Chinese did not differ significantly. By the early-1900s, the anti-Japanese movement combined with the already existing anti-Chinese movement to
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create an anti-Asiatic movement. Significantly, Chinese and Japanese students at Stanford and Berkeley experienced a relative lack of discrimination and violence.

By all measures, strong anti-Asian sentiment prevailed in California throughout the Progressive Era, and both Chinese and Japanese had to endure severe violence and legal restrictions. They were subjected to racial slurs, verbal attacks, beatings, and occasional lynching and massacres. Discrimination was also embedded in the law. Chinese were forced to reside and conduct their business in a very restricted area, and the Japanese faced similar confinement, though to a lesser degree. Moreover, both Japanese and Chinese faced many difficulties in their access to public schools. For many white people, allowing Asian pupils to study in public schools meant the ultimate form of assimilation and permanent residency for Asians in California. Arguing for Japanese student segregation from the public school, San Francisco Call stated plainly, “we are not willing that our children should meet Asiatics in intimate association… That is ‘race prejudice’ and we stand by it.”

Anti-Asian sentiment and violence were not only experiences exclusive to poor Asian laborers but also were felt acutely by many Asian students in California. This was especially true for Chinese students during their travels and entrance to the U.S. As soon as the steamer carrying Fu Chi-Hao, a Chinese student, docked on American soil, trouble began. He faced mistreatment despite having the necessary legal documents. The immigration officers examined his documents for the smallest errors and sent him to a horrendous detention jail, in which many Chinese stayed for weeks or months, without due process, representation, or promise of

---

eventual release. Although Japanese students were relatively free from harsh treatment in the immigration process, they were not free from the everyday violence against Asians. According to Nisuke Mitsumori:

It was March or April of 1905 when I landed in San Francisco… There was a gang of scoundrels who came to treat the immigrants roughly as soon as they heard that some Japanese had docked… There were a group of fifteen to twenty youngsters who shouted, ‘Let’s go! The Japs have come!’ We rushed to the inn to avoid being hit. As we went along, we were bombarded with abuses such as ‘Japs,’ ‘lewd,’ etcetera. They even picked horse dung off the street and threw it at us. I was baptized with horse dung. This was my very first impression of America.6

When they entered the universities after overcoming these initial violent experiences, Japanese and Chinese students still faced racism, though in a much lesser degree compared to the common practice in California. David Starr Jordan, the first Stanford president, was accused of segregation practices in Stanford dormitories, in which all the students of color were quartered in the basement and denied access to the much more nicely furnished upper stories where faculty and white students were quartered.7 In 1909, a Japanese student was attacked at the Berkeley campus by a handful of white students in a racially motivated attack.8 Moreover, the campus social experience of these students and the level of integration reveals subtle but pervasive differences. Both Stanford and Berkeley yearbooks show
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5 “My Reception in America,” Carton 22, Folder 2, Him Mark Lai Papers, Ethnic Library, Berkeley, CA - original document was written by Fu Chi Hao and published by The Outlook, 10 Aug. 1907.
the lack of Japanese and Chinese students’ involvement in campus activities besides having their own clubs. It is difficult to know whether this was due to the cultural difference and their relatively poor English skills or proof of a subtle form of discrimination.

Picture of members of Mechanical Engineering Association at Stanford. The Stanford Quad, 1908.10
(F. Nakayama is the right bottom row. He was one of the very few Japanese students at Stanford whose name and photo could be found outside the Japanese Students Club page in the Stanford yearbooks. The vast majority of student clubs and fraternities consisted of all white male students.)

Nevertheless, this discrimination on campus seems less significant compared to the vast freedom and opportunities Asian students received at these top two California universities. Indeed, Asian students were comparably well received and accepted.11 Despite California public schools segregating their students, Japanese and Chinese students at Stanford and Berkeley studied
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9 The Stanford Quad, 1890-1913, Green Library, Palo Alto, CA; Blue and Gold, 1890-1910, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.
10 The Stanford Quad, 1908, 240-41.
alongside white students. Newspapers often regarded university commencement ceremonies as unique social scenes as they featured Caucasians and Asians together. At Stanford, Japanese students formed a Japanese Student Club, which gained public support from the first university president David Starr Jordan, and also received help to build their own clubhouse. There was also a growing interest in Asian cultures among the college population, and Japanese students and their club at Stanford worked as cultural ambassadors, hosting events like a Japanese tea and teaching martial arts such as Jiu Jitsu. Chinese students at Berkeley established Chinese American Students Club (Cathay Club) in order to “further the understanding between Chinese and American students of the university and included both Chinese and American students in their club leaderships.” Like Japanese students at Stanford, they also featured cultural events like Chinese plays and costume displays.

12 The First Japanese Baseball Team, Unknown, 1907, Box 4, File 8, Myron C Burr Papers, Stanford Library, Palo Alto, CA.
13 “Praise Is Given to Fong Sec,” San Francisco Call, 19 May 1905.
17 “Cathay Club Discusses Chinese Social Manner,” The Daily Californian, 14 February 1911, Doe Library, Berkeley, CA; “Cathay Club Plans to Produce Chinese Play,” The Daily Californian, Doe Library, Berkeley, CA.
Japanese and Chinese students also proved themselves to be highly intelligent by winning competitive scholarships and presidential debates, by participating in Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), and achieving competitive memberships like Phi Beta Kappa and other prestigious attainments. Some were chosen
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18 Jordan is the white gentleman who sits on the center right. Japanese American Students with David Starr Jordan, Box 1, File 6, Toichi Domoto Papers, Stanford Library, Palo Alto, CA.
to partake in the editing of the school yearbook. Others upon graduation went so far as to receive professorships at both Stanford and Berkeley to research and teach Asian languages and histories. Their success stories were all clearly documented in student newspapers in a matter-of-fact tone without signs of prejudice or resentment, and Chinese and Japanese class members were mostly referred to as fellow students or friends. This feeling of friendship and acceptance encouraged some members of the universities to launch pro-Asian campaigns. For instance, Chinese students hosted and played a baseball game at Berkeley to raise funds to provide China with famine relief. Some students and faculty, most presumably white, even launched a donation campaign to build a hostel for a Japanese college in Kyoto to support Japanese students attending the institution to establish greater friendship with students in Japan. Although the campaign received opposition and skepticism on campus and they collected minimal funds, it proves the inviting and accepting atmosphere Berkeley had toward Asian students. Even the opposition voice to the campaign stated their primary reason for objection was that the donation would be made as a gift from Berkeley to the Japanese college as opposed to from private donors.”
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20 “Chinese Youth as Sub-Editor,” *San Francisco Call*, 13 April 1905.
What enabled these students to enjoy much broader opportunities with less discrimination? First, their international student status played a significant role. This status was understood clearly by their home countries, their host country, and themselves. Some Japanese students coming to California were poor student-laborers while others were sponsored by the Japanese government.28 Either way, their primary goal was not to stay in the U.S. but to learn English and Western technologies in order to have a successful career upon returning to Japan.29 Many Chinese students also pursued higher education in the U.S. through their government’s sponsorship. The Chinese government created a

27 This brochure was published and distributed at the Berkeley campus to fundraise the money.
scholarship program to send students to the U.S. specifically to expedite modernization and dictated that 80% of these students study science. These students on scholarship showed a strong commitment to “western learning” and hoped this would enable them to lead the modernization of China. Both Chinese and Japanese students’ journals showed their strong nationalism and patriotism toward their home countries.

Assumptions of their temporary visiting status were visible in both Chinese and Japanese students’ journals. Many writings featured in *The Berkeley Lyceum*, a Japanese students’ journal, stressed the mutual benefits of the good relationship between Japan and the U.S. with a tone that indicates the assumption of future leadership and representation for their country. Similar, *The World’s Chinese Students’ Journal* specifically states, “By educating and preparing in her (U.S.) schools of learning the future rulers of the rising Empire, much of the misunderstanding in the future relationship between America and China will be eliminated…” In fact, Chinese students associations in the U.S. aligned themselves to a larger World Chinese Student Federation in Shanghai.

This international identity of Japanese and Chinese students was understood clearly by the U.S. government and its intellectuals. As the U.S. sought to expand its influence in Asia, it actively recruited Asian youths to study in the U.S. American intellectuals supported the Chinese government to create a scholarship program to United States universities. Their hope was
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33 Chinese Student’s Alliance of Hawaii Records, 1906-1911, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.
that Chinese students would improve the image of the U.S. in their home countries upon their return. The federal government’s active effort to recruit Asian students was made plain in *Admission of Chinese Students to American Colleges* published by the U.S. Bureau of Education in 1909. It responded to strong demands by U.S. diplomats in China and provided students in China with a guideline to navigate their entrance process to American universities. The book provided a comprehensive guide to American higher education structures, academic requirements, major courses and their substitutions, and the special admission processes major U.S. universities provided to Chinese students.  

“Uncle Sam’s barking dogs waking up China,” Chinese Students’ Monthly, February 1910.  
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35 Bieler, 45.
Consequently, many intellectuals were keenly aware that the U.S. universities functioned as potential diplomatic relationship building sites for the U.S. and Asian nations. David Starr Jordan, the first president of Stanford, was fond of Japan and invited prominent Japanese leaders, promoted cultural exchanges, and publicly supported Japanese students and their achievements.\textsuperscript{36} Benjamin Wheeler, Berkeley’s president, wrote a cordial statement for \textit{The Berkeley Lyceum} in which he put Japan and the U.S. on equal footing by demanding that the citizens of both countries learn from each other.\textsuperscript{37} In fact, multiple volumes of the \textit{Lyceum} featured endorsements not only from high ranking Berkeley professors but also from prominent men such as other university presidents, reverends, and even William Jennings Bryan, a respected Democratic politician soon to be Secretary of State.\textsuperscript{38} Jordan also founded the Oriental History Department at Stanford, and Wheeler founded the Oriental Language and Literature Department at Berkeley. Both hired graduating Asian students to teach classes.\textsuperscript{39}

Their temporary visiting status was also clear in the types of employment available to these students. Many Japanese students without government sponsorship worked while they were going to college to cover their expenses, and one of the readily available employment opportunities was as “schoolboy.”\textsuperscript{40} Schoolboys were hired by middle and upper class white families to help with chores including dishwashing, cleaning, preparing meals, and so on. They usually worked in the morning and evening and were excused from

\begin{flushleft}
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9 to 5 so that they could go to school. In exchange for their services, these students received a room and meal at their place of work and also a small sum of money to cover their basic expenses. In places like San Francisco, Palo Alto, and Berkeley, employing Japanese schoolboy was not an uncommon practice. This schoolboy employment was nevertheless a challenge for both parties as most American norms and cultures were completely foreign to these students. Some white families held their racial prejudice toward Japanese students although many others were friendly and kind to these students. The weekly salary of a dollar or two was not enough to cover tuition for college. Running out of money, some of these poor students looked for more promising employment opportunities only to find such opportunities unavailable. These limited types and availability of employment suggest that Asian students had to conform to their international student identity.

Asian students in American higher education were understood by both Asian and U.S. governments as a key to bridging two different worlds. For China and Japan, American-educated nationals were future leaders. For the U.S., they were model Asians who served to quell the anti-Asian sentiments and establish a stronger American influence in Asia. Accordingly, governments, students, and the upper society of both America and Asian countries all shared the assumption that these students would return to their countries. Herbert Johnson writes in the Lyceum:

> It is not likely that a large percentage of the student class will desire to remain permanently in this country. But while they are students they can reveal the best side of Japanese life to the American with whom they come in contact, and they can greatly influence their countrymen who reside here. They
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However, what improved and protected the experiences of Japanese and Chinese students in California Universities even more than their foreign visiting status was their upper-middle-class status. In fact, none of the main reasons anti-Asian forces used to justify violence and exclusion were applicable to Asian students. Anti-Asian groups argued for the exclusion based upon the impossibility of assimilation of Asians to America, their filthiness and lack of morals, and, paradoxically, their industrious characteristics that were unfair to American laborers.\footnote{John H. Boalt, “The Chinese Question,” Aug. 1877, The Chinese Question. A Paper Read Before the Berkeley Club, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA; McWilliams, \textit{Prejudice: Japanese Americans: Symbol of Racial Intolerance}, 17.}

White workers, politicians, and newspapers were the driving force behind anti-Asian movements, which almost exclusively focused on “Asian coolies.”\footnote{K. Kawasaki, “The Japanese Question,” Berkeley Lyceum, 1907, 23, v.1, The Berkeley Lyceum, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA; Roger Daniels, \textit{Asian America} (Seattle: University of Washington Press: 1988), 47.} Therefore, all Japanese and Chinese exclusion laws between 1880 and 1910 specifically focused on poor Asian laborers, but allowed exempted classes like merchants and
students. Even those who favored the exclusion of Chinese coolies still supported “greater freedom in the admission of the Chinese students and merchant classes.”

Moreover, both Japanese and Chinese intellectuals and governments went alongside this class divide. The Japanese government was deeply interested in maintaining a positive national image and worried that the influx of poor Japanese laborers might ruin the image of Japan’s international image. Many Japanese students came from the Samurai class, a Japanese upper class, and felt uncomfortable aligning themselves with poor Japanese laborers. Many Chinese intellectuals also differentiated students and laborers. According to Ng Poon Chew, the editor of the Chinese newspaper in San Francisco, Theodore Roosevelt once promised him “all Chinese laborers and coolies should be excluded, but that all Chinese of other classes should be welcomed.” He used this remark to support better treatments of Chinese students. In the meantime, the usage of the quote also displayed his indifferent attitude toward Chinese laborers.

As the public’s anger and violence toward Asians intensified in the 1910s and 20s, there was a growing sense of appreciation of

Picture of Members of Cosmopolitan Club at Stanford with David Starr Jordan. The Stanford Quad, 1912.

multicultural experiences among educated people, which gave birth to a cosmopolitan movement. In many universities in the U.S., the Cosmopolitan movement gave Asian students distinct places where they could enjoy wielding strong influence and leadership. In Stanford yearbooks, the Cosmopolitan club consisted of multi-racial groups, including many Asian students, and the club’s first meeting stated that its “purpose [was] to learn the customs, viewpoints, and characteristics of different nations, to remove national prejudice and to establish international friendships.”

Significantly, higher education was mostly for middle and upper-class whites. Only about 2.3% of the 18 to 24-year-old population enrolled in higher institutions. Therefore,
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although Asian students faced perceived racial inferiority, their superior social class compensated for this.

Their aspiration to join upper class society and the promise of returning to their home countries gave these students temporary protection against the prevailing overt racial discrimination in California. Consequently, if either one of these two requirements—upper-middle class interactions and foreign visiting status—was violated, Asian students quickly found themselves subject to racism. This was especially true if they decided to stay in the United States after graduation. For instance, Asian students who married white women faced difficulties finding ministers willing to certify their marriages. William Ngong Fong, a Chinese graduate of Stanford and later the first Chinese professor in Berkeley, lost a libel suit against Goldberg, Bowen & Co. for its racist depiction of his marriage to a white woman. Even the most prominent Chinese and Japanese scholars in the U.S. found their lives increasingly strained after graduation. Yoshi Kuno, the first Japanese professor at Berkeley, who taught there for over thirty years, was still unable to purchase land because of the Alien Land Acts of 1913 and 1920. Even his connections to high state politicians including California’s Attorney General did not help. Moreover, the right to naturalization was not granted to all Asian immigrants until the late 1940s to 1950s, and neither Fong nor Kuno lived long enough to exercise that right.

The story of Yamato Ichihashi is even more tragic. A member of Phi Beta Kappa and a professor at Stanford, Ichihashi was probably the most prominent Japanese scholar in the United States. He spent decades demystifying anti-Japanese narratives and promoting a better relationship between Japan and the U.S.

56 “Japanese Elected to Scholarship Society,” San Francisco Chronicle, 10 November 1908.
only to find himself being forcefully relocated to an internment camp at Tule Lake during World War II. The bitter irony was that Ichihashi found the director of the camp he was incarcerated in to be one of his former students at Stanford. “The Emperor of Tulelake,” was how Ichihashi was often described. At the end of the day, even with all the fame and honor he received from the American upper class, he was only a “king” of the inferior race. Ichihashi survived until 1963, long after the passage of McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 that enabled Japanese immigrants to receive citizenship, but he never naturalized.

The life of Ichihashi shows the existence of nuances in anti-Asian racism in California during the Progressive Era. Contrary to the popular understanding of this era in California as a simple anti-Asian state, these Japanese and Chinese students’ experience in California universities shed light to the fact that anti-Asian racism in the West was much more nuanced and complex. No matter how racist the American upper class was in their personal beliefs, their intellectual and business interests in Asia ensured a relatively safe space for Japanese and Chinese students. Although access to this space remained closely guarded and limited to a small portion of Asians, it still provided educational opportunities for Asian students in the United States. Therefore, when upper-class Americans lost their rationale for supporting Japan after Pearl Harbor, the nuanced racism was quickly replaced by full-blown indiscriminate racism against all Japanese when Executive Order 9066 relocated all persons of Japanese ancestry to the internment camps, including students and scholars like Ichihashi.

The outcome of nuanced racism from the Progressive Era was the creation of model Asians. Westernized and educated, these early Asian students were the models to which all Asians needed to aspire in the eyes of the westerners. By accepting this role, Asian

57 “‘The Emperor of Tulelake’ Japanese Professor (Formerly of Stanford) Wields Great Power Inside the Camp,” San Francisco Chronicle, 29 May 1943.
students received relative freedom and opportunity in California universities. However, no matter how much they excelled, they were still the top of the inferior race. In the 21st century California Bay Area, the Asian American experiences completed flip-flopped compared to a century ago. At both Stanford and Berkeley, students with Asian ancestry are highly successful and now vastly overrepresented compared to the proportion of the Asian population to the state and national populations.⁵⁹ Not only do Asian Americans have more equal opportunities, but they are also becoming exceedingly successful. All these changes seem to suggest that Asian Americans have finally become accepted to the society. However, facing a new surge of racism that has intensified under the Trump administration and the continuing stereotype of Asians as the “Model Minority,” many aspiring Asian American students could find valuable lessons from the stories of the earlier generation. Without achieving complete social justice, even a model minority will always remain an inferior race.

Shifting Perceptions of Americanization: Progressive Era Press Coverage of Italian Immigration

Phillip Barber

Despite the Trump administration’s declaration that border patrol will “take into account certain criteria that enhance a refugee's likelihood of successful assimilation and contribution to the United States,” mainstream media eschews lockstep efforts to “assimilate” the immigrant in favor of “integration” or “adaptation.”

Yet, even to integrate or adapt an immigrant to the American way, one must define what it means to be American. The concept of American identity is evasive. The United States is uniquely built on immigration and has thus been dubbed the “melting pot” and the “nation of immigrants.” Despite this recognition, concern surrounding immigration is as much a hot ticket item in the United States as anywhere – and this is not a new phenomenon. But, as the “nation of immigrants,” the issue of what to do with immigrants once they have settled, is particularly vexing. Progressive era publications regarding immigration and Americanization exhibit remarkable similarities to political rhetoric today, but significantly depict a pro-assimilation consensus not seen in modern-day media.

There is extensive literature on the Italian experience in America. Philip Marshman Rose’s 1975 *The Italians in America* provides a comprehensive overview of Italian American history with a high-level analysis of many topics. The third chapter highlights the Americanization methods and their effectiveness as well as the social conditions that challenged Italians during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Giovanni Schiavo’s
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*Historical Perspectives*, Series II, Volume XXIV, 2019
1928 The Italians in Chicago, a Study in Americanization offers insight into the areas of American society and culture in which Italians participated throughout their Americanization process including occupations, social organizations, education, music, business, and religion. This paper contributes to the literature regarding the Americanization process of Italian immigrants during the progressive era through the lens of the contemporary press. Analysis of progressive era texts reveals contemporary views on the benefits, challenges, and methods of Americanizing Italian immigrants and their children during the progressive era, from 1890-1916. The news and media articles reveal an almost uniform assumption that Italian immigrants should assimilate into American culture. Further analysis in this paper contextualizes the historical experience within the greater progressive movement.

One of the more surprising arguments for bestowing American culture and values upon Italian immigrants, was as repayment for their own historical contribution to humanity. In 1909, the progressive Methodist magazine Zion’s Herald, later The Progressive Christian, published an account of an interdenominational conference discussing Americanization of Italians in Connecticut. Reverent C.S. Gillespie wrote of an epiphany in the room: “They have taught us that there are others besides us of who have done things. They remind us that Columbus was an Italian, and that civilization has been touched by Italian genius from the days of the Caesars down to the days of the Marconi and Victor Emmanuel.” The Italian empire earned, for its descendants, the coveted right to be Americanized. The progressive magazine, Outlook, reinforced this idea, describing Italian immigrants as “the sons of a country to which humanity

---

owes a great debt.”⁵ These points were extrapolated to serve the interest of contemporary America. If the Italians had contributed so much in the past, they were certainly poised to contribute to America now.

As with most immigrants, the value of Italians was measured by their contributions to the labor force. Progressive magazines began their plea to Americanize the Italians by confirming their worth to the American public. “We like the Italian as a laborer,” established Harper’s Weekly in an article imploring further Americanization efforts.⁶ Military magazine, United Service, published a lengthy article in 1894 titled “Italian Laborers.” It argued that Italians were particularly productive workers and one could: “get more work out of them on a farm than any of their labor competitors.”⁷ The press claimed a relative superiority of the Italians, in this regard, qualifying them for more public support in the Americanization process. As the best laborers, Italians deserved the first chance to assimilate. The New York Times expanded the value of immigrant laborers and recognized their contributions to America’s glorious gilded industry. Through Americanization, the United States may “Promote industrial greatness by a plentitude of laborers…”⁸ To Americanize the Italians would not only repay humanity’s debt to their people, but also support the country’s essential labor force.

