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Letter from the Editors

The year 2013 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States. The events that unfolded in 1963 shocked both the nation and the world as stories unfolded detailing the tragedies and triumphs that befell the booming metropolis of Birmingham, Alabama. Amidst the backdrop of church bombings, public demonstra-
tions, and fire hoses on peaceful protestors, the country watched as African Americans across the city stood together,
crossed arms, and dug their heels in so that their voices would be heard. Their cries for equal rights rang out across the
South and reverberated across the fifty states with a goal of exposing a shameful secret that could no longer be success-
fully suppressed.

In April of 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr. sat alone enclosed in a Birmingham prison cell and addressed his fel-
low clergymen regarding the city’s social irony. Located in a country proclaiming to bestow freedom and equality on all its citizens, many men and women faced discrimination and prejudice on a daily basis from their peers. Within his
famous Letter from Birmingham City Jail, King denounced the actions of the southern city and defended the protestors
as they pressed on for equal civil rights. As he wrote of segregation in Birmingham, he noted the oppression that African
Americans had endured and their natural desire to break free from the vicious cycle of abuse. Imbedded in his letter is
an essential, powerful statement:

One day the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths, with the noble sense of pur-
pose that enables them to face jeering and hostile mobs, and with the agonizing loneliness that characterizes the life
of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro women, symbolized in a seventy-two year old
woman in Montgomery, Alabama, who rose up with a sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride
segregated buses, and who responded with ungrammatical profundity to one who inquired about her weariness:
“My feet is tired, but my soul is at rest.” They will be the young high school and college students, the young
ministers of the gospel and a host of their elders, courageously and nonviolently sitting in at lunch counters and
willingly going to jail for conscience’ sake. One day the South will know that when these disinherited children
of God sat down at lunch counters, they were in reality standing up for what is best in the American dream and
for the most sacred values in our Judaeo-Christian heritage, thereby bringing our nation back to those great
wells of democracy which were dug deep by the founding fathers in their formulation of the Constitution and the
Declaration of Independence.¹

This year, to memorialize the fiftieth anniversary of the Birmingham Civil Rights Movement, the editorial staff
of the Vulcan Historical Review aims to pay tribute to those heroes of whom Martin Luther King, Jr. spoke. Had it not
been for those often unknown and uncelebrated individuals, a dark chapter in America’s history might have been pro-
longed or even have remained. The 2013 Vulcan Historical Review would like to honor those unnamed heroes who had
the courage and determination to stand up for what others were reluctant to face. In choosing our cover photo for the
2013 Vulcan Historical Review, we considered carefully the individuals who helped progress the movement and spread
the message of racial equality. The cover depicts Reverend Charles Billups and Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth demon-

¹ Martin Luther King, Jr., Letter from Birmingham City Jail (Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1963), 14.
stating in front of the Federal Courthouse on 3rd Avenue North in Birmingham. Through the symbolic act of kneeling, the ministers displayed the seriousness of the civil rights movement and their unwavering determination to no longer be ignored, wronged, and refused. Further, the kneel-ins represented the majority’s commitment to achieving equality through peaceful means. The photograph is a powerful statement. It is these demonstrations, and the vivid statements they made that allowed the fight against racial injustice to make headway in not only the state, but also around the country. Their endurance and bravery is something that should be celebrated and commemorated, and this issue is a testament to these individuals’ historical achievements.

Such a tribute would not have possible if it were not for the collaboration and assistance of multiple individuals. The UAB Department of History faculty and staff gave us tireless encouragement and support. Special thanks must be extended to Dr. Walter Ward, our faculty advisor; Dr. Colin Davis, the department chair; Dr. Harriet Amos Doss; Dr. George O. Libby, Dr. Carolyn Conley, and Dr. John Van Sant, all of whom challenged their students to become critical thinkers and, in turn, better historians. Also, special thanks must be given to Dr. Robert G. Corley who not only teaches about the Civil Rights Movement at UAB, but lived through it in Birmingham, Alabama. It is his passion and involvement that challenges his students to understand and appreciate the importance of these events in history. His personal experiences have made him a historian, I have realized that growing up in Birmingham and reaching maturity in the 1960s -- a tumultuous and fascinating period of change -- I was surrounded by History. At times, it felt like History was literally pulling me into its widening vortex. Events with long lasting historical ramifications were unavoidable and met me at every turn: in school, in church, and even at home.

I was fifteen in the spring of 1963. Birmingham voters had recently decided that the city would have a new form of government, changing from a three-member city commission to a mayor and nine-member council. The primary purpose of this change, which had been led by nominally conservative (and suburban) business leaders in alliance with young progressive professionals, was to remove from office the notorious and increasing controversial Commissioner of Public Safety, Eugene “Bull” Connor.

After more than 20 years in the office, Connor did not go quietly, and in March he ran second in the race to become the Mayor in the new government. Then in the runoff on April 2, Connor and former Lieutenant Governor Albert Boutwell vied for the top office. Boutwell won, apparently ending Connor’s lengthy, and oppressive, reign. However, Connor and his fellow commissioners refused to leave office, claiming their terms did not legally end until 1965. The matter remained in dispute until May 26, when the Alabama Supreme Court affirmed the new government.

In the meantime, the City had been reeling from a wave of demonstrations, first at lunch counters and then in the streets, mounted by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. These long planned demonstrations -- which had been delayed until after the election so as to avoid giving Connor a critical issue -- began on April 3, the day following the election. The story of these demonstrations and their eventual outcome on May 10 has been told in great detail and even greater eloquence by numerous historians (in addition to me), including the incomparable Taylor Branch, as well as Birmingham natives; Glenn Eskew (But for Birmingham), Andrew Manis (A Fire You Can’t Put Out), and Diane McWhorter (the Pulitzer-Prize winning Carry Me Home).

The main thing one should know is that during the entire period in which the demonstrations were occurring, the City had two governments -- the new Mayor and Council, and the former Commissioner who refused to leave office and challenged the election in court. That is why Bull Connor was still in charge of the police during the demonstrations. Therefore, it was under his orders that the powerful fire hoses and terrifying police dogs were deployed against school children who joined the demonstrations in early May. And this police violence was actually a key to King’s success.

As we all know now, these demonstrations carried significant weight in the history of 20th century America. The Birmingham demonstrations were not spontaneous events, but rather a carefully planned campaign designed to test...
whether King and the SCLC could achieve success in the “most segregated city in America.” They followed years of combat between Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth and Connor, during which the scrupulously nonviolent Shuttlesworth’s life had been repeatedly at risk; he had nearly been killed at least three times. King’s victory here, limited though it was in actual achievements, nevertheless riveted the attention of the national media, especially television news, and ultimately the direct involvement of President John F. Kennedy.

Overwhelmingly, historians and movement leaders all agree that Birmingham represented what McWhorter has termed “the climactic battle of the civil rights revolution.” In June President Kennedy finally addressed the issue of civil rights on national television. In what may have been his most passionate and personal speech, he announced that “because of events in Birmingham and elsewhere” he had decided to introduce comprehensive civil rights legislation for the first time since the end of Reconstruction. Kennedy later told Shuttlesworth and King when they met with him in Washington to discuss the legislation, “But for Birmingham, we would not be here today.”

As a white Birmingham teenager observing these events at a safe distance, and mostly through the news accounts on national networks (the local newspapers buried the stories deep inside), I was confused and concerned. I was terrified because the demonstrations were perceived as dangerous and unprecedented. I was concerned because thousands of the demonstrators who were being arrested were my age or younger. I was concerned because I was a young white teenager who dutifully came to wash our clothes and clean our house twice each week. Ophelia assured me that she did not understand why I continue to study about race and teach civil rights history, is because I am still trying to know myself more profoundly than anyone ever imagined. When the demonstrations began on April 3, it had barely been two weeks since the Warblers wiped the shoe black off their faces for the last time.

Since 1963, I have literally spent a lifetime studying and thinking about these events and their meaning, not just for me personally, but also for our city and our nation. For me and for many, these events echoed through time, and this echo resounds into the present, shaping and reshaping our response to them as we engage each other through our deeper understanding of their history. It is a story that has not yet ended. It is the continuing story of this community and of this nation. It is not finished, and may never be.

Eventually I also came to understand that the reason I wrote my dissertation about race relations in Birmingham, and why I continue to study about race and teach civil rights history, is because I am still trying to know myself more clearly by understanding what really happened in the past. I want to understand the increasingly consequential changes that this history wrought in our nation, changes that not only destroyed an oppressive system of racial apartheid, but also eventually led to the election of the first African American President.

Finally, I have come to see more clearly that I am not alone. All of us are pulled into the vortex of History; whether it is through the Cold War; or September 11; and the “war on terror;” or the “Great Recession” of 2009; or the immigrants living among us. History is inescapable. Knowing History -- our own and that of our times -- is essential if we are to know who we truly are, and what we need to do with our lives to give them meaning and purpose.

I was fortunate to grow up in a place and during a time when those lessons were easier to learn. But their value is never confined just to the past. As William Faulkner reminds us, “The past is never dead. It is not even past.”
A Dragon in the Den of the Bear: A History of the UAB Football Team

Donald C. Campbell

O n a winter’s day in early 1893, two college football teams met at Lakeshore Park on the south side of Birmingham, Alabama. After a spirited game of football, the team from Auburn University walked away with a 32-22 victory over the team from the University of Alabama. Yearly meetings between the two schools on the gridiron were plagued by setbacks, including a debate over which season to claim this game in. Auburn claimed it was the first win of the 1893 season, while Alabama believed it to be the last loss of the 1892 season. Despite such issues, which were not completely resolved until the state legislature intervened in 1948, this game helped set the stage for the modern Iron Bowl, perhaps the most intense college football rivalry in the United States.1 While other schools in Alabama began fielding football teams, such as Troy University and the University of North Alabama, almost everyone in the state today claims either the Crimson Tide or the Tigers as their own. In 1991, a newcomer to football, the University of Alabama at Birmingham, began play.2

Alabama Football before UAB: Two Giants Emerge

College football in the state of Alabama began in the early 1890s, when the sport was introduced to the students of Auburn University. After the first Alabama–Auburn game in early 1893, little outside notice was paid to football players in the southeastern United States. Football teams from the Northeast, Midwest, and West Coast were believed by many sportswriters, fans, and college coaches to be the best football teams in the country, while southern teams played an inferior brand of football. All that changed in the mid-1920s, when Alabama accepted a bid to the 1926 Rose Bowl in Pasadena, California, to play the University of Washington Huskies. The Crimson Tide upset the Huskies 20-19, winning the national championship, proving that southern football was equal to that of the rest of the country.3 The team returned to the Rose Bowl the following year, giving newspapers like the Anniston Star reason to exclaim that “the game ‘gave this state advertising that is of incalculable value.’”4 These victories became the first two of twelve national championships won by the Crimson Tide in the twentieth century, half of which came under the tenure of perhaps the most celebrated coach in college football history, Paul “Bear” Bryant. Alabama’s winning ways began to be threatened after Gene Stallings led the team to a victory over the University of Miami Hurricanes in the 1993 Sugar Bowl. However, current coach Nick Saban guided the team to three national titles in four years, 2009, 2011, and 2012, jump-starting a resurgence in the national prominence of the Crimson Tide.5

On the other side of the state, Auburn University sat in the shadows of Alabama for most of the twentieth century. Despite besting Alabama in their first meeting, the Tigers soon became the dominant team in the state, winning the national championship awarded to the Plains until quarterly victories, it is little wonder why the rivalry remains as strong as ever. On Iron Bowl Saturday, the entire state of Alabama comes to a standstill, as all eyes become glued to the nearest big-screen television, waiting to see if victory will wear orange and blue or crimson and white. Virtually no other college football team in the state of Alabama receives as much support outside of current students and alumni as Alabama and Auburn do.

