Front Cover:
Carver Hospital, Washington, D.C. Interior view, ca. 1860 - ca. 1865
Series: Mathew Brady Photographs of Civil War-Era
National Archives Photo No. 111-B-173

Back Cover:
People making teddy bears in factory, 1915
Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division
Reproduction Number: LC-USZ62-108038
Digital ID: cph 3c08038

Alpata is named after the Seminole word for alligator.

Alpata

A Journal of History

Managing Editors

Michal Meyer
Graduate Student
Justin Sorrell
Undergraduate

Editors

Matthew Hulbert
Mary Lester
Michael Goldman
Adrienne deNoyelles

Faculty Advisor
Sponsor

Dr. Jack E. Davis

University of Florida
Department of History
Dr. Joseph Spillane, Chair

Typography and
Page Design

Michal Meyer

Contributing Editors

Adrienne deNoyelles is a graduate student in American history, focusing on turn-of-the-century urban issues such as immigration and public health. A longtime editor and professional musician, she aspires toward a career in the public-history sector, such as a museum or archive.

Michal Meyer is writing her dissertation on the making of science for public consumption in nineteenth-century Britain.

Matthew Hulbert is a senior double majoring in history and classical studies. His main areas of study include southern politics, memory, and agrarian culture. In the fall, he will attend graduate school at North Carolina State University.

Justin Sorrell is a senior history major. He has focused on revolution and reform, particularly post-colonial revolutions and religious reformers. In the fall, he will be attending the College of William & Mary to pursue a law degree.

Michael Goldman is a senior majoring in history. He is interested in Atlantic history, with a focus on the relationships between imperial powers and their colonies. He plans to attend law school.

Mary Lester is a sophomore studying history, anthropology, and Spanish. She is especially interested in late antique and medieval Europe, and hopes to complete a senior thesis in these areas of history. She also hopes to attend graduate school and continue her studies in medieval history.

Contributors

Kay Witkiewicz is a sophomore double majoring in history and psychology, with interests in nineteenth-century American history. She plans to earn a Ph.D. in history.

Paige Scofield is a junior double majoring in history and political science. She is interested in American history, focusing on women, education, and public history. She is currently working on a senior thesis and intends to go to graduate school in history.

Sean Haley is a third year history and soon to be Middle Eastern languages and cultures major. After graduating, he wishes to attend the American University in Cairo to pursue a masters in Middle Eastern studies and to further his progress in Arabic.

John Hunt is a senior studying history, with a particular interest in southern history. Next year, he plans to attend University of Florida's Levin College of Law.

Lisa Booth is a doctoral student in European history. She is interested in Russian history and is focusing her work on the cultural and intellectual currents of 1960s Soviet Union.

Eunhye Kwon is a doctoral student in U.S. history. She is writing her dissertation on Asian-white interracial marriage in the U.S. West from the 1890s to the 1940s.

Keith A. Manuel is a doctoral student in Latin American and Caribbean history. He is writing a dissertation about Africans in early nineteenth-century Cuba.

Matthew White is a doctoral student in the history of science. He has worked for a series of museums, most recently the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History.

Table of Contents

Special Section

Public Health: From the Civil War to the New Deal

Articles

Book Reviews

Special Section

Public Health From the Civil War to the New Deal

Introduction

A Blue and Grey Awakening: The Civil War as a Catalyst for Public Health in America, 1861-1865.

Matthew Hulbert

On November 20, 1865, Confederate Colonel William Holland Thomas composed a letter to Dr. John Mingus. Thomas asked Mingus to provide him with two gallons of purified whiskey and asafoetida as a homespun preventative for smallpox.[1] Ironically, an effective vaccine using cowpox serum had been available since the late eighteenth century but had fallen into disuse as cases of the disease dropped off in the early nineteenth century, perhaps leaving Mingus with no knowledge of its existence.[2] Thomas's request provides an informative glimpse into disease awareness and the state of national public health during the Civil War. His request also serves as an appropriate beginning for more in-depth exploration of the topic, namely, the effects of disease as a catalyst for more extensive changes in public health.

From the time the first artillery shot was hurled at Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, to Lee's somber surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865, nothing reveals the state of American public health with greater clarity than the fatalities brought about by disease. It is estimated that of the 360,222 Union soldiers who died in the war, roughly 250,000 of them were struck down by germs, not bullets or cannon fire. This was also true

---

[1]Colonel William Holland Thomas to Dr. John Mingus, 20 November 1865, The William Holland Thomas Papers, Thomas's Legion: The 69th North Carolina Regiment, http://thomaslegioncherokee.tripod.com/wht.html (accessed November 1, 2007).
[2]Terry Reimer, "Smallpox and Vaccination in the Civil War," The National Museum of Civil War Medicine, http://civilwarmed.org/articles.cfm (accessed November 2, 2007).

for 164,000 out of approximately 260,000 Confederate soldiers who fell over the course of the war.[3] Mumps, measles, small-pox, cholera, yellow fever, malaria, and venereal diseases, the main culprits responsible for these sobering statistics, were the result of unsanitary living conditions and the inability of the clashing armies to provide mass wartime medical care.[4]

E. B. Root, of the Second New York Cavalry, testified to some of these stringent living conditions. He chronicled marching all day, waking up sick, cold, and shivering at night only to find him-self sleeping exposed in a forest.[5] Similarly, in a letter to his wife, Confederate soldier Joshua Callaway detailed traveling filthy, barefoot, and nearly naked save for the body lice that had covered him and his companions to an extent "beyond description."[6] Sol-diers frequently went without shoes or suffered from scurvy as a result of malnutrition. In fact, conditions in camp were arguably more perilous to a soldier's well-being than time spent on the skir-mish line. Flies, lice, maggots, mosquitoes, and other insects not only followed the animal-burdened supply trains, but prolonged exposure to them shed light on a nearly complete lack of ento-mological knowledge that impacted the abilities of both armies. These insects, some of which carried deadly pathogens, also made their presence known by ravaging open wounds and dead bodies, which frequently lay unmoved on the battle field for several days.[7]

---

[3]"American Civil War Casualties, Fatalities & Statistics," Thomas's Legion: The 69th North Carolina Regiment, http://www.thomaslegion.net/battles. html (accessed November 1, 2007).

[4] "American Civil War: The Soldier's Life," Thomas's Legion: The 69th North Carolina Regiment, http://www.thomaslegion.net/soldier.html (accessed November 1, 2007).

[5] E. B. Root, 1 May 1865, The Civil War Diary of E. B. Root, ed.W. H. Merklee, http://homepages.rootsweb.com/~merklee/Diary.html (accessed October 30, 2007).

[6]Joshua Callaway to D. Callaway, 27 October 1862, The Civil War Letters of Joshua Callaway, ed. Judith Lee Hallock, U.S. Civil War Effects on People: Kentuckians, http://www.ket.org/civilwar/war.html#callaway (accessed November 1, 2007).

[7]Gary L. Miller, "Section 2: Flies by the Scores," Historical Natural History: Insects and the Civil War, http://entomology.montana.edu/historybug/

The availability of proper food was another issue. At times, malnutrition was so rampant that Confederate soldier Louis Leon recalled men catching, killing, and then dressing rats to sell as delicacies.[8]

The everyday life of a soldier on either side of the conflict was a harsh struggle for survival, but a trip to the surgeon's tent may have been the most harrowing ordeal of all. In the 1860s, medical personnel had no knowledge of antiseptics, bacteria, or even complex nutrition. Sanitation was an afterthought as countless limbs were amputated and wounds were routinely leeched or bled.[9] The Union forces were allegedly overseen by the United States Sanitary Commission, while the Confederacy claimed no such governing body.[10] Doctors and surgeons did their best with what knowledge and materials they possessed, but their efforts were simply no match for the pathogen onslaught that accompanies full-scale war.

As a result of the war, battlefield ambulance tactics improved and attention—perhaps for the first time—was given to the psychological disorders of veterans. An argument can be made that the Civil War provided America's first real exposure to mass, long-term hospitalization, and its effects contributed greatly to the general hospital construction movements in both northern and southern states.[11] At the very least, it is clear that the war, its disease-related fatalities, and the conditions that produced them provided a much needed wake-up call to the nation with regard to the state of its overall public health.

civilwar2/flies.htm (accessed October 29, 2007).

[8] Louis Leon, October 1964, Diary of a Tar Heel Confederate Soldier, Documenting the American South: The Southern Experience in 19th Century America, http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/leon/leon.html (accessed November 2, 2007).

[9] "Civil War Medical Care, Battle Wounds, and Disease," Civil War Medicine, Shotgun's Home of the American Civil War, http://www.civilwarhome.com/civilwarmedicine.htm (accessed November 3, 2007).

[10] Knottingley and Ferrybridge, "Effects of the Civil War," Knottingley and Ferrybridge, http://www.knottingley.org/history/civilwar/effectsofwar.htm (accessed November 1, 2007).

[11] "Sections: Evacuation of the Wounded and Pavillon Hospitals," NMCWM Exhibits, National Museum of Civil War Medicine, http://www.civilwarmed.org/exhibits.cfm (accessed October 31, 2007).

Public Health: From the Civil War to the New Deal

Using the Social Gospel to Form a Secular Healthcare Network

Justin Sorrell

At the beginning of the Civil War, the federal government lacked a nationwide healthcare program. Instead, local doctors, churches, and family members provided the majority of medical care for sick and wounded soldiers. It was not until the end of the war and the post-war immigration boom that the government began to take a more active role in providing public medical care. However, throughout the period, many religiously inspired charitable organizations provided welfare services to compensate for the lack of federal health programs.

The nineteenth century promoted the growth of these religious voluntary aid associations. Personal wealth and leisure time had increased in America, allowing individuals the opportunity to participate in private organizations, including groups that provided healthcare. In addition, the wave of religious revivals during the century prompted a desire to use religion to combat society's ills. The popular doctrine of "Sanctification," common in many Protestant churches, taught that if men and women were free from sin and vice, then their physical well-being and environment would likewise be free from corrosive elements. In addition, the Holiness Movement, which held as a tenet that one should demonstrate one's conversion through the abundance of good works, prodded individuals to dedicate themselves to service. Thus, many religious Americans volunteered their time to serve others. Because of the prevalence of religious values, many historians describe these service organizations as part of a movement called the "Social Gospel." Social Gospelers' involvement in Civil War healthcare helped establish the foundations for the healthcare bureaucracies that emerged after the war.

Social Gospel groups provided needed care for wounded soldiers during the Civil War. The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) created a volunteer subcommittee, the Christian Commission, that sent its members to provide comfort to wounded soldiers, to distribute morale-boosting literature, and to preach. Military surgeons were so overwhelmed with medical cases during the war—surgeons at Gettysburg faced 900 cases for every one surgeon—that the personal attention from these volunteers alleviated the sense of alienation and loneliness felt by the sick and dying.[12] This commission also gave many women an entrance into service outside of the domestic sphere—they gathered supplies, raised money, and volunteered as nurses at military camps.

Although service organizations provided healthcare for both the North and the South during the Civil War, the Union had stronger service networks. Confederate states resisted interstate organizations out of fear that they would impinge on states' rights.[13] The states had good reason to fear such intrusions. The Sanitary Commission, another YMCA subcommittee, stated that it aimed to give service "with impartial hand to our national forces, military and naval, without local or State distinction."[14] While the South resisted interlocking, powerful institutions, the North thrived on them. The Sanitary Commission, for example, was incorporated as an official government body and renamed the "United States Sanitary Commission."[15] This group tried to improve issues with hygiene and physical facilities wherever Union soldiers were stationed. The Sanitary Commission hired agents to distribute

---

[12]Richard H. Shryock, "A Medical Perspective on the Civil War," *American Quarterly* 14, no. 2.1 (Summer 1962): 162.
[13]*Ibid.*, 170.
[14]M. Hamlin Cannon, "The United States Christian Commission," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* issue 38, no. 1, (June 1951): 64. (emphasis added).
[15]Shyrock, 170.

medical supplies, organize impromptu hospitals, and standardize methods for performing routine healthcare procedures.[16]

The Sanitary Commission marked a turning point in the way the Social Gospelers participated in society. The Commission had an expressly secular purpose—to "economize for the National service the life and strength of the National soldier"—and it paid agents to perform its work.[17] Some Social Gospelers objected to such a secular focus. Even members of the Christian Commission, its sister organization, boasted that they had done far more to serve soldiers, declaring, "The Christian Commission has taken a long stride in advance of [the Sanitary Commission], inasmuch as the soul is of more importance than the body."[18] Others balked at having a paid service staff, believing that Christian assistance should be given freely without recompense. Walt Whitman derided the paid agents as "hirelings . . . always incompetent and disagreeable."[19] However, the formalized healthcare the Sanitary Commission provided, its focus on "scientific benevolence," and its paid bureaucracy were successful, and established a precedent for post-war secular hospital organizations. Within cities, these same Social Gospelers also built up non-war related healthcare programs that provided a framework on which public boards of health could build in the future.

---

[16]Steven Mintz, *Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 78.
[17] *Ibid*., 77.
[18]Cannon, 75.
[19]Mintz, 78.

From Response to Prevention: The Evolution of Urban Public Healthcare

Mary Lester

The nineteenth-century American city was a place of contradictions. Visitors strolling through New York City or Philadelphia around 1860 would have found broad boulevards, beautiful parks, and impressive houses of the urban elite. Alongside these symbols of urban achievement, however, strollers would have also seen appalling slums, crowded tenements filled with the urban poor, and streets swimming in filth and horse manure. In these slums and filthy streets lurked one of the threats most dreaded by the urban population—disease. Nineteenth-century urbanization was inextricably linked with disease, epidemics, and unsanitary living conditions on a scale never before seen by Americans.

As residents of country towns moved to cities, they faced a number of unprecedented problems and inconveniences. City streets and public places were crowded and dirty, while water supplies were often contaminated. These conditions, coupled with the close proximity of city living, provided an ideal environment for the onset and spread of diseases such as cholera and yellow fever. Cholera, spreading through water contamination, was particularly prevalent, and epidemics swept through American cities in 1832, 1849, and 1866.[20] On a smaller scale, typhoid and dysentery plagued cities during the nineteenth century, while yellow fever claimed thousands of lives in southern cities.[21]

The constant presence of disease, along with unsanitary living conditions, contributed to a negative perception held by many Americans that cities were "essentially unhealthy"

---

[20]Charles Glaab and A. Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc, 1976), 69.
[21]*Ibid*., 71.

centers of decay and filth.[22] Before the 1880s and the widespread influence of germ theory, disease was generally thought to have been a result of environmental or moral depravity, both of which were closely associated with the urban environment. The concept of cities as centers of unhealthy living dates to the Founding Fathers; Thomas Jefferson often referred to cities as "pestilential," and went so far as to design a method for removing "disease-causing vapors" from them.[23] Dirty streets and unclean, smoky air contributed to the image of cities as cesspools of disease, and those who took this view often cited frequent epidemics to support their claims.

As the threat of epidemics loomed over growing cities, local governments grappled with the problem of facing the dreaded outbreaks. At first, city governments modeled themselves after smaller town governments, and adopted a laissez-faire policy towards public healthcare. In smaller towns, government service was largely voluntary, and focused on maintaining commerce and order. As there was no governmental obligation to address healthcare or sanitation, private citizens handled such issues through local hospitals and municipal companies.[24] Facing the unheralded levels of disease that accompanied a growing city, many American cities established boards of health as early as 1805 (New York City) and 1815 (Philadelphia).[25]

These boards of health, however, were different in scope and purpose from later board iterations. Cities did not intend to prevent epidemics, but rather respond to epidemics once they had broken out. The responsive nature of the boards reflected the city government's hands-off attitude towards public healthcare and sanitation, an attitude that prevailed in American cities throughout the first half of the nineteenth century.

---

[22]*Ibid.*, 56.

[23]*Ibid*., 56.

[24] Blake McKelvey, *American Urbanization: A Comparative History* (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973), 43.

[25]Glaab and Brown, 165.

As the century wore on, however, urban citizens began to call for the government to take a more active role in controlling disease and managing filth. Many citizens had been active in founding local hospitals and promoting cleanliness; despite this, private efforts that had previously sufficed in small towns proved inadequate in large cities. Due to several bad cholera epidemics and an increasingly vocal public demanding action, city governments began to reassess their boards of health, eventually moving them towards a more active role in improving public health. The founding of the Metropolitan Board of Health in New York City in 1866 was a major step in this reassessment of the purpose of urban health boards. Created at the urgent requests of citizens' associations and staffed with credentialed doctors, the board successfully warded off a cholera epidemic that threatened the city in 1867.[26] Encouraged by this success, several cities followed suit, and new boards of health began to take on preventative roles in disease control rather than responsive ones. The boards introduced regular inspections of meat and dairy products, as well as checks for wells and cisterns to help maintain a pure water supply. The boards also took upon themselves the task of recording births and deaths in the cities, which highlighted other pressing health issues, such as high infant mortality rates.[27]

As boards of health took a more active role in disease prevention and management, cities saw an improvement in the decreased quantity and scale of epidemics. In accepting germ theory, the boards were able to target the causes of those diseases rooted in filth and poor sanitation, leading to more effective preventative measures. As disease became more controllable and understood, urban citizens could see positive results from their newer, more modern boards of public health. Yet despite these positive results, cities and the threat of disease remained a potent concern, especially when it came to the perceived dangers posed by large scale immigration.

---

[26]McKelvey, 65-66.

[27] *Ibid*., 66.

Public Health: From the Civil War to the New Deal

"Vectors Of Disease": Immigrants And Public Health At The Turn Of The Century

Adrienne deNoyelles

The threat of contagious disease has regularly affected the interplay between public health and immigration in America. A few particularly vivid examples occurred in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when metropolitan infrastructures, economies, and social orders were reeling from the impact of massive immigrant influxes. Between 1880 and 1924, 23.5 million emigrants left for the United States, an increasing number of them from Southern and Eastern Europe. The sheer number of newcomers over this period—staggering when compared with the nation's total population of 76 million in 1900—became a catalyst for the creation and expansion of public health bureaucracies throughout the country. With the bacteriological revolution now underway, cutting-edge health departments like those in New York and Philadelphia now included laboratories, making medical diagnoses much more precise. Despite the discovery of germs and their direct linkage to certain illnesses, the mode of transmission was still in doubt; as a result, many physicians and public health officers continued to rely on tenets of the Social Gospel: disease was spread by filth, which was a by-product of substandard living conditions, which in turn indicated poverty, idleness, depravity, and vice.

With strong nativist sentiments running through America in response to the rise in immigration, disease was also associated closely with the foreign-born. Frequently, these fears had some grounding: conditions in the steerage sections of immigrant ships were typically overcrowded, under-ventilated, and devoid of proper nutrition and hygiene. As a result, the same kinds of contagious diseases that had crippled Union

and Confederate armies during the Civil War also ravaged third-class passengers from Ireland, Germany, and Russia en route to the United States, leading many nativists to view passengers merely as "vectors of disease." Upon arrival, immigrants were detained and subjected to a host of physical and mental examinations. At the turn of the century, Ellis Island processed up to five thousand immigrants daily. Public health officers screened for medical and economic situations that could prevent an immigrant's ability to contribute in America's rapidly industrializing society. Depending on what the officers found, the newcomers could be released in a matter of hours, detained for weeks at a nearby hospital, or deported.