In a progressive claim, the contemporary press suggested Americanization of the Italians would foster democracy. Upon arrival but before assimilation, Italian interest in American politics was limited. The Italian would soon be introduced to the “boss”
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⁷ Burnet Landreth, “Italian Laborers,” United Service; a Quarterly Review of Military and Naval Affairs 12, no. 3 (September 1894): 240.
who would ‘‘Americanize’’ him for the sake of his vote”

When the immigrant moved into Italian colonies of American society, he entered a unified electorate that voted for the token Italian candidate. As Outlook reasoned: “it is obvious that such a system tends to perpetuate race distinctions and to prevent assimilation.”

If the Italian man did not vote for the “boss” or the local favorite, his vote was secured for the Republicans. Why? Because the Irish were democrats: “Here in politics, as a rule, Italian laborers hostile to the Irish Catholics, naturally take the opposite side, and become Republicans; and under a little persuasion nine-tenths of them could be turned over to Republicanism as they could be to Protestantism…” Such a system was not attractive to the progressive press. Democracy required active citizenship derived from informed voters. Americanizing the Italians meant educating them on the American values of the progressive era, one of which, was civic engagement. The same New York Times article that called for Americanization to “Promote industrial greatness by a plentitude of laborers,” believed the process would also: “guard the safety of the Republic by an intelligent and incorruptible electorate.”

Above all else, Americanizing the Italian immigrant was beneficial as part of a general effort to unify the country. The immigrant figures in the United States had risen quickly to account for a staggering percentage of the population – at least in the eyes of the contemporary press. The statistics changed over the course of the progressive era, but sentiments (and concerns) remained steadfast. With so many immigrants, America was challenged to maintain its national unity. A 1916 New York Times letter to the editor titled “The American Melting Pot Overwhelmed” called for Americanization on the grounds of unifying the country. The writer argued that recent press “doubtless(ly) stimulated many
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minds to consider anew the factors adversely affecting national unity – among them the immigration factor.” The implication was clear; a unified America was a strong America, and this required immigrant assimilation.

Assimilating and Americanizing Italian immigrants; however, posed countless challenges in the eyes of the press. First of all: the language barrier. To highlight the breadth of this issue, the New York Times, in 1908, reported that 75% of Italians did not speak English even after years of residence in America. Many articles attributed their poor English skills to a lack of basic education. In 1897, The Arena published an article filled with sweeping generalizations about Italians in Boston: “If we consider the Italians as a whole, we find that their ignorance is astonishingly great. Although education is not always a test of good citizenship, illiteracy is, in this case, an obstacle to assimilation. First of all, it is a hindrance to their acquisition of the English language; and then it cuts them off from such knowledge of our life and customs as might be gained by reading.” Attacks on Italian ignorance were frequent. The press was quick to characterize Italians as poorly educated but did not insult their intellectual capacity. As described by the popular press, Italians were smart, yet illiterate and uneducated, making it worthwhile but difficult to assimilate them.

Some of the progressive press recognized the consequence of this rhetoric and of the resulting treatment of Italians by Americans and other immigrants. Both undoubtedly led to a resistance among Italian immigrants to Americanization. To many progressive journalists, this resistance came as no surprise. In 1904, Outlook proclaimed: “Indeed, many of our sins we conveniently saddle on the stranger, finding in him the responsibility for some of the evils of our own making. And so, a thoughtless majority fails to see that
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such procedure can result only in race prejudice and prevent rather than foster that very assimilation which we all desire.” 16 The article backed this point with a description of the violation Italians felt when interrogated by border guards. But the prejudice did not stop at Ellis Island. The contempt continued even to school playgrounds: “Take the Italian... His children make good students in our public schools, for they are bright boys; but many more would attend if they did not have to face the stigma placed upon them by their classmates, who look down upon them as ‘dagoes’.” 17 Similarly, the United Service magazine asked: “ostracized by laborers of other nationalities, unfamiliar with our language, is it any wonder that they adhere to their half-civilized habits of herding together for companionship and safety?” 18

Many Italians did live together in colonies in urban America. The communities were usually called “Little Italy” and were established destinations for Italian immigrants at the beginning of their journey to the United States. 19 These communities, while safe havens for many Italians, served to slow down the progress of assimilation. The Italian, according to the United Service, finds it convenient “to settle in communities for mutual protection and society, and as a consequent of such conditions he retains the old country habits of squalor, and is slow to learn our language.” 20 The colonies published their own newspapers written in Italian, about Italian matters, promoting Italian culture. An immigrant’s letter in the New York Times confirmed the “Italianization” resulting from the Italian press: “I have always entertained the idea that the Italian Newspapers give more space to news which tends either to obscure
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the mind of the newly arrived Italians, or to Italianize those already half Americanized.”

Described as “probably the most complex character that comes to our shores, and the least understood,” the Italians raised concerns about how their culture would mix in with the American way. Certain journalists believed that being of the Latin race meant a greater challenge in assimilation: “the Latin race is as distinct from the Saxon as are the olive-trees of Italy from the pines of Germany.”

Particular Italian tendencies worried the press. Within the colonies, families remained extremely tight knit. As the New York Times articulated, “Immigrant parents are hesitant to let their children be taken away from them for as a result they lose their ties to the family and Italy.” The progressives believed that if the immigrants failed to assimilate, their children had a far better shot of becoming Americanized through the public-school system. This, of course, was dependent upon attendance. The Arena wrote of Italians in the Boston school system: “The knowledge acquired beyond [English] is comparatively little, for the parent is impatient to put the child to work in order to swell the family earnings, and the child is scarcely less anxious to make the change.”

Truancy was not the only potential barrier to Americanization. Other threats included the “Black Hand,” an Italian crime organization that, like many such organizations, targeted troubled youth for recruitment. The Black Hand represented the antithesis of progressive efforts, taking children out of the classroom and perpetuating their isolation from American culture. Competing with the Black Hand, tuberculosis stole the lives of many Italian immigrants and their children. In 1910 the
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Board of Health opened a new clinic in the Italian quarters of New York as part of their “extensive plans to stamp out tuberculosis, particularly among the Italians, who have been shown among all aliens to be most subject to the disease.” Tuberculosis itself posed a threat to Americanization because immigrants who survived the initial infection were sent back to Italy. The challenge was convincing Italian immigrants to receive treatment in America. The New York Times reported: “…we know that tuberculosis is more prevalent among the local Italians than among natives or the people of other alien races, and yet the presence of Italians in the hospitals for treatment or their visits to infirmaries is not in proportion to the disease among them.” According to the same article, “During one year only six Italian consumptives were treated in three of the largest clinics, four of them being Italian-American and two Italian Immigrants brought to the clinic by the district nurses of the Charity Organization Society.” In addition to fears of deportation, there was a strong resistance to American medicine. For instance, children were born at home. The sick were treated in house or shipped back to Italy where treatment was more trusted.

Italians were suspicious about many American efforts to interfere with the lives of their people. The contemporary press expressed concern about this cultural phenomenon but not surprise. According to the United Service magazine: “The Italian…does not assimilate with Americans as quickly as foreigners of Saxon blood…because he is forced to take the defensive the moment he places his foot upon our shores.” The progressive Outlook magazine described the welcoming committee for the Italian immigrant. First the immigrant is interrogated by the federal border
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officials in a manner that “you would refuse to answer…or else [would] assault the official” and then,

having passed this necessary examination, his first experience in the land of the free is likely to be his acquaintance with the boarding-house “runner.” Who will force him to go with him, or the crook who will exchange his foreign money into Confederate notes or take him to the banker and padrone who want to sell his labor, or the district boss who will “Americanize” him for the sake of his vote. ³³

The first step to Americanize the Italian was to get beyond their justified suspicion of Americans. Standing in the way of this goal were the corrupt systems causing the suspicion to exist in the first place. One the most influential of which was the Padrone.

The Padrone (“Boss” in Italian) would act as a middleman between American employers and the immigrant laborers. As soon as immigrants arrived on American soil, they were tucked under the wings of Padrones who introduced them to the American way of work. With no money, no alternatives, and children who depended on them, Italian immigrants were at the complete mercy of the Padrones. Some Padrones were well intended. There was certainly a market for their service as labor was in high demand and immigrants needed help navigating their new work environment. Unfortunately, the system was easily corruptible, and the Padrones took advantage of the vulnerable new arrivals. Immigrants were exploited for their labor. The abuse of power was not lost on American journalists. The Outlook reveals “An even greater difficulty [than labor exploitation] lies in the fact that a successful labor bureau for Italians in competent American hands means the breaking up of the much talked of padrone system. The padrones recognize this and are actively using their great influence against the Italian labor bureau.” ³⁴

³³ Speranza, “Solving the Immigration Problem.”
³⁴ Ibid.
For every benefit that Americanization suggested, there were multiple challenges to overcome. With such an expansive and complex set of roadblocks, the contemporary press generated a range of strategies to Americanize Italian immigrants. The default solution was to promote public schools as tools to Americanize immigrant children. According to Harper’s Weekly, “Schooling in our public schools will make an enormous difference to those who get it.”35 The Arena agreed: “The work of assimilation must be done principally with the children, hence we look to the public schools for a leavening influence which can scarcely be exercised by other means.”36 The New York Times concluded, “For complete assimilation and Americanization we will have to wait for their children’s children to pass through our schools.”37 The public-school system exposed the Italian child to the American way and provided an opportunity to reinforce American culture. Peer pressure was presumed to play a huge roll: “Their dread of appearing strange before their playmates stimulates them to imitate American ways, and soon their home becomes the single link which binds them to Italy. Even their euphonious names become distasteful to them, and a Marondotti wishes he were a Smith or a Brown.”38 This process occurred even beyond the public-school system. In 1916, the New York Times reported that Catholic schools in Chicago were discontinuing textbooks printed in the native language of the children, “thus, unifying and Americanizing the teaching in the schools which come under the control of the Roman Catholic School.”39 The press, in agreement about child education, also suggested adult school and night classes as additional help to Americanization. The New York Times proposed “a special school of citizenship for foreign adults,” claiming, “the
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duty of teaching these newcomers what their public responsibilities are seems imperative…”40

Educational proposals went beyond the classroom. The New York Times lauded the benefit of libraries as Americanization tools. Libraries served two functions. First, to give a space for the Italian immigrant to learn English and American culture. Second, “so that he would not become the victim” of the Black Hand.41 The New York Times later suggested educating the Italians by compiling and distributing information relevant to Americanization: “Print and distribute information by newspapers, circulars, booklets, correspondence, conferences, etc. in the languages which peasant immigrants understand…” Relevant information included employment opportunities, banking practices, educational facilities, and general “means to become Americanized.”42

Progressive magazines supported an institutionalized system for Americanization. Outlook hailed “The Society for the Protection of Italian Immigrants” whose paraphrased objective was to advice and inform the Italian immigrant by 1) educating on language and customs of the country, 2) matching the immigrant with fitting employment, 3) investigating and remedying any abuses against the immigrant, and 4) familiarizing the immigrants with their rights. Such organizations would make the immigrants, in the words of a member, “feel that their advent into a strange land does not mean their coming among those who wish them ill.”43 The goal was to change the Italian perception of the American and not just the other way around. This would be accomplished by improving the immediate experience of the Italians upon arrival, fighting against injustices that the Italians encountered in America, adding credibility to the Italian people, and fighting anti-Italian prejudice. As a result, Italians would

40 Rittenhouse, “The American Melting Pot Overwhelmed.”
41 Caccini, “More Italians Than in Rome.”
43 Speranza, “Solving the Immigration Problem.”
lessen their resistance to Americanization and embrace American culture.

As with today, the conservative press suggested legislation and law enforcement as a means to assimilation. To some, this meant harsher immigration policies. The military magazine, *United Service*, supported the end of immigration altogether: “further immigration of the peasant class should be positively prohibited while giving all protection, rights, and opportunities to those now here.”44 In 1892, The *New York Times* suggested making the process expensive: “A substantial head money tax, in no case amounting to less than the cost of a steerage passage, is the remedy *The Times* has long been advocating….Such an imposition would undoubtedly accomplish the purpose of restricting immigration, and it would restrict immigration by sifting it.”45 By 1908; however, *The Times* offered a new message: “a man’s character rather than his ability to show $60 shall make him ‘persona grata’ in this wonderful country…”46 To these journalists, the best way to Americanize the immigrants was to filter, at the gates, those ripe for Americanization. Suggested legislation was not left at the border. The *United Service* supported laws that limited “the number of inhabitants to a given area of house space,” to prohibit overcrowding in Italian homes and colonies.47 Others proposed literacy tests at the ballot box. In order for the Italians to have a voice in politics, one *New York Times* article argued, they must be able to read.48 This would incentivize the Italians to pick up their English dictionary.

Finally, taking the Theodore Roosevelt approach, certain journalists suggested the key to Americanizing the Italian was to “center all their interest in America.”49 “I regret a tendency on the
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part of the Italians to amass money here and return to Italy to spend it,” wrote the New York Times writer who proposed ballot box literacy tests.\footnote{Ibid.} The immigrants needed to be instilled with a sense of national pride: “It is a problem of subordinating every personal ambition, every class interest and policy, every race attachment, to the one dominant idea of an America, free, just, powerful, forward-facing, etc.”\footnote{Rittenhouse, “The American Melting Pot Overwhelmed.”} In the words of Theodore Roosevelt, “there is no place here for the hyphenated American…Some of the very best Americans I have ever known were naturalized Americans born abroad. But a hyphenated American is not an American at all.”\footnote{“Roosevelt Bars the Hyphenated,” New York Times, 13 October 1915, 1.} Italians were Americanized when they embraced America as their exclusive nation and to do this, they must relinquish the ties of their Italian identity.

Progressives viewed America as a nation with incredible potential for continuous improvement. Strategies for reaching America’s full potential were diverse, unrelated, or even contradictory. The many ideals of progressivism are seen within the benefits, challenges, and methods of Americanizing the Italian immigrants. The padrone system and unethical borders fed the anti-corruption spirit in progressive magazines. The gilded age of American pride rings through Roosevelt’s impassioned words. Elements of scientific management, the progressive era belief that societal problems could be solved if solutions focused on system efficiency, are reflected in the approaches to educate the Italian people through distribution channels and organized societies. The press revealed a willingness to identify and address issues in a way that is characteristic of optimistic and impassioned Americans, and a consensus that assimilating the Italian immigrant was proper course.

While many challenges to the Americanization of immigrants are similar today, the context under which they occur is different. Unlike progressive era popular press, public opinion today does
not reflect a unified belief of what assimilation means. In 2019, *The Washington Post* published an article criticizing Tom Brokaw for his claim that “Hispanics should work harder at assimilation.” \(^{53}\) *The Washington Post* questioned what it meant to be Americanized: “So let’s say you’re an immigrant from Nigeria, and when you come to America you take a tae kwon do class and start eating burritos. Is that assimilation? You bet it is, even if it’s not exactly what some people have in mind.” \(^{54}\) The sense of a single unified national identity is less pervasive today than 100 years ago. As a result, the questions: “What does it mean to be American?” and “What does it mean to Americanize?” are even more challenging. A universal intention to assimilate immigrants no longer exists, in part, because the American identity is increasingly recognized as broad and diverse. Donald Trump’s claims that immigrants are unassimilable violent criminals who threaten American safety are increasingly rejected as “fearmongering” and thinly veiled xenophobia. \(^{55}\) The nation’s increasing celebration of America’s diversity, as a tossed salad rather than a melting pot, is revealed by the stark contrast in press coverage today when compared to that of progressive era media.
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Racism and Radicalism: Minority Responses to the Conflation of “Immigrant” with “Radical” in The Progressive Era

Marie Fagetti

Having a great propensity for recognizing patterns, the human brain likes to create models, otherwise known as schema, by which it can compare and consequently sort new information. These can be useful when drawing intellectual connections, but when a voting majority’s schemas reflect only negative conceptions about an entire ethnicity, religious group, or political party the resulting “othering” can lead to the rampant polarization that currently plagues our current federal government and political atmosphere.

To lend credence to the unfortunate ubiquity of this phenomenon, the American populace’s tendency to harbor racist, xenophobic, and exclusionary assumptions has been present in every epoch, culminating in the Islamophobia of the Patriot Act Era, contemporary politics’ clashes between the “alt-right” and far-left, and especially the divisions of the Progressive Era. Disconcerted by the flood of unfamiliar nationalities, ethnicities, and religions migrating into the United States at the turn of the century, more than a few Americans, either in willful distaste or in simple ignorance, allowed isolated incidents and whispered suspicions to shape their schemas of new immigrants. These fears were simply reaffirmed by images such as the Chicago Tribune’s cartoon, included in this work as figure one, that arbitrarily depicted immigrants as violent bomb-throwers. Rapidly, the public made conclusions that conflated Yiddish-speakers with radicalism, Italians with anarchism, and Russian immigrants with workers’
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uprisings. The United States government’s policies of censoring any remotely radical publications and deporting political dissenters with “undesirable” ethnic backgrounds encountered little opposition from the legislature, was lauded by the press, and reinforced radicalism as an anti-patriotic disease to be excised before it crippled the nation’s international economic and political development. Long-time residents of the United States mistook the alleged danger posed by immigrants with that posed by radicals with such frequency in their media denunciations, paralleling the government’s own prohibitive measures, that scholars studying American anarchism have little choice but to analyze the impact of racial and ethnic prejudices on radicalism’s public image. Where the scholarship is lacking, however, is in analyzing recent emigrants’ and radicals’ own media responses, which ranges from utilizing equally racist language in denouncing radicalism to protesting unjust appraisals of immigrants in a land that claimed to protect the civil liberties of all its residents.

Academia commonly acknowledges that anti-radical opinions were colored by rabid anti-“foreigner” sentiment, especially as newspapers and other popular media were inclined to use strong language when critical. Kenyon Zimmer’s analysis of west coast radical groups would have been incomplete without recognizing that Asian immigrants were feared for “threatening” the employment of native-born American labor. Similarly, Charles Conti’s and Sidney Fine’s analyses found that new Eastern- and Southern-European immigrants were regarded with suspicion throughout the United States for supposedly being vectors for radicalism, especially in the densely populated immigrant quarters of tumultuous cities. The news articles that form the basis of such
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conclusions are notable for how they group Bolsheviks, anarchists, and socialists alike under the same despicable label of “radical,” as journalists preferred to warn of imminent danger rather than make careful political distinctions, feeding paranoia with their unclear definitions. Not only was there no delineation as to who exactly was a radical, the wave of Eastern- and Southern-European immigrants was indiscriminately vilified. Popular opinion formed loose correlations between new immigrants’ tendency to be involved in low-wage work, their consequent connection to labor conflicts, and the Russian Revolution of 1917’s shocking victory for radicalism. As such, newspapers denigrated immigrants as either cheap labor for the industrial machine or disruptors instigating chaos, as depicted in figures two and three respectively. 63 Socialist or communitarian radicalism was deemed so antithetical to the traditional American political values of private property and restricted government that it was unilaterally declared by the press, the government, and finally the people that there could be “no such thing as an American anarchist,” for anyone even tangentially related to radical politics could never be a true American. 64 Consequently, any manifestation of foreignness was deemed inherently, diametrically, and most importantly, dangerously opposed to the American way of life, necessitating the neutralization of any culture or language reminiscent of the old world to allow the creation of a model American. 65

Plenty of settlement houses and social workers had had no qualms squelching other cultures in pursuit of “Americanizing” new immigrants, but such retroactively distasteful practices can be partially explained by the perfuse negativity and occasional blatant fear mongering of popular newspapers’ depictions of radical
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foreigners. A common sentiment reaffirmed in the Washington Evening Star, The New York Times, and the political cartoon included in this work as figure four was that the United States had become the dumping grounds for “foreigners of all nationalities and races, of all grades of ignorance and viciousness” who “enjoy[ed] the hospitality” of the United States but did not plan to assimilate, instead preferring to “plot [the Government’s] overthrow.” What was further threatening about these dangerous radicals was their ubiquity; any of that “mass of evil, angry, hungry foreigners” could be waiting for the opportunity to throw a proverbial match on, or a literal bomb into, volatile social situations. By 1890, the populations of major urban centers such as New York and Chicago were between 70 and 80 percent immigrants or the children of immigrants, and millions of more arrived in the United States in the next twenty years. This mass influx of foreigners was thus imposing for certain observers, not only for its sheer size, but in its alleged ability to hide any potentially, truly dangerous individuals. The Nation lamented in 1906 that if only anarchists “were all of one race, if they looked alike and had a distinctive dress or loudly proclaimed their tenets and their plots, it would be easy enough to hold them in check. But murder in the heart cannot be read on the face.” After all, the unknown variables posed by diversity played a significant part in fueling racism and xenophobia. Entire populations were entering the United States and their unfamiliar manners of speaking, acting,
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and interacting represented a massive unknown for the more established populations, leaving it to the popular imagination to deduce just how much of a threat immigrants represented.