The Opening Kickoff: Initial Debate over a UAB Football Team and the Club Years

Prior to the formation of a UAB Blazer football team, the only college team to rely on Legion Field as a regular home stadium was the Alabama Crimson Tide, who preferred the massive stadium to the relatively small confines of Bryant-Denny Stadium. It was not until the University of Alabama poured large amounts of money into renovating and expanding Bryant-Denny in the 1990s and 2000s that Legion Field finally fell out of favor with the Crimson Tide. The last game Alabama ever played at

5 Ibid., 127.
6 Flint, 425-431.
Legion Field was against the University of South Florida Bulls on August 30th, 2003.7 Despite the Crimson Tide remaining at the stadium up until the early 2000s, it was clear to Birmingham officials that Alabama would no longer be interested in playing at Legion Field once the expansion of Bryant-Denny Stadium was complete. With their departure, the bleachers on Graymont Avenue would be left completely empty. This would become even more obvious in the mid-1990s, when the United States Football League folded, taking with it the Birmingham Stallions, who had also called Legion Field home.8 Desperate to keep the stadium alive and the revenue coming in, city officials looked far and wide for a tenant who would be willing to play all its home games at Legion Field, and would be willing to stay there, no matter what. Professional teams came to town on more than one occasion after the departure of the Stallions. These teams included a franchise from the World League of American Football and one from the Canadian Football League, which experimented with teams in the United States and Canada in 1995. Neither team lasted, keeping the fears alive that Legion Field might truly become an empty shell.9 Neither team lasted, keeping the fears alive that Legion Field might truly become an empty shell.9

Around this time, the south side of Birmingham, UAB Athletic Director Gene Bartow began a quest which he had been planning on taking during his tenure with the Blazers. His mission: start up a football team for UAB, placing it squarely in the Division I-A (now FBS, or Football Bowl Subdivision) realm, the highest level of college football in the land. To begin, UAB hired the consulting firm Creative Sports Marketing from Charlotte, North Carolina, to perform a feasibility study and cost analysis on fielding and maintaining a Division I football team. In 1988, the firm returned with its findings, which were reported on by newspapers around the state. According to an article from the Huntsville Times, the analysts at Creative Sports Marketing found that it would cost the university approximately $7 million to start up and maintain a respectable team at the Division I level. In the article, UAB President Charles McCue was quoted as stating, “I believe that figure is too low. . . . That figure doesn’t include things like practice fields, dormitories, training facilities, and the band.”10 While Coach Bartow did not comment on the study, McCue would remind the readers of his firm stance that “Our priorities are academics.”11

Before Creative Sports Marketing undertook the study, Alabamians had been debating the need for a team at UAB. After articles like the one in the Huntsville Times were published, the number of voices giving their opinions on the subject multiplied rapidly. A number of letters to the editor appeared in Birmingham newspapers, either supporting or decriing the idea of a football program in Birmingham. The author of this letter then reminded the readers of his firm stance that “Our priorities are academics.”11

The author of this letter then reminded the readers of his firm stance that “Our priorities are academics.”11

According to a statement from UAB officials, “Why does UAB need a football team?”12

Joining in with other Alabamians, the head coaches at Alabama and Auburn spoke up, giving their opinions on football at UAB. Pat Dye, the coach of the Tigers, stated to the press that if UAB was to form a team, “I can see no way a football program in Birmingham could hurt Auburn football. There must have been a couple of teams of outstanding football players who left the state last week (on signing day), plenty for another football team in the state.”13 Dye would then go on to explain that if UAB was to field a football team, he saw nothing standing in the way of regular season meetings between the Blazers and the Tigers, much like the two universities had been doing in basketball. In Tuscaloosa, Alabama, head coach Bill Currie happened to be the exact opposite of Dye, vehemently against the idea of a Blazer football team. In the article, the press quoted Currie’s explanation that “Not only would we not play them, we don’t understand why they are talking about bringing another football team into the University of Alabama system. . . . I’m the only [football] coach in the University of Alabama system. We don’t need another football team at one of our other campuses.”14

Even though the University of Alabama at Birmingham did not field an NCAA sanctioned football team in 1980s, a Blazer football team was not out of the question. Talk of the possible formation of a team had sparked interest in UAB football throughout campus, and a number of students banded together to try and make it happen. While there was no firm decision on the future of a football team, there was hope for the future of the sport at the university. In 1989, the UAB Football Club officially formed, with senior Rick Segers as club president. The Birmingham Post-Herald reported that this first club season had a tentative schedule of five games, including a pair of games against both the Marion Military Institute and the junior varsity squad from Miles College. According to a statement from

11 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
Segers, the formation of a club football team at UAB hopefully put the Blazers on the road to playing at the Division I level. He also compared the club team’s beginnings to the way that football at both Alabama and Auburn had gotten started in the late 19th century. 21 Another hopeful, Dr. George Munchus, professor of marketing, stated his hopes that the club team would not only show the level of support for the sport on campus, but also demonstrate to Dr. McCallum “that the program is financially feasible.” 22

The Opening Drive: UAB Football, 1991-1995

After two years of playing college football at the club level, the Blazers were ready to become more than just a group of students playing football for “fun.” The time had come for the team to begin climbing the ladder of college football. 22 A non-scholarship Division III football team to begin playing this fall.” 23 The first NCAA game the Blazers played in was a 28-0 loss to Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi, but the team concluded its first four seasons of existence with a record of twenty-seven wins, twelve losses, and two ties. 24 During these first four years, UAB played the 1991 and 1992 seasons at the Division III level. The Blazers then climbed up to Division I-AA (now FCS, or Football Championship Series) for 1993 and 1994, after a 1992 NCAA mandate required all schools playing Division I basketball to move all other sports to the Division I level by 1993. 25 After 1994’s 7-4 season, Dr. Hilyer resigned from his position as head football coach, just as the team was prepared to jump from I-AA to I-A. 26 Two months later, Watson Brown was hired as UAB’s second head coach, a younger face to guide the team through the transition to the top flight of college football. 27

Two major issues that the team faced prior to the 1991 season were finding suitable practice facilities and securing a home field for the Blazers on Saturday afternoons. When discussing the subject of a home stadium for the Blazers, there were three main options for UAB on the table: Legion Field (still occupied on several fall weekends by the Alabama Crimson Tide), the Hoover Metropolitan Stadium (home field of the Birmingham Barons baseball team), and Lawson Field (used primarily for high school football games) on the Birmingham-Irondale city limits line. While UAB officials talked little of using Lawson Field during these discussions, much was said about using Legion Field or the Hoover Met. One opinion came from Clint Brueess, the Dean of the School of Education. Brueess advised Coach Bartow, “I hope we do not play our football games at Legion Field even though I realize there may be political or practical reasons for doing so [emphasis his].” 28 He went on to explain that the location and size of Legion Field would not be conducive to a successful atmosphere for UAB, since he believed the crowds would be relatively small, making the stadium appear almost empty with thousands of vacant seats during games. After hearing rumors about the Blazers playing at the Hoover Met, he believed that “If that can be set up for football, great! It would have be conducive to a successful atmosphere for UAB, since he believed the crowds would be relatively small, making the stadium appear almost empty with thousands of vacant seats during games. After hearing rumors about the Blazers playing at the Hoover Met, he believed that “If that can be set up for football, great! It would have
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reported the results of a survey it had taken of the nine high school football head coaches in Birmingham on November 22, 1994, which detailed how these coaches viewed their respective programs. According to the survey, a majority of Birmingham’s coaches stated that they were forced to take the field with inadequate coaching staffs, practice on mediocre fields, and play with a low average coaching supplement. Needless to say, deteriorating at a rapid rate is sad. It’s just a slap in the face.”

To give that money to UAB when the high schools are through the state. What the City Council did was a sham. Even after the University of Alabama at Birmingham formed its first NCAA sanctioned football team in 1991, the university’s medical facilities continued to expand and thrive. In late 1991, President McCallum opened the West Pavilion of University Hospital. The Center for Psychiatric Medicine followed in March 1992, along with the Blevill Biomedical Sciences Building. These buildings were designed to house classes and provide space for conducting medical research in order to keep UAB on the cutting edge of medicine into the twenty-first century. Even with all of these buildings being constructed on the growing UAB campus, what became perhaps the crowning achievement for McCallum was opening the Kirklin Clinic in June 1992, a $125 million hospital facility on Sixth Avenue South. In more recent years, the hospitals have continued to grow on campus, including a new building for Children’s Hospital and a new Women and Infants Center.

As the hospital facilities at UAB continued to grow, so did the accolades awarded to the university’s coaches, athletic department, and its medical facilities. In 1991, U.S. News & World Report ranked UAB as the number one “Up
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...And Shattered Souls: UAB Football, 2005-2012

After the successful 2004 season, many fans and sportswriters had high hopes for the team, who managed to only eke out a five win season in 2005. Things continued to get worse for the Blazers, as UAB only managed to piece together a record of twenty four wins and sixty losses between 2006 and 2012. Even after the 2006 season, UAB replaced Watson Brown with former University of Georgia offensive coordinator Neil Callaway, who guided the team through several more mediocre seasons until his removal after the 2011 season. After firing Callaway, the Blazers Athletic Department managed to hire the then offensive coordinator of the Arkansas Razorbacks, Garrick McGee, to become the fourth head coach in the history of the UAB Blazer football team. 46

By the end of the 2000s, the main debate regarding the UAB football team was not about money, nor primarily about the team’s existence, but instead revolved around a new home field for the Blazers. Even though the city of Birmingham did its best in maintaining Legion Field, the historic stadium had long since started to show its age. Built in 1927, it had been hosting college football for over sixty years when the Blazers played their first Division III game. With Legion Field on the verge of crumbling to the ground, UAB began looking for a replacement stadium for football. After lining up potential donors for the project of building a new, on-campus football stadium, university officials requested that the issue be brought up at a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama System. During a meeting in late 2011, “Plans for the UAB on-campus football stadium were tabled ‘as presented’ by the University of Alabama System Board of Trustees.” In response to the growing support for such a stadium among students and faculty, Trustee Finis St. John wrote an open letter explaining his disagreement with the stadium plans. His main points of contention were that pledged donor money had not actually been raised, the stadium would be built at a cost that was $25 million over initial estimates had indicated, and that the money spent would, in essence, be money wasted by UAB. In response to this, the grassroots move of http://espn.go.com/college-football/story/id/7380951/source-uab-blazers-hire-garrick-mcgee-arkansas-razorbacks-football-coach-ac (accessed November 7, 2012).
47 Mark Schlabach, “UAB Fires Coach Neil Callaway,” ESPN,

...to bring an on-campus stadium expanded into a larger movement, “Free UAB,” which advocated removing UAB from the control of the Board of Trustees in Tuscaloosa.51

In the Valley of the Hospitals: UAB and Her Nationally Recognized Medical Facilities

In 1936, the University of Alabama created an extension center in Birmingham, located in a house on the corner of Sixth Avenue North and Twenty-Second Street. The first classes offered consisted of pre-law, pre-engineering, business, and general education courses, allowing Birmingham residents who were unable to afford to go to Tuscaloosa to stay at home yet pursue a college degree from Alabama. In 1945, the university moved its medical education programs to Birmingham, expanding the role of the extension center. Working closely with several already established hospitals in Birmingham, the new dean of the Medical College, Roy Kracke, managed to establish sixteen medical departments with 172 faculty members by the fall of 1945. More good news for the fledging Medical College came soon after, when Kracke struck a deal with the Veterans Administration for the construction of a new VA hospital in Birmingham, which was completed in 1953.52

The next major step came in 1954, when the University took over Jefferson-Hillman Hospital, renaming it the University Hospital. 53 Along with the VA hospital, the Medical College added the Lyons-Harrison Research Building, the Cardiovascular Research and Training Center, the Alabama Transplant Center, Children’s Hospital, and the Lister Hill Library for the Health Sciences throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Due to the rapid growth of the college, University Hospital appeared on the list of “America’s Ten Best Hospitals” in the 1967 edition of U.S. News and World Report, and was ranked second among Southern medical schools behind Duke University, with specific regards to progress and research, in the Journal of the American Medical Association’s October 1967 issue. 49 Eric Roberts, “FREE UAB,”” KALEIDOSCOPE, February 7, 2012, 55 Eric Roberts, “FREE UAB,”” KALEIDOSCOPE, November 8, 2011.
54 Ibid., 344-345.
and Coming in Medicine” school in the country, ahead of Emory University in Atlanta, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. 56

By 1996, the UAB medical school was ranked twenty-fifth in the United States, 57 while the UAB Hospital facilities were ranked eighteenth in the country in cardiology, thirty-first in gastroenterology, twenty-sixth in general surgery, and eighth in rheumatology. 58

In 2001, when U.S. News & World Report released their latest hospital rankings, UAB Hospital ranked fifty-sixth nationally in cardiology, seventy-sixth in gastroenterology, seventy-seventh in general surgery, and twenty-eighth in neurology. 59

In 2001, when U.S. News & World Report released their latest hospital rankings, UAB Hospital received top fifty rankings in rheumatology, respiratory disorders, orthopedics, kidney disease, hormonal disorders, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. 60

In 2001, when U.S. News & World Report released their latest hospital rankings, UAB Hospital was ranked twenty-fifth in gastroenterology, twenty-sixth in general surgery, and seventh in neurology. 61

“In the nineteenth century, the game of football, as they knew it, was a violent sport where severe injuries were common, there was no medical care for players, and the football team was the center of attention,” wrote Morris. 62