In the face of potential epidemics, a volatile combination of fear and nativism spurred public health officials to link foreigners with contamination and to use extreme measures to separate them from the general population. In 1892, for instance, Eastern European Jews were quarantined in New York for more than a month in an effort to contain an outbreak of cholera on their ship. Several months earlier, a minor typhus outbreak caused Jews who had recently arrived aboard the *SS Massilia* to be forcibly rounded up from their newfound lodgings and isolated on North Brother Island, a quarantine station just off of Manhattan. In both cases, the quarantine conditions endured by the Eastern European Jews on North Brother Island and in the packed steerage sections of their ships contrasted sharply with those imposed upon their wealthier, native-born counterparts and may well have led to a higher death count. Recent historians have suggested that the Eastern European Jews were unfairly singled out and endured perilous quarantine measures, while emigrants from northern and western European countries—some of which had also seen their share of cholera cases—rarely encountered such obstacles to entry.[28]

---

[28]Howard Markel, *Quarantine! East European Jewish Immigrants and the New York City Epidemics of 1892* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 75.

Public Health: From the Civil War to the New Deal

Such measures also took place on the West Coast. In March 1900, the discovery of a dead Chinese immigrant believed to have succumbed to bubonic plague led to the speedy roping-off of the entire Chinatown district in San Francisco. At that time, Chinatown encompassed fifteen blocks and housed 25,000 residents. In addition to being extraordinarily well organized, Chinese resistance to subsequent public health measures such as forcible vaccinations stemmed from a decades-long distrust of their health department. "No matter how confident the health authorities were about their ability to calibrate the pathogens in order to manufacture a safe vaccine that would build immunity rather than induce death," writes Nayan Shah, author of *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown*, "the Chinese residents had enough experience with the health authorities to doubt their motives. … [Their] protests rebuked health authorities for seeking the containment of the epidemic instead of the care of ill Chinese."[29] While these quarantines varied in scope and outcome, each showcased the power of the public health establishment to target and isolate minority groups who were perceived, rightly or wrongly, to be endangering the health of others.

For immigrants who made it past entry examinations and quarantines, the struggle for survival was far from over. Many working-class city dwellings lacked basic amenities like indoor plumbing, adequate light and ventilation, and fireproof staircases. Overwork, low pay, poor diet, chronic stress, squalid living spaces, and near-total lack of privacy were hard facts of life for many new arrivals. Such conditions fostered an ideal breeding ground for diseases, which recent microbiological advances had determined to be unrelated to race, class, creed, or nationality. Over the next few decades, the pervasive image of immigrants as inferior and contaminated—a function of native-born insecurities—fueled the efforts of social reformers, immigration restriction proponents, and the eugenics movement.

---

[29]Nayan Shah, *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 2001), 137.

A Race to Progress: Public Health and the Rise of Eugenics

Michal Meyer

While the Gilded Age was largely content to leave the urban slums and their immigrant inhabitants to their own devices, the social pressures of a new era promoted an active interference in the health of Americans. The Gilded Age, roughly the last third of the nineteenth century, found a justification for its inequalities and laissez-faire approach in Social Darwinism. Herbert Spencer, Social Darwinism's high priest, coined the term "survival of the fittest" to describe how society worked. In the view of many of the leading industrialists of the age, including Spencer's friend and admirer, Andrew Carnegie, those who succeeded in business and power did so because they were the fittest. It was a perfect circle of self-justification: only those who were considered fit (generally the northern-European elite) could succeed, while those who had succeeded were obviously the fittest. In matters of public health this ideology encouraged an anti-interventionist mindset. Improving the living conditions of the urban poor, for example, would only lead to increasing numbers of the poor.[30]

A number of factors influenced the Progressive Era (which overlapped with the Gilded Age) approach to health: a changing understanding of infectious disease, increased immigration, with especially large numbers arriving from eastern and southern Europe, and an agricultural depression that pushed many to the cities. Progressivism grew partly as a result of this upheaval (combined with industrial unrest); what united its disparate strands was a belief that science could solve social issues.[31]

---

[30]Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945), 31.
[31]Martin S. Pernick, *The Black Stork: Eugenics and the Death of "Defective" Babies in American Medicine and Motion Pictures Since 1915* (New York:

Public Health: From the Civil War to the New Deal

By 1915, this social and cultural transformation of the urban United States spurred heated discussions on eugenics. While public health campaigns backed by progressives reduced childhood mortality and increased life expectancy, they also opened the door to intervention in families by both experts and state officials, with consequences such as the forced sterilization of those deemed "defective." The eugenics movement followed the general trends of the Progressive Era—a shift from the purely individualistic towards a recognition of connectedness and collective social action.[32] Eugenics met Social Darwinism in statements like this by the *Detroit Free Press*: "The original, sturdy Anglo-Saxon and Germanic stocks are dying out or being replaced by . . . a vast influx of degenerates . . . wholly undesirable for parenthood, to mate with our clean children."[33]

Eugenics, which literally means "well born," had connections to Social Darwinism, but from its origins in 1870s England, eugenics took a more activist approach to improving the "fitness" of the human race and eliminating hereditary diseases. The rediscovery of Gregor Mendel's genetic research in 1900 provided a solid biological foundation for heredity, one that could be applied to social issues. Eugenicists simply adopted the older Social Darwinist identification of fitness with the northern European upper class and acted to protect this group from perceived threats. Such threats included rapid urbanization, the growth of great slums overflowing with the mentally and physically diseased, and immigrants from the east and south of Europe. This non-northern European immigration spawned fears that degeneration—both moral and physical—would replace progress.[34] Economic decline at the end of the nineteenth century, combined with Social Darwinian ideas of progress, made it seem as though a biological

---

Oxford University Press, 1996), 25.
[32] Pernick, 25-32, Hofstadter, 144.
[33]Pernick, 56.
[34]Hofstadter, 139.

decline was to blame for the country's ills. Since proponents of eugenics focused on biological measurables—highlighting statistics of retardation in poor city populations—rather than environmental measurables—such as pollution or unsanitary housing, preventive healthcare was more easily ignored.[35]

What counted as hereditary diseases in the early twentieth century included ailments such as syphilis and poverty.[36] Eugenics was often used as a broad-brush term applied to any trait acquired from a parent (not necessarily ones passed on via genes). Prominent psychologist Henry Goddard held that feeble mindedness, which he considered a hereditary trait, was largely responsible for vices such as prostitution, drunkenness, and poverty.[37]

By 1914, eugenics had gone mainstream. Its supporters included doctors, social workers, and community leaders. Eugenics appealed to a broad spectrum of people, from radical socialists like John Humphrey Noyes to progressive reformer and public health nurse Lillian Wald. Eugenics appealed to many women's rights advocates, political radicals, and immigration campaigners.[38]

The issues that worried Progressive-era eugenicists were class conflicts, social disorder, and racial differences. It was a fear that made headlines: "Half Wits Peril Many," declared a 1915 headline in the *Chicago American*. The article described police plans to round up all "defectives" in Chicago following the arrest of an allegedly defective Persian immigrant for murder. Not long after, a judge prevented the marriage between alleged defectives on the basis that most crimes were caused by hereditary defects.[39] Both cases were used by Dr. Harry Haiselden, the maker of the pro-eugenics movie *The Black Stork* (1915), as justification for allowing defective babies to die. From a progressive perspective, the eugenic

---

[35]*Ibid.*,140.
[36]See Pernick, 55-60, for discussion on the constructing of hereditary traits.
[37]Hofstadter, 141.
[38]Pernick, 32.
[39]*Ibid.*, 55.

elimination of such traits could be regarded as leading to a better and more just society. Films like *The Black Stork* legitimized the spread and discussion of eugenic ideas amongst the public.[40]

From a eugenic point of view, good heredity drove human progress. Conceptions of good heredity during the Progressive Era were influenced by class, race, and ethnicity. In turn the understanding of these categories influenced eugenics. Eugenics often appealed to those who saw themselves as progressive and who believed that science could solve social and ethical issues, including issues of who should live or die, in an impartial way. Judging who was fit was a subjective exercise; eugenics wore an outer layer of objectivity that camouflaged the values, hopes, and fears of its supporters. Such fears led to the first forced sterilization laws in a U.S. state in 1907. By the 1920s many states had legislated for the compulsory sterilization of criminals, the insane, and retarded people. Indeed, during the first third of the twentieth century, the U.S. led the world in forced sterilization.[41]

---

[40]This is one of the themes of Pernick's book.

[41]Hofstadter, 139. Indiana was the first state to pass forced sterilization laws. Pernick, 31. For further information on this, see Philip Reilly, T*he Surgical Solution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991). Also see Stephen Trombley, *The Right to Reproduce: A History of Coercive Sterilization* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988).

The Federal Government and Public Health: The Post-War Period and the Bacteriological Era, 1865-1950

Michael Goldman

With the Civil War battlefields serving as a laboratory for public health services, the post-war era witnessed the birth of many federal programs designed to meet the health needs of the growing American population. The seeds of governmental awareness planted prior to the war, coupled with the growing immigrant population, acted as a catalyst to usher in growth and reform. Thus, following the war the federal government, in addition to state and local institutions, took the initiative to expand its role in managing the public health of the nation. This assumption of responsibility was largely in response to great advances made in various scientific fields. Likewise, several pathogenic organisms had been discovered by 1900, allowing for the availability of antitoxins and vaccines in quantities large enough to support entire populations.[42] In fact, a majority of the federal public health institutes and federal actions regarding public health that are still in existence today were created between the Civil War and the middle of the twentieth century.[43] Industrialization and population growth inevitably led to change, ushering in a period known as the sanitary movement; these developments, active from the end of the Civil War until the dawn of the new century, spurred public health reform. The federal government capitalized on the

---

[42]John Duffy, *The Sanitarians: A History of American Public Health* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 126.

[43]T. J. Litman, "Appendix-A: Chronology and Capsule Highlights of the Major Historical and Political Milestones in the Evolution of the Relationship of Government Involvement in Health and Healthcare in the United States," in *Health Politics and Policy* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), 445-71.

scientific advances of the bacteriological era, and in less than half a century, created a lasting national public health infrastructure.[44]

Perhaps the greatest issue of concern during the post-Civil War period was the control of disease and sickness, as they had claimed many lives during the war. In 1878, Congress passed the National Quarantine Act, signifying the transfer of quarantine powers from the states to the federal government, although the act was hampered by its narrow focus. More specifically, the act attempted to curtail disease brought in by immigration, barring any ship from a foreign port or country where infectious disease existed. In addition, ships found to be carrying passengers with infectious diseases were turned away from entering American ports.[45] Within months of the act's passage, though it had not yet been put into practice, the worst outbreak of yellow fever in the country's history broke out in the South. The epidemic caused the deaths of over 15,000 Americans. With the new act and the latest crisis in mind, President Rutherford B. Hayes addressed the issue of national public health in his 1878 annual message to Congress.

> The fearful spread of this pestilence has awakened a very general public sentiment in favor of a national sanitary administration, which shall not only control the quarantine but have the sanitary supervision of internal commerce in times of epidemics, and hold an advisory relation to the State and municipal health authorities, with the power to deal with whatever endangers the public health, and which the municipal and State authorities are unable to regulate. The national quarantine act approved April 29, 1878…is a step in the direction here indicated. In view of the necessity for the most effective measures…it is recommended that Congress give to the whole subject early and careful consideration.[46]

---

[44]George Rosen, *A History of Public Health* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 168, 270.

[45]Edwin Maxey, "Federal Quarantine Laws," *Political Science Quarterly* 23, (Dec. 1908): 623-24.

[46]Maxey, 624-25.

Hayes's words summed up the transformation that America's public health system would undergo in the decades to follow.

Over the next several decades the federal government increased its role in public health through legislation and the creation of new institutions. In 1887, a federally controlled lab opened on Staten Island to study disease. This lab laid the foundation for the National Institutes of Health established in 1930. In the first decade of the twentieth century, Congress passed the Pure Food and Drug Acts, giving the government the power to monitor the quality and safety of food and medicine; this responsibility was initially given to the USDA Bureau of Chemistry, but eventually reorganized under the Food and Drug Administration in 1930.[47] In addition, the U.S. Public Health Service was formally organized in 1912.[48]

The hundred years following the Civil War witnessed the construction of a federal public healthcare system that took on many responsibilities like disease control, sanitation, and research. With the years after the turn of the century known as the bacteriological era, it is not surprising that one of the government's final acts of the period was to centralize the nation's disease control forces. The Communicable Disease Center was established in 1946, eventually renamed the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.[49] The federal government's role in regulating public health continued to grow throughout the twentieth- and into the twenty-first centuries. But by the middle of the twentieth century most of the groundwork for federal institutions and legislation regarding public health had been put in place. Within just a few years of the Civil War's end, the federal government superseded the states' power to regulate health and continued to build a strong, lasting infrastructure to address problems at the national level.

---

[47]U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Highlights," April 2007, http://www.hhs.gov/about/hhshist.html (accessed December 24, 2007).
[48]Litman, 446-47.
[49]U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Highlights," April 2007, http://www.hhs.gov/about/hhshist.html (accessed December 24, 2007).

Articles

Failure of a Propaganda Campaign: The German Press Bureau and Information Service in the United States from 1914-1915

Kay Witkiewicz

The First World War helped shape the twentieth century, in part due to the coming of age of propaganda as a tool in war and peace. Propaganda is "the deliberate attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behavior to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist," and its effectiveness relies on speed, timing, organization, and a willing audience.[1] The turn of the century marked the institutionalization of propaganda as improvements in transportation and mass media—primarily in print and radio—expanded the target audience. In the United States the emergence of the penny press in 1833, followed by increases in printing speed and the extensive use of the telegraph during the Civil War, prepared the American audience for fast-paced, authoritative news.[2] Thus newspapers and official reports, also available from overseas with the completion of the transatlantic cable in 1866, gained the credibility lacking in the most prevalent mass communication tools prior to this time—rumor and public oratory.[3]

During World War I, Britain and Germany sought to lure America away from isolationism and towards their own viewpoint. In effect, this meant importing the war for the

---

[1] Mary S. Mander, "Introduction," in *Propaganda in the 20th Century: Contributions to its History*, ed. Jürgen Wilke (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, Inc., 1998), x.

[2] Garth S. Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage Publications, Inc., 1999), 93, 99.

[3] *Ibid*., 95.

Failure of a Propaganda Campaign

population.[4] Since Britain was its closest European counter-part, it became the United States' main source of overseas news.

Even before the outbreak of war, European news in the American press largely reflected Britain's perspective, since the United States lacked enough capable foreign correspondents to cover international news.[5] In addition, Britain controlled the transcontinental mail service, as well as the transatlantic cables due to its naval hegemony. Thus, upon Germany's invasion of Belgium on August 4, 1914, the first British act of war was the cutting of the German transatlantic cables in the English Channel by the cable ship *Telconia*.[6] Although Germany's wireless connection between Nauen and Sayville, Rhode Island, remained functional, its communication with the United States was severely compromised, especially after the deciphering of the German code in late 1914.[7]

Despite British control over much of the information on the war, Germany launched a propaganda campaign to influence American public opinion and actions. When the German Information Service and Press Bureau (GISPB), a branch of the German Foreign Office, began its overseas campaign in August 1914, it had opportunities to effect pro-German changes in American public opinion. The immigrant German population was both large in number and well organized across the nation, especially along the eastern seaboard and in the Midwest. Accompanying this demographic influence was a strong sense of German culture fostered by official U.S.-German exchanges in academia in the early 1900s.

---

[4] Frank Trommler, "Inventing the Enemy: German-American Cultural Relations, 1900-1917," in *Confrontation and Cooperation: Germany and the United States in the Era of World War I, 1900-1924*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Schröder (Providence, R.I.: Berg, 1993), 118.
[5] H. C. Peterson, *Propaganda for War: The Campaign against American Neutrality, 1914-1917* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939), 6.
[6] Barbara Tuchman, *The Zimmermann Telegram* (New York: The Viking Press, 1958), 11.
[7] Michael Kunczik, "British and German Propaganda in the United States from 1914 to 1917," in *Propaganda in the 20th Century*, 27; Tuchman, 15.

Despite these positive elements, the German propaganda effort in the United States during World War I failed. Analyzing these failures highlights the misunderstandings of American culture by German diplomats and propagandists. It also highlights their failure to make full use of sympathetic German-Americans and their potential to shape the attitudes of their adopted country.

Components of a Propaganda Campaign

Returning to New York from Berlin on August 25, 1914, Johann Heinrich Count von Bernstorff, German ambassador to the United States, proclaimed that "Germany was bound to win [the war] in the end."[8] He arrived with Bernhard Dernburg and Heinrich Albert, who, according to Bernstorff, were dispatched on commercial interests independent of the German propaganda agency they ultimately organized. Yet promptly upon arrival, the German officials disbanded the previous commercial office run by Heinrich Charles of the German-American Chamber of Commerce of New York, and instead set up a propaganda agency on Broadway.[9] In order to establish a clandestine operation by means of official dissociation, Dernburg was recognized as the leader of the GISPB while Count von Bernstorff acted as a well-informed liaison operating between New York, Washington, and Berlin.[10] The Germans, like the British, had a list of about 60,000 influential U.S. contacts courtesy of the Hamburg-America Shipping Line.[11] Strikingly dissimilar to the British,

---

[8]"Fight to Finish'-Von Bernstorff," *The Washington Post*, August 25, 1914, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

[9]Reinhard Doerris, *Imperial Challenge: Ambassador Count von Bernstorff and German-American Relations, 1908-1917*, trans. Christa D. Shannon (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 40-41. The first meeting of the GISPB took place in the offices of the Hamburg-America Line branch in New York.

[10]Reinhard Doerris, "Promoting Kaiser and Reich: Imperial German Propaganda in the United States during World War I," in *Confrontation and Cooperation*, 138-9.

[11]Kunczik, "British and German Propaganda in the United States from 1914

however, the printed media of the GISPB for the most part relied on private donations of Germanophiles rather than the pockets of the German government. Even though the German government, according to newspaper reports, spent some $27 million to finance propaganda of action, such as strikes and general labor discord, it spent little on the mass media directed by the GISPB.[12] At first, the main goal of the propaganda campaign was to convince the United States that Britain was the agitator that initially forced Germany's hand, yet as the war progressed, international neutrality and an arms embargo became the primary goals.