While some citizens may have already been uncertain about what the immigration situation would mean for the country, the sensationalist media that construed any threat as part of a greater conspiracy of insidious enemies intensified and solidified uncertainties into concentrated prejudices. The 1901 assassination of President McKinley and the 1908 attempts on a Catholic priest and Chicago’s police chief, planned by Polish-American, Italian, and Russian-Jewish self-proclaimed anarchists respectively, were all tragedies that the media capitalized on to frighten the masses, despite how well facts may or may not have aligned with the headlines.71 For example, Sydney Fine’s discussion of the McKinley assassination emphasizes that the perpetrator, Leon Czolgosz, was an American-born citizen who had never traveled outside the United States and was quite possibly insane rather than radical. These facts are habitually glossed over to this day to instead fixate on his aggressively Polish surname and the threat of his supposed radical beliefs.72 The 1908 incidents were even more conducive to encouraging fear of a radical, nebulous “other,” unclear in definition but clear in its alleged insidious desires. When Italian immigrant and anarchist Giuseppe Alia assassinated a Colorado priest, Father Leo Heinrichs, anti-Catholicism may have been prevalent but Alia’s widely publicized only regret being that he “couldn’t have shot the whole bunch of priests in the church” sparked fear in many with regard to the safety of their own religious communities.73 When Chicago police chief George
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Shippy survived the attempt on his life made by Russian-Jewish immigrant, Lazarus Averbuch, the media was quick to make the connection between the attack and Shippy’s recent proclamation that “Chicago [was] going to witness a weeding out of undesirable citizens,” recklessly insinuating that radicals were lurking in the hearts of cities, plotting to violently strike back against attempts to uproot their organizations. In each case, by virtue of the quantity and quality of the media attention generated, isolated incidents were made to stand out in the population’s imagination as proof of the widespread danger posed by radical immigrants. The details that Shippy survived, the priest was Catholic, and that the Presidential assassin was actually American-born were lost amid the media’s insistence that a foreign, radical threat was alive and active within the United States. Due to the narrative’s prevalence and the ease with which it aligned with pre-existing fears of the unknown, the concept of the conniving immigrant was incorporated into everyday perceptions of reality. The result was a perspective on new immigrants in the minds of the native-born masses that would be nearly impossible to redeem.

The government’s reaction to the alleged threat posed by foreign radicals made the already smoldering social relations stoked by a hostile media even more volatile. Instead of reassuring the populace that the vast majority of immigrants were harmless and that the majority of Americans had at one point been new to the country themselves, both the legislative and executive branches of government propagated policies that institutionalized xenophobia for the sake of eradicating radicalism. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 is often referenced as the peak of racist exclusionary measures taken by the United States government, but additional efforts were taken to exclude and even deport those who were designated too radical to be accepted into the United States.75
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In 1894, Congress passed an act for the “Exclusion and Deportation of Alien Anarchists, largely in response to the fears compounding ever since the deadly 1886 Haymarket Square labor riot.”76 The legislation gave the superintendent of immigration broad powers to deport “any alien anarchist that has been allowed to land” or “any alien resident of the United States [who] is an anarchist, and [whose] presence in the country will be a menace to the Government or to the peace and well-being of society.”77 Such language affirmed popular suspicions that foreigners were more likely to be violent disruptors who deserved only the most cursory right to due process. As for actions taken by the executive branch of government, President Theodore Roosevelt approved censoring anarchist publications and mail. Specifically referencing an Italian newspaper published in New York, La Questione Sociale, as a radical publication to be targeted, President Roosevelt reinforced the already popular conception that Italians, second only to Russians, were the most likely anarchists.78 By 1918, the United States government had codified its policy of radical exclusion and expulsion and redoubled its efforts to deport radicals and censor media. As a result, multiple significant figures within the anarchist movement, no matter their country of origin or their stance on the use of violence, were deported from the United States. For example, Emma Goldman, famous and infamous for her persistent arguments that anarchist thought was protected by the First Amendment’s provision for freedom of speech, was placed upon an army transport with 249 other “resident aliens” and deported to
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the Soviet Union in 1919. The media’s response included those who believed that the radicals would be happier under a government that had already bent to their beliefs, and those who argued that deportation was a just response for foreigners who would purportedly reap the benefits of a capitalist society yet would simultaneously “preach the gospel of disaster.”

Significantly, the efforts to vilify radicals and immigrant allies did not go unanswered. Despite discriminatory government policies and censorship, radicals and those supportive of immigrant communities persisted in using their own media outlets to communicate their perspectives to the public, resisting an overbearing government and hostile public in what little ways they could. Emma Goldman and other prominent radicals defended their rights to express their ideas through the press, on occasion, pointing out the hypocrisy of an immigrant nation born of revolution claiming tolerance yet enforcing immigrant quotas and suppressing innovative political ideas. George Herbert Mead in his letter to the *Chicago Record Herald* stated that every time the “mad-dog cry of ‘Anarchy’” sounded to have that “unforgivable cult of Anarchy be rooted out,” the people “unjustifiably assailed the Italians and the Russian Jews...due to...ignorance of these people.” Mead implored readers to reevaluate how, despite these groups having “provided the countless multitudes of hands which have built up this great Babylon of ours,” “their strangeness, their homesickness, their misery, and their humanity have been made into debased political currency of ward politics.” Speaking directly to common misgivings, he denied that immigrant-populated sections of cities or settlement houses were hotbeds for
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dangerous radicalism. Oahu Governor Archibald Cleghorn, quoted by future-Supreme Court Justice Nathan Bijur in an appeal to the House Representatives on immigration, observed that “the criticisms made of the Italians and the ‘slowbacks,’ as they are called, and the Russians who come to-day were made exactly of the Irish and the Germans who came in the [eighteen] forties,” highlighting the hypocrisy and injustice of mistreating new immigrants. Joseph Keppler’s illustration for Puck communicated a similar sentiment, included in this work as figure five. These appeals to respect ethnic minorities’ constitutional rights unfortunately did not persuade many, as society was already under the thrall of a primal fear of the unknown and the leadership of select intellectual, elite “experts,” who held the same racist views as the public but promulgated them through a sophisticated façade of scientific explanation.

Plenty of intellectual anarchists, such as George Brown of Philadelphia, fanned the flames of xenophobia. They were quick to denigrate the “few fiery-eyed Anarchists” within the movement who “believe[d] in settling arguments with bombs,” insisting that such ideological brutes were “confined to the Russian Jew element in the lower section of the city” or other “foreign settlements.” Frank H. Brook points out in his analysis of the American anarchist movement that some radicals were careful to make the distinction between the cultured, American-born, and individualist “Boston anarchist,” who deserved to be represented in all discussions of potential policy solutions, and the repugnant,
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immigrant, revolutionary, and collectivist “Chicago anarchist,” who was far too radical and beast-like to be reasoned with or treated as an equal.\(^{89}\) The crux of the arbitrary hierarchy created between them boiled down to ancient prejudices based on race and ethnicity, which maintained that certain groups, often the latest unassimilated immigrant group, were somehow less cognitively developed and more prone to brutality than assimilated groups. In light of this dehumanizing, “othering” societal trend, the fact that George Mead and others like him were defending the United States’ immigrant population is revealing as it indicates that at least some individuals recognized how much the fear of radicalism was based in xenophobia and racism. Edward Hale Bierstadt’s opinion in *The New York Times*, however, walks the intellectual line between Mead and Brown. Arguing that while he by no means would “intend to imply that the alien is a saint,” Bierstadt correctly observed that “[the alien] is quite as much a saint as the native born.” If the American public was going to blame the entirety of immigrants for the actions of the few, to avoid hypocrisy, society “might as well say that all Americans are anarchists because the I.W.W. is an American institution.”\(^{90}\) Unfortunately, Bierstadt’s approach of unbiased logic and neutrality towards minorities was as ineffective at moving the masses as Mead’s appeal for sympathy, for many often prefer unjustly scapegoating an entire community to having to accept a more nuanced and complicated reality.

Surprisingly, the commentary on radicalism’s connections to ethnic minorities made by ethnic minority groups themselves was equally complex, as there were immigrants who were indeed radical, yet also others who resented their more extreme counterparts for threatening hopes of peaceful assimilation. To this end, some ethnic communities experienced continual newspaper
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wars between the publications that rallied their readers to radical causes and those that ardently denounced actions that could reflect poorly on the rest of the community.\footnote{A. William Hoglund, “The Finnish Press,” in The Ethnic Press in the United States: A Historical Analysis and Handbook, ed. Sally M. Miller (Westport: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1987), 110.} Foreign language newspapers already aroused the majority population’s suspicion by virtue of their exclusivity, but the considerable number of radical newspapers printed in foreign languages fomented further distrust and sweeping generalizations. Despite protests made by more conservative members of ethnic minority groups and the obvious ire they would incur from the majority, Finns, Germans, even smaller populations within the United States such as Croatians and Slovaks, and especially Yiddish-speakers, all had prominent, and oftentimes virulently radical, labor-oriented newspapers.\footnote{George J. Prpić and C. Michael McAdams, “The Croatian Press,” in The Ethnic Press in the United States: A Historical Analysis and Handbook, ed. Sally M. Miller (Westport: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1987), 357; M. Mary Stolarik, “The Slovak-American Press.” In The Ethnic Press in the United States: A Historical Analysis and Handbook, ed. by Sally M. Miller, (Westport: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1987), 353.} Often targeted by government censorship efforts for allegedly encouraging violence, some of these publications, like the Finnish Toveri and Industrialisti, would meet their end, with “the arrest of the editors...along with other Finnish radicals.”\footnote{Hoglund, “The Finnish Press,” 110.} Others would merely be suppressed like the German-language, Chicago newspaper Arbeiter Zeitung (Workers’ news). The government’s conclusions, however, were not entirely unfounded as, for example, Arbeiter Zeitung was one German publication among several that actively encouraged labor radicalism. There was also a particularly strong correlation between the Yiddish language and radicalism.\footnote{James M. Bergquist, <“The German-American Press,” in The Ethnic Press in the United States: A Historical Analysis and Handbook, ed. Sally M. Miller (Westport: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1987), 145; Bruce C. Nelson,“Arbeiterpresse und Arbeiterbewegung: Chicago’s Socialist and Anarchist Press, 1870-1900,” in The German-American Radical Press, ed. by Elliot Shore, Ken Fones-Wolf, and James P. Dansky (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 82.} Being primarily from Eastern-Europe, Yiddish-
speakers often had had some exposure to anti-tsarist and anti-
bourgeois sentiments before immigrating to the United States,
where those ideas propagated to the point where labor influencer
Morris Hillquit learned Yiddish to better communicate with his
audiences and followers. Immigrants were undeniably
represented in radical groups; however, just as there were select
members of ethnic minorities using the press to express extreme
political views, there were other members of those ethnic groups
trying to combat the dangerous image those views encouraged.

“Hyphenated Americans,” first or second-generation
Americans who were simply trying to assimilate into the United
States, were just as willing to use the media to speak out against
some of their number’s increasing radicalism as any “native-born”
American. Finnish-Americans denounced the radical publication
Amerikan Suometar for not only misleading readers about the labor
movement but tarnishing the image of Finns as “good workers”
who could adapt well to American society. Hebrew publications
found themselves in a parallel situation concerning typically less
conservative Yiddish publications. The latter considered the
Hebrew language to be “elitist, reactionary, and utopian” while,
according to Hebrew advocates, Yiddish was a dialect, not a
language, a mere fad among the lower-class that would die out
with time. Seeing Yiddish denigrated by even Hebrew-speaking
populations, some officials saw yet another opportunity, beyond
suspicions of radicalism, to bar the Russian Jews stereotyped as
instigators of violence from entering the United States on the basis
that fluency in Yiddish did not constitute literacy. Accordingly,
native-born Americans were not the only ones to use the press in
the witch hunt for radicals. Ethnic minorities, in their desire to
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appear assimilated into American culture, would deny entry to members of their own ethnic group for the increasingly unforgivable crime of radicalism. While this could appear to be a surrender to the pervasive fear of radicalism as a rampaging evil in society, it was also an attempt to direct the majority’s suspicion away from the whole of ethnic minorities and onto a specific target, insuring the full benefits and protections of American society for other migrants.

Unfortunately, despite the high ideals being circulated in Progressive circles about the intrinsic value of the individual, any new immigrant or member of a proclaimed dangerous minority was categorically lumped into a single group of “other,” characterized as amorphous, malleable, and inherently threatening. The Progressive movement made grand claims about altering society and bringing about more equitable treatment by the government, yet those who honestly believed they could better the lot of others through radical political ideas were not only vilified in the media but risked deportation, while new immigrants and ethnic minorities bore the weight of the nation’s suspicion. On both sides of the debate, the media was weaponized for its ability to cultivate either fear or sympathy, yet in this case, fear of the “other” largely won out. Time may have progressed, but fear of a constructed “other” still haunts the United States’ immigration and foreign policies, only worsened by a polarized and cutting national news atmosphere. Society may never entirely overcome its fear of the unknown but allowing everyone their own voice and assessing them based on individual merits and not on schemas poisoned by fear is a preliminary step to a progressively more equitable nation.
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Medicine Infected by Politics:  
The American Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934

Cooper Scherr

“I will keep them from harm and injustice… whatever houses I may visit, I will come for the benefit of the sick, remaining free of all intentional injustice.” — Oath of Hippocrates

During a 1927 speech at the annual meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges, C.S. Butler, having recently finished his tenure as the Sanitary Engineer of Haiti, commented on the role of physicians in the American occupation of Haiti:

We physicians have failed to appreciate the enormous importance of our calling in helping governments to confer the benefits of civilization upon backward races… When a physician cures the complaints of an individual, he nearly always captures the friendship of that individual at the same time. So it is with governments in relation to the masses.1

The overarching tenet of medicine and the sworn mission of all physicians is to do no harm to the patient. Yet, such as all goals, the goal of medicine can sometimes become perverted. Doctors and patients do not exist in a vacuum, and thus all sickness and healing occurs within certain social, personal, and even political contexts. Yes, political. Desirable though it may be to separate health from politics, illness and death are ubiquitous to the human experience, and thus, treatment of the sick lies within the realm of social and political influence. Therefore, medicine is a tool that can
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be both wielded and *shaped* by politics. Various social and political factors can affect how, when, and for whose benefit medicine is practiced, and thus distort the humanitarian purpose of medicine itself. Such was the case during the American occupation of Haiti from 1915-1934.

America opened the 20th century intent on controlling the Western hemisphere and assuming a role as a global economic power. This surge of American imperialism fed into the Spanish-American War at the turn of the century and subsequent U.S. efforts to maintain control of its territorial acquisitions in the Pacific and Caribbean. Throughout this period, the United States carefully sought to portray its expansionist aims as beneficent rather than imperial. After all, the nation’s ethos was one of liberty and democracy, and the advent of America itself was characterized by the overthrow of foreign colonial rule. Therefore, the United States attempted to convince the world—and itself—that American imperialism differed from the colonial endeavors of Old World powers. Economic expansion? No, this was democratic pioneering. Imperial conquest? Try humanitarian uplift. Thus, the United States painted itself as a physician come to cure a patient plagued by illness; by administering the medicines of democracy and capitalism, the backwards colonies could be saved from their literal and metaphorical diseases.

Haiti was one such patient that fell under the “care” of the United States. Rife with political turmoil and saddled with debt to American investors, Haiti posed an opportunity for the U.S. to cure yet another blight in the Western hemisphere. Following the assassination of President Vilbrun Guillame Sam in 1915, the U.S. jumped at the chance to “save” Haiti. American troops—stationed just off the coast—immediately landed in Port-au-Prince and set about implementing the U.S. intervention in Haiti. For the next two decades, the Americans would prescribe whatever remedy they deemed necessary for Haiti. However, treatment of Haitian ills was compromised by the ulterior motives of the United States, and what was best for American interests was misconstrued as being
best for Haiti. By 1934, upon U.S. withdrawal from Haiti, the American intervention had left a complicated legacy of both harm and good.

In analyzing the American occupation of Haiti, it is crucial to distinguish how the faux humanitarianism of the U.S. government impacted the genuine humanitarian goals of medicine. America was primarily interested in Haiti because it wished to preserve its political influence in the Western hemisphere and acquire Haiti as a new market for U.S. investors. However, the multitude of problems plaguing Haiti—including political instability, widespread poverty, and poor public health—allowed the U.S. to disguise its invasion as a humanitarian intervention. In reality, Haitian benefit was always of secondary concern to the U.S. government. While American politicians employed humanitarianism as a front for the occupation, American physicians genuinely sought to improve the well-being of the Haitian populace. Recognizing the positive impact that medicine could have on Haitian health, the American doctors set about treating disease—both physiological and cultural—as they saw fit. However, the imperialism of the occupation distorted the humanitarian goals of medicine in Haiti.

The political objectives of the occupation meant that medicine was employed for a variety of purposes. First, medicine served as a means of protecting the American occupation force from disease and death in the tropics. Following the establishment of American control in Haiti, the function of medicine changed from a tool of pacification to a tool of propaganda. As the U.S. looked to justify its presence in Haiti, the American treatment of diseases such as malaria, yaws, and syphilis was held up as a bright spot of the occupation. U.S. doctors were not only improving the health of Haitian citizens, America argued, but also restoring the vitality of the country as a whole. However, the failure of occupation medicine to dramatically improve overall Haitian health subsequently cast doubt on the motives behind U.S. medical relief. Had the Americans sincerely sought to improve the lives of
Haitians, or had they simply wielded medicine as a political tool for their own benefit? The American occupation of Haiti highlighted the susceptibility of medicine to political aims and left a blemish on the record of medical humanitarianism. The U.S. had entered Haiti preaching of a miracle cure but left its “patient” perhaps worse off than before.

**Historiography**

Historians have been quick to decry the Americans’ stated humanitarian aims when invading Haiti. According to Hans Schmidt, “the immediate objectives of American expansion were to achieve hegemony in the Caribbean and the Pacific”—Haiti was no exception.² Throughout the late 1800s, the United States had been in competition with European powers for lucrative overseas trade routes and strategic military objectives, and the 19th century culminated with U.S. victory in the Spanish-American War. The resulting Treaty of Paris in 1898 brought the U.S. new territories in both the Pacific and the Caribbean, and the construction of the Panama Canal in 1914 officially linked the two regions of America’s imperial interests.³ Having established control over the Americas, the U.S. was keen on keeping Europe out of its transoceanic empire. The primary threat to U.S. influence in the Caribbean, according to Schmidt, was Germany.⁴ With its powerful navy and an economic foothold in Haiti, Germany stood poised to capitalize on the instability of the Haitian state in 1915. Therefore, following President Sam’s assassination, the United States acted to preserve its Caribbean dominance by landing troops in Haiti. Contrary to characterizations of an American Open Door policy in the early 20th century, Schmidt claims that the occupation
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of Haiti demonstrated the Americans’ “closed-door, sphere of influence diplomacy.”

In addition to U.S. political interests, American economic involvement in Haiti also played a significant role in the decision to intervene. Jeffrey Sommers notes that “as early as 1910, five years before the U.S. occupation of Haiti, United States banking interests obtained partial ownership of the National Bank of Haiti.” With American capital tied up in the Haitian bank, the U.S. was willing to forcefully intervene in order to protect American investments from the growing unrest in Haiti. According to Patricia J. Lopez, the Americans’ “big stick diplomacy” in Haiti built off the precedent set by Haitian-American relations of the 19th century. From 1849-1913, the U.S. had made a habit of sending troops into Haiti, intervening on over two dozen occasions. Leading up to the invasion of 1915, American involvement in Haiti had increased even further, with ten landings of U.S. troops in Haiti during 1914 alone. Lopez states that prior to the occupation, the U.S. was also interested in obtaining Haiti as a potential market for American land ownership and railroad development. Thus, in the eyes of the U.S., Haiti was a fruit waiting to be plucked, and the instability of the Haitian state in 1915 provided the perfect excuse to expand into a new economic market.

Most historians argue that racial paternalism also played a part in the United States’ blatant disregard for Haitian autonomy. Schmidt states that, in dealing with the Haitians, the Americans believed them to be “inherently inferior,” and “approached [them]...
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with ethnic and racial contempt.” 10 In *Taking Haiti*, Mary Renda expands upon this idea, stating that paternalism was in fact the driving force of the occupation as a whole. 11 U.S. Marines, Renda states, considered themselves father figures to the Haitians, and were convinced that the occupation was of great service to Haiti. 12 In the words of Marine General Smedley Butler: “We were all [imbued] with the fact that we were the trustees of a huge estate that belonged to minors.” 13 This characterization of the Haitians as incompetent minors stemmed from racist preconceptions in the United States. For example, the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, compared the Haitians to the American “negroes in the South,” while Rear Admiral William Caperton, seeking to justify U.S. presence in Haiti, portrayed the people as dark cannibals in need of firm guidance. 14, 15 In this way, America established a clear power dynamic with Haiti. As a father figure to the “orphaned nation,” the U.S. espoused concern for Haiti’s well-being, yet was justified in exercising authority over—and even disciplining—the smaller nation. 16 Thus, when faced with the stark contradiction between the occupation of Haiti and the national values of freedom and democracy, paternalism—a veneer for racism—offered Americans a convenient explanation for the discrepancy.