In 2001, when U.S. News & World Report released their latest hospital rankings, UAB Hospital was ranked thirty-first in cancer, diabetes and endocrinology, gastroenterology, cardiology and heart surgery, geriatrics, ophthalmology, pulmonology, and ear, nose and throat, while also attaining the position of being the number one hospital in the state of Alabama. 63

UAB: Football Factory, or Alabama's Top Medical College? 56


The question of the necessity of college football teams is as old as the sport itself. In 1894, J. William White and Horatio C. Wood published an article, “Intercollegiate Football,” in the North American Review. While they conceded that the game of football, as they knew it, was a violent sport where severe injuries were common, they were positive about football as a source of physical exercise for young men. According to the two, football exercised the body in ways that no other sport could, and also garnered more interest from students than other sports did. Also, the gate receipts from football games helped to fund not only the football team, but also assisted in providing funding for other college athletics, causing White and Wood to argue that “if these athletics be useful, the fact that they are largely supported by football is an argument for, and not against, the continuance of the game.” 62

Even a century later, the words of White and Wood ring true, as they conceded that the game of football, as they knew it, was a violent sport where severe injuries were common, there was no medical care for players, and the football team was the center of attention, 64

Regardless of whether UAB football can help fund other college sports, Morris believed that “claims of approaching inflationary bankruptcy coming from coaches and athletic directors would suggest that this situation is passing.” 65 In his article, Morris proposed a possible solution, where college athletics would begin distancing themselves further and further away from the rest of the university, becoming virtually a professional entity funded predominantly by alumni that would maintain the university’s name and allow for players to attend college during the off-season. 66

Perhaps the answer could be found when applying the results of a case study performed on the University of Notre Dame to the University of Alabama at Birmingham. In the late 1970’s, Allen L. Sack and Robert Thiel conducted a survey of former Notre Dame players, as well as former Notre Dame students, which was published in the journal Sociology of Education. Through their inquiries, Sack and Thiel found that non-football playing students at Notre Dame had come from more affluent backgrounds, while over half of the football players had come from families with less than half the income brackets. They also discovered that after graduation, relatively similar numbers of both football playing and non-football playing Notre Dame students had gone on to rather successful careers, with a large number of the football players having climbed out of the situation that they grew up in and gone on to build better lives for themselves. While there were issues with Sack and Thiel’s study, such as the knowledge that many Notre Dame football players had gone into “simpler” majors, rather than more exhausting ones like engineering, their research demonstrated that, without a football scholarship to the University of Notre Dame, many of the athletes that attended college in South Bend would not have been able to attend college, leaving they determined that, during the 1994 season, UAB spent approximately $5.4 million on athletics, while raking in revenue of around only $2.5 million, leaving the university to deal with a deficit of almost $3 million. 67

With all of this money being spent and lost on Blazer athletics, the question, “Why does UAB need a football team?” became a real issue to discuss once again.

The University of Alabama at Birmingham has scored a major victory, one that cannot be measured in non-loss records or in national championship titles.
them without the possibility of escaping the situation that they had spent their entire lives in.67

Examining how the formation of a UAB football team impacted the rest of the university, evidence suggests that, despite the financial loss that the athletic department suffered, the academic portions of the university managed to come out quite well off. In December 1991, a study of UAB students was conducted by several faculty members. The study determined that, when the tuition of Blazer football players and students who came to the university because of an interest in UAB football was combined with other fees paid by students, the university had increased its income approximately $300,000.68 As the football team moved up to Division I, and football scholarships could be offered by the university, more potential students were now able to attend UAB in search of a degree while playing football. Many of these new student-athletes chose majors in the medical field, possibly hoping for a career in medicine after graduation. In the 1996 Football Media Guide, twenty-three players on the Blazers’ roster had declared majors in the medical field. In addition, the university increased its hospital facilities, which quickly moved up the ranks of college football to compete at the highest level of the sport. At the same time, the university continued to expand its hospital facilities, which continued to be recognized as one of the best hospitals in the United States by one of the top hospital rating services in America. Even though the formation of the football team expanded the university’s athletic budget by thousands of dollars, UAB officials managed to find the money to keep the football team competitive, while not skimping on funding to keep the University Hospital system the best in the state of Alabama. While the team has fallen on harder times over the past several years, the Blazers managed to keep many of their losses competitive games until the very end, maintaining a cloak of respectability around UAB football. In a state dominated by a pair of giants in Tuscaloosa and Auburn, the football team represented the University of Alabama at Birmingham has scored a major victory, one that cannot be measured in won-loss records or in national championship titles.

Conclusion

In the end, one thing is clear: UAB did not fall into the trap that many detractors felt would happen. The University of Alabama at Birmingham formed a football team, which quickly moved up the ranks of college football to compete at the highest level of the sport. At the same time, the university continued to expand its hospital facilities, which continued to be recognized as one of the best hospitals in the United States by one of the top hospital rating services in America. Even though the formation of the football team expanded the university’s athletic budget by thousands of dollars, UAB officials managed to find the money to keep the football team competitive, while not skimping on funding to keep the University Hospital system the best in the state of Alabama. While the team has fallen on harder times over the past several years, the Blazers managed to keep many of their losses competitive games until the very end, maintaining a cloak of respectability around UAB football. In a state dominated by a pair of giants in Tuscaloosa and Auburn, the football team representing the University of Alabama at Birmingham has scored a major victory, one that cannot be measured in won-loss records or in national championship titles.

At the same time, the University Hospital system has remained dedicated to improving the quality of health care for its patients while researching the latest in medical science, giving the future a bright hope for those afflicted with serious illnesses. UAB has maintained the high level of quality health care that the university has become known for, yet has managed to put a competitive team on the turf of Legion Field, all while keeping the team from becoming the university’s main focus point. As such, the University of Alabama at Birmingham has scored a major victory, one that cannot be measured in won-loss records or in national championship titles.
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And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the LORD at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the LORD’s lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the LORD, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness. (Leviticus 16: 7-10 KJV)

3 Winston Churchill, “Message to President Franklin D. Roosevelt from Winston Churchill, 08/13/1943” (685129) [Textual Record]; Great Britain - Churchill, W. S., 1943 - 1943. Diplomatic Correspondence, compiled 1933 - 1945; Collection FDR-FDRSPF: President’s Secretary’s File (Franklin D. Roosevelt Administration), 1933 - 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (NLFRD), 4079 Albany Post Road, Hyde Park, NY, 12538-1999, 5.

Franklin Roosevelt knew it was coming and paid close attention to the events taking place in Europe. Roosevelt and Churchill stayed in frequent contact, developing strategies to stop the Germans. The two knew that the best way to prevent the fall of Great Britain was to open a second front in the war, thereby distracting the Germans and dividing their forces. Thus the courtship of the Soviet Union and its leader Joseph Stalin began.

During the interwar period, Stalin had been a staunch anti-fascist but, as the Nazis regime grew in power in the West and Japan’s imperialistic ambitions threatened the East, Stalin looked to ease those threats. Fearing the growing power of the Nazis, Great Britain and France had entered into treaty negotiations with the Soviet Union but, unbeknownst to them, the Soviets were also holding talks with Germany. Both Hitler and Stalin desired territory in Poland, and despite the animosity the two had for each other, they felt that aggression between them would not be in their best interest. Both had more to gain from an alliance, and so on August 23, 1939, Germany and the Soviet Union signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. On the outside it was an economic and non-aggression pact, but it contained a secret “spheres of influence” protocol that would divide parts of Romania, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland. However, the agreement did not work in the way the Soviets intended because the Poles tried to defend against Germany and the Soviet Union’s aggression. It was a crime of mass murder.

It was a crime of mass murder...
and taken prisoner. An estimated 180,000 Polish troops were imprisoned in one of three Soviet prison camps in Kozelsk, Ostashkov, and Starobelsk. Many of the enlisted men were eventually released but most of the officers and some civilians were kept in the camps. The Polish soldiers were not considered prisoners-of-war because no declaration to that effect was made. Instead of POW’s the men were considered “counter-revolutionaries.”

Now with Poland being divided between the Nazis and the Soviets, the two conquerors started reshaping their part of Poland into their own image. Firmly in control of two-thirds of Polish territory, the Soviets started the political, economic, and cultural annexation of the new territory. The Polish government was itself in turmoil due to the fact that it had been killed by the Soviets some time before the German invasion. The Poles received replies from the Soviet government or their families. However the omission silence continued which led to the conclusion that the men were no longer alive. Stalin had even suggested to Sikorski that perhaps the officers, after their release had escaped over the border into Manchuria, but no reasoning was given for the fact that not one single prisoner had tried to contact his family (or anyone else).

The evasiveness continued for more than a year with the Polish leaders receiving no satisfactory results. The Poles held out hopes that the Soviets were still holding the officers in Siberian labor camps but they refused to admit this fact to the Allies. Eventually though, their worst fears were realized. When the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union, they pushed the Soviets past the area of the Katyn Forest, just west of the Russian town of Smolensk. In the fall of 1941, the NKVD began what was known as their mokraya rabota (literally “wet work”). With his hands tied behind his back, the prisoner was taken to the side of a trench, his head pushed back into his chest, and with a single shot to the base of the skull, his lifeless body would fall into the trench. The whole process took six weeks but in time all but a scant few of the officers lay dead in the forest.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which had been a fragile agreement from the start, was continually plagued with disputes and anger over unauthorized actions. It was finally broken when Hitler launched an invasion of the Soviet Union, named Operation Barbarossa, on June 22, 1941. Stalin had ignored warnings that the German invasion was imminent and was not prepared. He thought that Nazi troop build-up along the border was posturing by the Germans to prevent a Soviet attack. He believed that because the Germans were still dealing with the British in the West, Hitler would be foolish to attack the Soviet Union. Stalin greatly underestimated Hitler’s hubris and did not realize that the Nazis were running out of resources, particularly gasoline, and desired the oil fields in the Caucasus. Facing the German Blitzkrieg, the Red Army had to fall back deep into Russia before the Germans could be slowed. Stalin immediately turned to Great Britain for an alliance and the two signed the Anglo-Soviet Agreement and Allied Cover-up started. The VKD executioners began what was known as their mokraya rabota (literally “wet work”). With his hands tied behind his back, the prisoner was taken to the side of a trench, his head pushed back into his chest, and with a single shot to the base of the skull, his lifeless body would fall into the trench. The whole process took six weeks but in time all but a scant few of the officers lay dead in the forest.
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Andrei Vayshinsky who was, at the time, the Vice-Commissar for Foreign Affairs. The Soviet government was itself in turmoil due to the fact that it was in the process of relocating 550 miles to the east to the town of Kuybyshev in order to remove them from a potential war zone. Despite the chaos, Kots pressed Vayshinsky on the fate of the Polish officers. When Vayshinsky argued that during war many people disappear, Kots replied that, “People are not like steam. They cannot evaporate.” As the Polish officials pressed the question more, they were assured that the officers in question had been released and where they had gone was unknown to the Soviets. In December 1941, the Polish prime minister in exile, General Władysław Sikorski, visited Moscow to personally seek his released colleagues. What he encountered was vague and general sense of evasiveness. Sikorski was given a variety of unlikely, if not impossible, excuses for the disappearances. The Poles received replies from the Soviets stating that the prisoners had been released before the Nazi invasion began and, at other times, were told that the prisoners were held in Soviet prisons when the Germans invaded. Thus, the Russian officials said that the Polish officers could be in Germany by now. The Soviet ministers, and even Stalin himself, claimed that the order had been given to release the men and if they had not released them, then it was that lower level commanders had not carried out those orders. Of course, all of the replies could not be true, and such uncertainty among the Soviets that no such action had taken place was characteristic because the NKVD had a reputation for keeping meticulous records. The impossibility of any of those scenarios was further backed by the fact that if the officers had been released or taken by the Germans, it would be likely that some would find a way to contact the Polish government or their families. However the ominous silence continued which led to the conclusion that the men were no longer alive. Stalin had even suggested to Sikorski that perhaps the officers, after their release had escaped over the border into Manchuria, but no reasoning was given for the fact that not one single prisoner had tried to contact his family (or anyone else).

The evasiveness continued for more than a year with the Polish leaders receiving no satisfactory results. The Poles held out hopes that the Soviets were still holding the officers in Siberian labor camps but they refused to admit this fact to the Allies. Eventually though, their worst fears were realized. When the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union, they pushed the Soviets past the area of the Katyn Forest, just west of the Russian town of Smolensk. In the fall of 1941, the NKVD began an investigation into the disappearance of the missing Polish officers and that the officers had been killed by the Soviets some time before the German invasion. German Minister of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels wrote in his diary on April 14, 1943 that
We are now using the discovery of 12,000 Polish officers, murdered by the GPU, for anti-Bolshevik propaganda on a grand scale. We sent neutral journalists and Polish intellectuals to the spot where they were found. Their reports now reaching us from abroad are gruesome. The Führer has also given permission for Goebbels to make a dramatic announcement in the German press. I gave instructions to make the widest possible use of the propaganda material. We shall be able to live on it for a couple weeks... Some historians believe that Goebbels held the information in order to exploit a time when he perceived the alliance with the Soviet Union was at its weakest but, the most reasonable explanation was that it would be spring when the ground thawed and only then could the bodies be exhumed.