Unlike the Germans, the British did not establish a separate propaganda office in the United States. Instead they distributed their various written media across the globe from Wellington House, headquarters of the British propaganda bureau.[13] Covert, completely funded by the British government, and endowed with a mailing list of between 50,000 and 60,000 contacts in America, Wellington House concealed its propaganda in the personal correspondence of Sir Gilbert Parker, the operator in charge of the U.S. section.[14]

Perhaps the most obvious Anglo-American connection that favored the British was language. The common bond of English made British news more believable because it seemed less burdened by foreign stigma. As a result, communiques such as the 1915 Bryce Report, which concluded that German soldiers massacred Belgian civilians and burned and looted houses, instantly carried greater weight with the American public than any German account could.[15]

---

to 1917," 40.

[12]Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 42; "$27,000,000 Spent Here by Kaiser?" *New York Times*, December 5, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).
The money spent was in terms of 1914 dollars.

[13]Kunczik, "British and German Propaganda in the United States from 1914 to 1917," 29.
Kunczik also mentions that the National Health Insurance Joint Committee operated out of Wellington House.

[14]*Ibid.*, 33-35.

[15]"Conclusions of the Bryce Report," *The Independent*, May 24, 1915, APS

Nonetheless, America did not officially enter the First World War until two and a half years after its outbreak. In his memoir, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker listed the outstanding grievances of the United States, namely that German attempts to stop supplies reaching Britain included unrestricted submarine warfare which resulted in the deaths of American citizens.[16] While the events in Europe ultimately dictated policy for the United States, it is interesting to note that the door for a U.S.-German peace remained open until 1917. A non-aggression pact between the two nations would have likely prolonged American neutrality in exchange for certain German concessions, such as the curtailing of their naval encroachments in international waters. However, no peace overtures were made from either side.

Bernstorff also inherited previous negotiations between his predecessor and the U.S. government conducted as early as 1904, regarding an arbitration treaty between the two nations. In fact, Bernstorff wanted to rehash these discussions, but opposition from Berlin to any such treaty remained strong before and during the war.[17] Britain had already signed such a treaty with the United States in 1904, but, along with France, agreed to re-sign with Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan a month and a half after the war had already begun.[18] The main

---

Online (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

[16]Newton D. Baker, *Why We Went to War* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936), 47.

[17]There was some support in the U.S., namely by Dr. Ernst Richard, chairman of the National German-American Alliance.
"German-American Favors Treaties," *Christian Science Monitor*, January 20, 1912, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

[18]"Anglo-American Arbitration," *New York Times*, January 11, 1904, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 6 March 2008); Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 26- 27, 31-32.
These various arbitration treaties signed around that time were a means to ensure peaceful settlement of certain questions of interest in case of war. The Hague Court was to be the deciding third party in these agreements, although the issues referred to arbitration were only of an adjunct nature to the actual causes of war.

advantage of such an arbitration treaty lay in creating goodwill between the German and American governments, which might have had an impact in the years leading up to 1914. Furthermore, it could have strengthened American neutrality by referring issues such as German maritime violations and similar war-related infractions to the Hague Court. The vacillating bureaucrats of the Wilhelmstrasse, however, bypassed this opportunity.

The German influence in American life, however, was undeniable. President Woodrow Wilson and his administration were aware of the extent of German-American organization in the country, and they were also in regular contact with one of the leading German scholars in the nation, Hugo Münsterberg. Even the less partisan newspapers ran accounts of German-American activities on a near daily basis. While the German propaganda operation was undoubtedly hampered by British control over the transatlantic cable and direct mail service, German influence remained a force in almost every aspect of American life during the war. Count von Bernstorff and his adjutants simply did not take advantage of the human resources at their disposal.

Due to the success of German immigrants and their families within the American population, implementing the GISPB's agenda appeared possible. According to the 1910 census, 8,282,618 people in the United States were of German origin, about 2,500,000 of whom were born in Germany.[19] This represented about a quarter of the total foreign-born population, well ahead of the second-largest group, the Irish.[20] Aside from this purely demographic element, Germany and the United States actively engaged in an unstructured cultural exchange between 1900 and 1914. The Germanic Museum at Harvard University, founded in 1901, featured German art, while the success of German

---

[19]U.S. Bureau of the Census. Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910
http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/36894832v1ch11.pdf.
[20]*Ibid*.

education in America was epitomized by the 24 percent of public high school students nationwide who studied German in 1910.[21]

This widespread embrace of *Deutsche Kultur*—a combination of "philosophical idealism" and cultural elitism—may in part be explained by America's own lack of an established culture.[22] In Lawrence Levine's study on the emergence of American culture, one source described the United States as "the most deficient in the higher culture of the mind."[23] Regardless, the "Kultur Club," a combination of Germanism and militarism with which America was threatened in the years leading up to World War I, represented an aggressive cultural infiltration of the American social fabric.[24] As soon as this German influence was viewed as a usurping power, as was the case by 1914, *Kultur* became an epithet and anything associated with it a target of anti-German animosity.[25] One intangible aspect inherent in German *Kultur* was an arrogance, a hubris, that caused the various German elements in the United States to continually exalt the supposed superiority of Germanism with a haughty disposition in mass meetings, publications, and speeches, hence alienating the common American. Newspapers decried a 1915 "neutrality" meeting held by the German-American National Alliance in Boston as anything but neutral, leading the *Providence Journal* to proclaim that the United States had "made up its mind about this whole matter" and it refused to be changed in favor of its immigrant brethren.[26]

Propaganda Efforts—Official and Unofficial

Although the German ambassador, at his post since 1908, was the only one of the German trio experienced in shaping

---

[21]Trommler, 101, 107.

[22]Georg G. Iggers, "Historians Confronted with the War," *Storia Della Storiografia* 42 (2002): 11.

[23]Trommler, 115.

[24]Elliot Shore, "The Kultur Club," in *Confrontation and Cooperation*, 128.

[25]Trommler, 107, 117.

[26]"The New Propaganda," *The New York Times*, February 5, 1910, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 6 March 2008).

public opinion through the press, he appears to have never involved himself in German-American efforts to influence U.S. opinion.[27] Instead, upon beginning his service, Bernstorff's main task was to inform the United States of the "peaceful and friendly intentions of German foreign policy," an endeavor in which he was aided by commissioned American journalists, even though he found the prevailing mood already favorable to German interests.[28]

Limited by his official position, Count von Bernstorff had to avoid any open association with the German propaganda efforts in the United States. Nonetheless, his connections were far-reaching and his relationship with the press was such that reporters would not quote him without permission.[29] Understandably, a number of his prominent acquaintances distanced themselves at the outset of the war, yet Bernstorff seems to have made no attempt to encourage any of his contacts to financially or ideologically support the German cause. Granted, the enormity of a potential scandal had his maneuvering been exposed must have been a significant deterrent, yet even so it is surprising, given what was at stake, that no efforts were made. Obviously, the ambassador had to guard his words with the press, but even his involvement in the GISPB-controlled papers was minimal despite his public relations experience.

On the other hand, his record is marred by rash declarations, such as that to the *The New York Times* in 1915 that the breakup of German-American diplomatic relations would be paramount to a German declaration of war on the United States.[30] With about 480 German-language publications and a readership of around three million in 1910, printed media was both the most immediate and most natural way to reach the U.S. populace.[31] The German propaganda agency found its publications in George

---

[27]Doerris, "Promoting Kaiser and Reich: Imperial German Propaganda in the United States during World War I" in *Confrontation and Cooperation*, 136.

[28]Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 15-7.

[29]*Ibid*., 25.

[30]"Had Bernstorff Talking of 'War,'" *The New York Times*,September 12, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

[31]Kirschbaum, *The Eradication of German Culture in the United States*, 7.

Viereck's *The Fatherland*, Herman Ridder's *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, and Marcus Braun's *Fair Play* after rescuing all of them from financial ruin. These papers being blatantly pro-German, the office successfully purchased the *New York Evening Mail* for approximately $1,200,000 to serve as a more neutral English-language daily in 1916.[32] Furthermore, it enlisted the services of well-known American journalist William Bayard Hale at an annual salary of $15,000.[33] Neither Hale nor the *Evening Mail* had much of an impact, yet Hale remained on the payroll until 1918, while efforts were made to purchase other influential newspapers in the country. These efforts created public suspicion, ultimately directing negative attention to the entire German propaganda mission.[34] This negative attention was particularly noticeable in the wariness with which news from German dailies were reported. For example, *The New York Times* heavily scrutinized the "private cables" that informed the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung* of the sinking of four British warships in 1914, despite their accuracy.[35]

Still, Count von Bernstorff and other sympathizers hailed the German publications as voices of truth regarding the war, and appealed to Americans to carefully weigh each report coming from the British side. No voice was louder than George Viereck's *Fatherland*, which pursued a pro-German agenda from its inception on August 10, 1914.[36] With a circulation of 100,000 by October, the paper's purpose was threefold: to give the German side of the war, to impartially recount the weekly events of the war, and to point out misrepresentations of Germany and German actions in the news.[37] The German-born Viereck revered the German

---

[32]Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 51-3.
[33]Doerris, "Promoting Kaiser and Reich: Imperial German Propaganda in the United States during World War I," 156.
[34]Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 55.
[35]"German Story of 4 Warships Sunk," *The New York Times*, August 9, 1914, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 6 March 2008).
[36]Phyllis Keller, *States of Belonging* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979), 142.
[37]*Ibid*., 145.

aristocratic lifestyle and was well connected with prominent German-Americans who willingly funded his magazines.[38] Thus, when the GISPB came to New York, Viereck was its most valuable link to the common people. As a result, the start-up *Fatherland* along with its chief editor were promptly added to the German payroll. Viereck received $1,750 per month to expand his various publications, while his distribution corporation was sufficiently subsidized to cover the printing costs of the various media it disseminated.[39]

Official Failures

Given such financial control and Viereck's regular involvement with the German leadership, it is questionable whether or not the GISPB made full use of his resources. Page after page of his numerous publications propagandized for the German cause, thus limiting his audience, but the German leadership never thought of censoring any of them, nor did they even consider suggesting that Viereck tone down his one-sided point of view. The GISPB did not realize that by distorting the war news—such as claiming that Belgium geographically belonged to Germany—while denouncing the British for the very same actions, they were sabotaging their own cause.[40] Certainly, *The Fatherland* successfully appealed to the German-American community at large, but as such it was only a niche publication and an easy target for anti-German sentiment. In addition, Viereck's moneyed connections with German ties, namely the Guggenheims and the Warburg family, were never utilized by the GISPB.

While Viereck himself was active in a wide range of activities, from literary circles to pro-German associations, the men of the GISPB were not only idle in comparison, but also inept. Dernburg defended the sinking of the *Lusitania* to a crowd in Cleveland days after its occurrence, and subsequently left the GISPB

---

[38]*Ibid.*, 131, 138.
[39]*Ibid.*, 142.
[40]Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 44-5.

before he could be dismissed.[41] In addition, on July 24, 1915, Albrecht absent-mindedly left a briefcase full of papers detailing German propaganda projects in the United States in the New York subway. By the time he realized his mistake, special agent Frank Burke, who had been trailing him all along, had picked it up and was on his way to divulge the German plans.[42] By August 15, 1915, publications in newspapers nationwide had compromised the entire operation. The briefcase implicated Bernstorff in the propaganda efforts, revealed the names of many other leading operatives, exposed German schemes of controlling the press through their own publications and newspapers, and various ongoing missions regarding labor discord and manipulation.[43]

Other failures were cultural in nature. The "Kultur club" leadership of the propaganda operation never fully understood the prevailing democratic egalitarianism in American society and did not try to enlist American leaders. They were not news salesmen and their actions were transparent. German propaganda did not appeal to common Americans, only to those already favorable to the German cause; in fact, to the average American, propaganda was equated with sabotage and foreign attempts at subversion coming straight from the despised Kaiser.[44] This created a Germanophobia that was compounded by the new distaste for *Kultur*, helped along by the more successful British influence on the American public. However, this context

---

[41]Doerris, "Promoting Kaiser and Reich: Imperial German Propaganda in the United States during World War I," 164.

[42]Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, 154.

[43]"Germany's Secret Intrigues to Involve the United States in Great War and Stir Discord Here by Press Campaigns Costing Many Millions Revealed by Original Documents in Vast Conspiracy, It is Claimed," *The Washington Post*, August 15, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

[44]Jörg Nagler, "German Imperial Propaganda in the American Homefront in World War I: A Response to Reinhard R. Doerris" in *Confrontation and Cooperation: Germany and the United States in the Era of World War I, 1900-1924*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Schröder (Providence R.I.: Berg, 1993), 168, 169.

does not excuse the failures of operation at hand, as the concerted efforts of the GISPB still failed to make use of their advantages—namely the many pro-German associations in the country.

The Role of German-Americans

Due to its numbers, the German-American community was extremely active in American life in general. Founded in Philadelphia in 1901 with Charles J. Hexamer as president, the National German-American Alliance often acted as a preserver of German heritage. In 1912, it strongly advocated the continuance of teaching German in New York schools, while in 1913, it took a decisive stand against an excise law with prohibition implications.[45] With more than 2.5 million members by 1915, its manifold causes adjusted to the course of the war; however, its rhetoric throughout was pervaded by assumptions of German cultural superiority, exemplified by statements that German fighting "will bring the world nearer to a universal peace." [46] The organization's defense of Germanism was epitomized by President Hexamer, who called upon German-Americans "to stand by one another with courage and loyalty in these trying times which are before Germany."[47] The Alliance made vigorous appeals for neutrality of the press, or rather, for German-Americans to deny erroneous anti-German reports. It also cooperated with the Friends of Peace and American Truth Society in calling for an arms embargo, protesting American war loans, and encouraging political involvement.

The Friends of Peace was an umbrella organization representing various German-American organizations, including the

---

[45]Doerris, "Promoting Kaiser and Reich: Imperial German Propaganda in the United States during World War I," 161; "War Upon Excise Law," *The Washington Post,* July 23, 1913, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 *Nov. 2007); "Want Languages Taught," The New York Times*, May 22, 1912, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).
[46]"German-American Alliance Convention," *The New York Times*, August 3, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).
[47]"Appeals to Germans," *The Washington Post* August 10, 1914), ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

Kay Witkiewicz

American Truth Society, a German-Irish alliance promoting Germany's cause as a means of simultaneously advancing Irish independence. The Truth Society, led by Jeremiah O'Leary, naturally defended the sinking of the *Lusitania* by blaming Britain, yet still demanded American neutrality, and denounced American papers for not properly providing news of the German side.[48] Both organizations held large-scale meetings to voice their stances, and both criticized President Wilson's policies and accusing the administration of plunging America into war.[49] One of the greatest advocates of the Friends of Peace was former Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, who had resigned following the *Lusitania* disaster. Bryan was a chief speaker at many of their meetings and German-American associations hailed him as "America's conscience."[50]

Ordinary German-Americans were responsible for the successes of these endeavors, the aims of which closely mirrored that of the German propaganda agency—although any official connection would have compromised the propaganda operation. Yet the lack of GISPB influence on these organizations meant their causes remained unconsolidated and their actions uncoordinated; the German-controlled newspapers and German-American organizations did not take joint public stances on crucial war issues such as American loans to the Allied forces. The GISPB also neglected to explore the political connections of the Friends of Peace to William Jennings Bryan. Furthermore, it did not second the general endorsement, led by the American Truth Society for a ban on the export of war munitions and the prevention of a billion-dollar war loan to Britain

---

[48]"Attacks President At German Meeting," *The New York Times*, May 10, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007).

[49]"Friends of Peace' Attack Lansing," *The New York Times*, August 3, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[50]"German-Americans Pleased," *The New York Times*, June 11, 1915), ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007); "For National Peace Meet," *The New York Times*, July 2, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

and France.[51] The GISPB also never asked the leaders of these pro-German organizations to stifle some of the more radical pronouncements in order to prevent additional anti-Germanism.

In terms of the failure of pro-German politics, German intellectual Eugen Kühnemann summed it up best by stating, "The Germans continued to live as apolitical beings, according to their custom."[52] Germans of that period were accustomed to being led by a nearly untouchable bureaucracy of king and high officials, leaving little political space for ordinary citizens. Nonetheless, the Friends of Peace and local branches of the German-American Alliance inspired political action, as shown by a German ticket in a communal election in Passaic, New Jersey, in 1915.[53] Bernstorff made no attempts at politically or socially activating German-Americans because he misjudged their potential.[54] He was convinced that their most valuable contribution to the German cause would be their commercial power, and that anything beyond that would only breed American discontent.[55]

The Intellectuals' Role and Failures

Aside from the leadership's underestimation of the popular German element in America, its use of the intellectual element failed as well. Along with the popular emergence of German *Kultur*, many German intellectuals occupied prominent roles in American society, most notably as professors at major universities. Among them were Kuno Francke and Hugo Münsterberg

---

[51]"Vote to Ask Ban on Exporting War Munitions," *Christian Science Monitor*, February 1, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007); "Plan Big Loan Protest," *The Washington Post*, September 17, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[52]Doerris, "Promoting Kaiser and Reich: Imperial German Propaganda in the United States during World War I" in *Confrontation and Cooperation*, ed. Schröder, 145.

[53]"Pro-Germans Enter Politics in Passaic," *The New York Times*, February 3, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[54]Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, 173.

[55]Doerris, *Imperial Challenge*, 22.

of Harvard University, both German sympathizers and advocates of neutrality. Francke and Münsterberg defended German entry into the war as self-defense against Russian imperialism, French revenge, and English economic jealousy.[56] Francke held fast to a more isolationist position, openly disavowing any German-American propaganda efforts in an attempt to truly preserve American neutrality by not causing it to yield to either the pro-German minority or the pro-British majority.[57] Francke obviously walked the proverbial tightrope with American public opinion by endorsing the German cause and decrying British actions as a crime against civilization.[58] His writing was often ambiguous, as when he denounced the American arms trade as immoral in the name of non-interference, called on the public to not be swayed by either side, yet wrote in an undeniably pro-German manner.[59]

Münsterberg, on the other hand, saw himself as an arbiter who explained the German actions to the American people. He openly expressed his pro-German opinions, and did not relinquish his German citizenship for the duration of his twenty-four-year residency in the United States.[60] Much like Francke, he was widely published in the newspapers, yet his work often contained references to the superior benefits German immigrants brought to the United States.[61] Münsterberg was closely acquainted with George Viereck, and even attended some

---

[56]Keller, *States of Belonging*, 70, 77; Kuno Francke, "Germany's Motive," *The New York Times*, August 6, 1914, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[57]"Holds Sea Freedom is At Stake in War," *The New York Times*, March 31, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[58]Kuno Francke, "Dr. Francke to Congressman Bartholdt," *The New York Times*, February 3, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[59]Kuno Francke, "The Moral Right to Thrive on War," T*he New York Times*, August 11, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

[60]Keller, *States of Belonging*, 6.