This discrepancy was on full display in the U.S. takeover of the Haitian government. Believing the Haitians to be incapable of self-government, the U.S. imposed the Haitian-American Treaty of 1915, which outlined a “partnership” between the two nations that condoned an American presence in Haiti until 1936. According to Schmidt, the treaty was morally and legally binding only at U.S.
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convenience; the Americans “frequently cited [the treaty] as justification for continuing the occupation,” that is until uprisings in Haiti prompted an early U.S. withdrawal in 1934.¹⁷ In the meantime, America operated without any regard for the Haitian democratic system, ramrodding the Haitian Constitution of 1918 into effect. The new constitution suspended the Haitian legislature, legalized American martial law, and—most symbolically—removed the ban on white, alien land ownership in Haiti (this law was a testament to the slave history of Haiti, and had been intended to preclude any future of white dominion over Haiti).¹⁸ When the Haitian government refused to ratify the constitution, the U.S. disbanded the legislature and appointed its own Council of State. The puppet government obediently installed the American-sponsored constitution and was not assembled again until the occurrence of anti-American riots in 1929.¹⁹

The paternalistic aims of the U.S. also meant that medicine, with its positive impact on individual health, proved to be a key symbolic component of the occupation. According to Antony Stewart in “An Imperial Laboratory,” Haiti had a reputation as a den of sickness and filth, contributing to the perception of its being a backwards nation. Thus, as the Americans entered Haiti, medicine offered an obvious means of uplifting the Haitians from their apparently substandard existence.²⁰ In addition to Stewart, many other historians have commented on the various functions of medicine during the occupation. Beyond basic improvements in health, historians have noted the Americans’ use of medicine to exert control over Haiti, pacify Haitian citizens, and justify the U.S. presence to the outside world.²¹ However, although the effect of medicine on the occupation has been acknowledged, the
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historiography fails to recognize the reciprocal effect that the occupation had on medicine. Indeed, U.S. motives in Haiti shaped the goals of medicine and how it was employed during the occupation.

**Medicine in the Hands of the Military**

In the beginning years of the occupation, medicine became a tool for conquest that was selectively practiced in accordance with U.S. objectives. In the hands of the military, medicine’s primary goals were: 1) to keep U.S. troops healthy; 2) to control and pacify the populace. Historically, the tropics had been considered the “white man’s graveyard”; in Haiti for example, yellow fever had ravaged both the French and British ranks during the Haitian Revolution. The U.S. was well aware of this history, and anxious not to repeat it. However, due to its forays into Panama, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, the U.S. had plenty of experience with tropical medicine prior to 1915. Having “[tamed] the tropics” previously, the Americans knew how to employ medicine strategically in Haiti. Thus, before the Marines even set foot on Haitian soil, medicine played a role in opening up Haiti for U.S. intervention.

Once in Haiti, the occupation quickly became militarized. Despite easily establishing military control in Port-au-Prince and other coastal cities in 1915, U.S. forces were not received warmly by the Haitians. In urban areas, people would glare at the Marines and pour household refuse onto American patrols that walked under their windows. Meanwhile, in the countryside, U.S. troops were opposed by Haitian guerilla forces, or cacos. Faced with hostility from the populace, Admiral Caperton admitted that the occupation began to be defined by military objectives, and “the
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‘human’ in humanitarian was reduced to ‘combatant.’” 25 Thus, from 1915-1922, U.S. Marines set about eliminating rural pockets of resistance in a series of campaigns termed the First and Second Caco Wars. These “wars” proved extremely one-sided, as Haitian casualties totaled more than 2,000 dead by 1922, compared to only a couple dozen American dead. 26 In addition to decimating the cacos, the American occupying force treated the Haitian citizenry with a marked degree of brutality. In 1919, Brigadier General George Barnett wrote to Colonel John H. Russell to complain about the “practically indiscriminate killing of natives” occurring in Haiti, eliciting an investigation into abuses by the Americans and Haitian gendarmes—Haitians conscripted into service with the U.S. military. 27 Out of 52 cases later brought before a court of inquiry, only 18 were found to contain punishable offenses—the rest were dismissed as the “casualties of ‘savage warfare.’” 28

The Americans’ heavy-handed approach towards the Haitians also negatively impacted medical efforts in Haiti. First, medicine was rationed in favor of the American occupation force, and only practiced for the benefit of the Haitian populace when conducive to American military aims. This prioritization of American health over Haitian health was evident in an anti-malaria campaign conducted by naval medical officers in late 1922. Since arriving in Haiti, U.S. troops had been hampered by a high frequency of malaria in their camps, despite the best efforts of the medical officers to sanitize the U.S. posts. For a seven-month period spanning from 1921-1922, 687 cases of malaria were reported among the Americans—indicating a rate of nearly one case per soldier. 29 The poor health of the Marines equated to exceedingly large treatment costs and decreased military efficiency, and thus
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prompted preventative efforts to treat malaria among the locals.30 Medical officers proceeded to treat Haitians living within a one mile radius of Marine posts with quinine; during the quininization campaign, the Marines reported only 237 cases of malaria over a seven-month period.31 Thus, the Americans treated the Haitians for disease, but “solely as a prophylactic measure for the [M]arines.”32

In addition to preserving the health of the Americans, medicine also offered a means of stabilization and pacification. When the Americans seized Port-au-Prince in late July 1915, they discovered “a large population of sick and practically starving people” suffering amidst the chaos of the Haitian state.33 To compound the problem, the cacos cut off food supplies to urban areas in the hopes that the resulting food shortage would hinder the U.S. forces. Faced with a destitute population in need of food and medical care, the naval medical staff distributed food supplies and cared for the medical needs of transient individuals in Port-au-Prince.34 At face value, this was a humanitarian gesture to the conquered populace. However, had the Americans let the Haitians die of starvation and disease in the streets, they risked fuelling further Haitian hatred and resistance towards the occupation, making the island nearly ungovernable. The U.S. would also have been compromising its identity as white savior to the poor, backwards nation.

Although medicine proved to be a key tool for the military, lack of funding for widespread medical services demonstrated the ways in which the politics of the occupation interfered with medical work. Under the control of the military, healthcare in Haiti was clearly not a priority, as the Americans did not establish a Haitian public health service (Service d’Hygiène Publique) until
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1917—two years after invading. In the meantime, Admiral Caperton had attempted to establish a sanitation program with a budget of $76,000; in contrast, the Americans set aside $3,000,000 of Haiti’s $8,000,000 yearly income to pay off Haitian debt to the U.S. Evidently, at the outset of the occupation, there was little impetus “to build up sanitation and public health beyond what would benefit U.S. troops.” Therefore, the medical budget from 1915-1917 merely provided for a street-sweeping service, minimal medicines and vaccines, medical treatment primarily for U.S. forces and the gendarmes, and the remodeling of some Haitian clinics and hospitals. Conditions improved in 1917 with the creation of the Public Health Service and the appointment of Norman McLean as Sanitary Engineer in Haiti. McLean set about organizing a public health system for Haiti and bolstered the medical budget to nearly $180,000, yet these improvements still proved inadequate considering the needs of the Haitian populace. With only five U.S. physicians and a handful of medically-trained corpsmen and gendarmes, McLean could only provide medical relief in urban districts—this only accounted for an estimated 5-10% of the Haitian population. Thus, not only did medicine function as a tool in the hands of the U.S. military, but its goals morphed from patient health and well-being to order and control via health. Under the supervision of the military, medicine was practiced selectively, normally in line with U.S. strategic objectives.

Reorganization of the Occupation

Though successful in establishing order in Haiti, martial law did little to advance the condition of the populace, contrary to U.S.
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portrayals of the occupation. With World War I dominating news headlines from 1914-1918, the beginning years of the occupation passed largely unnoticed by the American people. In fact, from 1917-1918, the New York Times did not have a single entry regarding Haiti. Therefore, as the Wilson administration focused its attention on Europe, American policy in Haiti was left up to the discretion of U.S. personnel on the ground. Lacking clear policy directives from Washington, American civilian and military officials clashed over how to best govern Haiti. While the civilian advisors worked to restructure the Haitian government and operate according to the Haitian-American treaty, the Marines set about eliminating local resistance and establishing martial law. The resulting conflict among the occupation’s leaders rendered the American administration in Haiti ineffective and directionless, to the point where Wilson considered an American withdrawal in the aftermath of the Great War. In contrast with actual conditions on the ground, the news that reached the American public continued to paint a rosy image of the progress being made in Haiti. Thus, prior to 1920, Americans largely supported the intervention, with vehement objections from only a few journals and publications.

However, following the outbreak of the Second Caco War in 1918, more journalists began to uncover the harsh U.S. treatment of the Haitians, prompting protests of the occupation back home. One of the most prominent accounts regarding the true nature of the occupation came from James W. Johnson of the NAACP, who visited Haiti in 1920. During his trip, Johnson met with Haitian elites and political activists, noting, “All the Haitians I talked to complained bitterly of conditions.” Meanwhile, Johnson found the Marines to be shockingly dismissive of the Haitians, with one
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saying, “The trouble with Haiti is that these n*****s down here with a little money and education think they are as good as we are.”46 When Johnson returned to the U.S., he proclaimed the oppression of the Haitians, sparking fierce public criticism of the newly-exposed American imperialism in Haiti. However, Woodrow Wilson’s bid for reelection in 1920 forced the president to double-down on the Americans’ commitment to the occupation. As U.S. atrocities in Haiti came into the public consciousness, the Republicans quickly acted to turn favor against Wilson during the election campaign, with Warren G. Harding denouncing the “rape of Haiti.”47 Popular approval thus swung against Wilson, as many Americans decried the irony of authoritarian rule in Haiti when considering Wilson’s Fourteen Points and calls for self-determination at the conclusion of World War I.

In response to the public outrage regarding American imperialism in Haiti, the Senate conducted an investigation of the occupation from the fall of 1921 to early 1922, led by Republican Senator Medill McCormick.48 In November 1921, McCormick’s committee visited Haiti, where they met with local Haitian elites and listened to various testimonies detailing atrocities committed by Americans during the occupation. Although the committee dismissed many accounts as inconsistent and untrustworthy, its final report reflected the need for change in the occupational administration; rather than withdrawing, McCormick and his fellow senators recommended the reorganization of American leadership in Haiti.49 According to McCormick, “We are there, and in my judgment we ought to stay there for 20 years.”50 By restructuring the administration, the U.S. hoped to bury claims of American brutality under a renewed narrative of humanitarianism
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in Haiti. As the U.S. worked to cast the occupation in a more humane light, medicine shifted its focus from conquering the Haitians to civilizing them instead.

Based on the recommendations of the McCormick committee, the State Department ended martial law in Haiti and appointed a “High Commissioner” to oversee all aspects of the occupation. Despite the occupational reorganization, the Americans remained intent on maintaining control in Haiti, and thus kept the Marine garrison stationed on the island. In fact, by appointing a military officer as High Commissioner of the occupation, the U.S. clearly indicated that it had no interest in relinquishing power to the Haitians. The new appointee, General John H. Russell—a Marine commander in Haiti since 1917—was granted total control over civilian treaty officials in addition to the Marines and gendarmes, and served as the direct link between the U.S. State Department and the puppet Haitian government.\footnote{Ibid, 126.}

Russell himself was a personification of the new policies he was tasked with implementing. Though he worked tirelessly “in supporting progressive policies in educational and economic uplift… he did not hold the Haitians in high regard,” considering them more or less to be a mix of children and savages.\footnote{Ibid., 124-125.} Similarly, U.S. policies in Haiti would henceforth focus on material and social improvements in Haiti, with the purpose of civilizing what was deemed a backwards nation. Thus, Russell’s appointment as High Commissioner alleviated the tension between the dueling civilian and military components of the administration and was intended to signal the occupation’s transition from pacification to uplift. Whereas the early years of the occupation had focused on stabilizing the tumultuous nation and quelling resistance among the “natives,” the Americans now sought to bring the benefits of capitalism and civilization to Haiti.
Moving forward, medicine promised to play a key role in emphasizing the humanitarian aspects of the occupation and, therefore, American medical services in Haiti underwent a transition similar to that of the occupational administration. First, in 1923, the U.S. recruited the aid of the International Health Board (IHB) of the Rockefeller Foundation—a philanthropic organization—in improving Haitian health services. Throughout the early years of the occupation, members of the occupational administration had reached out to the IHB requesting their assistance in transforming conditions in Haiti.\textsuperscript{53} However, the IHB had repeatedly denied these requests, stating that they lacked the personnel necessary to add Haiti to their list of humanitarian projects.\textsuperscript{54} Finally, in 1923, following the urging of the U.S. State Department, the IHB agreed to assist with American public health efforts in Haiti.\textsuperscript{55} Henceforth, IHB representatives “conducted extensive health surveys and disease vector studies, along with a survey of the medical education program.”\textsuperscript{56} On the one hand, the collaboration with the IHB served as a sound publicity move for the U.S. as it worked to restore the image of the occupation as a humanitarian endeavor. On the other hand, there were sincere hopes among American medical personnel that the Rockefeller Foundation’s involvement would ensure that medicine fulfilled its humanitarian objectives in Haiti.

In conjunction with the Rockefeller Foundation’s recent involvement in Haiti, in 1924—two years after the appointment of Russell as High Commissioner—Dr. C.S. Butler was named head of the Haitian Public Health Service.\textsuperscript{57} A naval medical officer who had served in the U.S. occupation of the Philippines, Butler arrived in Haiti prepared to revamp the nation’s sputtering public health program, and would serve as Sanitary Engineer in Haiti.
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until 1927. As director of health services, Butler’s goal was to “turn over a public health machine, as perfect in type and as smooth in its running as it [was] possible to make” to the Haitians by the time the Americans withdrew. In addition to Butler’s appointment in 1924, the Americans—after gradually increasing medical funds in 1922 and 1923—significantly bolstered the Public Health Service’s budget, allowing Butler to add personnel and expand health services in Haiti. Armed with a robust budget and ample staff, Butler set about implementing the objectives of medicine under the reformed U.S. occupation.

The Public Health Service and U.S. Medical Practice in Haiti

Prior to Butler’s arrival in 1924, Haiti had been divided into three health districts in 1918—north, south, and central—each with its own hospital, naval medical officer (physician), and chief pharmacist or chief pharmacist’s mate. In 1919, the establishment of the Public Health Service and the resulting boost in medical funds allowed for the construction of new hospitals and the further division of Haiti into nine districts. The larger regions—Port-au-Prince, Cap Haitien, Aux Cayes, and Jacmel—were overseen by a physician, whereas the smaller regions—Saint Mare, Gonaives, Port-de-Paix, Petit Goave, and Jeremie—fell under the supervision of a pharmacist. Upon its expansion in 1924, the Public Health Service added a tenth district—Hinche—and succeeded in staffing each region with a physician and assistant pharmacist. Medical duties in the districts fell into two
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categories: hospital activities and sanitation work, supervised by physicians and pharmacists, respectively. Butler himself operated out of Port-au-Prince—home to the main office of the Public Health Service and the Haitian General Hospital—with a physician and two chief pharmacists as his assistants.65

The General Hospital in Port-au-Prince, being “modern and ideal in every way,” functioned as the epicenter of all medical work in Haiti.66 With 350 beds, the hospital had the capacity to treat nearly twice as many patients as the next largest district, Cap Haitien, with 200.67 The General Hospital held the most advanced treatment and diagnostic technologies, as well as the most specialized medical services. For instance, while each hospital had its own small laboratory, the General Hospital housed the Central Public Health Laboratory of Haiti.68 It also was one of only three hospitals with an x-ray machine, and the only hospital with an eye, ear, nose, and throat department and specialist.69 Therefore, although other hospitals were able to offer general treatment to the patients of their districts, Port-au-Prince’s General Hospital offered the most advanced, comprehensive care in Haiti. However, the hospitals’ relatively urban locations made it difficult for the Public Health Service to reach the rural populace.

In addition to geographical access, the Americans considered Haitian voodoo and traditional practices a major obstacle to their medical mission. According to Butler, most of the population believed in voodoo and trusted in priests and priestesses—“Papa Loi” and “Mama Loi”—for healing; convincing people whose “idea of preventive medicine [was] to tie a string with a bunch of [asaefoetida] attached to it around the neck” would prove
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Therefore, given the reluctance of rural Haitians to stray from traditional healing practices, the Public Health Service “[developed] an extensive rural clinic service” designed to “awaken[...] the medical and hygienic conscience of the people.”

In weekly and monthly intervals, the American physicians would set out into the countryside to treat the Haitian peasants at over 100 rural dispensaries scattered among the health districts. These clinics often drew hundreds of patients per visit, with two physicians reportedly having treated 950 Haitians on one occasion. According to Butler, only town outcasts had visited the clinics initially, but as word spread regarding the effectiveness of the Americans’ medicine, attendance exploded to nearly 35,000 patients per month. While Butler himself admitted that the medicine being practiced en masse outside the hospital was not “medicine of the highest order,” he maintained that the Americans’ strategy of mass treatment was better than leaving the people to their own colloquial practices. Encouraged by the success of the clinics, Butler and the Americans hoped that their practice of rural medicine would erode the influence of the “Papa” and “Mama Loi” and treat what they viewed as the Haitian “disease” of ignorance. To the Americans, the juxtaposition of Western medicine with Haitian voodoo reinforced the perception of Haitians as a backwards people and validated the notion that they required civilizing. Medicine therefore legitimized U.S. hegemony over the Haitians by emphasizing American superiority and portraying the Americans as white saviors curing Haiti of its cultural ills.

This image manifested in a literal fashion, as the Americans set about treating the myriad of actual diseases plaguing Haiti.
“Haiti: An Experiment in Pragmatism,” Ulysses G. Weatherly cited American reports that “over 50 per cent [of Haitians were] afflicted with worms, at least 50 per cent [were] tubercular, and more than a third [had] malaria.” In addition, the populace was plagued by dysentery, typhoid fever, leprosy, various water-borne pathogens, and a host of other diseases, resulting in a high morbidity rate that took a distinct toll on the Haitian population. For instance, the American Marines were forced to lower the training standards for the Haitian gendarmerie due to the recruits’ poor physical stamina, and further medical examinations revealed that “95% of [the recruits] had blood diseases and 85% had intestinal worms.” To combat a wide array of the pathologies afflicting Haiti, the Americans first addressed sanitation issues in Haitian cities. Newly-instituted street-sweeping services kept the cities relatively free of garbage, gendarmes went about ticketing citizens for health violations, such as basins of standing water or “improper nightsoil removal,” and the health service capped springs and chlorinated water supplies. To combat malaria specifically, the Americans: drained low-lying swamps or filled them with garbage or oil; cleared underbrush; utilized mosquito netting at night; and distributed quinine among U.S. Marines and some Haitian residents. According to Butler, the U.S. also established a “quarantine station, asylum for insane and a hospital for lepers.” As if to summarize the nation’s great public health push, Haiti ratified the Pan American Sanitary Code in 1926.
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Among the spectrum of health issues facing Haiti, however, the primary disease target of American physicians was “yaws”—a close relative of syphilis that could be detected using the same blood test. Characterized by bone infections and painful skin lesions that could result in disfigurement and disability, yaws was the scourge of Haitian health when the U.S. invaded in 1915. Yet at the outset of the occupation, the Americans had largely misdiagnosed yaws, conflating the Haitians’ skin lesions as signs of leprosy and tertiary syphilis. Physicians’ inability to cure leprosy at the time, coupled with the stigma surrounding sexually-transmitted diseases such as syphilis, meant that yaws went largely untreated prior to Butler’s arrival in Haiti in 1924. While working in the Philippines, Butler had begun lumping yaws and syphilis together under a single diagnosis: “treponematosis.” Despite their distinct origins—yaws is a non-sexually-transmitted, rural disease prevalent in youth, whereas syphilis is a sexually-transmitted disease that affects adults and urban populations—Butler cited the two diseases’ identical progression and treatment (arsenic therapy) as justification for their diagnostic association. Once in Haiti, Butler argued that the “innocent” yaws had been largely confused for its more scandalous cousin, syphilis. He thus advocated heavily for the treatment of both treponematoses in Haiti, which he estimated as affecting approximately 70% of Haitians throughout their lifetime. As the Public Health Service began to diagnose and treat treponematosis via arsenic therapy, the disease proved to be extremely prevalent, with the Port-au-Prince rural clinic reporting 3274 cases in July 1926—64% of the clinic’s
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Therefore, under Butler’s leadership, the Americans significantly expanded the reach of medicine and public health in Haiti. All in all, U.S. efforts to improve Haitian public health were quite extensive, and “were often highlighted by even the most [skeptical] observers.”

Nonetheless, the efficacy of U.S. medicine in Haiti was frequently overblown, as evidenced by the smallpox epidemic of 1920. According to Butler, this outbreak infected about 60% of the Haitian populace and prompted the newly-formed Public Health Service to initiate a vaccination campaign. The Americans reportedly vaccinated between 850,000 and 900,000 Haitians, crowing that only vaccinated Haitians had avoided contracting smallpox. In this way, the Americans cast themselves as valiant defenders of Haitian health, a rosy characterization at best. In fact, U.S. officials had failed to enforce mandatory vaccination laws prior to the 1920 outbreak, and the manner in which smallpox tore through the country highlighted the shortcomings of American public health efforts in Haiti. While the vaccination campaign had indeed succeeded in reaching an impressive number of Haitians, the Americans conveniently glossed over the less flattering details of the epidemic. This evidenced American tendencies to propagandize medical work in Haiti, as well as the progress of the occupation as a whole.