The Nazi brought in the German Red Cross and forensic scientists as well as a group of allied POWs to observe the exhumation of the mass graves. Among these observers were two Americans, Army Lieutenant Colonel John Van Vliet Jr. (the highest ranking U.S. officer at the time of the massacre in Katyn) and Captain Donald B. Stewart, chosen by Van Vliet to accompany him. The Germans informed Van Vliet that he and the others would be traveling to Katyn, and on May 10, 1943 the group departed for the site of the mass graves.

There were several key observations that seemed to exonerate the Germans. Van Vliet recalled that as the bodies were removed and examined, their personal belongings were found removed from their pockets. All of the diaries and letters that were found, none bore any dates later than April, 1940. The American observers knew that it was possible that the Germans removed any material dated after 1940 before the group arrived, but Van Vliet and Stewart found the bodies packed tightly and almost fused together, convincing them that the Nazis could not have conducted a prior search. The state of the dead officers clothing also pointed to Soviet guilt. Officials in Moscow claimed that the Polish officers had been employed constructing roads between the time of their capture and the German invasion. Van Vliet and Stewart noticed that the boots on the bodies were in good condition and should have severe signs of wear if the Soviet account was true. The other indication was that the dead men wore heavy winter coats at the time of their execution. The Soviets had claimed that the Polish officers were captured and executed in late summer of 1941. The heavy coats supported the idea that the Soviets killed them in the cold month of April 1940, rather than the Russian assertion that the Germans murdered them in the warm weather of late summer 1941. No matter how much the men wanted to blame the detestable Germans, no matter how much they wanted to call the investigation of Katyn a hoax perpetrated for propaganda reasons, neither man could come to any other conclusion but that the crime was actually committed by the Russians. When the war ended, Van Vliet went to the highest ranking American officer he could find and gave him a limited version of what he knew. However, the report that Van Vliet filed with the Pentagon was quickly hidden away and he was ordered by American officials not to discuss his experience at Katyn with anyone...

Even though the Germans failed to get the question of Soviet guilt addressed by the American and British governments, their investigation did finally solve the mystery of what happened to the missing officers. The bodies found in the shallow graves were those of the missing Polish officers. Families and friends could begin to grieve for their lost loves ones and a mixture of sadness and anger welled up inside the Polish people. Polish newspapers around the world began to decry the murders, vilifying and blaming the Soviets. This caused uproar among the Allied governments. The Soviets claimed it was in fact the Germans that killed the Polish officers and the Germans were now attempting to blame the Soviets’ in order to disrupt Allied unity. Although the Germans had never proven to themselves to be trustworthy, the Polish government had reason to believe the German account due to the Soviet avoidance they had recently experienced...

On April 16, 1943, General Sikorski called for a meeting of the International Red Cross in Geneva Switzerland to conduct an independent investigation. This was met with protest from the Soviets who complained that any investigation would be “a fraud and its conclusions reached by terrorism.” Stalin threatened to break diplomatic ties with the Polish government-in-exile if the push for the investigation continued. Roosevelt and Churchill moved immediately to try and prevent the diplomatic split. Stalin sent a telegram on April 21 stating his intentions to break relations with the Polish government. Churchill responded on April 25 asking him to reconsider. He told Stalin that General Sikorski had been pressed to withdraw his request to the International Red Cross and every effort would be made to tone down the rhetoric of Polish newspapers. Stalin was clearly upsets as far as he was concerned.

He warned Stalin that a break with the Poles could have dire repercussions on American public opinion due to the large amount of Poles residing there. Churchill’s plea went unheeded. The prime minister received a telegram the same day from Stalin informing him that the matter was already decided. Stalin argued that he also had to be concerned with the public opinion in the Soviet Union, which perceived that the attacks by the Polish press were evidence of “the ingratitude and treachery of the Polish Government.” This breaking of ties was exactly what Stalin wanted since he had no intentions of giving up the Polish territory gained in 1939. By breaking ties with the Polish government, this left him free to deny Polish legitimacy in post-war Europe and allow him to fulfill his plan to bring Poland under the Soviet sphere of influence.

Obviously the British and Americans wished that this diplomatic nightmare would disappear. Churchill was certain that without the Russians maintaining a second front in the East, Great Britain would be at risk of a German invasion, which could potentially result in grave Allied losses. The Americans were already committed to the alliance with the Soviets through the Lend-Lease program which permitted the United States to loan the Soviets a substantial amount of military hardware. Allowing the Soviets to be openly accused of mass murder was seen as being counterproductive to the Allied cause. The relationships that Churchill and Roosevelt had with Stalin were already strained. The Russian leader was taking heavy losses on the eastern front and angry that the others had delayed opening up the western front to give the Russians some relief from Hitler.

In the summer of 1943 Churchill received a copy of a memorandum, dated the previous May, from Sir Owen
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The Nazis brought in the German Red Cross and forensic scientists as well as a group of allied POWs to observe the exhumation of the mass graves. Among these observers were two Americans, Army Lieutenant Colonel John Van Vliet Jr. (the highest ranking U.S. officer at the prison camp, Katyn, near the city of Smolensk, in the Soviet Union) and Captain Donald B. Stewart, chosen by Van Vliet to accompany him. The Germans informed Van Vliet that he and the others would be traveling to Katyn, and on May 10, 1943 the group departed for the site of the mass graves.

There were several key observations that seemed to exonerate the Germans. Van Vliet recalled that as the bodies were removed and examined, their personal belongings were found removed from their pockets. All of the diaries and letters that were found, none bore any dates later than April, 1940. The American observers knew that it was possible that the Germans removed any material dated after 1940 before the group arrived, but Van Vliet and Stewart found
O’Malley the English ambassador to the Polish government-in-exile. O’Malley was a career diplomat who had a reputation for being independent minded.32 In the memo, O’Malley presents the circumstantial evidence gathered by the Poles pointing to Soviet guilt for the massacre. His report was circulated among the British cabinet and a copy was eventually sent to Roosevelt. Like Van Vliet and Stewart, O’Malley points to the fact that none of the bodies contained any documents dated past April 1940. He further indicates that officer executions were inconsistent with the modus operandi of the Nazis. Although the Nazis were capable of acts of unspeakable cruelty, Hitler had a skewed code of honor as to the warrior class. The Nazis would exterminate millions of ethnic civilians but it was not their practice to execute enemy officers. It was hard to believe that they would choose to do so only in the case of the Polish officers. It was, however, seen as consistent with what they knew about the Soviets. Since the Bolshevivik Revolution, Lenin and Stalin and the other leaders had shown the belief that executions were necessary to protect the “Revolution.” The attempt at concealment was another action that did not correspond with the idea that the Germans were the perpetrators. The age of the saplings trees made it improbable that they were planted after the German invasion; it seems preposterous that an army conducting a Blitzkrieg invasion would take the time to plant trees during its rapid advance.33 Yet, O’Malley avoided making an emphatic direct conclusion. He stated that, in the face of the circumstancens, anyone who had looked at the evidence had to be “more than half convinced,” but as a diplomat he was trained not to deal in certainties. It is clear, though, that he was more than “half-convinced” and it was very likely that British officials understood this. O’Malley’s report on Katyn, while brilliant work, was not well received among the British government. When Churchill forwarded a copy of the memo to Roosevelt, the prime minister commented that the memo was well written but “perhaps a little too well!” He seemed to be implying that the case made by O’Malley presented them with an inconvenient truth that would leave both governments in a moral quandary. O’Malley never achieved great success in his career. When he asked colleagues why this was the case, he was told “he had been too often too right too soon.” To justify this moral lapse, O’Malley contends in his memo that, as science and technology improved, nations had to think more globally when it came to the decision making process. In the realm of international politics moral judgment, he thought, ought to be based on what was good for all of the nations involved and not just the individual. With this global mindset, one would see realignment of moral standards (or, in some cases, the dropping of moral standards altogether). O’Malley quoted Mr. Headlam Morley, writing, “what in the international sphere is morally indefensible generally turns out in the long run to have been politically inept.”34 Regardless of this justification, O’Malley seems concerned with the moral toll these judgments would take on Great Britain. He feared that British officials have “used the good name of England like the miners used the little conliers to cover up a massacre.”35 It was not until 1992 that documents were released providing physical evidence that not only had the Soviets been responsible but several high ranking officials, including Stalin, had signed off on the order in their own hand.36 Lavrentiy Beria, the head of the NKVD, sent a memorandum to The Central Committee branding the Polish officers as “counter revolutionaries” and saying they were “hardened and uncompromising enemies of Soviet authority.”37 He argued that the Polish men were too nationalistic and clung to their Catholic religion to the extent that they would choose to adopt communism seemed unlikely. Beria believed that extermination was the only solution and asked the Central Committee for permission to kill the officers. Stalin agreed as he had no intention of returning the territory he had seized in Poland.38 To justify this massacre, Churchill, Roosevelt, and their administrations made the right choice in turning a blind eye to the massacre? Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, the then prime minister of the exiled Polish government, expressed his frustration when he wrote:

Apparment of Russia grew by the hour both in London and Washington….We turned from Churchill to Roosevelt, then back to Churchill. They both were uniformly sympathetic but continued to impose silence upon us, as they were reluctant to inject anything into their relations with Stalin that might displease him . . . . We had there- after to reckon with the Roosevelt administration’s definite appeasement of Russia.”39

It could be said that the two leaders were practicing what is known as utilitarianism, the philosophic idea, develop- ed by John Stewart Mill that all moral choices are to be made while considering what would bring about happiness for the larger amount of humans. That is, one should ask, before any action, what would contribute the most to the “the greater good”40 No one can say that it was an easy choice. If Stalin had been sufficiently provoked, he could have gone back to the negotiation table with the Germans, thereby possibly changing the outcome of the D-Day inva- sion and in turn World War II. Nonetheless, the Polish officers were to be sacri- ficed on the “Hill of Goats,” and, as in the book of Leviti- cus, they became a sin offering for the Allies’ disregarding moral standards when they allowed the murderers to go unpunished. The Germans were guilty of a multitude of sins that would chill the soul, but making them the scape- goat for the Russian crime at Katyn could barely be justi- fied when the Soviet Union was treated with impunity. The Allies had entered the war on the grounds that the Ger- mans were carrying out an immoral war. Yet, with the So- viet Union entering the alliance after the Katyn massacre and its ongoing attempted cover-up, the Allies, arguably, no longer held the moral high ground. This idea was best expressed by O’Malley at the end of his memo when he wrote:

If, then, morals have become involved with inter- national politics, if it be the case that a monstrous crime has been committed by a foreign Govern- ment—albeit a friendly one—and that we, for however valid reasons, have been obliged to be- lieve it, if the utilitarianism, the philosophic idea, devel- oped by John Stewart Mill that all moral choices are to be made while considering what would bring about happiness for the larger amount of humans. That is, one should ask, 32 Ibid., 186-87. 33 Ibid., 3-5. 34 Churchill, “Message to President Franklin D. Roosevelt from Winston Churchill, 08/13/1943,” 1. 35 Reeves, 187. 36 Churchill, “Message to President Franklin D. Roosevelt from Winston Churchill, 08/13/1943,” 6. 37 Ibid. 38 Ibid. 39 Ibid. 40 Hoover, Herbert, and George H. Nash, Freedom Betrayed: Herbert Hoover’s Secret History of the Second World War and Its Aftermath (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University, 2011), 620. the Blood Sacrifice: The Katyn Massacre and Allied Cover-up
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the Soviet Government, the voice of our political conscience is to be kept up to concert pitch. It may be that the answer lies, for the moment, only in something to be done inside our hearts and minds where we are masters. Her at any rate we can make a compensatory contribution—a reaffirmation of our allegiance to the truth and justice and compassion. If we do this we shall at least be predisposing ourselves to the exercise of a right judgment on all those half political, half moral, questions (such as the fate of Polish deportees now in Russia) which will confront us both elsewhere and more particularly in respect to Polish-Russian relations as the war pursues its course and draws to its end; and so, if the facts about the Katyn massacre turn out to be as most of us incline to think, shall we vindicate the spirit of these brave unlucky men and justify the living to the dead.43 If the Allies had pressed the Russians about the murders, maybe Germany would still have been defeated. After the horrific events that had transpired between the Germans and Russians during the war, it seems very unlikely that Stalin would have ever returned to the bargaining table with Hitler. If the Soviets had been held accountable for the deaths, and the crimes had been brought to light, public opinion could have prevented the territorial concessions made to the Soviets by the British and Americans. Much of Eastern Europe could have possibly been spared the tyranny and terror that it suffered under Soviet domination in the second half of the twentieth century. However, in the discipline of history, dwelling on the “what ifs” can lead one down a myriad of useless paths. The fact is, that Great Britain and the United States took actions during the duel down a myriad of useless paths. The fact is, that Great Britain and the United States took actions during the du-
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Let us begin at the heart of the Greek civilization with the oikos, or family. Above all a patriarchal institution, the heart of the household, krypte, was a man who held his entire family under his sole guardianship. While this guardianship-lapsed for boys once they came of age, Athenian daughters spent their entire lives under the legal control of a male guardian—her father, husband, son, brother, or next-of-kin.2 Women gave birth at home with the assistance of a midwife and possibly a few female friends or neighbors.3 As for the baby girls who survived the many fatalities associated with infancy long enough to make it to their naming ceremonies (typically on the tenth day), data indicates that they were likely to be given a name derived from their father’s family, skipping a genera-