[61]Hugo Münsterberg, "The Impeachment of German-Americans," *The New York Times*, September 19, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 17 Nov. 2007).

of the first meetings of the GISPB.[62] Although he steadfastly denied any official collaboration in public, Münsterberg sought to revitalize the German-American National Alliance using his and other Germanophiles' connections to wealthy German-Americans.[63] His position as governmental liaison must not to be discounted either, as he frequently called on Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt to offer his unsolicited opinions on the war, policy, and the public mood.[64] Even though he lost the confidence of Roosevelt and the administration as the war progressed, Münsterberg was a respected leader in both the German-American community and with prominent Americans. He was perhaps the greatest individual German asset the GISPB had at its disposal.

While there were certainly others who expounded upon the German cause in the United States, Francke and Münsterberg were the most respected, most widely-read, and most influential of them all. Where Bernstorff, Dernburg, and Albert failed was in not utilizing their connections to exert more influence. Francke knew Münsterberg, Münsterberg knew Viereck, Viereck knew everyone else involved, and this was just one string of the vast interpersonal web the GISPB had at its disposal. Surely Francke and Münsterberg differed on finer ideological grounds, and it is perhaps unlikely that Francke would have deviated from his position, but both endorsed the German side.

One of the negative contributions by the German intellectuals' in their press writings was their pedantic tone, in effect lecturing the reader on what America should do regarding the war. This, however, could have been compensated for by editing out the offensive parts had the GISPB more closely collaborated with the intellectuals and the pro-German newspapers.[65] Furthermore, Münsterberg's connection with Wilson was left

---

[62]Keller, *States of Belonging*, 80.

[63]*Ibid*., 82.

[64]*Ibid*., 82, 83, 97.

[65]Nagler, "German Imperial Propaganda in the American Homefront in World War I: A Response to Reinhard R. Doerris," 168.

unexplored. Münsterberg had already supported Germany's cause to Wilson, yet he was not called upon to suggest various possibilities, such as German-American peace, an alliance, or even implicit understandings. Regardless of whether or not any of the above was possible, the complete lack of any attempt to utilize this association is noteworthy. In addition to neglecting organizational ties, the German propaganda campaign lacked initiative in cooperating with popular, intellectual German patriots.

Although the GISPB quickly discovered that a reactive rather than proactive position on propaganda was a death sentence, they missed many opportunities to be effective. Aside from the technical difficulties incurred by the loss of the transatlantic cable, the greatest obstacles to success was the German government itself and, moreover, the actual course of the war. True, the pro-German newspapers, instead of softening up the public for the reception of certain news, only reacted by justifying German actions, as they had done with the Bryce Report and the execution of British nurse Edith Cavell.[66] In addition, the Germans sought an alliance with the Irish, but given that 14 percent of the foreign-born population in the U.S. was of such origin, the results of that alliance were meager at best.[67]

The illusion of a short war, shared by many official, military, and civilian constituencies at that time, may have lulled the GISPB into a lackadaisical effort to win over the American public. In retrospect, greater organization and a more directed effort with experienced agents could have improved the German propaganda operation. While the people who were in charge were certainly not blameless for the way the campaign turned out, the government in Berlin was also at fault for not better assisting the

---

[66]"Germany's Reply to Bryce Report on Atrocities," *The New York Times*, July 18, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 18 Nov. 2007); "Germans Execute a Woman," *The Washington Post*, October 16, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed 19 Nov. 2007).
[67]U.S. Bureau of the Census. Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910 http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/36894832v1ch11.pdf.

Failure of a Propaganda Campaign

German mission, namely through financial support. The fact that the Kaiser's government did not allow neutral war correspondents at the front, while the British entertained them handsomely, did not help.[68] However, Bernstorff, Dernburg, and Albrecht committed their share of follies, neglected exploring personal connections, and did not attempt to change the common pro-German rhetoric which failed to appeal to the average American.

By 1914, the inroads made by German *Kultur* were more than a decade old and were well established in the American infrastructure. German-Americans embraced their lives in the Unites States with the slogan, "Germania is our mother; Columbia is our bride," thus simultaneously praising their German heritage and their American future.[69] German newspapers flourished, German immigrants were widely organized across the continent, and German intellectuals taught in some of America's most renowned institutions. What was lacking was concerted German leadership.

Citizens, immigrants, and sympathizers, foreign and native-born, defended the German war stance until the bitter end. Could a more effective propaganda office have kept the United States out of the war entirely? Probably not, but its operation did exert enough influence to show how a powerful minority might act to influence an entire nation. Organized or not, dissenting German-American voices were heard, their actions felt, and their effort and courage in a democratic nation hostile to their cause in times of war was their most significant contribution to the war effort.

---

[68]Kunczik, "British and German Propaganda in the United States from 1914 to 1917," 32.

[69]Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, 173.

Carl Schurz, who uttered these words, at another point further elaborated on the unique position of German-Americans, noting, "We German-Americans are the hyphen between Germany and America; we present the living demonstration of the fact that a large population may be transplanted from one to another country and may be devoted to the new fatherland for life and death . . . "

A New Era in the Brain: The Civil Rights Movement in Tallahassee, Florida

John Hunt

There were many pivotal events in the civil rights movement during the 1950s and 1960s. Rosa Parks's refused to give up her seat, igniting a bus boycott. Radical white citizens in some communities violently resisted the efforts of civil rights demonstrators in towns such as St. Augustine, Florida, and Selma, Alabama. Largely ignored, however, is the crucial topic of the moderate white response to the actions of African Americans, particularly in smaller communities where violence was not widespread. Understanding the responses of white citizens during this period is critical to fully grasping the changes that the movement brought to American society. In Tallahassee, Florida's capital, one can see a microcosm of the larger civil rights movement. The white population of Tallahassee, comprised largely of "moderates," a term used for those who acquiesced to the demands of African Americans because they did not wish to see the town fall into social and economic chaos, reacted relatively calmly to events between 1956 and 1964. Yet it is necessary to closely examine this relative calm, as the response of the moderate white community is a complicated aspect of the civil rights movement in Tallahassee, as elsewhere in the South.

Before focusing specifically on Tallahassee, it is helpful to examine what historians have said about the general subject of the white response to the civil rights movement. In David L. Chappell's *Inside Agitators: White Southerners in the Civil Rights Movement*, the author traces the role of sympathetic whites in the success of the African American quest for equal rights and opportunities. Chappell points out the divide within the white community concerning the protests of African Americans and

creates three categories of response by white southerners, all of which were present in Tallahassee. These categories comprised extreme segregationists; moderates who supported segregation but did not wish to take the necessary risks needed to defend the system (the largest group); and supporters of the African American movement.[1] He details the secretive nature of white support for the civil rights movement, as whites feared the consequences of openly supporting African Americans in their struggle.[2] This secretive element was visible in Tallahassee, particularly among prominent white businessmen such as banker George Lewis II, who provided aid to boycotters within the city.[3] Lewis's case provides an excellent example of an individual attempting to aid the black community in such a way as to not damage his reputation in the white community. As president of the Lewis State Bank, Lewis helped civil rights leaders by allowing them to enter the bank prior to opening in order to take out loans or withdraw money, thus providing crucial financial support.[4] Chappell also discusses the flawed logic of segregationists who attempted to maintain the established system through legal means, but found this strategy increasingly a failure as the civil rights movement unfolded.[5] For Chappell, then, the unwilling majority of the white community, which he labels "moderate," helped African Americans the most in their struggle for civil rights by acquiescing to black activist demands in the hope that society would avoid falling into disrepair. The reluctant concessions made by both residents and leaders in Tallahassee reflect this idea.

The works of George Lewis and Jason Sokol further illustrate the variety of responses of white southerners to the civil

---

[1]David L. Chappell, *Inside Agitators: White Southerners in the Civil Rights Movement* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), xxiv.
[2]*Ibid*., 61.
[3]Glenda Alice Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise The Struggle for Civil Rights in Tallahassee, Florida* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1999), 25-26.
[4]*Ibid*.
[5]Chappell, 114.

rights movement. In Lewis's *Massive Resistance*, he describes the heterogeneous approaches that southern whites developed in attacking the civil rights movement and how this heterogeneity undermined the attempts of segregationists.[6] He also discusses the legal means by which white southerners attempted to maintain segregation, including the subversion of the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board*.[7] Sokol's *There Goes My Everything* also observes the lack of homogeneity in the response of white southerners to the civil rights movement.[8] The author discusses the drastic changes that occurred in the South during the civil rights era and the common belief that segregation was the natural way of life.[9] The revolutionary changes brought about by the civil rights movement, Sokol claims, created a new southern society; in Tallahassee, beginning with the bus boycott, one can see clearly the drastic changes that occurred in the city, both for African Americans and whites.[10]

A brief examination of the civil rights movement in Florida's capital and the response of the white community in the city aids in understanding this important period of American history. On May 26, 1956, Wilhelmina Jakes and Carrie Patterson, two students at the all-black Florida Mechanical and Agricultural University (FAMU), were arrested by Tallahassee police for "placing themselves in a position to incite a riot."[11] These charges stemmed from the refusal of the young women to move from the "whites only" section of a crowded Cities Transit bus.[12] Inspired by the actions of these two young women, other students at FAMU,

---

[6]George Lewis, *Massive Resistance: The White Response to the Civil Rights Movement* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2006), 12.

[7]*Ibid.*, 31.

[8]Jason Sokol, *There Goes My Everything: White Southerners in the Age of Civil Rights, 1945-1975* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006), 4.

[9]*Ibid.*, 61.

[10]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 265.

[11]*Ibid.*, 9-10.

[12]"Front Sitting Negro Women Arrested Here," *Tallahassee Democrat*, May 27, 1956.

and soon the overwhelming majority of the black population of Tallahassee, began a bus boycott that paralleled the civil rights demonstrations occurring in other parts of the South. To the white community, the bus boycott came as somewhat of a shock, as race relations in Florida's capital seemed to be harmonious.

On May 27, 1956, students at FAMU launched a boycott of Cities Transit, Inc., the only provider of public transportation in Tallahassee.[13] Within days, the larger black community joined the students in protesting the segregationist policies of the bus company. As Glenda Rabby notes in her dissertation, "students began the bus boycott, but the adult black community would see it through and bear the reprisals from a shocked and powerful white community."[14] Indeed, soon after the beginning of the student-led bus boycott, influential black leaders formed the Inter-Civic Council (ICC), led by C. K. Steele, a Baptist minister who moved to Tallahassee in 1952.[15] The ICC, modeled after the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA), voiced similar demands for equality in Tallahassee that the MIA did in Montgomery, and took over the bus boycott from the FAMU students.[16] On June 20, 1952, the ICC made its demands public, publishing "An Appeal to the People of Tallahassee for Moral Justice" in the *Tallahassee Democrat*, the primary white newspaper in the city.[17] As in Montgomery and elsewhere in the South, African Americans in Tallahassee demanded that the bus company allow patrons to sit anywhere they wished on the bus, that the company give blacks an equal opportunity for employment, and that drivers treat all passengers courteously.[18] Predictably, the white community did not believe that the demands of

---

[13]"FAMU Students Start Boycott of City Buses," *Tallahassee Democrat*, May 28, 1956.

[14]Glenda Alice Rabby, "Out of the Past: The Civil Rights Movement in Tallahassee, Florida" (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1984), 16.

[15]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 16.

[16]*Ibid.*, 17-18.

[17]*Tallahassee Democrat*, June 20, 1956.

[18]*Ibid*.

African Americans were reasonable, and Cities Transit initially refused to concede despite the severe economic damage suffered by the company. However, the Tallahassee bus boycott proved to civil rights leaders and whites across the country that the Montgomery boycott was no fluke, and that the civil rights movement could thrive even in relatively peaceful communities.[19]

On November 13, 1952, the Supreme Court ruled that Montgomery's segregated busing policies were unconstitutional. Implementing this decision in Tallahassee took some time, but the bus boycott was effectively over, with the bus company eventually pushing for integration to avoid economic ruin.[20] During the course of the boycott, on 8 July, C. K. Steele and the ICC announced that protests would widen into other areas of Tallahassee society, most importantly the business community. Events in Tallahassee thus followed a similar path to those in Montgomery, and the boycott of the town's businesses signaled the emergence of an organized and powerful civil rights movement in the city, much to the chagrin of white leaders.[21]

From 1956 to 1964, African Americans made many strides in civil rights in Florida's capital, achieving the desegregation of the city's buses and businesses. After the Greensboro lunch counter sit-ins began on February 1, 1960, in North Carolina, such demonstrations quickly spread throughout the South. The Tallahassee chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) initiated its first sit-in at a Woolworth's lunch counter on February 12.[22] Similar to the ultimate response of Cities Transit to the bus boycott, white Tallahassee business leaders, fearing the economic ramifications of the loss of patrons, slowly began to desegregate their establishments.

---

[19]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 3.

[20]*Ibid*., 46.

[21]*Ibid*.

[22]William H. Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 99; Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 88.

A New Era in the Brain

The hardest battle that the black community in Tallahassee had to fight was the desegregation of the public schools, a point the white community was unwilling to concede without a fight.[23] Although the battle for school desegregation was not nearly as violent in Tallahassee and in Florida as whole as it was in Alabama or Arkansas, the white community managed to preserve segregation for many years through legal means. In 1962, Steele and other parents filed a suit in federal district court against the Leon County School Board in *Steele et al. v. Board of Public Instruction of Leon County*.[24] It was not until 1969, fifteen years after the original *Brown* decision and five years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act, that the Steele case finally brought about desegregation in Tallahassee schools.[25]

With this background of the civil rights movement in Tallahassee and the general response of the white community, it is important to examine more closely how white leaders and citizens at both the state and community levels responded to the actions of African Americans in Tallahassee during the civil rights era. "Moderation" as a response masked the attempts of white Floridians to maintain segregation. Although some genuinely wished to see a new society emerge, there were definite segregationist undertones in the words of white leaders in both Florida politics and at the local level in Tallahassee. The first two individuals whose words are important to examine are LeRoy Collins, the governor of Florida from 1955 until 1961, and Farris Bryant, governor from 1961 until 1965. Although Collins would later become a civil rights figure in the Johnson administration, as governor he advocated a moderate stance, meaning that he sought to preserve segregation in Florida during his term in the belief that integrating too quickly would be detrimental to the state.[26] As Tom Wagy notes in his work *Governor LeRoy*

---

[23]Rabby, The Pain and the Promise, 200-201.
[24]*Ibid*., 225.
[25]*Ibid*., 252-255.
[26]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 162.

Collins of Florida: Spokesman of the New South, the heritage of Collins greatly influenced how he responded to the racial crisis that arose during his terms as governor.[27] Born and raised in Tallahassee, Collins grew up in an environment in which the white community assumed that African Americans were happy in a segregated society.[28] Unlike other southern governors of the era, Collins managed to present a position that appeased African Americans, while at the same time reassuring the white population that he would not support drastic changes to society.

On January 2, 1957, in an effort to ease racial tensions in his hometown, Governor Collins once again suspended the bus service in Tallahassee, blaming the "irresponsible Negro leadership" and the "rabid pro-segregationists."[29] In his inaugural address, given on January 8, 1957, Collins justified the actions of the South in regards to race relations, stating that they "were under the impression they were not proceeding in violation of the United States Constitution."[30] The address Collins gave to the people of Florida on March 20, 1960, presented in response to the racial crises taking place throughout the state, provides the best illustration of the ideology of the governor. In the address, Collins discussed the racial tension in the capital, and called on both protesters and the white community to maintain order in the city.[31] However, the governor went on to explain his stance on the issue of integration, providing a glimpse of the changes in his thinking on race relations during his time in

---

[27]Tom Wagy, *Governor LeRoy Collins of Florida: Spokesman of the New South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 2.
[28]*Ibid.*, 3.
[29]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 50-51.
[30]LeRoy Collins, "Inaugural Address of Governor LeRoy Collins at the Capitol in Tallahassee, Florida," January 8, 1957. P.K. Yonge Library of Florida History, Gainesville, Florida.
[31]LeRoy Collins, "Transcript of Statewide TV-Radio Talk to The People of Florida On Race Relations," Delivered March 20, 1960. Florida Heritage Collection, http://fulltext10.fcla.edu/cgi/t/text/textidx?c=fhp&idno=NF0000 0161&format=pdf.

office, which gradually became more liberal.[32] For example, Collins proclaimed that it was "morally wrong" for an owner to allow "negroes" into the store and then single out one department which they cannot enter.[33] In addition, Collins used the rhetoric of anti-communism to encourage the people of Florida to overcome the "racial strife" that was plaguing the United States.[34] The governor called for the creation of biracial committees throughout the state to investigate racial matters in each community, and declared, "We've got to have men with new eras in their brains," meaning that the old southern ways of thinking about race could no longer be maintained.[35] At the end of the speech, the television crew "stood still, too stunned to move."[36]

LeRoy Collins's successor Ferris Bryant did not share Collins's "moderate" stance on integration. Instead, Bryant was a governor more in the ideological mold of the conservative governor of Alabama, George Wallace, although Florida's governor did not repeat Wallace's extreme actions. During the campaign season in 1960, the *Tallahassee Democrat* asked the gubernatorial candidates, Doyle Carlton and Bryant, their opinions on the subject of school integration. While Carlton stated that he would not remove his children from an integrated school, Bryant said that he would remove his girls from such schools, as permitted under Florida's pupil assignment law.[37] This statement proved a harbinger of Bryant's approach to race relations during his time as governor from 1961 to 1965. In his inaugural address, Bryant declared his firm support for state rights', saying that he and his administration would "oppose with vigor any efforts by the Federal government to usurp the proper and lawful prerogatives

---

[32]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 107.

[33]*Governor Collins*, 6.

[34]*Ibid*., 8.

[35]*Ibid*., 9, 12.

[36]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 108.

[37]*Tallahassee Democrat*, May 23, 1960.

of the state."[38] Throughout his administration, Bryant opposed racial progress throughout Florida, particularly in Tallahassee.[39]

The white community in Tallahassee, as evidenced by articles, editorials, and letters to the editor found in the *Democrat* from 1956 to 1964, was also largely opposed to changes in race relations in the city, although there were those who called for "moderation." Beginning with the bus boycott in May 1956, the newspaper continually ran stories and editorials, the latter written by long-time conservative editor of the *Democrat* Malcolm Johnson, reflecting fears of the changes that were occurring in the city.[40] As in other southern communities, the *Democrat* constantly spoke of the threat of outside agitators of the civil rights movement, despite the fact that civil rights leaders were citizens of Tallahassee.[41] Although the paper presented itself as a "moderate" voice, fair to both the white and black communities in Tallahassee, it is clear that the paper was far from unbiased in its view of race relations in Florida's capital. Throughout the civil rights era, Johnson continually chided black leaders for not compromising in their attempts at equality.[42] During this period in Tallahassee, the *Democrat* reflected the prevailing beliefs of its white readers that African Americans needed the white community to lift them up, and that protesters were confusing desires for rights.[43]

Although the paper often focused on the "unreasonable" demands of the African Americans, there were times when Malcolm Johnson spoke out against radical segregationists, in the belief that while society should remain segregated, violence was

---

[38]Farris Bryant, "Inaugural Address of Governor Farris Bryant, Tallahassee," Given 3 January 1961. P.K. Yonge Library of Florida History, Gainesville, Florida.