Justification and Uplift Through Medicine

Although the reorganization of the occupation had placed an increased emphasis on Haitian public health, the benevolent veneer
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of the occupation was belied by its racist undertones, which subsequently caused the racialization of medicine in Haiti. Occupational racism largely stemmed from the attitudes of U.S. leadership in Haiti, as many officials had roots in the American culture and institutions of Jim Crow. Admiral William B. Caperton was a “child of the Civil War South” who believed the intervention was “liberal and fair” given the supposed inferiority of Haitian government and culture. Meanwhile, High Commissioner John Russell, originally from Georgia, supported racial segregation and privately considered most of the Haitian populace to be “bordering on a state of savagery.” Woodrow Wilson himself was a Southerner deeply shaped by the racial ideology of the Jim Crow era. Therefore, in subordinating the Haitians, the U.S. drew on a number of racist, black stereotypes. Comparing the American and Haitian “negroes,” Charles Chapman characterized the Haitian as “more subdued, simple, and well-mannered” than the American, yet with a “far greater burden to throw off before he can take his place among the civilized peoples of the earth.” Considering Haiti to be the equivalent of a “happy-go-lucky” child, the Americans assumed a racially paternalistic attitude towards the Haitians that manifested in a number of ways. Primarily, the Americans deemed the Haitians incapable of operating their own country, and thus the grounds that had served to justify the invasion of 1915 also established the racial hierarchy of the occupation. During the occupation, white Americans held all positions of ultimate authority, originating in the office of the High Commissioner and disseminating into the lower ranks of the administration. In the gendarmerie, not a single Haitian
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advanced past the white Marine officers in rank, and only five Haitians had been promoted to the rank of captain by 1929. The Americans also conferred special treatment to the lighter-skinned, elite mulatto class of Haiti, installing them as puppet rulers.

Medicine itself also served to further entrench occupational racism. In the Public Health Service, all the hospitals were run by white naval medical officers, while Haitian doctors, nurses, and technicians—comprising a majority of the staff—assumed subordinate positions and carried out menial tasks. Racism also played a factor in the American reluctance to treat syphilitic patients in Haiti. Prior to C.S. Butler’s categorization of yaws and syphilis under the same diagnosis, treponematosis, all patients infected with Treponema were diagnosed as syphilitic. This played into “derisive, longstanding stereotypes of uncontrolled black promiscuity,” and rationalized American refusals to treat the Haitians for syphilis due to the supposedly “insurmountable biological and cultural defects among Haitian society.” Thus, racist ideologies caused American physicians to view their Haitian patients as subhuman, and fed into the perceived “moral obligation of the white races… to assist [the] little Caribbean republic to her feet.” Haiti symbolized not only the white man’s burden, but more specifically, the physician’s burden as well.

The racial paternalism of the occupation meant that, even following occupational reform, the humanitarian vision of medicine in Haiti remained tarnished. Namely, medicine’s primary goals in the latter half of the occupation were: 1) to revive the Haitian economy by improving the health of individual Haitians; 2) to civilize the Haitians; 3) most importantly, to justify the continued American presence in Haiti. With regards to U.S.
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capitalist aims, C.S. Butler himself advertised medicine as the remedy to Haiti’s economic woes, stating:

By elevating the standard of health, [the government] increases the earning capacity of the laborers…

Experience… in the Caribbean… and western Tropics shows that it is best for generals of commerce and industry, as well as for military generals to ‘purchase this big thing from the physician.’

Butler’s statement made evident the aims of the restructured U.S. occupation. Following the reorganization of the administration in Haiti in the early 1920s, it soon became clear that the occupation’s focus had simply shifted from military conquest to economic uplift. In 1927, for example, the United States continued to exert total control over Haitian finances, funneling $2.68 million—$1 million more than necessary—towards paying off Haitian debt to U.S.-based creditors. In comparison, public health received only $0.68 million of the Haitian budget, indicating that health remained less of a priority than U.S. economic interests in Haiti. Therefore, the economic motives of the U.S. occupation meant that increased medical outreach was mainly for the purpose of keeping Haitian workers healthy and improving Haitian agricultural productivity. As the U.S. sought to revitalize the Haitian economy, medicine transitioned from treating Haitians as combatants to treating them as the means of production.

In addition to improving the Haitian economy, the U.S. saw medicine as a means of raising the Haitians from their seemingly uncultured, ignorant existence. According to Hans Schmidt, “Americans, as representatives of an advanced, modern, industrialized nation, felt that they could transform backward,
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underdeveloped Haiti with American technology and practical ingenuity.” These sentiments were espoused by Ulysses B. Weatherly, who in his article, “Haiti: An Experiment in Pragmatism,” insisted that “intelligent guidance from without may sometimes accelerate the process of national growth and save much waste.” American disdain for Haitian capabilities applied to medicine as well, with C.S. Butler remarking: “With politics in such a shocking condition… what could we expect from [Haiti] for medical education or sanitation or for hospitals…?” In the eyes of Butler, “from 1804 to 1915, the medical side of Haiti’s story [was] not long to tell,” and America had “a moral obligation… of rendering to backward peoples… much-needed medical assistance.”

In order to bestow the “gift” of Western medicine upon the Haitians, Butler and the Americans considered a modern medical education system of chief importance in Haiti. Towards this aim, in 1926, the Haitian government allocated $50,000 for the construction of a new medical school in Port-au-Prince. The medical school would initially be run by the naval medical officers, who would train classes of 15-20 Haitian medical students over a period of four years, after which they would complete a one-year internship. To ensure a high quality education for the Haitian students, the Americans secured an extra $30,000—three yearly installments of $10,000 —from the Rockefeller Foundation to furnish the school with new medical equipment. Finally, the Rockefeller Foundation also provided Haitian doctors with
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fellowship opportunities in the United States and Europe in order to enhance their training. 118

Although of undeniable benefit to the Haitians, the emphasis on improved medical education did not spring from a place of beneficence on the part of the Americans, but rather of necessity. Indeed, up until the late 1920s, the Haitians had operated solely as subordinates to the American physicians—this was due in large part to the Americans’ racist preconceptions regarding the competence of Haitian medical personnel. 119 For instance, when K.C. Melhorn called the Dean of the Haitian Medical School into his office to brief him on the intricacies of the Public Health Service’s budget, “the Dean’s eyes ‘fairly bugged out’ for… ‘he had not realized all the other elements entering into the Sanitary budget.’” 120 Therefore, had the deadline for the American withdrawal from Haiti not been fast-approaching, the Americans would likely never have considered fully training Haitian physicians. However, facing the imminent U.S. withdrawal, the Americans had no choice but to pass the reigns of their public health machine to the Haitians and hope that “the foundations for a Haitian medical personnel… [would] be able to carry on according to the plans laid down by their American friends.” 121

The primary function of medicine in the later years of the occupation, however, was to legitimize American control over Haiti. Following reports of U.S. Marine brutality in the early years of the occupation, the Americans were desperate for favorable propaganda surrounding their presence in Haiti; medicine provided them with the perfect justification. 122 Richard Parsons raved that
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“the yaws work [stood] out as the most glowing chapter of all Haitian medicine… because of its tremendous accomplishments for the human and economic betterment of Haiti.” Dr. Elwood Mead, after visiting Haiti in 1926, marveled at how the Public Health Service had succeeded in bringing “the benefits of modern medical science and sanitation” to the Haitians, stating, “Today Port-au-Prince is as clean and sanitary as Washington.” Thus, medicine portrayed the Americans not only as benevolent, but infallible, and blame for any shortcomings of the occupation landed squarely on Haitian shoulders. For instance, when American attempts to eradicate yaws in 1929 failed, it was due to the “ignorance of the people.” Similarly, concerns regarding the ability of Haitian nurses in Port-au-Prince stemmed from their lack of initiative and responsibility, not poor instruction. Thus, medicine fed into U.S. propaganda regarding the occupation, and served to vindicate the takeover of Haiti by erasing American ineptitudes.

U.S. Withdrawal and Fallout

As the U.S. occupation wore on, it became increasingly difficult to ignore the growing discontent in Haiti. Contrary to U.S. public portrayals of the occupation, many Haitians had always resented the Americans running their country, and the puppet administrations installed by the Americans relied heavily on U.S. military might to keep them in power. For example, in 1915, the newly-established president, Sudre Dartiguenave, lasted a mere month before the U.S. felt it necessary to impose martial law in Haiti. Backed by the U.S., Dartiguenave remained as president until 1922, when he refused to authorize the consolidation of
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Haitian debt in the U.S.-owned Banque Nationale—a move that practically sold Haiti’s “soul” to U.S. creditors. Over the years, Dartiguenave had grown resistant to U.S. objectives in Haiti, and therefore the Americans made sure Dartiguenave’s replacement, Louis Borno, would be more amenable to U.S. demands. Borno—who admired the Italian fascist leader, Benito Mussolini—was a proponent of U.S. authoritarian uplift in Haiti and a willing participant in the Americans’ anti-democratic machinations. However, Borno’s continued refusal to assemble the Haitian Council of State and thus allow for presidential elections prompted student strikes in 1929, which soon developed into full-fledged riots by the political opposition. Faced with growing tensions in Haiti, the Americans ousted Borno and conveniently sidestepped the electoral provisions of the Haitian Constitution to pronounce Eugene Roy—a candidate agreed upon by both Haitian parties—as the interim president. While the immediate collapse of the occupation was avoided, the political unrest of 1929 marked the beginning of the end of the U.S. occupation.

By 1930, Haiti had ceased to be worth the headache it was causing the Americans, and the U.S. began a slow exit from the island nation. With Europe no longer a threat to its hegemony in the Western hemisphere and the Great Depression’s devastating effect on the domestic economy, the U.S. had little interest in running a small Caribbean nation chafing against American authority. Unwilling to remain in Haiti until 1936—per the stipulations of the 1915 Haitian-American Treaty—yet recognizing that a hasty retreat would destabilize Haiti and reflect poorly upon the U.S., the Americans opted for a prolonged withdrawal. When the last remaining Marine detachment left Haiti in August 1934, the Americans spun their departure as “a positive affirmation
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of the new Good Neighbor Policy in Latin America,” not an unceremonious retreat.\textsuperscript{133} While the Americans pronounced their intervention a success, upon closer examination, the supposed benefits of the American occupation in Haiti could scarcely be found. While in Haiti, the Americans had controlled nearly all aspects of the occupation, leaving the Haitian government and civilian professionals starved of experience and education.\textsuperscript{134} Following the American withdrawal, the Haitian government found itself further indebted to foreign creditors, Haitian technology lagged behind that of other Latin American nations, and a vast majority of the Haitian populace remained impoverished, unhealthy, and uneducated.\textsuperscript{135} Thus, after nearly two decades of atrophy under U.S. rule, Haitian government and society struggled to operate effectively.

The abysmal fallout of the American intervention in Haiti subsequently brought the legacy of occupation medicine into question. Had the Haitians actually benefited from American aid? In the aftermath of the occupation, the Americans proudly proclaimed that U.S. medicine had treated droves of Haitians for disease and made massive improvements to the Haitian public health system. However, during the slow U.S. transition out of Haiti, “the health systems infrastructure was slowly dismantled—the budget was slashed, prescriptions were watered down, and Haitians were expected to pay for or provide their own bandages and oils, by order of the Sanitation Engineer.”\textsuperscript{136} America’s callous exit exposed occupation medicine as no more than a travelling clinic, gone as fast as it had come. In the meantime, Haiti was still mired in disease and left unprepared to treat itself. “Haitian medical personnel had been starved of experience for nearly two decades,” and were unable to adequately address Haiti’s daunting
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public health challenges following the U.S. withdrawal.\textsuperscript{137} American medicine thus caused Haiti to become increasingly reliant on foreign medical aid in the aftermath of the U.S. occupation. Although medicine addressed many of the immediate health issues facing Haiti, it failed to provide for the long-term health of its Haitian “patient.”

**Conclusion**

The U.S. occupation of Haiti demonstrated the susceptibility of medicine to political and social aims. As the U.S. sought to control Haiti in the early years of the occupation, American military and political objectives led to the selective practice of medicine on behalf of the Haitians. Medicine looked to stabilize Haiti by fostering an environment in which the American military could operate, and as a result, the Haitians were often viewed as combatants rather than patients. Once the brutal martial law imposed by the Americans was no longer acceptable in the public eye, medicine worked to cast the occupation in a more humane light. However, the lenses of racism and economic uplift distorted medicine’s view of the Haitians, reducing patients to little more than ignorant children and the economic means of production. Nevertheless, the treatment of disease and development of public health infrastructure in Haiti served as wonderful propaganda for the Americans, who highlighted medicine as a primary justification for the continued U.S. presence in Haiti. Ultimately, once the Americans lost interest in the Haitian project, the beneficent hand of American medicine was quickly retracted, and the Haitians were left perhaps worse off than before. Thus, the politics of the U.S. occupation drastically affected the goals of medicine and how it was practiced in Haiti. From the occupation, we can see that medicine in and of itself is not inherently good. Rather, it depends upon the context in which it is practiced and the aims that it serves.
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C.S. Butler was correct in saying, “We physicians have failed to appreciate the enormous importance of our calling in helping [government].”\(^{138}\) However, he failed to recognize the reciprocal impact that government had on him and his fellow physicians.
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Eleanor Roosevelt, Setting the Stage for the Future

Haley Butler

Amidst copious backlash, Hillary Clinton displayed a deep interest in involving herself in her husband’s presidency and voicing her strong opinions. However, First Ladies did not always have their own initiative and ability to voice their political opinions. Historically, they managed domestic and social affairs. They held no official role other than to host social events, greet dignitaries, and aid their husband’s in creating connections to strengthen his presidency. In a political arena dominated by men, women’s opinions were deemed unworthy and unnecessary. This all changed during the presidency of Franklin Roosevelt and his wife, Anna Eleanor Roosevelt. The press named her “First Lady of the World.”

She spoke out for minorities and advocated for human rights. She was never afraid to voice her true opinions when necessary. She was a revolutionary new type of First Lady that America had never seen before, especially in regard to her use of the press. Her effective use of media allowed her to appear non-threatening to the role of American men and the American family ideal by showing women could hold dual roles in society while still not encroaching over the line of equality. In addition to acting as a wife, she had opinions and participated in politics. She used the media to try and change the public mindset on how women should behave in political conversation. Mrs. Roosevelt would transform the role of First Lady in the White House permanently. She set a precedent for First Ladies to have no qualms against being political if they chose to do so and avidly pressed for them to take action if necessary.

Although Eleanor Roosevelt had always been an independent woman, she did take some time to find herself. She struggled to find a balance between the political life she craved and the
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homemaker role that she knew she needed to fulfill.\(^2\) Although she did not come into her political prime until later in her life, reporters began to see her as a powerful figure even before her husband’s rise to president. A reporter interviewing Mrs. Roosevelt described her as, “first of all a domestic woman, but she has one outside interest… That is politics.”\(^3\) Mrs. Roosevelt had found an area of expertise that she could flourish in while still maintaining the role of mother and wife. She presented herself as if she was not connected to politics but eventually her political nature would come to light. In his biography of Mrs. Roosevelt, *Eleanor and Franklin: The Story of Their Relationship*, author Joseph Lash wrote, “Not only was she the governor’s wife and a political power in her own right, but, most important of all, she was a useful champion when their own programs were in trouble—or when they wanted the governor’s support for new ideas.”\(^4\) Mrs. Roosevelt possessed noticeable power, but she would never admit to her strength as that would have stepped too far past the bounds of a traditional woman. She needed to strike a correct balance between policy and family values to gain the favor of the people around her. A balance that allowed her opinions to aid the others around her while not seeming overbearing and overly forceful. In addition to this necessary balance, she would need an outlet conveyor for her opinions to be facilitated to the public which would come in the form of the media.

Mrs. Roosevelt’s relationship with the female media proved to be one of her most important in regard to her personal image. In particular, Lorena Hickock, a journalist for the Associated Press, famously had an extremely close relationship with Mrs. Roosevelt which would come to be one of her most important and influential


friendships. Lorena was said to have been the “the first journalist to recognize Eleanor Roosevelt’s news making potential.” Their friendship would benefit each of them greatly as both would attain more recognition through their combined thinking of new ways to influence the media. In February of 1934, Hickock and Eleanor went on a trip to the Caribbean along with several other female journalists. Ms. Hickok taught her how to express herself properly to the press, orchestrating many photo opportunities and talks with the media. Mrs. Roosevelt used this trip to show her concern for the less fortunate. Mrs. Roosevelt would maintain this public appearance by taking part in photoshoots when she gave lectures, visited school children, and met migrant workers, thereby spreading her frequent and ceaseless activity to the general public. Through the advice of Ms. Hickok, Mrs. Roosevelt held frequent press conferences in the White House solely for female reporters to nurture a mutually beneficial relationship with the press. Initially the conferences dealt with menial things such as Mrs. Roosevelt’s daily schedule yet, as time went on, the female reporters asked for more in-depth information to give to the public. As time progressed, she went on to discuss many issues that were more political in nature. Not only would she discuss her own views, in addition, she would bring in dignitaries and politicians to give outside opinions as well. Mrs. Roosevelt nurtured an almost symbiotic relationship with the female press. One journalist described these conferences as “a group of school-girls gathered at the feet of their beloved principal.” She saw these conferences as
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an opportunity to give female reporters the step into equality that they needed to be seen as legitimate in the journalism sphere. These journalists in return praised Mrs. Roosevelt and spread her opinions in their articles. These were the opportunities that they needed to become equal to their male cohorts. These conferences became so famous that the women who attended were given the name “hen-press”. Mrs. Roosevelt saw that the people who read about what she said during these conferences gained a greater interest in what went on in the White House and saw a more pressing need for female journalists. These press conferences became a necessary source of information for pressing issues of the time and the female press took the advantage they were given. The relationship that Mrs. Roosevelt created benefited her greatly and benefited the public. She gained greater attention in the newspaper and the people gained a greater understanding of her as a person and White House business as well.

Her most effective use of media first came to fruition on December 31st, 1935. At the advising of her trusted confidant, Lorena Hickok, Mrs. Roosevelt began writing a nationally syndicated newspaper column entitled “My Day.” It gave the American people a look into the daily life of the First Lady and the people involved in her life. Initially, the column included menial things like day to day activities and musings of the First Lady, yet it still played an important role in connecting the First Lady to the public. In 1938, she became much more open about her political opinions and her ability to make a difference in America. She backed her husband’s policies when she felt necessary, yet she was never afraid to say when she disagreed. She became known for the tone and look in her eyes directed at Mr. Roosevelt that displayed
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her displeasure with his decisions and opinions. In her column, Mrs. Roosevelt freely fought for many causes from her husband’s New Deal plan to the rights of African Americans, and the importance and inevitability of fighting in World War II. Mrs. Roosevelt praised the role of a housewife and a strong mother figure, but also a woman with political opinions showing that women can hold both roles at the same time. Equality was necessary during times of struggle and change. She called for women to understand their necessary part in American politics in her February 3, 1936 column writing, “Many women feel that they are so unimportant that their action can count little for good or ill, but it is the mass of individuals that makes up public opinion and public opinion is what runs a democracy!” Mrs. Roosevelt reasserted that women could and should be political participants. She believed in the empowerment of women in a time where women predominantly felt they had little to no political power. She believed the world success necessitated women becoming active in politics and the “My Day” column gave her a vehicle to voice those opinions and connect to disenfranchised women directly. The “My Day” column was an outlet for Mrs. Roosevelt that improved her image immensely. The American public was not familiar with the experience of getting a daily account of what a First Lady did and thought. She effectively connected with the people in ways that they had never experienced. They gained an inside look into her views and her influence spread massively as “My Day” proved to be extremely popular and it slowly became one of America’s most popular news columns. Her ability to connect with the public became one of her strongest suits and necessary for her to maintain the reputation she had created for herself. Mrs.
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Roosevelt’s use of the media would give her a reputation as formidable political player.

Mrs. Roosevelt was not one to shy away from causes and issues she felt needed her support. An independent woman at heart, she had no reason to accept and support viewpoints that she wholeheartedly did not agree upon. Lorania K. Francis writes for the *Los Angeles Times*, “Her personal creed is based on the belief that ‘I wouldn’t be true to myself if I didn’t stick to my ideas.’ And she grants a like privilege to her attackers. In consequence, attacking Mrs. Roosevelt is rather like the old, old story of ‘an irresistible force meeting an immovable object.’ Nothing happens.”\(^{20}\) Mrs. Roosevelt believed that her personal beliefs were powerful against others and their attacks did not phase her. Francis correctly argues that when others around her did not agree, Mrs. Roosevelt believed that her true opinions would prove them wrong. She cared for all minority groups whether they be African Americans or low wage laborers. Everyone deserved the chance to be seen as equal in society; a revolutionary belief at the time as many promoted social segregation and distinct class differences. She understood the necessary part that everyone played in a well-functioning society and wanted everyone else to understand that as well. In her “My Day” column, she wrote about how migrant workers received unfair treatment in America for too long. She argued for the American people to recognize the importance of migrant workers and stressed the importance of equal treatment. She wrote, “I am filled with shame” when discussing the horrendous conditions, they were forced to endure. Further on, she wrote about how the need to fight for better treatment and protection of rights for these workers.\(^{21}\) Mrs. Roosevelt stood for human rights and believed no matter what race, gender, or class, everyone deserved equal opportunity and equal rights in the eyes of the government. She openly fought for civil rights and
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promotion of anti-discrimination which other politicians decided were not as important as Mrs. Roosevelt believed.