I n his lost play Tereus, Sophocles speaks through a fictional woman about the woes of female’s lives and the trauma of marriage for girls. He writes, “How fre-

quently I’ve thought of women’s nature in this very regard, how we are nothing. When we are young, still in our fathers homes, I think we live the sweetest life there is; for igno-

rance, alas, breeds happiness.”1 Sophocles’ description of a woman’s life can thus be summed up in a single word: nothing. Indeed, a woman’s very existence was deprived. Females living in classical Athens were completely sub-
jected to the domination by and control of an overbearing, misogynistic male population. They had no legal citizen-

ship or human rights and, despite their necessary and im-
portant roles in society, they were continually disregarded as being inadequate and sub-human.

Through the research and analysis of the personal experiences of the average citizen-class Athenian woman, focusing on her birth, the rules of guardianship, marriage, and domesticity, we will be able to gain a clear under-
standing of what life was like for such women living in classical Athens. We will examine the levels of her politi-

cal and social roles as they pertain to the functioning of the Athenian polis and, finally, her multifaceted positions found within the religious realm of the state. Although we might find many contradictions and complexities, the lives of Athenian women were fundamentally impacted by her depraved treatment and denied status.

Dominated, Denied, and Debauched: The Lives and Roles of Women in Classical Athens

Marialeen Ellis

...
ing his decision, he most likely evaluated the newborn’s health, the financial feasibility of raising another child, and, of course, the baby’s gender.6 While most sons were raised, as well as the firstborn child regardless of sex, less value was placed on girls. Girls would lack earning power, would cost the family an additional dowry, and would bear children who would belong to another family. One playwright, Posidippus, later observed, “A poor man brings up a son, but even a rich man exposes a daughter.”7

The custom in Athens was to put the infant into a crockery pot and abandon it on a roadside usually not far from home.8 According to Pomeroy, it has been estimated that as many as twenty percent of newborn Athenian girls were left deserted, if not in the streets, in places like the local garbage dump.9 Though some were found and raised by slave dealers, the majority of these infants quickly died.10 The motives behind the exposure of newborn infants varied for a woman.11

For example, a law attributed to Solon was that of fathers selling their daughters into slavery for fear that they would bring honor or infamy to the family work at a very young age.12

Though we do not know everyday details surrounding a child’s life in classic Athens, it is understood that they participated in the religious activities of the family and that they passed the time playing with various types of toys, in addition to games similar to those still played by young children.14 Babies’ rattles and bells have been discovered, vases have been found showing boys and girls accompanied by various pets, and it is known that girls played with dolls per the customary ritual in which she played with the family work at a very young age.15

While modern readers might find these practices horrifying, all classes in classical Attica practiced these customs. Thus, from the moment of birth, girls in Athens were immediately vulnerable and subjected to a life of control and fear of men. Scholars have calculated that the average Athenian woman would give birth to 4.3 children; however, only 2.7 of these would survive infancy. It is unsurprising then, given the hazardous factors surrounding childbirth and infancy, that the death ratio for Athenian babies was 500 per 1,000 adults or half of those born.16 Even those children who were not subjected to exposure were still not completely relieved from the psychological impact that the custom so often presented for both themselves and their mothers. We can only guess as to the ramifications felt by siblings when their mothers’ pregnancies ended with the disappearance of newborn babies. Those children born to wealthy families may have been raised by and may have spent a great amount of time under the supervision of slave nurses and nannies while those from poorer backgrounds were likely to begin helping with the family work at a very young age.17

One condition of peculiarity, known as the “wan- dering womb,” was believed to be a malady in which the womb was notanchored in place due to the lack of sex or pregnancy and traveled to different areas of the body causing problems as it went. Naturally, it was believed that this was only curable through intercourse, providing us with the most obvious example of an ideological misinterpretation of such female-specific illnesses. Blundell’s argument that “the restlessness of the womb is suggestive of a bio- psychological instability to which a woman inevitably falls victim [sic] unless a man intervenes in her life,” shows us again the susceptibility of girls to the mercy of men.18

Greek girls were commonly married off quite young and often to men who were at least double their age. Typically, brides were about fifteen and the grooms were about thirty. One reason behind this custom could origi- nate from the advice of the author of a treatise titled On Virgins. The author writes that prior to sexual intercourse the womb was not yet fully opened, which caused blood to run and a fear of men. Scholars have suggested that this was a carrier of feverish and “suicidally insane.” His prescription for this state “when virgins have this trouble, they should marry as soon as possible. If they become pregnant, they will be cured.”19 Therefore, his advice is in sound accord with the sexual norms for the appropriate marital age of girls.

Occasionally, physical attraction might have also been an incentive for marriage, as is described in Herodotus’ Histories about Priender of Corinth, a seventh-cen- tury tyrant. He is said to have fallen for his future wife, Melissa, upon seeing her in a field wearing a simple tunic and pouring wine for some workmen. However, Melissa’s own feelings do not appear to be taken into account. Their relationship was one plagued by Melissa’s pregnancy and ill-fated as the crazed man later murdered her and proceeded to sleep with her dead corpse.20 While this example represents a slightly different time and place, it nonetheless still gives us some insight into the possibili- ties related to marital relationships in ancient Greece. It is conceivable that genuine affection between husbands and wives may have existed, as indicated with- in the works of Homer in which he acknowledges that a man’s feelings for his wife might have formed a significant part of his motivations. This can be seen in The Iliad when Hector tells his wife, Andromache, that when he contem- plates the capture of Troy, he is distressed not so much by the pain that will come to the Trojans, or by the suffering of his parents and brothers, but rather by the thought of his wife being dragged into captivity.21 Blundell writes that Hector describes “an ascending scale of loyalties—city, kin, and wife—in which his wife stands at the pinnacle.”22

While this romantic ideal is pleasant to consider, the reality remains that this fondness was not felt out of unadulterated love, but was likely closer to feelings one writes of. Indeed, while we might not now feel the same fondness for someone whom we would not compare, as a friend was likely one’s equal while a wife was far from it, and so it surely would be tre- mendously rare for a couple to be in love prior to marriage. Additionally, though Homer does give us insight into the writers, lovers, and relationships of spouses, we must also remember that his works were indeed romanticized fictions. Finally,
ior of their wives. Further, men regarded women as having been naively seduced, proving that they did not believe them capable of such desires and ploys. By the beginning of the classical period, the giving of bride wealth (gifts from the groom to the bride’s father to win his daughter’s hand) had been replaced by the near-opposite, dowry—property allocated to the daughter upon her marriage and outlined within the eurige—to the husband, who managed it for his wife. 20 The dowry usually took the form of money or valuables, allowing the father to provide for his daughter even after she was married, while also giving him a greater stake in her marriage because if a divorce were to take place, the husband was obligated then to return the wealth. 21 On the other hand, the dowry might act as a reinforcement of reasonable behavior on the behalf of the husband. He would be less likely to seek a divorce for frivolous reasons and would live under the threat of divorce by his father-in-law, which might aid in preventing the maltreatment of his wife. While the dowry relates primarily to the upper classes, we know much less about marriages within the lower classes. It is safe to assume that they were far less complex affairs, and a man’s primary reason for marrying was in order to produce offspring to take care of him in his old age and to inherit his property so that it did not pass to distant relatives. 22 Hesiod is probably the best source for reproducing the precarious class status, advising men to marry when they are thirty and to choose a virgin in her fifth year of puberty who lives nearby. 23 Yet, for those women who were directly affected by the custom of the dowry, this payment acted as somewhat of a barrier for the transfer of property between men of equal wealth. Marriage can therefore be viewed as a business deal. Consequently, women are so closely associated with property that it is a wonder that the Athenians did not simply refer to them as such. While some might argue that the dowry helped give women somewhat of a higher status (because they were so closely associated with capital), the understanding that this union was nothing more than a means by which men could personally benefit and prosper shows us that, once again, women’s status was further decreased and their lives manipulated. A woman’s work revolved around the home; social norms confined them to it for the majority of their lives. In Xenophon’s Socratic dialogue, the Oeconomicus, the division of labor is described: “I think the god, from the very beginning, designed the nature of man for the out- door work. . . . For the woman it is more honorable to remain indoors than to be outside.” 24 Lysias writes, “The most excellent of wives” was a “clever, frugal housekeep- er” who “kept everything in the nicest order.” 25 Lysias, taking this into account, finds one case concerning the emotions and mental health of women, but that ultimately is a fleeting reflection. Once married, women would be primarily concerned with conception and giving birth. While men natu- rally were meant to enjoy their sexual pursuits and society encouraged these endeavors, they did not approve of female sexual desire, at least as far as wives were concerned. Blundell explains, “According to Xenophon...sexual en- joyment was not the object of marriage; men acquired wives in order to raise a family, not to satisfy their lusts, which were amply catered for in the streets and brothels.” 26 Although it was normal and acceptable for men to have affairs, a great contradiction remained in the case of women. If an Athenian woman was said to have committed adultery, something she could have been charged with regardless of its validity, she would have been banned by law from temples and relig- ious festivals (two of the few places or events she was even allowed to venture to), and her husband would be obligated to divorce her. 27 Additionally, it was considered in Athens “justifiable homicide for a man to kill not only the lover of his wife, but also any man who seduced or raped his mother, daughter, sister, or concubine.” 28 This is perfectly evidenced in the speech written by the logographer Lysias, titled The Murder of Eratosthenes: Defense, which he intended for Euphiletus, an Athenian who was charged with the murder of the known scholar and geographer Eratosthenes. In the oration, Euphiletus pleads his case claiming that his only motivation was to fulfill sanction of the law after catching Eratosthenes in bed with his wife. He accuses him of having seduced her and carrying on an affair in his own home while he was there, telling the criminal, “It is not enough to be going to kill you, but our city’s law, which you have transgressed and regarded as of less account than your pleasures, choosing rather to commit this foul offence against my wife and my children than to obey the laws like a decent person.” 29 This prime example shows us that even in the case of such affairs, men felt personally affronted more than they felt concern for the well-being and behav-
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in the case of Periander of Corinth, his stimulus was de- rivcd out of lust rather than pure love, allowing for his wife to serve only as a means by which he can fulfill this desire and subjecting her to his ultimate control. Upon a match being arranged, the father of the bride and the groom made a promise of marriage, or eurige, which was the legal step required to constitute a valid wedding and in which the terms of the marriage were settled. 24 The actual celebrations lasted a total of three days, included multiple events, and typically took place at night. As previously mentioned, among the first of these involved a ritual in which the bride would dedicate her dolls and childhood things to Artemis as she was making the transition into womanhood. The main occasion occurred on the second day of festivities and included a procession in which the bridegroom drove his wife in a chariot to her new home, followed by relatives and friends on foot bearing gifts. 25 Finally, the bride could be visited at her new home on the last day—a custom which may have helped to ease the dramatic change and brought her a sense of familiarity as she embarked on the tumultuous journey of married life and encountered new expectations sudden-ly. One scene, Telemachus tells his mother, Penelope, to go home while he was there, telling the criminal, “It is not enough to be going to kill you, but our city’s law, which you have transgressed and regarded as of less account than your pleasures, choosing rather to commit this foul offence against my wife and my children than to obey the laws like a decent person.” 29 This prime example shows us that even in the case of such affairs, men felt personally affronted more than they felt concern for the well-being and behav-
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servants.36 Women performed these tasks mainly in their own rooms, which were spaces confined from the rest of the house, often on separate floors. Euphiletus describes his home as a “dwelling… on two floors, the upper being equal in space to the lower, with the women’s quarters above and the men’s below.”37 All socializing took place in the main area of the home, the men’s space, and it was quite normal for visitors to never see nor speak of the women that lived there.38 Additionally, though they were in charge of either preparing meals themselves, or ensuring that slaves did, women rarely dined together with men except during informal family dinners.39 These citizen women seldom ventured far from home except to attend festivals and funerals,40 special occasions that could even cause trouble as pointed out in regards to Euphiletus’ wife, who was first seen by her seducer at the funeral of her mother-in-law as she was often treated as a piece of property that could be bought and sold, and that even within the comfort of her own home, she was forced into seclusion and stripped of almost all social opportunities. Through all of this, it was ingrained within society that women should always return to what was seen as their single, primary purpose of exist- ing: to mother the future citizens of the state, which as we shall soon discover, brings about another great contradic- tion.