[39]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise*, 141.

[40]*Ibid.*, 3.

[41]*Tallahassee Democrat*, July 1,1956; *Tallahassee Democrat*, July 11, 1964.

[42]*Tallahassee Democrat*, July 1, 1956; *Tallahassee Democrat*, March 4, 1960; *Tallahassee Democrat*, May 30, 1963.

[43]Rabby, *The Pain and the Promise,* 3; *Tallahassee Democrat*, March 4, 1960.

not the way to maintain the established system. The best example of this came on January 3, 1957, the day after someone placed a burning cross on the front lawn of Steele.[44] The *Democrat* condemned this action and the use of the cross as a symbol of "hatred and terror and intolerance."[45] When Congress passed the Civil Rights Act on July 3, 1964, Johnson and the *Democrat* called on the citizens of Tallahassee to observe the law, while at the same time decrying the "offensive" portions of the bill, including the ban on discrimination in employment and the requirement that establishments be open to all races.[46] Letters from citizens, which the *Democrat* ran on occasion, reflect the variety of feelings to the civil rights movement that the wider white community held. One letter proclaimed that "God made each race for a purpose," and added that both African Americans and whites should remain separated and not allow leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr. to sway them from such beliefs.[47] Another citizen felt that "Civil righters are publicity seekers," referring to the role of agitators from outside the community in the death of three civil rights activists in Mississippi.[48] There were some, however, such as Mrs. Gregg Phifer, who not only supported the Civil Rights Act, but also called for more than just good intentions in the implementation of the new law.[49] These various opinions of white citizens of Tallahassee regarding the civil rights movement and the Civil Rights Act reflect the division within the white community on these subjects seen throughout the South.[50]

In order to place the white response of Tallahassee into the larger context of the civil rights era, it is helpful to examine the response of white citizens in other communities. In his work *Racial Change and Community Crisis*, David R. Colburn discusses

---

[44]*Tallahassee Democrat*, January 3, 1957.
[45]*Ibid*.
[46]*Tallahassee Democrat*, July 3, 1964.
[47]*Tallahassee Democrat*, September 16, 1963.
[48]*Tallahassee Democrat*, July 11, 1964.
[49]*Ibid*.
[50]Chappell, *Inside Agitators*, 4.

the violence that plagued the nation's oldest city during the civil rights era. According to Colburn, the white community in St. Augustine viewed the work of civil rights activists as communist-inspired, threatening St. Augustine's economic, social, and political traditions.[51] Similar to Tallahassee, the white leadership in St. Augustine opposed changes in race relations in the city, believing that radical changes would not bode well for society as a whole.[52] A crucial difference between Tallahassee and St. Augustine, however, was the prevalence of violence seen in St. Augustine during this period. The combination of active protests by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an angry black community, a large population of ardent segregationists, and an increasingly alienated group of city leaders led to the violent nature of the events there.[53] Unlike Tallahassee, where the white leadership managed to maintain control over the racial situation in the city, the leadership of St. Augustine failed to manage the tension between the white and black communities. The large group of white extremists, not present in the capital, also created a situation ripe for violence, as compromise with African Americans was not part of their vocabulary.[54] Colburn's work illustrates the violence and hatred of one white southern community towards those who threatened their cherished way of life.

In William H. Chafe's examination of the civil rights movement in Greensboro, there are obvious parallels with Tallahassee. Blacks in Greensboro in the middle of the twentieth century lived in "both the best of times and the worst of times," as the racial situations in both cities were better than in many southern communities.[55] Chafe describes the attempts by white leaders in North Carolina to maintain segregation legally, such

---

[51]David R. Colburn, *Racial Change and Community Crisis: St. Augustine, Florida, 1877-1980* (Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1991), 59.
[52]*Ibid*., 60.
[53]*Ibid*., 109.
[54]*Ibid*., 5.
[55]*Ibid.*, 22.

as through a pupil placement law similar to that passed in Florida following the *Brown* decision, which allowed whites to maintain segregation under the guise that all parents were free to choose the school their child attended.[56] He also details the sit-in movement, an important component of the civil rights movement, which began in Greensboro on February 1, 1960.[57] Like Tallahassee, it took the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to bring about viable changes in Greensboro, as the white population resisted change until it was no longer legally able to do so.[58]

When the Tallahassee civil rights movement began in earnest in May 1956, it was clear to the black community that the journey ahead would be long and difficult. Using boycotts, sit-ins, and peaceful demonstrations, civil rights activists in the city managed to slowly chip away at the segregationist policies of the white leadership. By 1964, with the passage of the Civil Rights Act, blacks in Tallahassee had managed to integrate many areas of the community, although the battle to integrate public schools would last for several more years. The response of the white community in Tallahassee to the civil rights movement was, as in other southern communities, varied. While there were those who ardently supported segregation, and those who fought with vigor for integration, the majority of the citizens fell somewhere in between. As Colburn, Chafe, Lewis, Chappell, and Sokol all describe, it is very difficult to develop a single label for the response of white southerners to the civil rights movement. The situation in Tallahassee was much calmer than in other communities throughout the South, such as St. Augustine and Little Rock, but one must remember that the "moderate" whites of Tallahassee largely supported the established system, although economics and the fear of chaos eventually led whites to give in to the demands of African Americans for equal rights and opportunities.

---

[56]*Ibid*., 68.
[57]*Ibid*., 99.
[58]*Ibid*., 209.

The Jewish Community of Casablanca: Growth under French Control, 1907-1933

Sean Haley

Casablanca has been said to be "a city without memory."[1] The city, however, has a rich history dating back to the early days of the French occupation, when it became the chief economic hub of Morocco under French control. At this time, many Moroccans moved to Casablanca from the interior cities and rural hinterlands in order to find economic opportunity. Jews, the largest minority population in Morocco, also relocated to this blossoming city. Because of the cosmopolitan nature of the growing city of Casablanca, Jews lived side by side not only with Muslims, but also with a significant European minority. This melting-pot condition, however, was also found in other port cities of the Maghreb, such as Algiers and Tunis. What made Casablanca unique was the speed of its development and rise to prominence. The Jewish community of Casablanca played a key role in this city's development, adopting aspects of Western modernity while remaining thoroughly Moroccan and mostly in harmony with their Muslim brethren.

The period from 1907 to 1933 in Casablanca begins with the French bombardment and occupation of the city (although nominally still under Sharifian control until 1912) and ends with the coming of Hitler to power. These years showcase the results of a relatively uninterrupted French control in Casablanca.

Jews of the Maghreb

The experiences of the Jewish community of Morocco were far different from those in Algeria and Tunisia. Since the invasion of 1830, lay French Jewry took a particular interest in the Jewish

---

[1] Susan Ossman, *Picturing Casablanca: Portraits of Power in a Modern City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

community of Algeria, whom they saw as the people most likely to become proponents of the *mission civilatrice*. The Crémieux Decree of 1870 uniformly granted the Jews of Algeria French citizenship. Ironically, the decree led to an anti-Semitic backlash within the settler community of Algeria.[2] In fact, in a letter dated September 27,1901, Moïse Nahon of the Alliance Israélite Universelle from Algiers laments two outbreaks in 1884 and 1889 in which "the Jews were stripped de facto of almost all the prerogatives of citizenship and slandered; the cynicism with which they were unrelentingly humiliated was like none ever seen before."[3]

The French used what they had learned in their colony of Algeria to formulate policy regarding their "Protectorate" of Tunisia, established in 1881. Learning from the experience of Algeria, the French in Tunisia were less eager to give to Tunisian Jewry the benefits of French citizenship. The goal of the protectorate, in contrast to the colony of Algeria, was to reform the Tunisian administration under French tutelage as opposed to making Tunisia a part of France[4]. This meant that the majority of the Jews of Tunis were left to their own governmental regulations and usually confined to the Hara (Jewish Quarter). Lazare Guéron of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, a French-Jewish organization dedicated to uplifting Jews from across the world, most often through education, stated in a letter from 1908 that "the human plant has not fared well in the shadows of the Hara," referring to the filth in which the Jews of Tunis lived.[5] But, as was found in Morocco, Tunisian Jews served as a link between the locals and the French government. Many Jews became French or

---

[2]*Ibid.*, 175.

[3]Moïse Nahon, "Algiers, Annual Report, 1900-1901," in *Jews and Muslims: Images of Sephardi and European Jewries in Modern Times*, ed. Aron Rodrigue (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 107-10.

[4]Schroeter, 175.

[5]Lazare Guéron, "The Goal of Moral and Material Regeneration: Tunis 1908," in *Jews and Muslims: Images of Sephardi and European Jewries in Modern Times*, ed., Aron Rodrigue (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 78-79.

foreign protégés, thereby receiving protection and privileges not awarded the standard Jew. In another letter, Lazare Guéron writes:

> After the occupation, as the progressive transformation of the country was creating the need for a population specially trained in intelligent and modern methods, the country found in the Jew a marvelous answer to its new needs. The Jews are the flexible element par excellence of this society and they were aided by circumstances on this occasion, having received a sufficient primary school education thanks to the providentially opportune opening of our school. Banks, maritime agencies, commercial agencies, stores and shops of all kinds, everything was overrun by graduates from our school.[6]

The Jews of Morocco had quite a different experience. Jews in nineteenth-century Morocco lived under the Islamic state of the Sharifian Empire under which they were labeled as *ahl al-dhimma*, paid the *jizya* tax and lived in the separated *mellah* communities. They also lived under control of local Jewish institutions within the *mellah*.[7] There was no Crémieux Decree as in Algeria, nor Ottoman *Tanzimat* reforms addressing the issues of religious minorities within Morocco. Historically, Jews were divided into two groups: native Jews (often divided between urban *mellah* Jews and rural Berber Jews), and Jews of Spanish descent, who fled after the *Reconquista* of 1492. Native Jews were more known for their piety, whereas the Spanish Jews were known to be less strictly observant, as well as more apt to seize opportunities, according to British journalist Walter Harris.[8]

[6]Guéron, "Comparisons between Tunisian Jewry and Other Groups in the Regency, 1908," in *Jews and Muslims*, 161.
[7]Schroeter, p. 175
[8]While European and American travelers and journalists provide good insight into the different regions of the Middle East and North Africa at the time, they were heavily influenced by their times and Western upbringing that could make their descriptions of the East and its "backwardness"

The Jewish Community of Casablanca

Within Casablanca, the Jewish population was subdivided still further. Albert Saguès of the Alliance school observed that the Casablanca Jewish community was divided into three distinct groups: the *Shylloks*, the *Rumis,* and the *Forasteros*. The *Shylloks*, Saguès said, "are the true natives . . . their ways and customs are identical to those of the Berber nomads." The *Forasteros* were indigenous Jews whose native tongue was Arabic, and the *Rumis* were Spanish-speaking Jews whose ancestors were expelled from Spain during the inquisition. The *Forasteros* and the *Rumis* had a strong disdain for one another, so much so that Saguès writes that "Between these two groups there is no possible communication; they each despise each other more than either detests the Muslims or the Christians."[9] The differences among Jewish groups led to a glut of different dialects coming together to form the language of the Casablanca Jewry. Moïse Nahon of the Alliance denounced it as "jargon, a jumble of expressions from Arabic, Chaldean, Spanish and even Berber composed without logic."[10]

The *makhzen* (Moroccan government), however, viewed these different groups of Jews as a united Jewish entity. The Jewish community had significant autonomy and although they suffered some difficulties and drawbacks, they gained a position within Moroccan society. Because of the large number of Jewish bankers and artisans, Harris observed that "the *mellah*, as their quarter is called, is the centre of trade."[11]

Although Moroccan sultans had tried to block European encroachment on Morocco throughout the nineteenth century, their efforts were in vain. In fact, in order to prevent further economic

---

exaggerated. It is important to keep this in mind when utilizing Western sources regarding the region.
Walter B. Harris, *Morocco that Was* (London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1921), 308-309.
[9]Albert Saguès, "The Jews of Casablanca, 1909," in *Jews and Muslims*, 147-148.
[10]Moïse Nahon, "French to Replace the Local 'Jargon': Casablanca 1898," in *Jews and Muslims,* 126-127.
[11]Harris, 311

penetration, the Moroccan Sultan Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahman gave monopolies over the country's chief exports in the years 1848 to 1856 to the *tujjar al-Sultan*, the Sultan's personal retinue of Jewish traders.[12] The passage of commercial treaties with the Europeans by the *makhzen* led to the decline of these traders and the rise of European economic superiority. This led to a new need for Moroccan commercial agents to deal with the Europeans. This role was most often filled by Jewish merchants who served, as they had in Tunisia, as intermediaries between the Muslims and the now-growing European community. Because of their services, several of these traders gained protégé status and protection from foreign governments: a process that had its beginnings in Morocco with the Franco-Moroccan treaty of 1767.[13] The establishment of protégés eroded the *makhzen*'s sovereignty because it allowed these protégés to escape the jurisdiction of the *makhzen* and to seek out protection from the European powers. This led to a number of abuses, which became an issue during the reign of Sultan Mawlay Hasan. A meeting of the major powers was called in Madrid in 1880, which did little to change the position of the Muslim and Jewish protégés and the foreign nationals living in Morocco.[14] It is estimated that as many as 1,500 Jewish families enjoyed the protection of a foreign power by the time of Madrid Conference.[15]

The establishment of European-Jewish institutions during the pre-occupation period can be traced back to the visit by the British Jewish philanthropist Sir Moses Montefiore to the court of Sultan Mohammed IV in 1864. The Sultan granted Montefiore a decree stating that the Jews were permitted to seek out justice in Morocco and that "not the slightest injustice may be done them nor any unmerited treatment accorded them."[16]

---

[12]Laskier, 39.

[13]*Ibid.*, 39.

[14]*Ibid.*, 40.

[15]Schroeter, 177.

[16]Rom Landau, *Moroccan Drama 1900-1955* (Gateshead on Tyne: Northumberland Press Limited, 1956), 29.

The Jewish Community of Casablanca

The effectiveness of this decree is doubtful as people felt that it did little but uphold the status quo and the system already in place.[17] The visit and decree, however, did lead to an increase in Moroccan Jews seeking foreign protection and an increase in European Jewry's awareness of them. In fact, Morocco was the first country in French North Africa to open an Alliance Israélite school (the first in Morocco opened in Tetuan in 1862, in contrast to 1900 for Algiers and 1878 for Tunis). A total of twenty Alliance schools opened in Morocco before the French occupation of Casablanca in 1907, with another five opening before the Treaty of Fez in 1912, which established the French Protectorate.[18]

Development of Casablanca

Wyndham Lewis, an American traveler writing in 1931, quoted Arthur Leared in his description of Casablanca in 1870. Leared stated that Casablanca was the "dirtiest, most tumble-down place ever seen."[19] Lewis quoted another observer in 1889 as stating:

> Casablanca occupies a flat, low-lying piece of ground close to the sea; the houses have not a single feature worth remarking; the principle street is a running sewer of filth…the people are more ugly and dirty, the donkeys worse treated and more mangy, the dogs more numerous and repulsive, and the beggars in greater numbers and decidedly more importunate and loathsome, than in any of the other places we had yet seen.[20]

The period of large-scale migration and urban transformation was just beginning at this point. At that time, Casablanca was a

---

[17]Laskier, 34; Schroeter, 7.

[18]Aron Rodrigue, ed. *Jews and Muslims: Images of Sephardi and European Jewries in Modern Times* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 18-19.

[19]Wyndham Lewis, *Journey into Barbary*, ed. C.J. Fox (Santa Barbara, Cal.: Black Sparrow Press, 1983), 66.

[20]*Ibid*., 66

township of only four thousand residents.[21] Before a French company was granted a contract by the *makhzen* to build a port in 1906, the city had no major source of economic prosperity.[22] Lewis described it as "the world's worst natural harbour. . . . [I]t is cursed with an abnormal surf: it has an abordage calculated to prejudice any mariner against it," and then goes on to tell the stories of the troubles Europeans had in approaching Casablanca by sea.[23]

By the French occupation of 1907, the city of Casablanca had a population of roughly twenty thousand, including five thousand Jews and one thousand Europeans. In addition, due to a drought, six thousand Moroccans had fled from the countryside to the city, attracted by its growing commercial activity.[24]

The murder of the French physician Emile Mauchamp on March 22, 1907, sparked the French occupation, which began with the takeover of the city of Oudja in eastern Morocco.[25] The city was to be held until the Sultan met the demands of the French. This was seen as the final step in eroding *makhzen* power. By the end of July, anti-French sentiment in Casablanca was high.[26] This sentiment led to the attack and murder of nine European workers, three Frenchmen, three Italians and three Spaniards, who were transporting stone for the construction of the port. The proximity of a Muslim cemetery to the railway line used by the workers provoked the attack.[27] The French, in return, landed the battleship *Galilée* at Casablanca and began a bombardment of the city, while a French regiment was sent to protect the Europeans of the city. Walter Harris stated that the French bombarded "the native forts

---

[21]*Ibid*., 66.
[22]Frederick Moore, *The Passing of Morocco* (New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908), 13.
[23]*Ibid*., 65-66.
[24]Ossman, 28.
[25]Landau, 62.
[26]William A Hoisington Jr., *Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995), 31.
[27]Harris, 116.

and garrisons,"[28] while Frederick Moore, an Englishman who wrote for the *Westminster Gazette*, reported that they bombarded the whole "Moslem quarters of the town."[29] In any case, the attack resulted in hundreds dead and a period of looting and lawlessness.