With topics such as these, disagreement became natural. When FDR did not make more efficient moves to forward the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill in 1934, she fought back. FDR hesitated to support the bill due to his support base from Southern voters. If they believed he was too liberal, he would lose the next election. She saw FDR’s hesitation to push the bill forward and found her own support in the form of Walter White, an important civil rights leader at the time. She supported White and his cause, frustrating others around her. Despite FDR’s protests, she continued to support White and the fight for anti-discrimination as civil rights became one of her main causes of interest. More issues spawned from this event causing even more backlash from others around her, yet she did not let up. Shocking the nation, she resigned from the Daughters of the American Revolution due to their allowance and passive promotion of discrimination. She announced her resignation in her “My Day” column on February 27, 1939. Poised and refined, she did not mention the name of the organization, but she did strike at them writing, “if you belong to an organization and disapprove of an action which is typical of a policy, should you resign or is better to work for a changed point of view within the organization?...I belong to an organization in which I can do no active work. They have taken an action which has been widely talked of in the press. To remain as a member implies approval of that action, and therefore I am resigning.”

She could have remained silent but refused complacency as she understood that silence was comparable to affirmation. When given the chance, she would speak her mind in subtle ways that were not overtly aggressive. Her open support of civil rights went
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against her husband’s wishes and his support system, yet she followed her own passions. In the face of pushback, she voiced her opinions without hesitation if the cause truly deserved her support and would benefit the public.

Mrs. Roosevelt’s continued outspoken nature did get her in to trouble in certain instances. Despite the support she gained for her views, her many public roles in American society and her lack of caution with voicing her liberal opinions faced backlash. At the time of her husband’s election, she faced criticism for not resigning from her job as a teacher at the school of which she retained part-ownership. Critics argued that she could not have jobs other than First Lady. Typically, her opponents were far right leaning republicans who believed she and her husband were too politically liberal for the good of America. At one time, critics charged her with stealing gas that could have been utilized by civilians to visit army troops in the Caribbean even though FDR insisted she visit.25

Even simple things such as her choice of verbiage in her articles or speeches faced criticism and analysis. Lynn U. Stambaugh, the Commander of the American Legion, ridiculed her for arguing that World War II should be fought for a “changed world”. Stambaugh argued that Mrs. Roosevelt had lost touch with the opinions of the American population. He argued that the war should be fought to “preserve the world we have known.”26 Stambaugh misconstrued her words to make her seem out of touch with the population when in truth, she argued for a better world for the American people. In essence, they both wanted the same thing however Stambaugh chose to attack Mrs. Roosevelt because of his disagreement with her choice of words. One of her most avid critics, a journalist named Westbrook Pegler wrote numerous articles criticizing her beliefs and role in the White House. He

framed her as greedy, taking advantage of FDR and the power and wealth that came along with him. He claimed she lied about her donations of her salary to charity, therefore claiming she was profiting off her role as First Lady.\textsuperscript{27} He made comparisons between her and Hitler.\textsuperscript{28} He also attacked her for her role as a journalist and questioned whether she had the correct qualifications to be one. He called for her eligibility to be taken away from her due to journalism not being her “principal role.”\textsuperscript{29} Another attack claiming she could not have more positions other than First Lady.

Even after the death of FDR, critics continued to attack Mrs. Roosevelt for her beliefs during her time as First Lady. In 1950, a famous Christian minister, Gerald L. K. Smith, famously attacked FDR, Mrs. Roosevelt, and the policies that they supported, especially the New Deal.\textsuperscript{30} Smith attacked her and her beliefs on numerous occasions, even going so far as to pen an open letter to her in his book, \textit{Too Much and Too Many Roosevelts}. Smith first began his attack by commenting on her appearance, calling her an “aggressive Amazonian female, who personifies opportunism at its worst.”\textsuperscript{31} Smith went on to say:

\begin{quote}
Her manipulation of the radio and the newspaper column proved to be the creation of a new art. It was not new for a woman to be money hungry or publicity conscious. It was new for the wife of the President of the United States to use the influence of her high position for financial purposes. No one was interested in what Eleanor Roosevelt said because
\end{quote}
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she was Eleanor Roosevelt... The newspapers which published her columns knew that large numbers of people would read it merely because she was the wife of the President.  

Smith argued that she purely gained recognition due to her being First Lady. Her power was threatening to him as traditional First Ladies do not exhibit such political might. He devalued her opinions by framing them in a negative light and taking her power away, arguing it came from her husband and the position he gave her.

Mrs. Roosevelt faced criticism due to her concerted effort to cross the boundaries of traditional female power. Some men saw a powerful woman like Eleanor Roosevelt as a threat. They fought to uphold the narrow-minded view of the role of First Lady. For some, she had pushed the boundary too far, crossing the line of the domestic sphere for women and the line of powers men had given to the First Lady. She had accumulated too much strength for one woman to have by herself and it was their job to disvalue it and take it from her. Her critics wanted to prove that women could not hold more than a domestic role in America. Potentially, they had a fear that women would become too powerful for them to control. Any criticisms were attempts to discredit her, diminishing her supporter’s ability to trust her. Critics attempted to show that her power came solely from her husband, painting a picture of a traditional wife that could do nothing without her husband’s power. Attacks about her appearance were meant to discourage her yet these baseless attempts did not phase her. She possessed too much strength to take trivial attacks to heart. In many instances, she even fought back and responded by either denying or proving them wrong with the real truth.  

She used the media to show her status as a woman of character, especially in regard to directly
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speaking with female journalists who were more likely to be in favor of her views. Doris O’Donnell, a daughter of a close companion of Mrs. Roosevelt said, “She enlisted them in her causes. She had an extraordinary creative capacity to see how people could best use their talents. These women had fought their way to the top in their profession against great odds…But they responded to Mrs. Roosevelt’s vitality, sincerity, strength of character and her real interest in them.”

She had a special way of drawing them in and captivating the media. Had the female lead media not been in her favor, Mrs. Roosevelt would not have had the power to fight off such attacks. She needed the female media to connect her to the public and spread her ideas of an equal society that she strove to create.

Because of Mrs. Roosevelt, the President and First Lady were no longer distant individuals that did not interact with the American people. The public loved her and believed in her causes because she cared about the public and the issues they faced. When referencing her great work, journalists noted, “It took courage, but that’s the quality which seems to most accurately describe Mrs. Roosevelt—the courage of her convictions. Because of her apparent sincerity and her ability to do what she preaches; she has gone across with the American people. Whatever your politics, it’s almost like saying you don’t believe in good government to say you don’t believe in Mrs. Roosevelt.”

She changed the way people perceived the role of the First Lady. She could be political, but also a devoted wife and mother. She could push for political change, even participating in the United Nations and writing the Declaration of Human Rights. She was emotionally honest and
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let her opinions be known regarding issues she truly cared about. Despite all of these amazing traits, in addition, she was humble. Lucy Greenbaum wrote, “Asked for what single accomplishment of her own she would best like to be remembered, she answers: ‘There is no accomplishment of mine that I think could possibly be important enough to be recorded, and I have no desire to be remembered except by the few people whom I love.” In Mrs. Roosevelt’s opinion, none of her acts were revolutionary because they should have been normal. She genuinely believed everyone should care for each other and fight for equality, which shouldn’t be a revolutionary ideal.

Mrs. Roosevelt set a precedent in the way she presented herself first and foremost as a loving wife and secondly, as a political power, proving her traditionalist male critics wrong. She made herself non-threatening to the traditional role of a woman, yet she put a new twist on the idea of women in power, arguing for a partnership of equality between men and women. She became a figurehead for women, giving them a model for exercising their political power like any other American citizen deserved to do. After Mrs. Roosevelt’s time in the White House, subsequent First Ladies were presented with a choice. Maurine Hoffman Beasley writes, “Eleanor left an indelible impression on her successors…For years presidential spouses have been described as either activists in Eleanor Roosevelt mold or traditionalists who do not follow her example. Mrs. Roosevelt widened the concept of the First Lady from being a minor player to a key supporting actress in the drama of the presidency itself.” However, the change did not become apparent immediately. Bess Truman, the First Lady directly succeeding Mrs. Roosevelt did not attempt to make her own mark, staying within traditional barriers of what it means to be
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First Lady.\textsuperscript{39} Conversely, Rosalynn Carter made a concerted effort to form a strong political partnership with her husband.\textsuperscript{40} Hillary Clinton avidly spoke out on many different issues and topics and faced her own amount of backlash. Since the late twentieth century, it has become traditional for a First Lady to have her own initiative that she outwardly supported. Some were more successful and outspoken than others. However, as more First Ladies made their way through the White House, they became more likely to flex their political muscles as Mrs. Roosevelt had first done. Mrs. Roosevelt set the stage for the political path of the American First Lady and progressively First Ladies have become more politically active because of her work.


\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, 221.
The People’s War:
A Chronological Look at the Great Patriotic War
Through the Lens of Soviet Propaganda

Nick Ellis

“Glory to the Soviet troops, who hoisted the banner of victory over Berlin!”

Soviet propaganda during the Great Patriotic War was necessary to rally not only troops, but also the entire population in order to combat the advancing German forces. Propaganda was presented in many different forms: posters, music, policies, speeches and declarations, and even fighting tactics. Though some
propaganda was ineffective, wartime propaganda and policies played an integral part in holding the Soviet Union together during the Great Patriotic War and had lasting effects on public memory of the conflict.

Setting the Stage:

Pre-War Propaganda and Operation Barbarossa

Before Operation Barbarossa began in June 1941, Stalin led the Soviet Union in a massive attempt to industrialize and modernize the country in order to compete with western capitalist nations and potentially fend off any attacks from the West. During this time, Stalin also enforced his unpopular policy of collectivization and conducted purges against potential political enemies and “enemies of the people.” Stalin’s prewar policies greatly affected the Soviet Union’s initial response to German invasion in three major ways: the military was ill-managed, Soviet citizens were already fighting a war of preparation, and the collective was emphasized over the individual.

When Wehrmacht forces invaded the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941, it was not much of a surprise that war had come. Stalin expected Hitler to invade for some time, which may have led him to use Poland as a buffer state in earlier years. During the war of preparation, propaganda alerted citizens to be ready “if tomorrow brings war.”1 Interestingly, the biggest shock when war broke out was how the Red Army responded. Troops were mismanaged and many fled when they heard about the German blitzkrieg. According to Red Army soldier Samoilov, “We were all expecting war … but we were not expecting that war.”2 During Stalin’s purges, many experienced officers were removed, and a culture of scapegoating and lying developed in response. This left

1 Choi Chatterjee, Lisa A. Kirschenbaum and Deborah A. Field, Russia's Long Twentieth Century: Voices, Memories, Contested Perspectives (London; New York: Routledge, 2016), 133.

the army with mostly inexperienced and irresponsible officers who had not developed the leadership skills necessary to respond. As a result, the Red Army was disorganized and scattered across the western border allowing the Wehrmacht to advance rapidly, take many prisoners, and destroy much of the Soviet Union’s infrastructure and supply lines.

Despite the Red Army’s striking losses, many Soviet citizens, men and women, patriotically enlisting in the Red Army to respond to the imminent threat largely thanks to the emphasis on the collective and the war of preparation. A secret police report noted, “The workers feel a profound patriotism. There have been significant numbers of applications to join the army from young people from the cities and the farms.”3 It is important to note that many of these enthusiastic volunteers were often ethnically Russian. Many ethnic minorities, such as Ukrainian nationalists, saw the German invasion as a chance to escape Soviet collectivization, and often welcomed German soldiers early on. This is not meant to diminish the role ethnic minorities played in the Great Patriotic War, but to show that not everyone was enthusiastic about joining the Red Army.

As a result of Stalin’s pre-war purges, collectivization, and the state’s brutal emphasis on the war of preparation, the Soviet Union suffered major tactical losses when the Germans invaded. At the same time many citizens seemed to experience a sudden surge of patriotism despite the demoralizing defeat. Years of exposure to collective Stalinist propaganda seemed to train scared citizens to look to Stalin for leadership and work harder to defend their motherland against the Soviet Union’s arch-nemesis, fascist Germany. Even so, much of the Red Army had lost its morale and the Soviet Union was left in shock as German troops rapidly gained more ground.

---

Repairing the Broken Propaganda Machine of 1941

Although there was a notable movement towards greater participation in the war by citizens, early Soviet propaganda seemed to be ineffective in conjuring much of this support. At the time, Soviet propaganda generally consisted of calling for defense of the Soviet Union and obedience to Stalin – the kind of propaganda citizens were used to hearing. In fact, many Red Army troops and civilians had grown skeptical of state reports on the war because they had already lost trust in the state due to the paranoia of the purges and forced collectivization. Instead of fighting explicitly for the Soviet Union or for Stalin, many soldiers often fought out of fear of execution by a politruk or the NKVD, anger at the world, the need to prove their masculinity, or for the love of their hometown. Many Red Army troops also chose to fight to the death instead of being taken captive after hearing about the fates of the Wehrmacht’s prisoners.4 At the time, state propaganda did not address these motives for fighting and its propaganda often did not have the desired effect. Outside of state propaganda, a tactic that did work for boosting troop morale was their signature “Urah!” shout during charges. This not only struck fear into the hearts of the enemy, but also worked to unify and excite Red Army troops as they shouted together.

The state had to reform its propaganda’s focus and strategy if Stalin was to succeed in his propaganda war. According to Merridale, “Over a thousand writers and artists joined the campaign to report [on] the front … Their work was controlled by yet another new body, the Sovinformburo.”5 The state soon learned their overuse of terror was losing its effectiveness. Though many troops still fought fearing punishment, others simply did not care as they already considered themselves dead. Early on, many officers either refused to execute soldiers out of fear of losing numbers or executed too many soldiers which brought Red Army

4 Chatterjee, Russia’s Long Twentieth Century: Voices, Memories, Contested Perspectives, 137.
5 Merridale, Ivan’s War: Life and Death in the Red Army, 1939-1945, 189.
morale to a dangerous low. As a result, the state focused more on building their troops’ morale up instead of forcing them into battle. Much of this reform came from loosening Stalin’s grip on military leaders (something Hitler could have learned from) and increasing freedoms in general. By granting military leaders more autonomy, they were able to better execute their own strategies without being micromanaged directly by Stalin and the state. In a sense, this allowed “the experts” to handle their affairs more effectively. Much of the Red Army’s morale was also boosted when they were allowed to worship and even receive religious blessings.6 For many, this increase in freedoms signaled that perhaps the state would end collectivization in due time. Regardless of when collectivization would end, this brought more hope to Soviet civilians and Red Army troops.

In addition to loosening Stalin’s grip, Soviet propaganda began emphasizing the Motherland over the Soviet Union and Stalin. This was the start of the Russian-centric image of the Soviet Union that would prioritize stories of pre-Bolshevik and Russian Civil War heroics and continue to grow in the post-war years. The use of “Motherland” is strategically interesting because “calling her children to war, rodina-mat’ stood on the blurred border between spontaneous defense of home and family and obedient service to the Stalinist state.”7 Essentially, by creating a parental figure (rodina-mat’) to represent the Soviet Union, Father Stalin could indirectly manipulate citizens to sacrifice for the Motherland. To represent a more aggressive nationalism, slogans like Pravda’s masthead, “Proletarians of all lands, unite!” were changed to “Death to the German invaders!”8 Songs like “The Sacred War” were also written to emphasize unity in defending

---

one’s homeland against the Germans. Author of the song, Lebedev-Kumach wrote:

“Rise up enormous country
Rise to the struggle of life and death
Against the fascist forces of darkness,
Against the cursed horde!
Let the noble fury
Boil up like a wave,
The people’s war has begun,
The holy war!”

This song reflected an additional focus on stirring up emotions of anger and unity against the Germans. Anger, revenge, and Russian excellence were also reflected in new military machinery. The BM-13-16 multiple rocket launcher was a weapon famously dubbed “Katyusha” or “Stalin’s Organ” for the panic-inducing sound it made and the fear it struck into German troops. The name “Katyusha” comes from the Russian folk song about a woman who is waiting for her beloved soldier to return home. The Katyusha rocket launchers directly reflected the rage that Red Army troops felt towards the German invaders: hot anger loudly and chaotically overwhelming the enemy position. Perhaps this was why the Katyusha rocket launchers were incorporated into Soviet propaganda and became legendary.

Partisan troops behind enemy lines helped local villagers and farmers with their daily work to gain their loyalty and trust. Partisans also worked to fight German propaganda by destroying it and distributing Sovinformburo propaganda in its place. To “remind people of the joys of Soviet life,” partisans would also hold party meetings and celebrations. The role of the partisans is often overlooked – partisan fighters played an important role in

---

creating chaos behind enemy lines as well as maintaining Soviet power in occupied regions.\textsuperscript{11}

Despite the strategy change in the propaganda war, the NKVD still continued to purge potential political opponents, defeatists, and ethnic minorities it deemed untrustworthy. The propaganda reforms that took place after the stunning defeats of the Red Army began to reflect more accurately what soldiers were feeling: rage at the German invaders and concern for their homeland and families. Regardless of the focus on Russian contributions, propaganda attitude and public opinion moved towards viewing the Great Patriotic War as the people’s war for the homeland.

\textbf{The Defense of Moscow and Propaganda Leading Up to Stalingrad}

As the German Army Group Center approached Moscow in the fall of 1941, Soviet propagandists and strategists worked to raise morale and support for the defense of the city. Morale reached a dangerous low as Red Army troops continued to give ground to the Wehrmacht. Much of the Soviet Union expected a bloody defeat as the Germans approached Moscow. Leningrad was already under siege and suffering greatly, and now Moscow was next. As troops were rallied to defend Moscow, many citizens in the area were also conscripted to build city defenses such as trenches and tank traps. Some citizens volunteered to join the Narodnoe Opolcheniye hoping to quickly deter the Germans. Yet due to low morale, some citizens did not jump at the opportunity to do this, so the NKVD used force to coerce participation. Though NKVD coercion seemed to contradict the loosening of the state’s grip, it remained constant throughout the war. Regardless, having citizens working side by side to defend their capital certainly reinforced the concept that this was a people’s war. Stalin himself remained in Moscow during the defense, “rekindling many

\textsuperscript{11} Merridale, \textit{Ivan’s War: Life and Death in the Red Army, 1939-1945}, 144.
people’s hope.”\textsuperscript{12} Having the leader of the Soviet Union remain with his people to defend Moscow, showed Stalin in a new light – certainly a more positive light than during the 1930s. In addition to these efforts to defend Moscow, Stalin learned that Japan was not interested in fighting a war with the Soviet Union which allowed him to call in reinforcements from eastern regions. Regardless of individual motivations for fighting, the fact that the capital was under attack contributed to both Red Army morale and citizens’ participation. The defense of Moscow was not only a key event in the war, but also one in which the Soviet Union decisively changed its style of propaganda to one reflecting the idea of a people’s war instead of Stalin’s war and focused more on cultivating emotions of rage towards the Germans.

Moscow’s defense through the muddy and icy winter of 1941-1942 was used as a massive morale booster for the Soviet people. State propagandists did not let this opportunity go to waste and took full advantage of the pride in defending the capital of the Motherland. Indeed, “many military historians consider the German retreat from Moscow – just days before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor – the turning point of the war.”\textsuperscript{13} By the summer of 1942, the Germans were gaining substantial ground in the south near the Caucasus oil fields and by Stalingrad. State propaganda had a greater sense of urgency that could be noticed in Stalin’s public speeches. In July of 1942, Stalin released his famed Order No. 227 which said, “Every officer, every soldier and political worker must understand that our resources are not limitless. The territory of the Soviet state is not just desert, it is people – workers, peasants, intellectuals, our fathers, our mothers, wives, brothers, and children.”\textsuperscript{14} The urgency and frankness of the General Secretary’s words played to soldiers’ and civilians’ concerns about their families and hometowns. It personified the

\textsuperscript{13} Chatterjee, \textit{Russia's Long Twentieth Century: Voices, Memories, Contested Perspectives}, 133.
vast expanses of territory that had become occupied by the German invaders. He continued by announcing the disciplining of troops, which was famously summarized into the slogan “Not a step back!”\textsuperscript{15} Though this is now an incredibly famous order, many Red Army troops felt that it was repetitive and stated the obvious. However, by Stalin explicitly calling for no retreats, it instilled a new degree of confidence in many Red Army troops as they felt that Stalin himself was urging them to fight for the Motherland, especially after Moscow. In a way, the Father of the Soviet Union was saying, “This is it, make it count.” This policy acted very effectively as propaganda to tie the Soviet Union together leading up to the Battle of Stalingrad and onward.

At about the same time, Red Army troops had begun to develop a new sense of professionalism, which was recognized by the state and publicized to the populace via propaganda, public art, and new medals. Perhaps this professionalism was due to the large numbers of defeats or the relaxing of Stalin’s and politruks’ control over military strategic affairs. Troops and their leaders now began to function more as resourceful and “self-reliant fighters.”\textsuperscript{16} As a result, troops took more pride in their skills as they were rewarded for proficiencies and not political allegiances. Military leaders were no longer kept on such short a leash and were able to conduct operations the way they saw fit (with of course, no retreating). Encouragement for this way of thinking was expressed not only in the Red Army, but also in propagandized public art, such as the play \textit{Front!} by Aleksandr Korneichuk. A review of the play said that it showed how “nothing in the Soviet land will sustain an ignorant or unskilled leader – not the personal courage, not honors from the past.”\textsuperscript{17} The play echoed the attitude of the Red Army and spread the spirit of pride in one’s work to the rest of the Soviet Union.