Roger Just suggests the idea that women’s posi- tions were worse during the democracy than in earlier pe- riods, and worse in Athens than in any other polis. This argument holds at least some truth.41 The laws and con- stitutions of the democracy in Athens reveal that women within this state possessed no active political rights. They could neither speak nor vote in the ekklēsis, a citizen as- sembly, nor could they attend its meetings. Further, they were unable to hold any administrative or executive posi- tions within the secular organization of the state. Just says it best, writing, “In the Greek sense of the word, they were not citizens.”42

Being a citizen in Athens meant that one was a free adult male of the recognized Athenian parentage, a group that actually could have only accounted for a small proportion of the total population.43 As Aristotle wrote in Politics, “It must be admitted that we cannot consider all those to be citizens who are necessary to the existence of the state.” Those whose presence was necessary for the existence of the state, or polis, but who were excluded from its gov-

emanace and who were not considered citizens (patria), included all women and children in addition to resident aliens (metics), freedmen, and, of course, slaves.47

The primary reason it was so crucial for one to be considered a citizen was because only then did a person have the right to own land and houses in Attica (the equiv- alent of wealth). It is possible that the laws on citizenship were meant to mini- mize the population of those who were considered citizens, thereby centralizing the wealth of the polis into a smaller, more easily controlled upper class. While it was essentially a democracy, it was far from the ideal republic of equality and justice for all. Another law proposed by Pericles in 451 or 450 BCE placed even more limitations on citizenship by ordaining that a citizen had to be of Athenian parentage on both his father’s and his mother’s sides.48 Further, in the fourth century BCE, it became illegal for a non-Athenian to marry an Athenian, and the penalties for transgression were severe. Indeed, the fact that the very definition of be- ing a citizen in democratic Athens involved being born to pure Athenian parents.

All of this considered, a person’s parentage and kinship clearly defined his or her political, social, and religious status. Being a citizen not only had a political conno- tation, as in the modern sense of the word, but also meant being a member of a polis, which was just as much a social and religious entity. A person’s social existence derived from his situation within a network of kinship connections that supplied him with his personal identity in life.49 But even though this realm was only opened to the perceived dominant gender, it was equally, if not entirely, dependent on the other.

While there is nothing to suggest any sort of in- clusion of women into the political life of the polis, it is ironic that a feminine form of the word “citizen” does oc- cur (politis), but it was generally only used to distinguish the mother, wife, or daughter of an Athe- nian citizen from another woman.49 Although these Athe- nian women were distinguished from non-Athenian females living in Athens, and the difference in being free and being a slave was just as radical for wom- en as it was for men, it remained that these females were placed in a group of outsiders (like mêtics) who were al- ways subject to being ruled rather than ever being capable of becoming rulers themselves (like slaves). This clearly affected the male idea of women in a number of contexts since “the Athenian polis was both a ‘citizen’s club’ and a ‘men’s club,’” which women fell, or side of by definition.50 Here, we are again presented with a contradiction in the position of women in classical Athens: on the one hand, we have the polis, which excluded wom- en, yet on the other, we have a closed community bound together by the above-mentioned ties of kinship and reli- gion, which most certainly included women as channels through which all rights were passed down and transferred between men.

However, there is always an exception to the gener- al rule, and even this strict political system was not entirely exempt from a little female influence. Just is quite right in his statement that, “In narrowly oligarchic, aristocratic, or monarchic states, women who belonged to the elite have
often wielded considerable power, even if illegitimately.

... But in the Athenian democracy there were no thrones or throned persons, nor was she capable of exercising her free will in the privacy of her homes, might have discussed what had taken place in the courts or assembly or other general political news with their wives and daughters. It is also conceivable that some women may have even influenced their husbands’ political decisions and actions. For example, Aspasia of Miletus, who was the mistress of the fifth-century Athenian politician and orator, Pericles, was portrayed in Plutarch’s later written biography of the public figure as an influential, though immoral, intellectual. However, this instance of a courtesan having such political influence caused quite the scandal amongst classical Athenian socialites and politicians, proving that women who pushed the boundaries to become involved in public life were both rare and highly frowned upon.

Although there was this exception, the average Athenian woman had previously held little to no political influence, and she was not granted legal rights as a citizen nor was she capable of exercising her free will within the realm of the polis. However, there still remained one major aspect of Grecian life in which she was granted just the same status as her male counterpart—themselves in the religion of marriage.

The participation of females was vital to the religious life of the city. The women in the private life of the polis, such as married women married to Athenian citizens—though they were allowed to leave their homes and the guardianship of their husbands for the duration of the feast—had to be virgins until marriage, the similarity ends there. It was that the gods should be virgins until marriage, the similarity ends there. It was that the goddesses continued to be poor paragons as female counterparts—in the realm of religion. The participation of females was vital to the religious life of the city. They took part in the rites and cults within individual households (oikoi) and within the various divisions of the state or polis itself. For example, while it was a citizen selected each year to act as Archon Basileus (King Archon) to preside over all ancestral festivals, his wife, titled Basilissa, presided with him over these ceremonies, and even represented the wife of the god in the annual ritual celebrating the marriage of Dionysus.52 Also important to note, in the religious sphere, the wives of Athenian citizens formed just as exclusive a group as their husbands; they alone were able to participate in certain festivals and ceremonies from which female slaves and the wives ofmetics, foreigners, concubines, and courtesans were excluded. One such celebration honoring Demeter, the festival of the Thesmorphia, was even more exclusive in that only married women married to Athenian citizens attended it. These wives were allowed to leave their homes and the guardianship of their husbands for the duration of the feast.53 Another cult in which married women played a central role was that of Dionysus. Every other year, women from Athens, known as Thyades, traveled to Delphi to join the women there in celebration of the rites of Dionysus on the slopes of Mount Parnassus, performing dances at fixed points along their routes.54

Even though women were granted much more freedom through this major cultural facet, the beliefs of the ancient Greeks were fostered by one of the most contradictory and misogynistic religions. In Hesiod’s Theogony, which describes the creation myth for the Greek gods and goddesses, three are dedicated virgins; one could be considered a semi-virgin since she is able to renew her virility annually; and two are mothers who are known for showing a lack of devotion to their children.55 As Blundell points out, Hesiod believes her beauty “conceals a worthless interior…her belly is always taking, but men must be subject to this ‘if they want what her belly can also give, the children whom they need in order to survive.’"56

Further, regarding the Greek deities, the Olympian goddesses present a major contradiction as it relates to their being role models for their worshippers. Of the six goddesses, three are dedicated virgins; one could be considered a semi-virgin since she is able to renew her virility annually; and two are mothers who are known for showing a lack of devotion to their children.56 While some positions could be attained through allotment, election, appointment, or even via purchase, the most prestigious and time-honored priesthoods were passed down as an inheritance from some of the oldest and noblest family clans.57 In the most privileged and honored priesthood was that of Athena Polias, which was claimed by the Eteoboutad clan, which was related to the king of Athens, and the position continued to be held by the family for seven hundred years. Athena Polias was one of the most distinguished
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offices in the ancient Greek world. These priestesses held the position for life, possibly making them the most pow-
erful women in Attica.70 One Athenian priestess, Chrysis, was
granted rights by Delphi that surpassed being mere honorary privileges and included “freedom from taxes, the
right to own property, priority of access to the Delphic
oracle, guaranteed personal safety, and a front-row seat
in all competitions.”71 This placed her not only in a posi-
tion superior to that of the average woman, but, more im-
portantly, superior to that of the average man. Moreover,
many priestesses held such authoritative and influential
offices that they were able to sign and affix their seals to
documents, argue cases of sanctuary law before the Coun-
cil and Assembly, appoint sacred officials, give advice, and
enforce the laws of the sanctuaries in which they served.72
In this way, such priestesses exercised power. Although it
originated from the religious sphere, it stemmed into the
political realm more and more with the passing of time. It
is safe to say that some of these women held just as much,
if not greater, power than their political male counterparts.

Connelly writes, women “function[ed] as legitimate politi-
cians within the polis bureaucracy.”73 In addition, history
has sometimes portrayed them as “valued colleagues and
confidants of male philosophers.”74

Their sacred authority was so embedded in politi-
cal authority that Plato writes in Laws, “No sensible person
will try to change whatever Delphi of Dodona or Ammon
or some ancient tradition has authorized in any manner…
on the strength of which people have established sacrifices
and rituals.”75 The female agents who oversaw these rituals
were indeed endowed with an authority that “no sensible
person” would question. With this in mind, it is interesting
to consider that, while all of the positions held by women
within the religious sect were very important and vital to
the well-being of the polis, and while these women were
praised as being the most worthy of the honor in all of Ath-
ens, it remains that they were still women. They were still
second-class beings, scorned forever as being unworthy of
citizenship.

In classical Athens, as in all of Greece, religion,
though not entirely connected, was still also not completely
separated from the functions of the political state. It formed
the most central part of Athenians’ lives; it held within it
the roots of their social morals, values, and norms; it was
interwoven into their daily activities. We must therefore
consider this question: if men were the only ones entitled
to individual freedoms and citizenship, why were women
found at the center of all things religious? Further, why
was it seen as acceptable (in the eyes of men) for women
to be held in such esteemed and powerful positions if they
were the weaker and lesser sex? While there is no definite
answer to these questions, we might find insight by consid-
ering that, although this somewhat seemingly redeeming
quality afforded to women was of high regard, power only
pertained to an extreme minority of the female population.

Priestesses were already members of the most elite groups
of society and, therefore, the connection with the average
woman is limited.

As we have seen, the average woman living in clas-
sical Athens lived in a world in which her very existence
was regarded as being next to nothing. From the moment
of her birth, she was immediately vulnerable to the will
of the misogynistic males under whose guardianship and
control she would live out her days. They deemed her as
a means by which they might financially, politically, or
socially prosper. The very existence of the Athenian polis
was dependent on her, yet men granted her no legal or hu-
man rights of her own. Finally, while she was a present
component in the religious sector of their lives, her mere
mythical creation came as a punishment to man; the female
goddesses that were idolized presented a major contradic-
tion in comparison with the expectations of their worship-
ers, and the sole redeeming facet associated with her life,
the roles played within the spiritual realm, only pertained
to a small percentage of the overall female population. It
is undeniable that these ancient women suffered tremen-
dously at the hands of their male counterparts. However,
we might be left to wonder whether these women were
conscious of their deprived treatment and desolate status
or, rather, were content to carry on unaware of any funda-
mental deprivations, for as Sophocles wrote, “ignorance…
breeds happiness.”76

---
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The Great Alteration: The Motivation behind the Rebellion Following the Imposition of the 1637 Scottish Book of Common Prayer

Ashley Vee Foster

Introduction

At the beginning of 1638, a group of men congreedated at the Greyfriars Church in Edinburgh, Scotland to mark their names on a contract which would become legendary in following centuries as a turning point in Scottish history. Ministers, nobles, and laypeople came together to endorse a national document which promised to “stand...in the defence and preservation of the true Religion, Liberties, and Lawes of the Kindgome.” These signatories pledged to preserve the religious and political rights of their native land by declaring “if any such dangerous & divisive motion be made to us by Word or Writ, We and every one of us, shall either supprese it, or...it may be timelie obviated.” Offensive political and religious motions will be furiously revoked for “neither do we fear the foul asperitions of rebellion, combination, or what else our adversaries from their craft and malice will put upon us” in protecting the “true Religion, Liberties, and Lawes” of Scotland. Thus, the National Covenant of 1638 promised to defend Scottish liberties in politics and religion to the point of armed rebellion.