The Jewish community in particular was affected by the French bombardment. Harris, who arrived at Casablanca just a few days after the bombardment, described it as "a confusion of dead people and horses while the contents of almost every house seemed to have been hurled into the streets and destroyed…Out of the dark cellars, Moors and Jews, hidden since the first day of the bombardment, many of them wounded, were creeping, pale and terrified."[30] This highlights the fact that the native population, whether Jewish or Muslim, were affected in much the same way by the initial attack and the landing of French troops. Moore, who arrived at the scene three weeks after the bombardment, took a more sectarian view of the violence and looting that ensued. "Town Moors and Arabs turned out to kill and rape and loot, as they do whenever opportunity offers, and for three days they plundered the places of Europeans and Jews . . . until driven from the town by reinforcements of French and Spanish troops." Moore also told of mosques and Muslim "Saint Houses" that the French fired upon.[31] Later in the description, however, Harris stated that "the Jews and Jewesses were perhaps those who suffered the most," and then recounted the story of a Jewish woman who fled from a cellar, forgetting her baby in a corner of her hiding place.[32] In the aftermath of the attack, Moore stated that the Jews were the only laborers, recovering damaged property at good pay. He added that the Jews were "grinning at their good fortune."[33] Once order was restored, the French began investigating the murders and

---

[28]*Ibid*., 116.
[29]Moore, 15.
[30]Harris, 117.
[31]Moore, 15-16.
[32]Harris, 117.
[33]Moore, 17.

looting. While they interrogated both Jews and Muslims, Moore added that the Jews "went in first to be questioned because their examination was not so rigorous as that to which the Moors were put."[34] Once the city was pacified, the French used Casablanca as a base to secure the fertile Shawyia plains outside of the city. The French occupied Fez by 1911, and the Treaty of Fez established the French Protectorate of Morocco the following year.[35]

French stylistic influences soon made their mark. As early as 1908, Casablanca is described as a "modern town" with "little that is remarkable in its architecture." It was also, once again, stressed that "it is only within the last forty years that stone buildings have begun to replace the native huts of reeds."[36] In fact, Marshal Louis-Hubert Lyautey, the first French resident-general in Morocco, hired highly respected Henri Prost in 1917 as his chief architect. Lyautey's plan for Morocco was that of a dual city, of a preserved, traditional Arabic *medina* and a French-built *ville nouvelle*. The reasoning behind this was not to segregate the populations, according to Lyautey, but to "touch the indigenous cities as little as possible."[37] Recognizing the potential economic importance of Casablanca, the French ordered the construction of a *ville nouvelle* twenty times the size of the Arabic *medina* that would feature buildings with both European and Moroccan influence. Prost's vision for the *ville nouvelle* included wide thoroughfares and several large city parks. The design was not only for health reasons, creating a "sanitary corridor" between the indigenous and European quarters, but also for the quick mobilization of French troops along the wide avenues of Casablanca.[38]

The sprawling *ville nouvelle* transformed Casablanca into a "modern" city, according to French ideals. It also gave its

---

[34]*Ibid.*, 35.
[35]Landau, 82.
[36]Rankin, 238.
[37]Gwendolyn Wright, "Tradition in the Service of Modernity: Architecture and Urbanism in French Colonial Policy, 1900-1930," *The Journal of Modern History* 59, (June 1987): 291-316.
[38]Wright, 301.

residents all the amenities of a modern city, including sewage, water, and electricity, all of which were rarely found in the *medina*. Even as early as World War I, Casablanca attracted an enormous number of Moroccans from the interior, leading to the development of the *bidonville*, which Wyndham Lewis described decades later as

> a city within a city, [consisting] of small huts mainly composed of petrol-tins. Petrol-Tin town is again a mushroom settlement of nomads, attracted by the dollars to be picked up in this Babylon of the Nazarene, half-finished. Thousands of these petrol-tin dwellings already exist, day by day they are added to: they have streets and squares.[39]

These poor Moroccan neighborhoods stood in stark contrast to the *haute*-European district, the *Quartier Réservé* exemplified in Lewis's dry assessment: "When I described the houses of its *Quartier Réservé* as palaces, I was not dealing in hyperbole."[40]

Naturally, these shantytowns posed a problem for the French, who wanted to keep their romanticized ideal of Moorish life (which they thought would endear them to the native population) and to cultivate large-scale tourism.[41] The French saw a solution in the development of the *derb al-habous*, a new district for the local population. Established on land from Islamic religious foundations, the *habous* district was in harmony with the design of the old *medina*, while boasting modern amenities that the *medina* lacked. The district's designer was Albert Laprade, an associate of Prost, who wrote that "every house was designed with love. We taxed our ingenuity to create the maximum expression of serendipity, so dear to the Muslim."[42] The result, however, was an oversimplification of Moroccan life, one that existed on French terms and which perceived the community as static.

---

[39]Lewis, 71.
[40]Lewis, 73.
[41]Wright, 304.
[42]Wright, 303-04.

Jewish Community Life in Casablanca

As the city developed, so did the Jewish community. The French command addressed the question of where Jews would live; a decree issued by Commander Mangin, who was in charge of the Casablanca area, gave Jews the right to settle anywhere in the city by 1909. Saguès, a teacher appointed by the Alliance to Casablanca in 1908, wrote in a letter that "a few families, the richer ones, of course, have taken full advantage of this authorization; but in spite of this emigration, the *mellah* still remains home to the greater part of the Jewish population."[43] Statistics for the total number of Jews vary. Reporter Reginald Rankin asserted that "the whole Jewish population does not exceed five thousand" during his visit to the city in 1907, whereas writer Paul Rainbow reported that the Jewish population had expanded to reach nine thousand by 1912.[44] In 1936 the World Jewish Council found that the number had grown to 38,600 living in Casablanca.[45]

The *mellah* of southwest Casablanca, where the Jewish population lived, enjoyed a dual life. It was described as a center of trade, but more frequently as a residence of misery. Saguès described it in 1909 in unflattering terms:

> Its population is much more dense than that of the other parts of the city. A shapeless mass of disparate constructions arranged without the slightest regard to order or harmony; an impossible maze of narrow, twisting streets, gullied and rutted; a treacherous passage for strangers who dare enter, especially on moonless nights; such is the Jewish district.[46]

---

[43]Saguès, 146-48.

[44] Rankin, 142; Ossman, 28.

[45]"Reports of the Institute of Jewish Affairs: The Jews of Morocco (World Jewish Council: September 1949)," in *The Jews of Morocco* (New York: Zionist Youth Council, 1956), 25.

[46]Saguès, 147.

The Jewish Community of Casablanca

According to Saguès, the *mellah* of Casablanca was divided into two parts: the *mellah* of the privileged class and the *bhira*, which has the aspect of a camp set up on the outskirts of the city. The privileged *mellah*, although dirty, "had a number of spacious, though poorly maintained dwellings."[47] The *bhira*, however, was akin to a Muslim *duar* (temporary residence camp) and contained wooden huts located on the outskirts of the Jewish quarter. The population of the *bhira* was said to be comprised of "needy farmers."

Regarding the *mellah* as a center of trade, Walter Harris observed that the "tailors, jewelers, tent makers and metal-workers were practically all Jews . . . . In their shops there was nothing too small to be bought."[48] In fact, the Jewish population often filled a purpose as moneylenders. This was a lucrative trade in Casablanca, for "the natives borrow from the Jews and rich Arabs at 60 per cent."[49]

Being a center of trade imposed a darker side upon the *mellah*. Gambling was present, as the lower classes played the primitive *roulette* and *rouge et noir* games set up inside the *mellah*.[50] David Corcos, a Moroccan Jew from the wealthy Corcos family of Essaouria (Mogador), blamed the rural Jews for the problems of the *mellah*s.[51]

Opportunities for Jewish Education

One of the more active bodies of the Jewish community was the Alliance Israélite Universelle schools located in Casablanca. The first school in Casablanca opened in 1897 for boys, with a girls' school following in 1900. A new boys' school and a co-ed educational facility were opened in 1933, bringing the number of Alliance schools in Casablanca to four.[52] Many of the Jewish

---

[47]*Ibid*., 147.

[48]Harris, 311.

[49]Rankin, 77.

[50] *Ibid*., 134.

[51]David Corcos, "Les prénoms des Juifs du Maroc," in *Studies in the History of the Jews of Morocco* (Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, 1976), 155. "Particularly at Casablanca, where promiscuity is widespread and it isn't the only factor of the multiplications of divorces there" (author's translation).

[52]Rodrigue, 18.

leaders of the Casablanca community had a connection to the Alliance or its schools. The Jewish community of Casablanca made its Alliance schools more prominent by offering a larger variety of courses and turned the Casablanca Alliance School into more than a four-year institution.[53] In fact, in the first decade of the twentieth century, the director of the Alliance School introduced Arabic into the curriculum, as he felt that local Jews had a vital interest in doing business with Muslim merchants and being European intermediaries.[54] This program was dropped only to be revitalized in the late 1930s with limited success within Morocco. French was the language of choice for instruction, drawing students from all over the country. Nahon said that of the 220 students at the Alliance School, "thirty-four children [were] of Casablanca parents, seventy five were migrant youths from the north, twenty-three from the Atlas, twenty-six from Marrakesh, forty-four from other parts of the interior and eighteen from unspecified places."[55]

The test for achieving the French *Certificat des Etudes Primaires* was administered to members of the Alliance School and also to two private schools whose enrollment consisted of European Christians and a few "assimilated" protégés. In Casablanca schools, all of the Alliance students passed, while sixty-six percent of the private school students passed.[56] Because those who passed would continue their studies in France or Algeria, the certificate was seen as a valuable passport to further education.

The girls' school was as well equipped as the boys'. They learned mostly the same subjects as the boys with the addition of some sewing and embroidery.[57] Rankin applauded them for carrying civilization to the interior of the country and said that the girls "do much to raise the standard of civilization amongst Moroccan Jews."[58]

---

[53]*Ibid.*, 27.
[54]Laskier, 103.
[55] *Ibid.*, 126.
[56] *Ibid.*, 107-108.
[57]Rankin, 142.
[58]*Ibid.*, 143.

The Jewish Community of Casablanca

The Alliance and its members often dominated local politics. The power structure of the Jewish community in general rested upon the local committee traditionally known as the *jam'at al-Yahud*. Lyautey sought a policy to largely keep the traditional institutions intact so as not to favor Jews over their Muslim countrymen. In general, the French wanted to reform the Moroccan institutions without replacing them. Institutions such as the Alliance, however, lobbied against French policies and pressed for policies to progress the local Jewish community. Local elites addressed several issues, especially French nationalization because Alliance members saw the Jews as pioneers of French civilization in Morocco. Saguès of the Alliance School met with General Lyautey in 1912 to discuss obtaining foreign citizenship for Jews. Lyautey made an effort to persuade Saguès that the French were friends of the Jews, but knowing that Moroccan Jews had also been seeking out foreign assistance from Spain, he accused them of wanting to undermine French influence in Morocco.[59] Lyautey's message was clear: he wanted to work with the Jewish community, but would be unwilling to establish a Crémieux-esque Decree for Moroccan Jewry. Lyautey, however, did state that the Protectorate would have a policy of limited, selective naturalization.[60] This issue was revisited in 1927 by Yomtov David Sémach of the Alliance, with the same result.[61]

Members of the Alliance also lobbied for the inclusion of Jews within the French legal system. The Protectorate decided against this; they issued a *dahir* in August 1913 that established French courts for Europeans but kept the Muslim and Jewish courts intact, meaning that Jews were still subject to the *makhzen* government and its traditional courts, in which the Sultan had full authority.[62] This system, however, was to be reformed in the future. Yahya Zagury, president of the Casablancan *jam'at al-Yahud*, was

---

[59]Laskier, 164.
[60]Schroeter, 179.
[61]Laskier, 166.
[62]Schroeter, 180.

instrumental in persuading the Protectorate government to change how Moroccan Jews were adjudicated. Vehemently opposed to the Sultan's control of Jewish courts, Zagury suggested an appeals court headed by a rabbi for all of Morocco.[63] Another *dahir* was issued in 1918 that established the Jewish high court of appeals in Morocco, but also limited the power of the *jam'at al-Yahud*s by restricting their power and creating the office of the Inspector of Jewish Institutions, a liaison between the Protectorate and the Jewish communities.[64] This *dahir* was unsatisfactory to Jewish leaders and Lyautey responded that "the Jews have no cause for complaint against the Protectorate, which is always committed to keeping the equal balance between them and the Muslims, in enabling them to benefit from all the reforms realized in this country." Lyautey's perception was that Jews were seeking out a special status due to World War I, and the pressures of Zionism in Europe.[65]

Casablancan Jewry and the Zionist Movement

Zionism divided the Jewish community in Casablanca. Imported into Morocco, it was not until the early 1920s that Zionist literature was disseminated in Casablanca.[66] Most of the Jews in Morocco openly welcomed the Balfour Declaration of 1917, along with the establishment of the British Mandate in Palestine at the San Remo Conference of 1920. The first major Zionist leader of Casablanca was Jonathan Thursz, a Jew from Poland who published the pro-Zionist journal *L'Avenir Illustré* from 1926 to 1940. Thursz disseminated literature and established links between Moroccan Zionists and European Zionists.[67] Soloman Kagan, a Russian Jew who settled in Casablanca, spread the Zionist message in the 1920s and 1930s, worked with Jewish intellectuals in Casablanca, established links with Eastern

---

[63]*Ibid.*, 184.
[64]*Ibid.*, 190.
[65]*Ibid.*, 190.
[66]Laskier, 199.
[67]*Ibid.*, 203.

The Jewish Community of Casablanca

European Jewry, and discussed the dwindling conditions of German Jewry at the time.[68] Local Alliance leaders such as Samuel Lévy assisted in Zionist activities. There were also high-ranking Casablancan Jews who worked against Zionism such as Sémach, Zagury and Elie Nataf. Sémach and Zagury criticized the Zionists, stating that Jews were well-off under French control and that Zionism was an obstacle to their progress. Zagury even restricted Zionist activities in Casablanca.[69] Nataf, an Alliance school graduate, published an anti-Zionist, pro-French newspaper *L'Union Marocaine* to counteract the spread of *L'Avenir Illustré.*

Conclusion

Throughout the early years of the French occupation, Jews had a place of importance in Casablancan society. Not only were they connected to their Muslim countrymen via a shared history, but they were also connected to their new European rulers and business partners through Casablanca's emergence as the most economically important city in Morocco. Although the French cast Muslims and Jews in the same light, as seen through their decrees regarding the community, the Jewish community nevertheless attempted to advance itself through education and through working alongside the French. While the Jewish community itself was divided by ideals and descent, it still managed to play an active role in the city, and its opening up to the Europeans.

In the future, most Moroccan Jews were to leave for Israel, with many residing in Casablanca for a period of time until their departure. Today, Casablanca houses a population of around two thousand Jews, and has the only Jewish history museum found in an Arab nation. Without the contribution of the Jewish community, their willingness to work for reforms and their pursuit of education for a better life, it is unlikely that Casablanca would be as prosperous as it is today.

---

[68]*Ibid.*, 204.
[69]*Ibid.*, 207-08.

"Blackboard Power": Florida's 1968 Teacher Walkout

Paige Scofield

> *As professionals let us say we will not practice*
> *our profession where teaching is not respected and*
> *children are not important. Let us then resign.[1]*
> – Florida Education Association

A veritable showdown, Florida's three-week, statewide teachers' walkout in 1968 was the first in U.S. history. The Florida Education Association mobilized almost half of the state's 58,000 teachers to resign in protest, thus demonstrating the persuasive strength of the organization and its power in organizing such a large-scale demonstration. The civil rights movement roused the teachers to battle the state as they assembled together for recognition of teaching as a true profession warranting better pay and working conditions. The larger national battle between conservative principles and liberal social forces ultimately set the highly politicized tone of the walkout. The dispute between Florida Governor Claude Kirk, the Florida Education Association, teachers, and the public embodied the national struggles over political identity and alignment on a state level.

Never before had so many teachers organized across various racial, geographic, and ideological divisions to unite as a single force for educational equality. Twenty-five thousand teachers expressed their discontent through a mass resignation that, in many counties, essentially closed all school operations. This was an issue because, per state law, striking was

---

[1]Juanita Parks, "Crisis in Education: A Cause for Sacrifice," *Florida Education* 45, (March 1968): 6, Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

illegal, and educators declared the entire crisis a mass resignation while the state viewed it as an illegal strike. A combination of long-simmering frustrations over lack of funds for education and teachers' exasperation over their working conditions contributed to the tense atmosphere in Florida. The mounting unrest in the state toward the multiplying education problems reflected national themes of agitation and protest. Yet, teacher activism differed from the militancy shown by some other groups during the period, such as Black Panther violence in the civil rights movement. For teachers, "militancy" meant becoming a member of a teachers' union or participating in a strike or walkout, not necessarily using violence and force.[2]

To state the matter generally, tension existed between those who believed in the need for wholesale changes in society's structure and those who supported the status quo. Examples of activists favoring social change in this period are proponents of the women's liberation movement, participants in the civil rights movement, and anti-war campaigners. For the sake of shorthand, such groups are called "Liberals" in this paper. The opposing group, characterized by traditionalism, and a general hesitation or disdain for the civil rights agenda and race relations are called "Conservatives," although it is acknowledged that these are broad-brush terms and that there were many shades of grey between the two categories.

Ideological clashes among Florida's residents and institutions colored their response to the educational crisis. Governor Kirk, a conservative Republican, built upon the growing conservative sentiment in the U.S. while the activist Florida Education Association (FEA) wanted to sway public opinion in favor of liberal improvements to education. The walkout drew its momentum from statewide pressures surrounding the teachers in Florida, as well as the overall confrontational nature

---

[2]Wayne J. Urban, *Gender, Race, and the National Education Association: Professionalism and Its Limitations* (New York: Routledge Falmer, 2000), 202.

of events in 1968. The walkout effectively challenged societal norms—that educators were meant to instruct children and accept their conditions, however poor. The walkout underscored the tensions between conservative attitudes lingering from the 1950s with the more change-oriented mindsets of the 1960s.

Historians consider the Florida walkout as seminal in the development of teacher activism. Labor scholars, including Wayne J. Urban and Marjorie Murphy, cite the rivalry between professional teacher organizations and unions as a key component of the turmoil. This intense rivalry was pivotal in the conservative-versus-liberal face-off. While most scholars attribute the main motivations for the strike to activism and militancy, many have failed to adequately acknowledge politics as a focal point. Politics was important, as education scholar Wayne C. Malone points out in one of his surveys of strike participants. According to Malone, forty-six percent of respondents cited political conditions as a main catalyst for the walkout.[3] The national political trend toward conservatism had a larger impact on the strike than has been shown in other research. Kirk sought to show the rest of the country that Florida was committed to a law-and-order society that did not tolerate civil disobedience; likewise, teachers and the FEA sought to capitalize on the activist fervour generated by the civil rights and anti-war movements.

Broken Promises

Teachers' discontent originated with Kirk's initial dismissal of the seriousness of the state education problems. During the 1966 gubernatorial campaign, Kirk promised to fix the worsening physical conditions of public schools, as he stated in his pledge that "in education . . . Florida shall

---

[3]Wayne C. Malone, *Development, Operation, and Evaluation of the Statewide Teacher's Walkout in Florida* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970), 171.

be first."[4] In his White Paper on Education, Kirk cited specific goals, including "a building program to provide 4,400 additional classrooms," a kindergarten in every county, and a process for raising salaries for teachers at 1-, 7-, and 12- year junctures.[5] However, he wavered in his public commitment to improving education and thus sparked much of the mounting animosity in the months prior to the official walkout, which began on February 19, 1968. Superintendent of Public Instruction Floyd T. Christian charged that, "None of these White Paper promises—none of those pledges—were kept."[6] Kirk's lack of follow-through aggravated teachers who had hoped that he would carry out his promises to improve education.

Nevertheless, despite Kirk's unwillingness to adequately address the problem, he had inherited a failing education system from previous administrations. By 1968, Florida was thirty-seventh in the nation for its expenditure per student, and teachers' salaries were below the national average.[7] Christian affirmed that the state's reluctance to spend more on education resulted in poor physical conditions of school buildings, as well as a lack of proper teaching materials.[8] Complete exasperation with the dismal state of classrooms and supplies was a significant catalyst for the strike to occur when it did. Teachers saw the state government, controlling much of the purse for educational needs, as an impediment to improving conditions.