\textsuperscript{15} Merridale, \textit{Ivan's War: Life and Death in the Red Army, 1939-1945}, 156.
\textsuperscript{16} Chatterjee, \textit{Russia's Long Twentieth Century: Voices, Memories, Contested Perspectives}, 138.
\textsuperscript{17} Merridale, \textit{Ivan's War: Life and Death in the Red Army, 1939-1945}, 161.
Similar to the Red Army’s focus on skills, civilians might have also been inspired to work harder than they already were to churn out more tanks and armaments. As a result of the increase in weapons and armaments, the Red Army’s confidence was boosted. The state used additional methods to improve morale such as awarding more medals to Red Army troops in recognition of exemplary skills and achievements, and refurbishing troops’ military gear. Many women were recruited to clean the soldiers’ uniforms and improve the Red Army’s look which also proved successful in improving the Red Army’s self-image. As one officer wrote, “Nina, don’t worry about our uniforms. … We dress better these days than any commander from the capitalist countries.”

As a result of the “self-reliant” fighting style, increase in awards, and refurbished image, Red Army soldiers were not only instilled with greater confidence than before, but also re-energized in a way that prepared them for the Battle of Stalingrad.

The state also often used women and their stories in propaganda to inspire more women to get involved and increase civilian morale within the Soviet Union. The myth of a young woman named Zoia Kosmodem’ianskaia was featured in Pravda for sacrificing her life. The story read, “Standing under the gallows, she tries to rouse the villagers, shouting, ‘Why are you sad? You should be courageous, you should fight, you should beat the fascists, you should burn them and poison them!’” Women participated in the war far more than just in production or cleaning uniforms.

The Soviet Union recruited women starting in the summer of 1942 initially as medics, but soon after as pilots, snipers, tank crewmembers, and other positions as well. Many women were excited to join the front in fighting the German invaders and felt a duty to do so just as much as men. While women’s participation itself was used as propaganda to improve recruitment and civilian morale, they also added a new dynamic to combat.

---

morale, propaganda and state policies also attempted to boost the morale of female soldiers already serving. Since this was the first time such a large number of women served in combat – 800,000 – Red Army leaders were not prepared to deal with the different needs of women, such as properly fitting uniforms and hygiene products. Male troops also had a difficult time assessing how they should treat the female soldiers. Bella Isaakovna Epstein wrote, “When we arrived at the 2nd Belorussian Front, they wanted to have us stay at division headquarters. Meaning: You’re women, why go to the front line? ‘No,’ we said, ‘we’re snipers, send us where we’re supposed to go.’ Then they said, ‘We’ll send you to a regiment where there’s a good commander, he takes care of girls.’”20 These conditions often made life on the front lines difficult for women which affected morale. One attempt made by the state to boost female troop morale was to provide 43 mobile front-line tea shops each equipped with hairdressers, small cosmetics counters, and supplies of dominoes and checkers.21 Many women became famous because of their service and were recognized publicly, such as the women of the 588th Night Bomber Regiment or “Night Witches” as German soldiers called them out of fear. Many snipers, such as the famed Roza Shanina, were also recognized publicly for their skill and contributions to the war. The stories of units like the Night Witches and many famed snipers were publicized to increase recruitment numbers and improve Soviet citizens’ confidence. Unfortunately, women’s efforts as a collective were never addressed and largely omitted from post-war propaganda, unjustly erasing their large contributions from the Soviet memory of the Great Patriotic War.

In the period from 1941 to 1943, Soviet propagandists learned to change their tactics from primarily employing coercion and promoting the image of Stalin’s Soviet Union to building up the Red Army’s confidence, stoking their fury, and promoting a

people’s war based on many soldiers’ actual fighting motives. Many policies such as the relaxation of the state’s grip, Stalin’s Order No. 227, and the recruitment of women were also propagandized and played a key role in boosting the Soviet Union’s faith in victory over the German invaders.

The Battle of Stalingrad and Onward to Berlin

The hard-fought Soviet victory in Stalingrad created a massive morale boost for the Red Army and the rest of the Soviet Union which helped them drive the Germans all the way back to Berlin. After their defeat in Stalingrad, the Wehrmacht ceased to gain ground and were now fighting a largely defensive war as the Red Army continued to push back with growing fury, supplies, and numbers. Soviet propaganda had played a large part in rousing Red Army troops’ emotions and pride. The combination of Stalin’s Order No. 227, the realization that the Soviets were against the wall now, and the re-framing of the war as the people’s war worked to turn the Soviets into “some kind of cast-iron creatures,” as one German put it.22 Stalin’s slightly loosened grip allowed Marshal Zhukov to devise strategies such as the encirclement of General Paulus’s Sixth Army within the city. Ironically, Paulus’s predicament was largely due to Hitler’s micromanagement of military forces and refusal of Paulus’s request to break out.23 Soviet propagandists also used stories of valiant acts during the battle to rouse soldiers’ strength and show the rest of the Soviet Union the dedication of the Red Army. One such story told of a “man in flames leap[ing] out of the trench … run[ning] right up to [a] German tank, and smash[ing] the bottle against the grille of the engine hatch. A second later an enormous sheet of flame and smoke engulfed both the tank and the hero who had destroyed it.”24 With regards to the Red Army’s rage, Soviet propaganda

---

only worked to stoke the flames that were already present and helped it grow stronger. Many movies were made showing soldiers’ valiant acts with the press explicitly encouraging the killing of Germans. Many poets, artists, and writers also published works that depicted Germans being slaughtered and used humor to encourage German killings.

Ignoring the Red Army’s self-developed proficiency and existing rage, the Soviet state took credit for the Red Army’s successes as proof that those in the Red Army were loyal to the Party and dedicated to Stalin. Since Stalingrad was “the end of the most difficult period of the war for the Soviet Union, the press resurrected the prewar convention of attributing success to the party bureaucracy and to Iosif Stalin personally.” 25 This shift back in propaganda style was the early stages of what would eventually become the celebration of Stalin’s victory instead of the people’s victory. Regardless of who took the credit, the victory at Stalingrad worked to destroy the myth of German invincibility and supremacy and reinforced the idea that the Soviet Union could still be successful in destroying the German invaders.

Throughout the rest of the war, Soviet propaganda worked on cultivating the image of the ravaging German and constantly reminded the Red Army troops of the atrocities committed against their people. It was a propaganda strategy that would begin with rage, continue onto dehumanization, and end in the mass-rape and murder of countless Berlin civilians as well as any Germans caught along the way. Soviet propaganda’s greatest contribution at this stage of the war was to strengthen the rage and desire for revenge that propelled many Red Army troops forward. Soviet propagandist, Ilya Ehrenburg, wrote, “Not only divisions and armies are advancing on Berlin, … all the trenches, graves and ravines with the corpses of the innocents are advancing on Berlin.” 26 Images of comrades killed in battle and of mass graves

found on the way to Berlin reminded the Red Army of what the Germans had done to them and why they desired revenge. In fact, signs in Germany read: “Red Army Soldier: You are now on German soil; the hour of revenge has struck.” Signs and propaganda explicitly encouraged Red Army troops to take their revenge any way they liked. This was the first stage along the road of propaganda that would lead to the Red Army committing atrocities in Berlin. All that was needed to mix with this fiery rage was dehumanization of the enemy by developing a hostile collective identity.

While returning to a focus on Stalin’s Soviet Union, Soviet propaganda worked to instill a morality that would allow and attempt to justify the violence encouraged. Troops were led to believe that “a soldier washed his neck to sluice the lice, but a Communist was on a cleansing mission that would end with the whole world.” This language led troops to associate the German enemy with lice and encouraged good Communists to cleanse the world of such fascist lice. This accomplished two things in Red Army minds: the dehumanization of Germans, and the collectivization of Germans as a single body of lice that must be removed. Therefore, when troops encountered Germans, they did not see an enemy soldier or enemy civilian but the manifestation of Nazi Germany – the hostile collective identity. This is how such savage serial-rapes were able to occur. According to Merridale, “It did not matter, either, if the women were young or old, for the women themselves were not the main object. The victims of the gang rapes were just meat, embodiments of Germany, all-purpose Frauen, recipients for Soviet and individual revenge.” It was the Sovinformburo and Soviet propagandists that helped lead Red Army troops to commit these acts. Propaganda images included one depicting “a German soldier swinging a baby, torn from its
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mother’s arms, against a wall – the mother screams, the baby’s brains splatter against the wall, the soldiers laugh.”

Images stayed in Red Army troops’ minds and justified for them the serial-rapes as a sort of revenge for what the Germans had done.

As Red Army troops stormed the Reichstag, the symbol of Hitler’s power, they defeated the defense forces and planted a Soviet flag at the top of the building. The next day, a photographer would immortalize the moment the Red Army defeated Germany in Berlin. Soon after, the Red Army celebrated the surrender of Nazi Germany and looked forward to returning home to their families as they had all hoped. Many did not return to their families for months as they were transported to the East to defeat Japan. Whether or not they knew it, their people’s war had now become Stalin’s war and the people’s victory had become Stalin’s victory.

Post-War Propaganda and the Soviet Memory

Almost immediately after the conclusion of the Great Patriotic War, Stalin re-tightened his grip on the Soviet Union and sent many troops and ethnic minorities he deemed as traitors to gulags or had the NKVD execute them. According to Zubkova, “Stalin tried … to direct the process into the channel that he needed. He removed himself from the society of we, moved into a kind of solitude, preserving for himself the right of orchestrating the process of marking sociopolitical boundaries.”

By now, state propaganda had shifted back to promoting the Soviet Union and Stalin, however now state propaganda promoted Russia and its contributions more than other nations or regions within the union. Many ethnic minorities such as the Ukrainians and those living along the western border were deemed traitorous and diminished in the credit they received for participation in the war. Stalin had re-established his reign, which could be seen in propaganda posters

---

that depicted Stalin leading the Soviet Union to victory. The concept of the people’s war was dead now and had been replaced by Stalin’s war.

In addition to non-Russians, women as a collective were erased from the record of contribution and reduced to just a handful of famous individuals. Women were not allowed to take part in the Victory Day parades. In fact, the first time female troops marched in a Moscow Victory Day parade was in 2016.32 Jewish veterans experienced incredible violence and hatred at the end of the war. As the Great Patriotic War ended, Soviet views on Jewish people took an oddly racialized stance. Many newspapers depicted Jewish people with stereotypical body features (reminiscent of Nazi propaganda) and a book called Judaizm Bez Prikras was published demonizing Jews and spreading the rumor that they could not do manual labor.33 Such anti-Semitism grew from the Soviet move to not recognize Jews as a specific group that was persecuted in the Holocaust because that would promote “hierarchal heroism.” Instead the state said that the Nazis persecuted all Soviets regardless of ethnicity or religion. Also, Jewish soldiers serving on the front lines often hid their identities so as not to be immediately executed if captured by Nazis. This led many other soldiers on the front line to believe that there were no Jewish contributions to the war.34 Soviet propaganda further strengthened anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union by omitting any recognition of collective Jewish contribution – similar to what happened to women.

Many war crimes were also forgotten with time or omitted from the records, such as the mass rapes in Berlin and NKVD mass executions near Poland. After they won the Great Patriotic War,
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state propaganda worked to reestablish Stalin’s sole rule over the Soviet Union and establish a twisted racialized communism that excluded non-Russians’, women’s, and Jewish contributions from the Soviet memory of the war. Instead it was replaced by Stalin’s outstretched arm, leading the way to victory.

**Conclusion: The Role of Soviet Wartime Propaganda**

Soviet propaganda during the Great Patriotic War initially did not seem to work well, but after adjusting strategies to fit the idea of a people’s war, it became more appealing and often underscored Soviet citizens’ fears and angers. Soviet propaganda and policies, though seemingly ineffective, often painted the environment in which Soviet citizens and Red Army troops observed and thought about their conditions during the war. For instance, though the Red Army was on the brink of defeat in Stalingrad, Soviet propaganda managed to instill confidence in troops, and Stalin’s Order No. 227 gave troops a sense of urgency that this was the “end of the line.” Without propaganda’s focus on cultivating the rage of the Red Army and trumpeting the victory of Stalingrad, the Red Army might not have made it to Berlin due to low morale. Though contributing to the Red Army’s victory over the Nazis, propaganda often also had negative implications as well. A major example is the level of rage and dehumanization that was developed and ultimately culminated in state-sanctioned mass-rapes in Berlin and other war crimes. However, positive or negative, it is evident that the use of Soviet propaganda was effective in getting the results Stalin and the state wanted when applied properly. In fact, propaganda applied during and directly after the war still affects the way the former Soviet Union remembers the war today. Though Soviet state propaganda was incredibly important, it does not and should not diminish the essential role millions of Soviet men and women played in defeating Nazi Germany and securing victory in the Great Patriotic War.
Leaders and Players: The Role of Jazz Artists as Civil Rights Activists

Jonathan Claridad

The 1960s was a time for massive cultural movement, and a notable aspect of this period was the relationship between music and the political voices of the time. One such relationship was in part due to the tensions over civil rights rising to a head, bridging the political desires of African Americans to much of the music produced at the time, particularly in jazz. Even beyond simple civil rights advocacy, the music and writings of jazz artists were voices of challenge to much of the status quo. From Max Roach’s condemnation of America’s checkered past to Nina Simone’s reclamation of both black and female artisanship, jazz musicians were at the forefront of expressing the suffering and the injustice that permeated the lives of African Americans. This deliberate expression of the cultural voice and grievances, as well as the inspirational examples they set with their lives, qualifies many of the jazz artists of the 1960s and 1970s as activist leaders.

The history of African American protest through artistic expression is important for contextualizing the specific calls to action of the 1960s that jazz artists made. Dating back to the days of slavery in the United States, music has been an incredibly important outlet of expression for African Americans. According to Santa Clara University Professor Reed, enslaved Africans in eighteenth century New Orleans would congregate in Congo Square, often called the “birthplace of jazz,” on Sundays, despite constant threat, to sing, dance, and play music, taking solace in their one day of respite from lives of labor. 1 Such congregation is especially moving considering that many of these participants did not speak the same language, and had to rely on music and creative
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intent to connect with each other. This inciting moment in jazz history is also indicative of the style’s particular relationship to protest, which would continue with the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, an explosion of African American arts. Much of the poetry, writing, and music produced in this era was very critical of how Americans had treated African Americans thus far, inspiring similarly critical African spirituals years later, such as Billie Holiday’s “Strange Fruit,” which provided commentary on the practice of lynchings in the South, and Paul Robeson’s “Go Down Moses,” which drew parallels between African slaves and the Hebrew Exodus. This explosion of politicized art brought the injustice dealt to African Americans into the limelight and was the impetus of the civil rights movement of the early 1960s. Additionally, the growing voice of discontent within the African American community received greater volume through the cultural microphone that is music.

Jazz artists served as gateways into the often-unheard thoughts and feelings of African Americans. A common message that jazz and blues musicians that promulgated during the 1960s was the lingering ramifications of institutionalized slavery in the United States. One piece that speaks to this theme is jazz/folk singer Nina Simone’s song, “I Wish I Knew How it Would Feel to be Free.” The piece contains lines full of a depressive longing, such as: “I wish you could know / What it means to be me / Then you'd see and agree / That every man should be free.” Simone here is recounting how impossible a standard “freedom” is for African Americans within the current American society, and the suffering due to how far from realization that ideal is. She laments the lack of recognition for what should be an obvious blemish, and the “wishes” she makes seem to come from a place of defeatism. This remorse filled folk song is not an uplifting message, but more importantly it speaks to a greater issue of discontent in the black
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community and serves as a plea for awareness. This music carries a powerful sentiment, but more importantly, “their salience lies in the transmission of a more muddled, profound, and often unheard tension over how slavery—and the struggle against its continuance—is articulated and remembered.”4 The vocalization of such difficult yet prevalent emotions and experiences is an important step to cultural healing. Public awareness and opinion is a key motivator to cultural change, as we see with the success of Martin Luther King’s nonviolent approach that generated public sympathy in the face of violent opposition. For some artists, however, a quiet and spiritual approach like this is too passive.

The jazz of the 1960s also often served as more dramatic calls to action, and some works by jazz artists approached the subject of slavery with a far more aggressive tone. Bebop pioneer and drummer Max Roach collaborated with lyricist Oscar Brown to produce the We Insist! Freedom Now Suite, a gripping album filled with allusions to the oppression of African Americans in U.S. history. The lyrics of this album, such as that of the track “Driva Man,” point to strong emotions and realities: “Driva' man de kind of boss/ Ride a man and lead a horse.”5 In this example we see Oscar Brown draw a parallel between the lives of African Americans to those of beasts of burden. “Driva’ Man” is the kind of song that makes listeners uncomfortable with its powerful message, and the way the words are accented with the striking of an anvil evokes such strong imagery of Southern chain gangs. The intense unease and malcontent of this album is made even more tangible with an image from the Greensboro Diner sit ins being featured on the cover. The association of the horrible realities of slave practices in the U.S. with specific and current discrimination was a powerful statement that undercuts the very notion of freedom in America. By approaching this difficult content with the

music of his own band, thrusting the consequences of slavery even further into the public limelight, Max Roach served as a cultural guide. Stimulating important discussions in the public sphere is an important aspect of public leaders.

In addition to this potent discussion, jazz leaders guided Americans in the preservation of American history. Another track from We Insist!, “Triptych: Prayer, Protest, Peace,” delves even further into the suffocating discontent, taking the listener through a cascade of emotions. It opens with a singer improvising a melancholic melody, accompanied by a somber drum procession. Then the energy swells, as vocalist Abbey Lincoln wails over an explosive drum solo, a cacophony of rage and distress that builds and builds before dropping back off into the quiet melody, but now with an air of exhaustion, before Lincoln resigns into silence. The tension that this emotional experience generates is palpable. The amount of anger that fuels this song, and truly this entire album, is gut wrenching, as it reinvigorates a large amount of the pains that African Americans endured. By making present such buried suffering, Roach and Brown present the issue of slavery as one that both literally and figuratively harms the well-being of African Americans in the present, doing so in a way that is hard to ignore. This gripping memory of an unjust history forces Americans to confront the lingering consequences of racism that remain. In many ways, Roach’s Freedom Suite serves to simultaneously commemorate this struggle, as well as urge Americans to resolve it. The employment of music to recognize and comment on events also applied to several current events of the tumultuous 1960s.

An important aspect of leadership is the guidance of communities through particularly tough times. On September 15th, 1963, a small Baptist church in Birmingham Alabama was bombed by White supremacists, killing four innocent girls. This horrific event rocked the nation, and several cultural icons, including jazz
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musicians, responded to it in hopes of helping the country heal and preventing any similar tragedy in the future. Nina Simone and John Coltrane both wrote songs in response to this horrible event, but with very different approaches. Coltrane employed a subtle but striking title and mood in “Alabama,” and Simone with an aggressive and angry verbal denunciation in “Mississippi Goddam.” These differing approaches represent some of the different ways that jazz artists decided to lead and engage with their communities during the 1960s.

Nina Simone’s response to the Alabama church bombings was a call to arms in a similar vein to Roach’s _Freedom Suite_, but more contextualized to current events. “Mississippi Goddam,” attacks racial inequality in a much sterner tone than “I Wish I Knew How it Would Feel to be Free,” in part due to Simone’s, and the nation’s, visceral reaction to the church bombings. Simone refers to the song as a showtune and juxtaposes an energetic and rollicking shuffle with the emotionally charged lyrics that decry the nation for allowing racism to continue to exist in such bold form. Simone even ties in commentary about the state of faith in the country, with lines such as “Lord have mercy on this land of mine / We all gonna get it in due time / I don't belong here / I don't belong there / I've even stopped believing in prayer.” Simone demonstrates a feeling of her prayer lacking efficacy, feelings shared by much of the nation. Simone addressed these feelings with lines that speak to not only African Americans, but also to the many Christian communities that felt such horrific events were potentially faith shaking. Simone also demonizes and condemns the actions of the extremists with a righteous indignation, which simultaneously reflects poorly on even moderate forms of racial oppression. By appealing to Christian values, Simone reached out beyond the African American community with a plea of morality. As such, “Mississippi Goddam” is a rallying call to the entire

---

7 Nina Simone, “Mississippi Goddam,” Track 7 on _Nina Simone in Concert_, Philips Records 1964, Record.
nation, born out of utter exasperation, in hopes that a collective national conscience will prevent future tragedies.

Saxophonist John Coltrane’s “Alabama” is a much more somber approach to dealing with the events of the Birmingham church bombings. Coltrane was a very reflective man and musician, and by the early 1960s, he, “like countless other artists, had become increasingly aware of and influenced by the ugly racial wars being waged on the nation's streets. His music was a powerful medium that allowed him to express his anger, fear and, in ‘Alabama,’ his abject sadness.”

“Alabama” opens with a dark tone, like that of a funeral. A lonely saxophone played by the stoic Coltrane floats around, accompanied by McCoy Tyner on a foreboding piano that rumbles in the lower register, calling to mind images of death and despair, paying homage to both the little girls lost in Birmingham, as well as the great sense of loss that Americans felt in this time of suffering. The song then opens up into a slow, blues inspired groove, where Coltrane’s tone is synonymous with grief. Where Simone called the nation to act against the circumstances that bred such tragedies, Coltrane called the people to really reflect on the lives lost. The distinction is important, as it reflects that the nation was not entirely up in arms over Birmingham, and Coltrane responded to many people’s desire for consolation. The piece swells at the end, calling to mind images of funeral criers, before settling on a blue note of acceptance. This public grieving that Coltrane led was one of the ways in which he operated as a public figure that could guide his community.