The fervent nature of this National Covenant, which spearheaded royal revolt in Scotland, stemmed in part from an incident which happened a year before its inception at Greyfriars Church. On 23 July 1637, the Scottish royal Crown enforced the reading of a new Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments in Edinburgh kirk. This reading spawned an extensive national opposition as the imposition of the new prayer book conflicted with two chief principles mentioned in the National Covenant, religion and liberties. This new liturgical innovation was the conclusive straw in a long and complex history between inhabitants of Charles’s northern kingdom and the Crown. Charles’s enforcement of the book ultimately led to a national revolt in defiance of not only the institution of the Scottish Kirk but the entire political kingdom as well. While Scottish amity certainly derived from the religious nature of the 1637 Book of Common Prayer and its conflict with Scottish Calvinism, it also originated, perhaps even more significantly, from Charles’s complete disregard for the institutions and liberties of Scotland. He entirely bypassed the Scottish Kirk and parliament to introduce his book into the kingdom. To illustrate the king’s lack of concern for these Scottish principles, a detailed analysis of the incompatible religious ideologies inhabiting the British Isles in the seventeenth century precedes a description of the Scottish Kirk as a rallying institution for Scottish Lowland nobility and laymen.

If needed. A year later in February 1639, that need for open armed rebellion took hold of Scotland as the first two British Wars pitted the Covenanters against the reigning Stuart, Charles I. Roughly three years later, Charles raised the standard of his second kingdom to announce the start of the English Civil War against the Parliamentarians, men who had been greatly influenced by the success of their northern brethren in opposing their king. This reading of a new Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments in Edinburgh kirk was visited by a prominent entourage of national importance.

On a Sunday in late July 1637, the regular congregation of the High Kirk at St. Giles in Edinburgh was visited by prominent national figures. This group was composed of not only the two archbishops of Scotland along with eight of his bishops, but also members of the king’s own privy council and the majority of the Scottish judicial body, the Lords of the Sessions. They came to the church previously ministered by John Knox to attend the first service conducted according to the new Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments. However, unimpressed with the prestige of their fellow guests, the congregants of St. Giles openly and almost immediately expressed their hostility towards the new royally approved proceedings. When the dean began reading aloud, a substantial number of Scots simply walked out while remaining others began shouting abuses at him. John Leslie, the sixth Earl of Rothes, opened the reading “made sum out of zeal, sum out of grief, and sum from astonishment at such a change, vent their words and cries” while further “provok[ing] a number of the Commons...to cry out, and, it is alleged, to throw stones at the Bishops.”

Legend even mentions a stool being hurled in the direction of the dean’s own pulpiter. After such a public outcry, the dean retreated from his podium, but people continued to demonstrate not only outside the High Kirk of St Giles but also outside three other Edinburgh churches which had practiced the new liturgy that Sunday. Fleeing the capital dissenters, the bishop of Edinburgh’s coach was stoned as he travelled to Holyroodhouse Palace, one of Charles’s royal residences in the capital city.

Rothes attributed the demonstrations to “these people, formalie patient upon all other new devocies that wer brought in by degrees, [who] were unable to bear at ane instant so great a change as appeared, in the matter, to those of best understanding, and, in the manner and forme, to the weakest...to change the whole external frame of Gods publicit tutor of worship formenrised.” The open hostility towards the new liturgy led the Scottish royal council to abandon the book on 29 July, less than a week after its implementation. Yet, still the dissidence did not cease. Scots flooded the privy council with over sixty-eight petitions and supplications against the prayer book. These petitions extended from Fife to Dumfriesshire and were a result of collaboration between over a hundred ministers and a faction of the nobility who worked alongside burgesses and gentry men.

By October, the privy council no longer felt safe in Edinburgh and moved to Linlithgow, literally abandoning the capital to nonconformists and dissidents. Citizens of Edinburgh were flooded with the heavens for two months. By November, the established four Tables of Scotland represent the four main political groups of the kingdom, the no...
The Desired Union of Two Clashing Churches

Charles I had wanted a new Scottish liturgy in 1637 to bring the Scottish Kirk in closer alignment with his Anglican church to the south. As king of both Scotland and England, Charles sought the amalgamation of the national churches of his two kingdoms. His father, James VI of Scotland, had inherited the English throne following the death of Elizabeth I and so combined the two royal thrones in 1603. Yet to James’s frustration, the Union of the Crowns did not immediately lead to a union of the kingdoms as he desired. His successor, Charles, hoped creating one comprehensive British Church would help consolidate his power as the sole ruler of the British Isles.14 However, the union of the Scottish Kirk and the Anglican Church would never occur as he desperately wished and planned for. They were just too different. The two kingdoms were both Protestant in declaration by the 1630s, but both the histories and the forms of Protestantism differed significantly. England, which had become Protestant as the result of a royal decision was Anglican and Episcopalian, while Scotland’s Protestant Reformation, on the other hand, was Calvinist and Presbyterian. This meant England’s Anglican church to the south.

Scottish Religious Opposition to the ‘Popish’ Service Book

Religious opposition arose from a variety of complaints specific to Scottish Presbyterian beliefs. The very existence of the prayer book originated from Charles instructing Scottish bishops in the early 1630s to draft a new liturgy using the English Common Prayer Book as a basis for the new Scottish one. Further, any draft or amendment had to be approved by himself in advisement with the Archbishops of Canterbury William Laud, William Juxon, bishop of London, and Matthew Wren, bishop of Norwich, all Anglican and Episcopalian. Thus, Scottish bishops overseen by English residents produced a book in which Scottish Presbyterians saw the Crown attempting to adulterate their national church with Anglican practices. For instance during compiling, Scottish advisors warned against reproducing the full English Prayer Book Kalender in the Scottish equivalent. The Kirk had long condemned the use of wafer bread was even attacked because it represented Charles’s hierarchical attitude, the royal prerogative and governmental ideologies of the two national churches were especially favourable to Episcopacy and its governmental ideologies of the two national churches were especially favourable to Episcopacy and its

The Incompatible Ideologies of Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism

While there were specific doctrinal and liturgical religious differences, one must not overlook the differing governmental ideologies of the two national churches which caused tension among Scottish subjects. James and Charles were especially favourable to Episcopacy and its structure of hierarchy, specifically the hierarchical system supported under the Church of England. Anglican doctrine allowed bishops to have a prestigious and important function in ecclesiastical affairs. In turn, the monarchs also viewed them as essential figures in parliament to represent royal interests.26 The Scottish Kirk possessed a different opinion of the existence and/or role of bishops. As early as 1578, the Scottish Kirk’s Second Book of Discipline stated that in the church the name bishop was “not a name of superiorit and lordship, but of office and watching.”27 In the 1570s, while there might be an actual episcopal office in the Kirk, the existence of such an office did not necessarily mean that one minister was superior or inferior to another. Such a thing in their mind was not scripturally based for “it agies not with the Word of God that bishops would be pastors of pastors.”28 Yet even though the Book of Discipline supported the actual presence of bishops in the Kirk’s ranks, it did not shy away from mentioning the abuses of this particular church office. The authors clearly declare “the corruption of the kirk” has allowed “this name [as others] [to] have bene abusit, and yit is lykelie to be.”29 The dispute centered on who was allowed the final say on ecclesiastical affairs. This would have political and religious implications in the future. The Stuarts believed Scottish ecclesiastical authority should reside with the king and bishops as it did in England. This would give Charles, with his absolutist attitude, the royal prerogative in all ecclesiastical decisions and government. The government of the Scottish Kirk has been described by Scottish historian Allan Macinnes as “concilary and anti-erastian,” meaning the church was not subjected to the authority of the state and the Anglican system of hierarchical courts supported under the Church of England. Anglican doctrine allowed bishops to have a prestigious and important function in ecclesiastical affairs. In turn, the monarchs also viewed them as essential figures in parliament to represent royal interests.26 The Scottish Kirk possessed a different opinion of the existence and/or role of bishops. As early as 1578, the Scottish Kirk’s Second Book of Discipline stated that in the church the name bishop was “not a name of superiorit and lordship, but of office and watching.”27 In the 1570s, while there might be an actual episcopal office in the Kirk, the existence of such an office did not necessarily mean that one minister was superior or inferior to another. Such a thing in their mind was not scripturally based for “it agies not with the Word of God that bishops would be pastors of pastors.”28 Yet even though the Book of Discipline supported the actual presence of bishops in the Kirk’s ranks, it did not shy away from mentioning the abuses of this particular church office. The authors clearly declare “the corruption of the kirk” has allowed “this name [as others] [to] have bene abusit, and yit is lykelie to be.”29 The dispute centered on who was allowed the final say on ecclesiastical affairs. This would have political and religious implications in the future. The Stuarts believed Scottish ecclesiastical authority should reside with the king and bishops as it did in England. This would give Charles, with his absolutist attitude, the royal prerogative in all ecclesiastical decisions and government. The government of the Scottish Kirk has been described by Scottish historian Allan Macinnes as “concilary and anti-erastian,” meaning the church was not subjected to the authority of the state and the Anglican system of hierarchical courts
and councils.25 Presbyterian Scots, also referred to as Melvilleans after the zealous Scottish pastor Andrew Melville, sought a national church based upon a presbyterian system of courts, beginning at the local kirk sessions and advancing to the district presbyteries and regional synods concluding at the national assembly with representatives from Kirk presbyteries. In these ecclesiastical courts composed of elected elders would ecclesiastical matters be decided.26 The Act authorising Presbyterian Government itself was ratified in 1592, over thirty years before Charles came to power and eight years before he was born. Presbyterianism was not a new dissenting sect in the 1630s springing up to curb Charles’s royal power. Long before his coronation, Scotland’s parliament “dec-lairis that it saie lauchful to the kirk...to hald and keip an courts composed of elected elders would ecclesiastical
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physical absence from Scotland. This absenteeism or aban-
donment felt by the Scots began with James VI when he packed his bags in Edinburgh and permanently relocated to London in 1603. He returned to his homeland only once in his remaining twenty-two years of reign. His successor, Charles, was born in Scotland in 1600 but soon left as a three year old with the royal family. He did not return un-
til his coronation in 1633. Hence from 1603 and onwards, Scotland’s king did not reside in the royal cap-
ital but in a city four hundred miles away. Its king also had to be shared with a more populous and wealthier nation to the south, which ironically was Scotland’s traditional enemy. As the years progressed, the Crown lost its validity in being the protector and thus symbol of Scottish independence sim-
ply because the monarch was much more concerned with the affairs of England than with those of his native land.30 During his reign, Charles increasingly exhibited favour-
ity towards Englishmen over Scotsmen. After the Duke of Buckingham’s rise in the king’s favour, court and govern-
mental positions were restricted from Scots. The nobility soon lacked any chances to advance themselves in the eyes of the royal court.31 As a result, the nobility felt alienated from their king as his own administration became progres-
ively less responsive to the expectations of the nobles-led political nation. In turn, these men grew more apprehensi-
ve in dealing with instructions from Court and less devout in their desire to preserve Charles’s monarchial position in Scotland. His monarchical influence in Edin-
burgh was fading.40

In the wake of this power void in Scotland, the Scottish Kirk rose in the hearts and minds of its people to supereide the royal Crown. The Kirk became the emerging symbol of Scottish identity and not the Stuart king since he was no longer the quintessential Scot. The welfare and prosperity of the Scottish kingdom ceased to rest in the hands of the monarch. Instead, it rested in the hands of the Kirk, in the hands of the ministers who created it and the nobles who led it. The Kirk would have such an effect on the mindset of contemporary Scots and their identity that the eighteenth-century Scottish historian Da-

All felt that the process in which the Book of Common Prayer was introduced was infringing upon their liberties.
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Calvinism allowed both spheres to be in their hands if the situation required. The Calvinist Kirk allowed them direct access to their religion and an access to politics through the preservation of their faith. The Reformed Church allo-
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term for Scottish gentility, to have an opinion in the national scene through the positions of elders. The structure of the Kirk court systems ranging from local sessions to the na-
tional general assembly allowed for close relationships to spring up between shires and central government and con-
sequently provide a link for the gentry to have a national voice. Furthermore, since Melvillean ministers should only be involved in their religious calling, the gent-
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a precedent for the nobility to exercise control over the monarch, not the monarch over the nobility as James and Charles wished it to be. Scotland also had a precedent for the kidnapping of kings by power-hungry nobles. One could argue the noble-led revolt occurred because James began and Charles expanded upon the idea of an absolute king in an environment where noble-led revolts traditionally dominated and influenced national politics. When England suddenly experienced a rise in aristocratic governmental involvement, Scotland witnessed a drastic reverse of participation that went against centuries of tradition. These men had been virtually abandoned by their monarch for another country’s peerage and crown. They suddenly had little to no opportunity under Charles to advance in court culture and government simply because they were Scottish. None of Charles’s closest advisors were Scots. Furthermore, the economic turmoil of the mid 1630s with its bad harvests and plummeting trade caused nobles to feel increasing strain on their pecuniary. In turn, they fought for a place on the payroll when none was available to feel increasing strain on their pecuniary. In turn, they fought for a place on the payroll when none was available to feel increasing strain on their pecuniary. In turn, they fought for a place on the payroll when none was available to feel increasing strain on their pecuniary. In turn, they fought for a place on the payroll when none was available to feel increasing strain on their pecuniary. In turn, they fought for a place on the payroll when none was available to feel increasing strain on their pecuniary. In turn, they fought for a place on the payroll when none was available.