---

[4]Edmund Kallina, *Claude Kirk and the Politics of Confrontation* (Gainesville, Fla.: University Press of Florida, 1993), 85.

[5]"Florida Schools and the Crisis of Education, Television and Radio Address," Sept 19, 1967, box 2, 4 Floyd T. Christian Speeches, Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

[6]*Ibid.*

[7]"Walkout in Florida," Time.com, March 1, 1968. www.time.com/printout/0,8816,941242,00.html

[8]"Teacher Walkout and the FEA Leadership," April 19, 1968, box 2, Floyd T. Christian Speeches.

In May 1967, the FEA imposed sanctions on the state for not taking enough action to better education, and then, in a mass gathering in August 1967 at the Tangerine Bowl in Orlando, convinced some 35,000 teachers to hand in signed resignation letters in the event that they might be needed in the future. In response, Kirk created an education commission to tackle the issue.[9] Unfortunately, this remedy did not satisfy the legislators, as the legislature voted down all of the 32 bills resulting from the recommendations of the Commission for Quality Education report.[10] As tensions mounted, Kirk called for a special session of the legislature in January 1968 to ward off a potential strike. Alas, as the official FEA publication, *Florida Education*, reported, "Governor Kirk let the situation sizzle while he delayed action on the special session education bills on his desk. He seesawed between threats of veto and promises that he would let them become law."[11] Most historians portray Kirk as a divisive public figure whose governing style contributed to some of the problems he encountered with the teachers. Don Cameron places much of the blame on Kirk for the way that the walkout ultimately transpired, describing his "political rhetoric [as] belligerent, unhelpful, and incendiary."[12]

In 1968, critics attacked Kirk's personal use of the strike to bolster his national image as a conservative governor who would not tolerate disorder. A day after the strike started, he was in California, where he "told the press that the situation 'doesn't appear to be that bad.'"[13] The FEA observed that Kirk "said there was no crisis while he pondered which role would best further his national political ambitions—that of 'friend of education' or the 'governor

---

[9]Wilma Norton, "Recalling the lesson of 1968," *St. Petersburg Times*, Nov. 10, 1991. http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic, Lexis Nexis.
[10]Parks, 7.
[11]*Ibid*., 8.
[12]Don Cameron, *The Inside Story of the Teacher Revolution in America* (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Education, 2005), 95.
[13]Marshall Donley, *Power to the Teacher: How America's Educators Became Militant* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 91.

who broke the back of the teacher strike in Florida.'"[14] Christian depicted Kirk as "a strong man" who "thinks more of his national image than he does [of] the citizens and children of Florida."[15] These statements reveal the role that Kirk played in the strike as the steadfast, conservative face of opposition to the teachers. He wanted to "win" both in the eyes of the public and in the national political scene to prove the triumph of government over activist groups. It became a question of who would win—Governor Kirk or the teachers, but not both.

Criticizing "Blackboard Power" and State-led Retribution

The walkout also revealed the lengths to which the local newspapers across the state and the governor were willing to go in their efforts to portray the teachers poorly to gain support. Kirk exploited the press as a mouthpiece for his opinions, while the FEA called attention to the smear campaign Kirk used.

During the battle, the teachers' reputation and image had been deliberately besmirched, stained, and tarnished by the use of such terms as "educrats," "blackboard power," "closed union shop," and "quisling." These were the Governor's words, used for one purpose only—to make the public lose confidence in the teachers and in the teaching profession.[16]

Here, the FEA touched upon a salient factor: Kirk's courting of public opinion. The media was a sure-fire method to reach households across the state, and he capitalized on the negative imagery that his labels conjured in the minds of the average Floridian. By calling the movement "blackboard power," Kirk drew upon the

---

[14]Parks, 8.
[15]Transcript of Press Conference with Floyd Christian, Feb 29, 1968, 5. Education in Florida Subject Files, box 21, 5 Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
[16]Parks, 7.

connotations from other national movements, specifically, "Black Power" a term that made "most whites . . . infuriated."[17]

Additionally, throughout the weeks of coverage, newspapers demonstrated their own views for or against the strike. The loaded language that newspapers employed to represent public opinion provides insight into contemporary perspectives. For example, the *Miami Herald* declared that it had "utterly no sympathy" for the teachers, while the *Vero Beach Press Journal* praised those teachers who had remained on the job.[18] *The Tallahassee Democrat* depicted the crisis as a "plague."[19] Some journalists did support the walkout; Bill Baggs' *Miami News* editorial identified with the difficult position teachers were in, saying that they had been "patient as various politicians . . . neglected or declined to appropriate enough money."[20]

Public opinion significantly affected the teacher walkout as it wavered between resistance to the liberal protest movement that people saw touching their own towns and support for improved education conditions. A conservative public berated teachers "because they did not want to see their school system brought to confusion by a pressure group."[21] Certainly, negative feelings regarding pressure groups across the country influenced how the average resident viewed the teachers' actions. People saw the walkout "as a threat to the status quo."[22] Society held certain expectations for its teachers; they served as role models for their children, and walking out on the job was a lesson parents did not want learned. Moreover,

---

[17]David Farber and Beth Bailey, *The Columbia Guide to America in the 1960s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 49.
[18]"It's No Time for Bitterness," *Miami Herald*, March 12, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files; *Press Journal*, March 14, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files.
[19]*Tallahassee Democrat*, March 11, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files.
[20]*Miami News*, 9-A, Oct. 12, 1967, Education in Florida Subject Files.
[21]Boyd Lairsey, "The 1968 School Crisis in Sumter Co." (student paper, University of Florida, 1968), 9, Special and Area Studies Collection.
[22]*Ibid*.

one of the FEA's objectives had been to alert the public to the poor physical conditions of the schools. Encouraging parents to visit schools increased awareness of the reality of the state's education situation and brought people to the FEA's side. Public opinion influenced the walkout as parents took cues from national power movements and their own values to decide whether they cared more about disrupting society to bring improvement or maintaining an appearance of order.

Undoubtedly, the FEA misjudged the public's willingness to support the teachers as a way of improving their children's educations. Instead, many parents wanted to end the disturbance of local schools and were upset at teachers for disregarding their contracts.[23] Some agreed with the *Vero Beach Press Journal* that the teachers were in "rank disobedience."[24] Adding to the miscalculation, other parents believed the FEA was "a greedy, arrogant labor union grasping for . . . money and power."[25] In a letter to the editor in the *Miami Herald*, Frael Percy wrote that "teaching is no longer a calling but a union."[26] As the NEA tried hard to distance itself from these types of harmful labels, the FEA quickly acquired an association with unionism.

However, not all public opinion opposed the walkout. Newspapers significantly influenced public opinion with the editorials and letters that they printed. Reflecting the divisions over the matter, newspapers often juxtaposed on the same page a letter from someone such as Percy with one from someone such as Rebecca Herrold of California, who said, "the teachers of Florida are to be congratulated for . . . no group has sacrificed more for the country than these hard-working, unrewarded souls."[27] Following this theme of sacrifice, John Salmon also wrote, "Our soldiers are daily sacrificing

---

[23]*Ibid*., 7.
[24]*Press Journal, March* 14, 1968.
[25]Kallina, 98.
[26]*Miami Herald*, Feb. 27, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files.
[27]*Ibid*.

their lives . . . while our Florida teachers are sacrificing their jobs, likewise in behalf of others."[28] Those who believed in the walkout recognized the discrepancy between the teachers' dedication and the low status afforded them by society.

Despite mixed displays of public support for the teachers, state officials applied various tactics to induce returns to the schools. Threats and harassment were the most common forms of pressure, and anxiety about the war and draft were sometimes abused to intimidate teachers. Many male teachers were warned that they would receive draft reclassifications of 1-A if they did not resume teaching.[29] Similarly, female teachers whose husbands were already in the military were threatened that their husbands would be sent to Vietnam.[30] The government also manipulated its power over citizenship to force teachers back to the schools; one teacher, a Cuban refugee, had her application for impending citizenship jeopardized for participating in the walkout.[31]

The desire to punish the teachers and the FEA for the walkout illustrates the firm resolve of the government to prove its dominance over what it viewed as disruptive, liberal militancy. Particularly insulting to educators was the special action by Christian to allow schools to hire substitutes during the walkout to keep schools in session.[32] Historians, students, and teachers alike have described these replacements as "unqualified and inexperienced," "Baby Sitters," and "without eductional qualifications, without reference checks."[33] The FEA asserted that the legislators were "angry" at the teachers

---

[28]*Ibid*.
[29]Cameron, 98.
[30]Parks, 7.
[31]*Ibid*.
[32]"Cabinet Tells Christian: Keep the Schools Open," Robert "Bob" Canney Collection, 1964-1988, Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
[33]Malone, 131; *Playground Daily News*, March 11, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files; Parks, 8.

and thus imposed this "punitive law."[34] This struck a nerve with teachers because it appeared to dismiss their efforts at gaining respect within a career that required certain skills. Interestingly, the much-criticized substitute teachers gained appreciation for the depth of the problems as they spent time teaching. Even though substitute Julian Erwin "disagreed with the strike . . . [he] admit[ted] it made [him] more aware of the problems."[35] Yet, by hiring even high school students as substitutes, state officials communicated their contempt for the teaching profession and disregard for educating children.

Accepting Militancy

In addition to the tensions with the state government, the emerging trend of national teacher activism also played into the politics of Florida's walkout. The competition between the NEA and its rival, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), complicated matters in the pitched battle between conservative government forces and activist teachers. Echoing the conservative-liberal clashes of the period, the NEA perceived itself as a professional organization, and "this ideology sought to tarnish AFT union activities as anti-professional and to prevent teacher affiliation with the organized labor movement."[36] NEA's "images of propriety . . . clashed with urban-based appeals to militancy and unionism."[37] Yet the confrontational nature of the period forced the NEA to approve this development; after 1967, upwards of 100 strikes occurred every year, making it difficult for the NEA to ignore the militancy.[38] More teachers viewed strikes and walkouts as a forceful statement showcasing teachers' strength as a group.[39]

---

[34]Parks, 7.

[35]*Tampa Tribune*, March 10, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files.

[36]Urban, 177.

[37]*Ibid*., 203.

[38]Donley, 106.

[39]Allan West, *The National Education Association: The Power Base for Education* (New York: The Free Press, 1980), 34.

This highlights the trend in the 1960s of certain subsets of the population developing a group identity. Teachers saw themselves united in their common struggles in the classrooms.

Even when it became obvious that the NEA would have to resign itself to militancy, reluctance remained. Historian Marjorie Murphy writes that "Florida represented the last attempt to reconcile the old NEA language of professionalism with the language of trade-union action."[40] Similarly, NEA Executive Secretary Sam Lambert did not wholeheartedly embrace the manner in which the FEA handled the walkout.[41] Institutionalized structures resist change, and the NEA, after establishing itself as a respectable organization, found it hard to accept such activism.

Despite the NEA's disdain for strikes due to their links with teacher unionism, the FEA forced its hand. The FEA, the rebellious NEA chapter, was unique in its support of strikes as an effective tool; most state chapters opposed teacher militancy.[42] One reason for its support was that the militancy stirred up by FEA local chapters in urban cities such as Jacksonville and Miami inspired the rest of Florida.[43] "Ten urban counties . . . had 70 percent of the total number of teachers . . . that joined the walkout."[44] Additionally, urban counties had upwards of "25 percent teacher walkout ratio, a greater proportion than the rural counties."[45] The NEA came to support the FEA; the needs of its members overrode any opposition it might have still held against strikes in principle. This prompted *Time* magazine to surmise that "the NEA's new president Braulio Alonso . . . obviously finds Florida a choice battlefield on which his organization can display its militancy."[46] Whether this was

---

[40]Marjorie Murphy, *Blackboard Unions: The AFT and the NEA, 1900-1980* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 231.
[41]Urban, 181.
[42]*Ibid*., 188.
[43]*Ibid.*, 181.
[44]Malone, 157.
[45]*Ibid*., 127.
[46]"Walkout in Florida," *Time*.

true or not, once the NEA assisted the FEA, in the minds of the media and government, it crossed over to liberal activism.

The Influence of Civil Rights

The civil rights movement inspired the swelling militancy among teachers. It motivated Florida teachers to stand against inequalities in the schools and it also focused attention on the racial dimensions of state education. National media coverage of civil rights activists speaking out against institutionalized systems that did not include them and their needs motivated teachers to overcome their own hesitations. Historian Marshall Donley suggests that "massed displays of power have not gone unnoticed by teachers who . . . see other power blocs getting their share not through reasonableness but by belligerence."[47] The activism of the civil rights and labor movements, which had been increasing throughout the 1960s, became a model for teachers trying to effect change. Additionally, "economic pressures and the proven effectiveness of civil rights activists appealed to . . . young male GI teachers," whom Allan West implied were more likely to engage in events championing social equality.[48] He also called them a "new breed of teacher . . . [with] a more aggressive spirit and demand[ing] a voice in determining what went on in the classroom."[49] As a result of their involvement in the Vietnam War, these veterans contributed a different perspective than many of their female colleagues with regards to the necessity of banding together for a just cause.

Teachers also tried to work through legislative channels for the changes they wanted. Educators sought recognition for their roles in society, of shaping the minds of young people. Appealing to the governor and state legislature and repeatedly watching bills fail impressed upon the teachers that they would have to resort to stronger action. One teacher, Evangeline Joyner, expressed her feeling that "the situation . . . had become critical and

---

[47]Donley, 200.
[48]West, 33.
[49]*Ibid*., 29.

drastic measures had to be taken to stir public apathy."[50] Walkout participant R. L. Johns told Malone that Governor Kirk "considered the teachers as 'hired help' and was infuriated at them for demanding to be treated like professionals."[51] Indeed, once committed to the urgency of acting on their grievances, teachers found encouragement from other activists. West writes that "it [was] more acceptable to walk a picket line [on] behalf of better school conditions" because other groups had successfully used protests for "constructive results."[52] Though teachers were also part of mainstream America and might have previously considered themselves members of the conservative, law-and-order majority, the facts of their situation urged many to act, even if it meant that others would now label them as liberal activists.

Race also figured into the walkout, as Florida was part of a southern tradition that had difficulty grasping integration and the Black Power movement. Erika Gubrium argues that African American teachers, in Alachua County at least, did not see themselves starkly as either activists or not activists. For them, many factors influenced whether they kept their opinions to themselves or participated in the walkout. At this time, "teaching was one of the few professional options" for blacks, and it is for this reason "taking collective leave of one's occupation for greater professional leverage was not relevant."[53] Blacks tended to give the walkout "silent" endorsement.[54] They may have believed that not stirring up further resentment within the larger community over the teacher walkout would downplay some of the white resistance to broader civil rights themes of the time. Black parents sent their children to underperforming schools, just like white parents, and they, too, wanted educational reform. Civil rights activism and local racial issues determined how blacks viewed the walkout.

---

[50]Lairsey, 3.
[51]Malone, 64.
[52]West, 36.
[53]Erika Gubrium, "African American Teachers Look Back: Interpreting Participation in the 1968 Florida School Walkout" (PhD diss., University of Florida, 2006), 22.
[54]Lairsey, 8.

Consequences

In 1968, Florida teachers and the FEA demonstrated the consequences of a statewide walkout. Though the results differed from what many had hoped, the strike did bring enormous change to both state and national education. The compromise ending the strike produced pay raises and increased classroom funding by a combined total of "$254.5 million . . . the greatest single appropriation for education in the history of [the] state—more money for schools in one year than previous legislatures [had] provided for two years."[55] Additionally, the strike touched off similar actions in other cities across the country, including Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Oklahoma City.[56] Further, the FEA mobilized almost half of the state's 58,000 teachers to resign in protest, thus demonstrating the strength of the organization in persuading its members and in organizing such a large-scale demonstration.[57]

After the strike ended on March 8, the battle still raged over rehiring. Again, local school boards exercised their power by refusing to rehire those teachers who had walked out. Twenty-seven counties did allow all their teachers back while "in 40 others, vindictive school boards—anxious to punish teachers—set up road blocks to their return."[58] FEA executive secretary Phil Constans believed the boards sought to "break the strength of their professional teacher organizations by demoting or 'locking out' administrators."[59] Following weeks of negotiating, most counties resolved their concerns, usually making teachers re-apply for their jobs. Ultimately, 628 teachers of the approximately 25,000 statewide who walked, for whatever reason, were not rehired.[60]

---

[55]Statement, State Legislature, Funding for Education, Feb 15, 1968 Floyd T. Christian Speeches.

[56]"A Fighting Mood," Time.com, March 8, 1968. http://www.time.com/printout/0,8816,941242,00.html

[57]Parks, 7.

[58]*Ibid*., 8.

[59]FEA News Release, March 21, 1968, Education in Florida Subject Files.

[60]Malone, 127.

Later in 1968, largely in reaction to Florida, the NEA agreed "on record in opposition to legislation banning teacher strikes."[61] The professional association that had avoided the growing tendency toward militancy for so long finally formally acknowledged the inevitability of activism among educators. Ironically, the strike and the NEA's uneasy acceptance of militancy actually alienated some of its members, worsening the competition with the AFT.[62] Ultimately though, as most historians agree, the FEA failed in the walkout despite its convincing success in bringing the public's attention to the actual condition of the state educational system. Although parents witnessed problems in the schools, they still could not see how a teacher walkout could lead to any possible improvements. Instead, Wayne Malone concludes, "public resentment and loss of faith in teachers can be identified and attributed to the walkout."[63] Although public opinion was not on their side, teachers characterized the activist spirit of the 1960s by uniting as a collective group to make a stand against the state's disregard of their needs.

Throughout the intense three-week crisis, parallels to the national schism between government and activists emerged. When the teachers and the FEA took their stand for increased school funding and recognition as professionals, most of the public and the conservative state government attacked them as militant activists who did not stay within their expected, submissive role in society. The walkout was a product of the times as people's perspectives were truly shaped by national trends and the way they interpreted militant action—as either an effective tool or a menace to society. The national and state political environment was the main stimulus behind the vehement and steadfast positions that government leaders and the public took against the teachers and the FEA. These political undercurrents deeply influenced the manner in which the strike played out. The FEA saw the walkout as a battle and indeed it was—symbolizing the national drama between conservatism and liberalism.

---

[61]Urban, 179.
[62]*Ibid.*, 241.
[63]Malone, 7.

Reviews

Book Reviews

Renee C. Romano, *Race Mixing: Black-white Marriage in Postwar America*, **Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003**

Historian Renee Romano offers a thoroughly researched account of marriages between black men and white women in the United States since the 1940s. Her book examines the ways in which racial integration and the civil rights movement influenced the increase of marriages across racial lines. Scholars have produced a considerable number of works on how the U.S. criminalized interracial marriage from the colonial era to the 1960s in order to keep boundaries between whites and blacks intact. While previous scholarship on interracial marriages focuses on anti-miscegenation laws and legal challenges to them in the mid-twentieth century, Romano explores the political, cultural, and social history of black-white interracial marriage since the 1940s. She examines the ways in which black-white couples have responded to the challenges of prejudice in everyday life, such as persuading parents to accept their decisions and raising biracial children. Romano's major achievement is to place these seemingly personal choices in a historical context. Using interviews with blacks and whites who intermarried as well as the discussion of interracial marriage in contemporary social science and psychological literature, popular magazines, and films, Romano deftly reveals the ways in which such marriages were seen by both white and black communities and by various participants in the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.