Despite the disparate messages that Coltrane and Simone sent regarding the bombing in Birmingham, they achieve similar goals within the context of activism. When comparing “Mississippi Godam” and “Alabama,” as well as We Insist! Freedom Now Suite, one historian notes that “on a casual listen they could not sound

more different, yet there is a continuous undercurrent of suffering and irrepressible grace that courses through this set of music.” ¹⁰ These particular artists reveal the tensions that permeated American culture, and their work expresses the unheard voices of the time. Both of the pieces that commented on the Alabama bombing were performed on national television, allowing for widespread acknowledgement of the strong emotions felt by African Americans, as well as demonstrating the jazz community’s dedication to that goal of expression. This ability to realize and share the feelings of many is a key criterion of leadership, and it is often demonstrated by jazz artists of the 1960s who went out of their way to express the concerns of those who often lacked the platform to share their thoughts.

Many jazz players were community leaders by the virtue of their status as cultural icons. John Coltrane, for example, is a prolific name in jazz history whose influence extended much further beyond the music that he played. With his progressive musical endeavors, such as his innovations in Modal Jazz, and even with some of his writing and poetry, “Coltrane helped establish the template for the artistic aspirations of countless African American creative artists during the later civil rights and Black Power eras.” ¹¹ There is no doubt that “Trane” is remembered for his mastery of his craft. However, even more than an artist, Coltrane served as an ideal that so many, both within and outside of the jazz community aspired to resemble. Beyond his pushing of the artistic envelope, John Coltrane was, as his friend and former band leader Miles Davis called him, “a spiritual kind of person.” ¹² This spirituality, this desire to create with an almost religious purpose, permeates all of Coltrane’s work, and causes the art that he produced to resonate with so many people. Despite his
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relatively short life, (an unfortunate trend of the time for both civil rights leaders and jazz musicians), Coltrane is often venerated as an activist due to this deep connection with and demonstration of his spirituality. His participation and prevalence in African American culture and voice were such that “by the time of his death in 1967, John Coltrane’s status as an icon of the civil rights era, and of the burgeoning Black Arts Movement, was already secure.” Coltrane achieved an almost monolithic importance due to the depth and authenticity of his work, and his work demonstrated an immense concern for justice. This concern of his trickles down to the artists who look up to him, whom we can loosely refer to as his followers, fostering a community similarly focused on justice. Not all artists, however, would be similarly recognized for their marks on the history of efforts pursuing American equality.

Nina Simone is also a figure in history that led people during the 60s with the way in which she lived. In stark contrast to Coltrane’s immense recognition as a participant of the Civil Rights movement, many historians, both of African American history and of jazz, overlook Nina Simone’s contributions to the fight against inequality, beyond her writing of critical pieces like “Mississippi Goddam.” However, Simone, born Eunice Kathleen Waymon, lived a life that opposed so many preconceived notions about artisanship, such that she “matters not necessarily because she definitely caused a specific number of fans to change their behavior, but because the perspectives on black freedom and gender that she among others articulated circulated as widely as they did in the early 1960s.” Simone challenged several stereotypes with her career, such as those surrounding black jazz artists and female performers, and her efforts served to both undo
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these prejudiced norms, as well as to inspire artists that followed her to not fall into those same trappings.

In early jazz history, there was this notion that jazz music was essentially an uneducated craft, undercutting the merit of many black performers. Some detractors even referred to many of the jazz greats as “naturals.” For example, this attitude of the inherent skill and musical aptitude of African American artists was sometimes applied to Charlie Parker by “high brow” critics, despite Parker’s obsession with extremely rigorous practice habits and his kickstarting of Bebop, a definitive era of jazz music. Another example of this condescending attitude toward jazz musicians is Billie Holiday, who was described as emotionally evocative yet “unrefined.” This characterization of black jazz artists as “naturally gifted” is deeply rooted in a history of prejudice, attempting to explain away the accomplishments of African Americans and maintain the superiority complex of the white majority.

Many artists were similarly looked down upon by a society that held this blatant prejudice. Nina Simone, however, was a classically trained pianist who studied at Julliard, flying in the face of such detractors. Since there is no question of how “refined” she was, Nina Simone serves as a prime example of the polar opposite of common stereotypes of black performers. Simone also challenged many conceptions of female jazz entertainers of the time, who were often looked down upon by their male peers, as she was both an accredited band leader and songwriter. Due to her classical upbringing and high popularity, Simone “straddled the worlds of high art and mass culture, of so-called authentic blackness and a universal genius that transcended race and gender.”

Nina Simone reclaimed the meanings of the words “black” and “female” with the way that she defied cultural norms
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and exploded into mass popularity. She was an artist that pushed boundaries not just with the work that she did, but with the life that she lived. That willingness to lead the way into a reevaluation of cultural norms is an essential and defining characteristic of civil rights leaders.

Of course, even with their inspiring lives and politically salient work, not all of these entertainers were intentionally avid activists and protestors. Despite her involvement in the highly political piece, *We Insist! Freedom Now Suite*, vocalist Abbey Lincoln did not personally view herself as an activist. When interviewed recently about activism being a priority in her career, Lincoln stated that "It never really was, darling. I sang the 'Freedom Now Suite' with Max Roach, and I wore my hair natural when it wasn't popular. I was a glamour queen. I never was a freedom fighter." Just because Abbey Lincoln was an African American that definitely contributed to the civil rights movement, she did not define herself by her activism. However, while we should not rush to conclude that these artists that produced politically powerful works were all “activists” in a strict sense, I argue that it is important to recognize that the importance of some artistic works is not the political intent of the creators, but the way in which the creators demonstrate and guide a cultural mood. Abbey Lincoln may not have been an activist, but she did lead the African American community with her actions, just like Simone and Coltrane, in the way that she fostered a public voice against inequality.

When people think of civil rights leaders from the 1960s, many think of Martin Luther King Jr. and Malcolm X, conjuring images of long philosophical speeches and figures leading protests in the streets. However, leadership and activism extend beyond these obvious examples of protest and limiting our discussion of activism to them also limits the way in which we view our own
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efficacy. Many of the jazz artists of the 1960s were shining examples of activist leadership, in the way that they took to the forefront of the public view as public figures and guides, steering cultural discussion and change. This characterization of jazz musicians and singers as civil rights activists is an important concept, because it strengthens the idea that seemingly innocuous, but very human, actions such as creative endeavors hold great power within our multifaceted society.
“Women Supporting Women”: How San Jose Became the Feminist Capital of the World

Maggie Oys

As the only sitting woman member on the San Jose City Council in 1971, Janet Gray Hayes repeatedly faced strategic blocking by the “gang of four,” four male San Jose City councilman that united in a majority to impede Hayes, the only female member. To combat the sexist political sequestering Hayes experienced from her male colleagues, she decided the best solution would be to get more women representatives on the city council, as she was quoted, “I wanted to work with the Council and I found with the gang of four that was next to impossible, so I said well, the next best thing is to get some more women elected.” At that moment, Hayes sparked a movement among women of San Jose in the 1970s to run for political office and gain greater political representation, turning San Jose into what would be called the “Feminist Capital of the World” by Newsweek.

The city of San Jose and surrounding area of Santa Clara County, now defined as “Silicon Valley”, is characterized by a traditionally male dominated major tech companies and startups. However, female representatives dominated the political arena in the area between the 1970s and late 1980s, with the election of Janet Gray Hayes as mayor of San Jose in 1975, becoming the first elected female mayor of a major US city of over 500,000 people. Hayes’ election as mayor of San Jose ushered in a wave of female elected officials in local government, culminating in the election of seven women representatives to San Jose’s City Council, one of
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the few female majorities in the nation. The unprecedented number of women elected to San Jose city government caught the nation’s attention, as San Jose and the Santa Clara Valley was dubbed, “The Feminist Capital of the World.” The two decades of female political activism and successful election of women candidates to local offices between the 1970s and 1980s constituted a rare period of women dominating a local political arena, which has rarely been replicated as successfully in most areas of the United States until very recently. The unprecedented number of women politicians elected during this period stemmed from an attitude and consensus among women in local politics of “women supporting women” through grassroots political organizations, exemplified by active local chapters of the National Organization of Women and the League of Women Voters. In short, women elected officials actively encouraged and endorsed the election of other female politicians to elected offices.

Previous scholarship on women in politics and second wave feminism suggest that women are more successful in local, municipal elections due to their community involvement and the lower stakes associated with local politics, rather than state and national elections where women often struggle to run successful campaigns. Therefore, traditionally most women in politics serve in offices at the county and city levels. Danelle Moon has investigated the significance of the women elected representatives in San Jose during the era of San Jose as the “Feminist Capital of the World,” attributing the electoral success of these women to the demographics and affluence of the Silicon Valley and the local grassroots, political organization. Janet Flammang has asserted that the combination of highly educated voters, a high voter
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turnout, and the high median income and affluence of the Santa Clara Valley created a unique environment in which women could be successfully elected to local government. This paper builds upon Moon’s scholarship and research by elaborating on the importance of grassroots, political organization to the successful election of women to local elected positions. This paper provides a closer examination of the culture of “women supporting women” in office, through campaign support, political endorsements, personal mentorship and coalition building among women elected representatives. Finally, this paper concludes by refuting Flammang’s argument that the high levels of education and wealth in the San Jose area significantly contributed to the success of women politicians. Instead, this paper argues that the mechanisms women on the ground and running for office used to campaign, win elections, endorse other women for office and support each other once in office resulted in the successful elections of large proportions of women in San Jose, not attributed to education and income demographics of the area.

**Women’s Issues on the Political Agenda**

The election of Janet Gray Hayes as Mayor of San Jose, the first female mayor of a major US city marked one of the defining moments of San Jose’s era as the “Feminist Capital of the World.” With Janet Gray Hayes in the city’s highest office, she inspired a flood of women to campaign for elected offices at the city level, which resulted in an unprecedented majority female San Jose City Council. By 1981, seven women were elected to the San Jose City Council, comprising an unprecedented female majority on the city’s council. Women also constituted a majority of San Jose’s Board of Supervisors, during a period when only 6% of women held county positions and only 13% held city positions nationally, further characterizing San Jose as a rarity for their representation
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of women in government, and a model for gender equality at the municipal level. With Hayes as mayor and a female majority on the City Council, San Jose became a beacon of feminism and female representation in politics, with only 6% of cities having a female major and only six other city councils holding female majorities in the US in 1978.

The greater proportion of women elected representatives in government also meant that women’s issues and women’s voices rose to the forefront of San Jose city politics. The feminist bloc on San Jose’s city government provided an opportunity to promote and endorse issues specific to women, that are so often silenced and overlooked in American politics, such as pay equity, rape counseling services, domestic violence, childcare, and a children’s center. The women that dominated San Jose city politics in the 1970s and 1980s particularly prioritized the issue of equal pay and comparable worth. The women of this female dominated era of San Jose politics accomplished contributions to local gender equality and government services for women, including focuses on sex discrimination cases, especially in the growing Silicon Valley tech industry, comparable worth, and county funding for battered women’s shelters. Therefore, these women representatives not only sought equality in government positions, but prioritized women’s issues in their political agendas and utilized their opportunity and positions to help local women, fight for women’s rights and further the feminist movement politically.

Grassroots, Political Organizations

Grassroots political organizations led by women enabled local, civically engaged women to get involved in local politics and support women candidates that represented their political agenda, focusing in San Jose on slow growth, urban planning,
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maintaining neighborhoods, honesty and integrity in government, and bringing women’s issues to the forefront of city politics. Women political candidates tended to rely more on grassroots political organizations, as opposed to men who ran based on their professional careers. The National Organization of Women (NOW) and the League of Women voters were two of the most prominent grassroots political organizations led by women with local chapters in the South Bay. The South Bay Chapter of NOW encouraged their local members to run for office, sought out and trained prospective candidates, encouraged local women to run on women’s issues, and supported women candidates in their campaigns. NOW focused on getting women into office who would use their power to make societal changes in the United States toward gender equality and women’s rights, as a part of the broader feminist movement. As opposed to more radical sects of the feminist movement, NOW offered a place for politically active wives and mothers to seek government reforms and a recognition of all women as equal partners with men at every level of society, and especially in politics. Organizations such as NOW helped support women candidates, such as Mayor Janet Gray Hayes, a member of NOW, through campaigning and promoting her as a mayoral candidate. The community and coalition of women in the South Bay through grassroots organizations initially got women involved in politics, and then supported and elected women candidates through successful campaigns. When asked years later if she was a member of NOW, Hayes responded, “Yes. NOW, always have been,” illustrating the significance of grassroots political organizations for women.
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The League of Women Voters also offered local women in the South Bay the opportunity to participate in the political scene, engaging women to vote and have their voices heard and interests represented. Local chapters of the League put on Candidate nights for local elections, sent out unbiased voter guides, set up Candidate fairs and debates in order to inform and educate local women about the voting and political process, encouraging women to vote independently based on their individual views, opinions and interests. The League, less political and feminist leaning than NOW, offered unbiased, objective voter information to inform and engage local women in politics. Many of the female elected officials from the era of San Jose as “the Feminist Capitol” started their political participation and activism through the League, such as Janet Gray Hayes. \(^{17}\) Hayes credits the League for her initial involvement in San Jose politics because the League offered an opportunity for women, especially wives and mothers, to get involved in politics and truly learn the political process, looking at both sides of issues and encouraging debates. \(^{18}\) Susie Wilson, former San Jose city councilmember, also acknowledged the significance of the League in making important connections among women politicians. \(^{19}\) Both the League of Women Voters and NOW shared the common goal of electing more women to government office, which Susan Hammer, a member of San Jose’s female dominated City Council, used to define what feminism meant to her: female political participation and representation. \(^{20}\)

Platform for Women Candidates and Community Driven Politics
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San Jose’s feminist political wave in local government coincided with the transition of San Jose and the Santa Clara Valley from a mainly agricultural, suburban area to the heart of the tech industry and what would become Silicon Valley. Women politicians in the South Bay during this time period, such as Hayes, Wilson and Hamer, prioritized areas of slow growth, honesty and integrity in government positions and promotion of women’s issues. Janet Gray Hayes ran for mayor in 1974 and then again for re-election in 1978 primarily on the platform of slow, controlled growth of San Jose, opposed to male politicians who were often accused of and depicted as being “in the pockets” of big developers.

The San Jose mayoral election of 1978 between Janet Gray Hayes and Al Garza best illustrates the debated issue of growth in San Jose. While the press and competitors accused Garza of making deals with big developers and industry in San Jose, Hayes ran on a campaign of slow, controlled growth, and maintaining neighborhoods, symbolized by one of her 1978 mayoral reelection campaign slogans, “make San Jose better before we make it bigger.”

The local press and San Jose Mercury News admired Hayes for her management of the fast-paced growth in San Jose as mayor, by stopping urban
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sprawl, restricting growth, preserving neighborhoods, and lowering taxes, with an aim to avoid a San Jose that grew so fast and out of control that it would resemble Los Angeles. This platform appealed to long term residents and families of San Jose and the Santa Clara Valley who wanted to maintain their neighborhoods, schools, and communities in the face of rapid growth, and women who ran on this slow growth platform proved successful against male political opponents with business ties to big developers and industry. When interviewed in 2006, Susan Hammer claimed that women politicians were more responsive to family and neighborhood issues and the humane aspects of what a city should be, rather than being enticed by money offered by big business developers.

Women candidates were also depicted by the press and self-identified as honest, trustworthy and less likely to engage in machine politics, government corruption and the influence of big industry and developers. In Susie Wilson’s 1978 campaign for San Jose County Supervisor, she is described in a political ad as bringing integrity to the County Board of Supervisors, stressing her honesty, integrity and willingness to “do the right thing for San Jose.” Janet Gray Hayes was also profiled by the local press for her relationship with the citizens of San Jose and how she took each citizen’s need seriously, without the typical red tape and bureaucratic obstruction that separates most voters from their representative, by responding to individual requests by citizens for solutions to local, community issues. Women candidates in the South Bay appealed to voters and offered a different version of what it means to be a politician by focusing on local issues and the experiences of local citizens and voters, rather than entering
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politics for personal gain or monetary interest from connections to big business. Janet Gray Hayes believed that most women brought in honesty to the political stage in San Jose and the Santa Clara Valley and a sense of transparency that fueled their success, “I think most women brought in honesty [to the political arena in the San Jose area].”

Local press, like the *San Jose Mercury News*, often characterized male political candidates as being in it for the money, personal gain and business connections, lacking the local and community understanding and engagement that women politicians time after time displayed.

These women ran campaigns based on issue areas particularly concerning their communities, rather than using the “woman card” and focusing their campaigns on their gender or try to appeal especially to women voters. They introduced an honest, down to earth, representative style of politics that was well

---

26 Hayes, interview by Danelle Moon, 2006.
received in the Santa Clara Valley as it opposed the politics of many male candidates backed by big business. Blanca Alvarado, the first Latino to be elected to the San Jose City Council, ran with the support of her Latino community in East San Jose, and noted how the women elected representatives of San Jose’s “Feminist Capital,” were community driven, as they all began their political careers in San Jose through local community involvement. These women, as mothers and wives, entered the political realm through local community involvement, and with the influence and support of grassroots, political organizations such as NOW and the League, ran for office, and once in office, used their power and position to address local issues brought forward by the community, and issues of women’s rights.

Support, Endorsements, Coalition and Mentorship

The attitude and movement of “women supporting women” did not end once women representatives were elected to office, because these women elected officials created opportunities for other women to follow in their footsteps. They encouraged other women to run for office, supporting them through public endorsements, mentorship, and campaigning, with a mutual goal of equal representation of men and women in local government. Hayes used her position and
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influence to support other local women in politics. For instance, she publicly endorsed Blanca Alvarado and Susan Hammer through newspaper endorsements in the *San Jose Mercury News*.  

Hayes publicly endorsed Hammer for San Jose City Council in 1982 through political ads, promoting her as an honest, trustworthy candidate saying, “Susan possesses a rare combination of the many qualities needed by elected officials today: integrity, intelligence, candidness, courage and humor.”  

Hayes also supported and endorsed women, such as Hammer, through corresponding with other politicians and influential people, detailing Hammer’s political experience, her stance on controlled growth in San Jose and livable, safe neighborhoods, and her commitment to open, honest government.  

Between the 1970s and 1980s, the San Jose City Council demonstrated the possibilities of women supporting women once in office, ensuring that women’s voices were heard and respected. Hayes worked to get Iola Williams, the first African American to serve on San Jose’s City Council and later as vice-mayor, and Susan Hammer into office in San Jose’s City Council. Hayes described how difficult politics could be for women due to gender stereotypes and the often accepted notion that a woman's place was not in the political arena; therefore, Hayes stressed the importance of women supporting each other through endorsements and campaign support to get more women into office.  

Susan Hammer, former San Jose City Council member and mayor from 1991 to 1999, described how women in political positions tend to be consensus builders and share power among them, further supporting the pattern of women supporting each other politically in San Jose city politics.  
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Jose City Council with Hayes in 1983, remembered how she and Hayes, as the only women councilmembers, would excuse themselves to the women’s restrooms during council meetings in order to work on an issue area together, strategize how to get votes, and discuss certain ideas and policies, exemplifying the consensus building and coalitions between women politicians to resist silencing by male majorities. San Jose’s Board of Supervisors during the era of the “Feminist Capitol” illustrate the coalition and mutual support of women representatives as they often worked together on certain policies, creating a united female majority rarely found in American politics.

The relationships of mentorship and mutual support among women elected representatives, candidates and grassroots organizers contributed to the success of the women’s movement and second wave feminism in San Jose city politics. Janet Gray Hayes served as a personal mentor and public supporter of Susan Hammer as she ran for San Jose City Council and later for mayor of San Jose. Hayes was also very supportive and influential in the campaigns of San Jose City Council members Susie Wilson and Iola Williams, who partially made up the infamous female majority city council. Looking back, Hammer emphasized the impact of mentorship from women in office to other female candidates and newly elected officials on the success of San Jose’s female dominated politics and steps towards female representation: “Women mentoring other women was really important for the success of women becoming or not becoming, but being elected to public office.”

**Conclusion**

Historian Janet Flammang has asserted that the high numbers and proportion of educated residents in the San Jose area and affluence and wealth of the area created an environment in which
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women politicians could be successful in the 1970s and 1980s compared to other areas of the US because San Jose voters were more progressive.  

However, this paper and thesis challenges Flammang’s argument and claims that the success of the second wave feminism in San Jose, characterized by the high number of female elected officials, is due to grassroots political organization and the political and personal support among women elected officials in city positions. Basing the success of the women politicians who made San Jose “the Feminist Capital of the World” solely on the education and wealth levels in the Santa Clara Valley doesn’t explain why other affluent, highly educated areas, like Cambridge, Massachusetts or Raleigh, North Carolina didn’t boast the same high numbers of women elected representatives in local government. Therefore, women throughout the US, not just in wealthy, educated cities, can learn that women anywhere can gain success in elections and holding office, to create greater gender equality in political representation, by supporting each other through grassroots political organization, campaign support, political endorsements, mentorship and women coalitions as Hayes, Hammer, Wilson and Alvarado did in San Jose.
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