Romano begins with examining how World War II set the stage for a noticeable increase in interracial marriages—black American soldiers brought more than 300,000 European war brides home to the United States. Romano brings to life the stories of black American soldiers who found European countries less hostile to interracial relationships. Upon their return to the

Reviews

United States, these couples had to deal with social ostracism at a time when more than a third of states had anti-miscegenation laws.

During the 1940s and 1950s, the racial stereotypes of hypersexual black men and morally depraved white women still dominated white society's images of black-white marriage. Whites opposing interracial marriage feared that integration and associations with blacks at an intimate level would lower their social status and erase racial boundaries.

Unlike white Americans who generally opposed interracial marriage, black Americans in the 1940s and 1950s were ambivalent, and some blacks believed that social acceptance of black-white marriage would testify to the improvement of race relations in America. While middle-class black Americans and especially black women criticized the lack of racial pride of those black men who married white women, Romano reveals that the black community in the 1950s tended to see marriage as a personal matter and did not believe that these black men had abandoned their race. Romano argues that since the 1950s, blacks have been more open to black-white marriage than whites.

Desegregation at the college level and increased integration in the workplace contributed to the increase of interracial marriages. Such marriages were common among subculture groups like the beatniks of the 1950s and those devoted to radical political movements. However, many more black-white couples met at workplaces rather than in political settings. Black parents accepted, sometimes grudgingly, white daughters-in-law, while white parents tended to disown their daughters and refused to see their black sons-in-law. Black-white couples often lived among black neighbors because they were rejected by white neighborhoods due to *de facto* segregation.

Romano shows how debates over black-white marriage became the center of southern segregationist opposition to *Brown* and public school desegregation in the 1950s. The civil rights movement in the 1960s played a critical role in changing white society's perceptions of interracial

marriage, and Romano highlights how the racial views of those born after World War II differed from those of their parents.

While the black nationalist movement harshly criticized black men who married white women for betraying their race, it did not deny the idea of marriage as a personal matter. Romano analyzes the consequences of the rapid increase in the number of black-white marriages compared with that of white-black marriages that left black women without adequate marital partners. Romano also skillfully captures another layer of the situation by discussing black women's tendency to oppose interracial marriage. Black women who historically assumed the role of keeping their families intact believed that marrying white men was relinquishing their racial pride as black women. Furthermore, in light of the history of white men's sexual abuse of black women during the slavery era, black women in the 1960s and 1970s did not think that white men would be seriously interested in marrying them.

Romano concludes with a caution against viewing the increase of interracial marriages and changes in whites' attitude toward them as a straightforward improvement in race relations, stating "the erosion of the taboo against interracial marriage cannot be read as a simple sign that America has overcome its racist past" (9). Since black Americans still deal with inequalities in terms of income and poverty rates, etc., she argues that the erasure of legalized racism and whites' acceptance of interracial marriage on an individual level should not blind society from seeing the workings of "structural racial inequality" today (290). Romano's insightful work on the implications of marriage between blacks and whites is a must-read for those interested in twentieth-century race relations in the United States.

Eunhye Kwon

Reviews

Stuart B. Schwartz, ed., *Tropical Babylons: Sugar and the Making of the Atlantic World, 1450-1680.* **Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.**

In the history of the Atlantic world, the two themes that seem to be the most "Atlantic" of all are African slavery and sugar. Since the publication of Eric Williams's *Capitalism and Slavery* in 1944, historians have concerned themselves with the connection between colonial plantation labor and metropolitan industrialization, an idea that dates back to Karl Marx's theory of primitive accumulation. That the link between slave labor and free labor seems so commonplace in modern historiography provides cause to challenge its validity. In *Tropical Babylons: Sugar and the Making of the Atlantic World, 1450-1680,* Stuart B. Schwartz brings together eight original essays that dispute what historians have asserted regarding the role of sugar in the first centuries of European expansion in the Atlantic basin. The collection begins with a tour-de-force assessment of the field. Schwartz asks several thought-provoking questions, including a call to establish, so far as possible, the actual productivity comparisons of sugar plantations. The editor shifts attention to new research in the field which draws upon previously unknown sources, such as Genaro Rodríguez Morel's discovery of relevant material in the Archivo General de Indias .

The historians whose work Schwartz has brought together in this collection question basic facts in the history of sugar and slavery in the Atlantic world. For example, William D. Phillips Jr. approaches sugar cultivation in southern Iberia over the *longue durée*. He demonstrates that, despite this region's temperate climate and rainfall patterns that are often contrary to the needs of optimal sugar production, sugar producers in Valencia and Granada have operated for over a thousand years. Historically, these operations produced sugar primarily for local markets, where proximity granted certain advantages not available to those producers whose cane fields were on the other side of

Reviews

the Atlantic. Phillips may say more than he realizes in his discussion of the labor force set to work on Iberian sugar production. One of the cornerstones of the historiography on slave treatment in the Americas, the so-called Tannenbaum school, places great emphasis on the previous experience of Iberians with slavery in determining the character of slavery in Spain's American dominions. That sugar in Iberia was cultivated as Phillips argues—largely by the hands of day laborers and the vassals of sugar planters—suggests that perhaps the initial assumptions of this school of historiography require some rethinking.

In Chapter 8, Eddy Stols argues that the European consumer market for sugar dates to much earlier than scholars, including Sidney Mintz, have argued. The author first describes the wide-spread use of sugar among Europe's upper classes as a medium for decorative art, one more palatable than the wax and lard figurines that had previously graced banquet tables. Stols then provides a great amount of evidence that the Iberian kingdoms pioneered the widespread use of confections, jams, and preserves. His most important contribution, however, is his argument for the importance of sugar between 1500 and 1650 to general European economic development, which he posits had more of an impact than other "colonial" commodities and ranked more properly among the exotic spices arriving from the Orient.

In the collection's final chapter, John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard reassess another pillar of the sugar-and-slavery historiography, the "sugar revolution" that, it has been argued, fundamentally transformed Barbados's economy between 1640 and 1660. Basing their argument largely on the Bridgetown deed books, the authors argue that sugar alone did not revolutionize the Barbadian economy. Rather, it was one of many crops that benefited from an improving economic position. They also present evidence that tenant farming was an important feature of the island's sugar production throughout the seventeenth century due to the problem of labor supply. This evidence questions the long established assumption in the historiography of a mass exodus

of the island's white population during the sugar boom. Finally, McCusker and Menard turn the established canon on its head, arguing that sugar production did not change Barbados. Instead, they assert, Barbados forever modified sugar production by implementing a system based on a centralized unit of production owned by one individual rather than the *senhor de engenho* model, which had been the norm in the Atlantic islands and Brazil.

Tropical Babylons is an important contribution to Atlantic history thanks to the questions its essays pose about what historians know about sugar and slavery in the early Atlantic world. The research results contained in this volume should prove thought provoking for field specialists and encourage future scholarship on the basic relationships between sweet sugar and bitter slavery.

Keith Manuel

A. D. Kirwan. *Revolt of the Rednecks: Mississippi Politics, 1876-1925*. **New York: Harper & Row, 1965**.

The end of Radical Reconstruction reached Mississippi in late 1875, and it was not long before white men restored the Democratic Party to its machine status and regained control of the state legislature (3-5). In his book *Revolt of the Rednecks: Mississippi Politics, 1876-1925*, A. D. Kirwan asserts that this restoration corresponded to a shift in the ideology and methodology of the Democratic Party—away from its traditional base in agriculture and towards a platform rooted in diversified industry. This change resulted in internal strife, which Kirwan rightly argues manifested itself as agrarian discontent. The steadily escalating intra-party struggle of whites, combined with the reinstitution of white supremacy as a Party calling card, and the disfranchisement of blacks (and many poor whites) only served to widen the fissure between the financially minded operators of

Reviews

the Democratic machine and the agrarian workers who made up the majority of Mississippi's white population. Through speeches and correspondence, public voting and registration records, and the state's prominent newspapers, *Revolt of the Rednecks* shows how poor hill farmers—or "rednecks," as Kirwan labels them— became part of a policy-oriented tug-of-war for control of the Democratic party, which the hill farmers felt had abandoned them in the midst of a strong post-War agricultural depression (vii).

In 1876, Democrats in Mississippi successfully reclaimed power from the federally subsidized Republican regime. Kirwan states that these new "revolutionaries" had not been men of great importance before the Civil War and had few objections to the new manifesto of industry (8-9). In order to assure the party's future, these Democrats turned white supremacy into a tool for unifying whites through bypassing and ignoring the economic gap between the affluent and the Rednecks. Most important to Kirwan's theory, though, is the disenfranchising effect the new poll taxes and literacy tests had on Rednecks. It was at this point, Kirwan convincingly writes, that the first real seeds of agrarian frustration began to boil over into hard-line factionalism within the Democratic party. His evidence here clearly demonstrates that Rednecks, tired of not receiving a fair and balanced opportunity to elect their representatives, cast their votes for agrarian-mind-ed opposition candidates. This departure from status-quo voting procedure signified a revolt against the Democratic machine. Ironically, the farmers ought to have dominated the election through their popular majority status, but Mississippi's system of legislative apportionment nullified their numerical advantage.

The crushing defeat of the farmers' electoral hopes led to their turning to the Populist party. Kirwan argues strongly that although the Populists never unseated the Democrats, their ten-year stint as competitors was paramount in the "training of the agricultural population to independent thought and action" (102). He shows that scandals involving the state treasury, coupled with the Primary Law of 1902, razed the last barriers impeding

Reviews

Redneck-endorsed candidates. The election of Governor James K. Vardaman in 1903, and the rise to power of Theodore G. Bilbo, serve as Kirwan's evidence of this shift away from the old guard of the Democratic Party. Some readers may become bogged down in the details concerning Vardaman and Bilbo, but frustration in these intricate sections is later rewarded by greater comprehension of the pivotal roles both men played in the Redneck movement. Even with their election, Kirwan correctly points out that the poor hill farmers were never delivered from their agricultural troubles, and, in hindsight, it is clear that no such salvation was possible. Their problems, Kirwan maintains, were the result of economic trends too complex to be addressed by state legislators.

In engrossing fashion, Kirwan tells the story of the Mississippi Rednecks and the political canvas of post-Reconstruction Mississippi. Their plight, brief ascendancy, and subsequent descent back into the depths of rural poverty is plotted through political events spanning over half a century. Kirwan never loses sight of the book's central theme: that the Rednecks staged their revolt at the polls in a bid to ease financial penury and establish a more lucrative economic system for themselves. *Revolt of the Rednecks* not only grants critical insight into Mississippi's own political and cultural history, it also serves as an essential starting point for understanding the political nature of the post-Reconstruction South.

Matthew Hulbert

Douglas Northrop. *Veiled Empire: Gender and Power in Stalinist Central Asia.* **Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004.**

Douglas Northrop has written a remarkable study on the Soviet Union's attempts to modernize and "Sovietize" Uzbekistan. Drawing on Communist Party documents, Soviet secret police reports, and Russian and Uzbek newspaper articles—many used for the

first time in his study—he demonstrates how Soviet activists came to view Uzbek women as a surrogate proletariat and the resultant difficulties arising from such a conception. His work also highlights the colonial encounter between individuals of different cultures, arguing that "Soviet authorities no less than their Central Asian subjects were reshaped through this protracted encounter, and it was the ongoing interactions between these groups . . . that in the end defined what it meant to be both 'Bolshevik' and 'Uzbek'" (7). While Northrop does consider the Soviet Union to have been a colonial empire, he asserts that "its insistent anticolonialism also needs to be taken seriously, as more than mere rhetoric." For Northrop, such an anticolonialist attitude is extremely significant in that it is the motivating factor behind the Soviet efforts to modernize Uzbekistan. He argues that unlike previous empires, the Soviet Union sought to erase the difference between lands on the periphery and the metropole. In contrast with its tsarist predecessor, "Soviet colonialism would be affirming and constructive, not oppressive or exploitive" (23).

Although the desire to modernize Central Asia and establish Soviet power in the region was not lacking among Soviet activists, the manner in which they should undertake it proved particularly troublesome. Traditional Marxist beliefs required the Soviets in Uzbekistan to ally themselves with the indigenous proletariat, but given the small number of Uzbek workers, such an alliance offered little opportunity to modernize and transform Uzbek society. In the search for allies, the Bolsheviks initiated land redistribution schemes and anti-religion campaigns, and attempted to establish Soviet clubs and other such organizations to expound the virtues of Marxism. According to Northrop, it was only after such measures failed to produce the desired results that Party activists turned to the liberation of Uzbek women as the cornerstone of their program.

The Soviets assumed that Uzbek women would welcome the liberation campaign and that it would result in a "ripple effect, creating social change from the ground up and leading

ultimately to a thoroughgoing transformation of local culture and politics" (77). However, one of the ironies of Soviet attempts to liberate Uzbek women, namely through the 1927 campaign against veiling, is that veiling practices among Uzbek women were initially viewed as an Uzbek cultural marker by Soviet authorities in the early 1920s. The Soviet attempts to abolish veiling among Uzbek women therefore sought to eliminate this cultural difference, a difference that Uzbek men and women had also come to accept as a cultural norm—what it meant to be Uzbek. As the campaign against veiling grew more aggressive, so did resistance, ultimately leading to the veil becoming a symbol of Uzbek nationalism. By remaining veiled, Uzbek women were seen by their compatriots as "patriotic Uzbeks" (195).

Perhaps one of the most interesting sections of Northrop's work is his discussion of the Uzbek worldview and the way the Uzbeks' religious views affected the perception of Soviet power in Uzbekistan. As Northrop shows, religious leaders in the Uzbek community viewed the Soviet intrusion into their lands and customs as a "plague" sent by Allah, and the only way to end the Soviet presence was through increased devoutness. For pious Muslims "the problem, then, lay not in the superior power wielded by Bolshevik authorities, but in the insufficient resolve and weak faith of the Uzbeks" (201). Ironically, such Uzbek attitudes mirrored those of the upper-level Bolsheviks who viewed their lack of success among the Uzbek population to be the result of inept Party activists and not poorly conceived policies. It seems that as a result of ideology each side overestimated its power vis-a-vis the other.

Northrop's work demonstrates that Bolshevik power was neither as omnipotent nor as consistent as has been suggested in previous scholarship. The inner-party debates over how best to proceed with the campaign against female seclusion, or *humjum* as it was referred to in the Party press, and whether or not veiling should be deemed illegal, are extremely enlightening in this regard. Moreover, his many comparisons with British policies in India are quite useful in placing the Soviet Union and

its modernizing project in a European light, showing that the Soviets possessed many of the same Orientalist attitudes toward their Eastern subjects and a similar desire to civilize Central Asian peoples as other European empires. While some may take issue with Northrop's insistence that Bolshevik ideology be taken seriously, arguing instead that the Bolsheviks sought only power and domination, Bolshevik policies in Uzbekistan hardly make sense without the consideration of ideology.

Lisa Booth

Angela Lakwete. *Inventing the Cotton Gin: Machine and Myth in Antebellum America.* **Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.**

The story of the cotton gin has proven to be one of the most tenacious myths in American history. Simply stated, the myth goes something like this: the South's cotton production was unable to keep up with the demands of the British textile industry during the late eighteenth century due to a "bottleneck" in the processing of raw cotton. This problem was exacerbated by the lack of a mechanized industrial tradition in the South. Then Eli Whitney, a Yankee from Massachusetts, cleared the production bottleneck with the invention of the wire-tooth cotton gin. His discovery paved the way for the expansion of cotton cultivation and ensured the spread of slavery, which ultimately led to the Civil War.

The Whitney narrative is one of southern failure, historical reductionism, and mechanical agency. It is Lakwete's goal in *Inventing the Cotton Gin* to "reopen the discussion," and explore "the history of the gin as an aspect of global history and a facet of southern industrial development" (viii).

Lakwete's analysis is global in its opening chapters, spanning more than two thousand years of cotton production and ginning

Reviews

technology through the Middle East, India, Egypt, and China. She concludes that "ginning technology was not a bottleneck as the nineteenth century dawned," and that roller gins in use at the time were sufficient to keep up with production demands (45-46).

Based upon her close study of the correspondence between Eli Whitney, his business partner Phineas Miller, and Thomas Jefferson (then Secretary of State and head of the Federal Patent Office), Lakwete argues that it is unlikely Whitney actually invented "his" gin, but merely profited from the ingenuity and labor of others, as well as from Miller's political savvy and connections. Or, as Lakwete bluntly states, "Deliberative invention on Whitney's part seems to have played no part in the invention of the gin. Instead the gentlemen seemed engaged in duplicity masked by prestige" (54-55). According to Lakwete, Whitney not only failed to save the South with his invention, but did not even invent the gin for which he took credit. His patent also relied heavily on the work of the same southern mechanics and gin makers the Whitney myth would later portray as failures or nonexistent.

What follows is a rather technical exposition on the evolution of the saws and roller gins of the antebellum South as they evolved concurrently throughout the nineteenth century. These chapters are both wonderful and exasperating. They are wonderful in the sense that Lakwete's South is alive with invention, industry, and communities of mechanics. The residents of Lakwete's South, both black and white, free and enslaved, are technologically and industrially literate and do not need Yankee ingenuity to save them. However, these sections might prove frustrating to readers who do not value technological detail. These chapters are worth browsing, however, as the sheer quantity of improvements and innovators presented is enough to make Lakwete's case that the South was not the technological backwater previously portrayed. She oversteps the evidence a bit when claiming that southern industry on the eve of the Civil War was a complete "success narrative," since most manufacturing for southern cotton still came from factories in Massachusetts;

Reviews

while the South was not dependent on northern aid, it was not independent either.

Lakwete concludes with a historiographical study of the Whitney myth, noting that although Whitney, Miller, and early biographers created the myth, it fit the temper of the times. Whitney's gin was the iconic machine of a new country entering a new age; everything else was considered backward and obsolete. After the Civil War, the Whitney myth reinforced the image of the South as technologically naive and dependent. Lakwete deftly weaves these themes into her analysis of technology and economics to not only debunk the myth, but also to illustrate how it was planted and what conditions encouraged its growth.

Ultimately, *Inventing the Cotton Gin* is a very traditional work in the history of technology, almost a throwback to early internalist approaches to invention. What makes it exceptional, and worthy of the 2004 Edelstein Prize from the Society for the History of Technology, is not Lakwete's argument or evidence, but her myth-busting conclusion. This volume should certainly be read by historians of technology, but may also prove to be a useful tool for anyone teaching American History at nearly any level.

Matthew White