Charles's successors would have been in the shadow of two important events. The first was the death of James in 1625, who had shut them out. The second was Charles's accession to the throne in 1625, which would have mimicked a national economy suffering from a sudden collapse in property values. Scotland’s economy would have been almost nonexistent. Almost as nonexistent would have been the nobility’s faith in their king who wanted to claim their lands.

The Revocation Act would never be fully implemented by Charles, yet the political damage done by his resolve to see it through based solely upon his royal prerogative was great. The Commission for Surrenders and Teind, founded to oversee the project, remained a hated shadow over Scottish politics until July 1637. The scheme managed to even alienate bishops from Charles, though they were initially seen to greatly benefit from it. However, they were the ones urging him not to exhibit such an insatiable appetite for land and money for it would only isolate the Church from Scotland. Covenanters would even mention the Revocation Scheme in the 1640s. Charles’s greatest failure in the scheme was his lack of understanding the tenacity of his noble subjects in protecting their land and subsequently their class privilege.

A Coronation Eight Years Too Late

Charles would face the zealousness of his subjects when he eventually returned to Scotland in 1633. His return was the first in thirty years and the first as ruler. His coronation and Edinburgh Declaration took place on 8 June 1633, eight years after he ascended the Scottish throne with the passing of his father in March 1625. He had been crowned in England on 2 February 1626. Originally descended from a Scottish royal dynasty, Charles waited eight years, or more technically nineteen months, to return to his homeland and be officially crowned. He waited only eleven months for the official coronation in Edinburgh. Yet those eight years between his succession and his coronation in Scotland were an especially trying time for his subjects and played into the fear of being a used and abandoned nation by their now seemingly foreign king. After 1627, the economy took a hit as grain prices rose and overseas trade drastically declined. Simultaneously, Scots were experiencing an unprecedented rise in taxes. They had suffered tax increases under James VI but those increases paled in comparison to those his son would impose. Michael Lynch points out the fact that the city of Edinburgh paid more in taxes during Charles’s first two years as king than the capital had paid in the last twenty-two years of James’s reign.

Balmerino’s Supplication

The nobility’s grievances confronted the king in 1634 with the public leaking of Haig’s Supplication. This document is probably more commonly known, however, by the name Balmerino Supplication, after Second Lord John Elphinstone Balmerino, who, as a nobleman in 1634, had much to lose with the new monarchial direction. As a second generation son of James’s new nobility and thus a beneficiary from the previous Stuart creating lordships out of former church lands, Balmerino and his family were heavily indebted to the Crown for their title and land, which in turn were liable to abrupt seizure by Charles’s Revocation scheme. He would become an outspoken leader for the dissident faction and what he did was his involvement with William Haig’s supplication. Because of his participation with this piece of writing, Balmerino would find himself on trial for treason which in the words of Macinnes would lead to “the single most important event transforming the disaffected element from a political faction into a national movement.”

51 Lynch, 267; 52 Ibid., 248; 53 Macinnes, 138.

48 Ibid., 266-267; 54 Ibid., 248; 55 Macinnes, 53.

50 Lynch, 266; Macinnes, 71-72.

49 Ibid.; 266, 267.
an M. Lee in describing the Balmerino trial as the Scottish version of the infamous English ship money case.54 Haig’s Supplication appeared a year after Charles’s Coronation Parliament. Critics of the king had been unsuccessful in blocking much of Charles’s legislation during his first Scottish parliament a year before in 1633. The king’s belief in his “own royal prerogative, and the grievances, which were only mounting. To address these, the authors penned a supplication to their monarch. They bluntly admit opposing James’s and Charles’s parliamentary acts ratifying a controversial religious legislation entitled the Five Articles of Perth, for they believe “that experience hath showed how much these articles of Perth have troubled the peace of this church and occasioned innumerable evils and distractions in it.”55 They claim these acts are “importing a servitude upon this church unpractised before.”56 Since they see these articles as a sole attempt by a king to corrupt their Kirk with Anglican doctrine.57 These Scots continue to inform Charles they are caught in an unprecedented predicament. Either they must vote “undutifully in favour of power stemming from the monarch and not Parliament.58 The writers further conclude these grievances have been “altogether slighted in this your first parliament” and they finish their supplication critiquing the formation of the Lords of Articles, the body used by the Stuarts to control parliamentary agenda.59 They criticise Charles for denying his “nobility their freedom by author- ity to meet with the Lords of the Articles, [which] may seem against the constitution of a free parliament...which before the parliament held in anno 1609 did always elect and choose the Lords of the Articles from among them of their own free will and judgment.56” They even claim a precedent of “there having been no parliamentary bishops from the reformation of religion till then, nor were they such as now do cull and single out such noblemen either positively affec- ted in religion or of little experience in our laws, as having had their breeding abroad, and so none of the ablest to be upon our Articles but fittest only for the clergy’s mystical ends.”60 While the editor Gordon Donaldson points out the falsehoods lying in these last two claims (that the election for the Lords of Articles had differed throughout history and parliament had always sat bishops) the nobility felt in 1634 that they could make these statements, they believed they were in a supportive enough atmosphere in Scotland where they thought such liberal measures could be stated even if there was no precedent. Perhaps they wanted these false claims asserted in hopes these procedures would eventually happen, allowing these writers a voice in the Scottish parliament and thus Scottish politics. In the end, Haig’s Supplication concludes with the thought, therefore we are confident that your majesty find- ing such a hapless and unwilling to give any ser- vice in preserving our religion and liberties, will be unwilling...to introduce upon the doctrine or dis- cipline of this your Mother-Church anything not compatible with your majesty’s honour, your good people’s consciences, or that hath been rejected by acts and public practice of this Reformed Church.61

Because the authors end their document with two named specific ideas, they choose to define their grievances and, in turn the grievances of their nation, with the two concepts of liberty and religion, the exact ones evoked in the Natio- nal Covenant. They believe Charles’s decisions of endorse- sing the Five Articles, approving legislation supporting his own royal prerogative, and drastically increasing taxation and reliance on bishops were damning to Scottish religion and liberty. In doing so, Charles has attacked both Scottish religion and political liberties. Hence, these two concepts become Scottish essentials to rally behind to preserve their Church and in turn their kingdom from Charles. Further- more, it is important to note that the Scottish religion and liberties at stake here are not determined by the king or his privy council alone. They are also directed by “the people’s consciences” and the acts of the Kirk. The writers declare the king’s prerogative is not the only thing which governs Scotland. The public practice of the Kirk has a significant influence in the direction of ‘their’ religion and liberties. Therefore, they argue the people of the Kirk have a decisive say in the practices and policies their govern- ment should introduce and perform. The conscience of the nation has the right to influence and, if need be, what is happening on a national scale and what is affecting a national institution such as the church. Scotland is not a kingdom to be run by one man alone. In his dealings with William Haig’s Supplication, the Scottish crown tried Lord Balmerino for treason. This treasonous involvement consisted of Bal- merino receiving two copies of the written document and showing them to the Earl of Rothes and a Mr. John Dun- drum, a notary from Dundee. He overwrote three phrases to help moderate the tone and sent one copy back to Haig. Unfortunately for Balmerino, three pirated copies sur- faced, two from his household and one from Dunmore. It was the copy which found its way to the royal court and provoked a trial which ironically focused solely on Balmerino and never on William Haig, the actual author. The outcome of the trial from Decem- ber 1634 to March 1635 was a guilty verdict on just one of his initial four charges by an eight to seven vote. His punishment would have been execution if he had not been eventually pardoned by Charles.62

Even though Balmerino walked away in the end, the dissident’s to Charles’s reputation along with his bishops who supervised the affair was unsalvagable. Scottish Ar- chbishop of St. Andrews John Spottiswood, the chancellor of Scotland who ascended to the position during the trial, along with other prominent church bishops were heavily involved in collecting information and interrogating wit- nesses.63 Spottiswood’s push for Balmerino to be charged with treason alienated many people of the Scottish admi- nistration and more importantly nobles and gentlemen who had not beforehand sided with the dissident Scottish faction. The use of bishops as investigators only sparked fury at the Episcopal administration that was increasingly seen as the main implementation of Charles’s will. Mr. William Drummond from Hawthorned, a conservative supporter of the church’s hierarchical society, made a com- ment declaring the bishops who were so determined to punish Balmerino to the fullest were just as erring as libellers themselves. Arguably, Balmerino’s trial caused more alie- nation from the Crown then what was actually written in the document itself. The indictment provided yet another rallying point for the dissidents as the查尔斯 was no longer trying to halt an individual’s freedom to oppose the poli- cies of the Crown and using the Episcopal system to secu- re its stoppage. The public clearly sided with Balmerino, whom they felt had been targeted by Charles. Edinburgh magistrates had to provide an armed escort not only for the prisoner but for the judicial commission as well when they passed through the streets of the capital. Prayer meetings for Balmerino, both public and private, alongside petitions
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and political agitation, illustrated the distance growing between Charles and his subjects. The outcome of the trial depicted to the dissident faction the lack of control Charles had in Scotland. He lacked the ability to prevent such a public outcry and to prevent such a close ruling even if its outcome was in his favour. The disappointed he lacked the ability to use coercion and coaxing to his advantage even with his loyal bishops.64 Simultaneously even as the Balmerino trial was progressing, Charles was pressing for the composition of the Scottish liturgy book which would bring the Kirk in closer alignment to the Anglican Church. There had already been three Scottish publications of the English Book of Common Prayer between his coronation and October 1634. The new book, as mentioned before, had been compiled by bishops with Anglican priests as overseers and then ordered by royal decree to be read in the churches of Edinburgh. That fateful Sunday of 23 July 1637 was not the first day, however, to witness a ruler trying to impose his agenda on the Kirk. It was the first day, however, where he met fierce opposition and revolt. To discover the reason behind the Scottish revolt of 1637, it is important to understand how the 1637 Book of Common Prayer differed from three major religious innovations of the early seventeenth century, the restoration of the Episcopacy, the Five Articles of Perth, and the assertion of Charles’s royal prerogative in church affairs. For instance, as previously quoted, the Earl of Rothes had mentioned that the Scottish people were “formalike patient under all other new devices that wer brought in by degrees.”65 All these innovations were hated by Presbyterian Scots, yet it was the last one in 1637 which caused them to revolt simply because the king never allowed the service book to be ratified by any Scottish degree.

The Restoration of the Episcopacy

With the passage of the 1592 Act authorising Presbyterian Government, the Scottish Kirk’s Presbyterian government was flourishing, giving power to a series of local church courts made up of ordinary men. Twelve years later the General Assembly actually had affirmed Episcopacy unscripturally.66 However, this system did not please James in the least who had fought furiously against giving up so much power so easily. So while Presbyterianism was established in 1592, the general assemblies’ decisions were still licensed by parliament. The king regained the right to determine the time and place of general assemblies. Lay commissioners who were drawn from the political estates and not regional synods or presbyteries were additionally allowed to sit in these national assemblies. Consequently, James at the turn of the seventeenth century could effectively manipulate these meetings. In this environment where titular bishops continued also to sit in parliament, James could influence his way to restoring more Episcopalian beliefs in Scotland. By royal decree in July 1607, every synod had to now elect a bishop as the moderator of their local meetings. The full spiritual restoration and reconstitution of the Episcopate took place just three years later in 1610 alongside the creation of the English inspired High Court of Commission which dealt out civil penalties to those ecclesiastical reprimands.67

To realise the success James had in restoring an Erastian form on the Kirk, one just needs to look at the acts accepted by the General Assembly of Glasgow in 1610. In one piece of legislation passed, it called for “no sentence of excommunicatioun or absolutioun therfra, be pronounced against or in favours of any person without the knowlege and approbation of the Bishop of the Dyocese.”68 Ironically, the 1592 Act authorising Presbyterian Govern- ment also talked about who had the power to excommunicate. However, it never specifically named that only a bishop held that special power. It referred to those men with such a high ecclesiastical power to perform such a severe religious censure as those “spiritual office bearers in the Kirk,” but he did not. In a pure Presbyterian form, bishops would not possess a more sacred and prestigious opinion and authority than other ministers simply based on title alone. The idea that “bishops salbe Moderatours in every Diocesan Synod” was also passed by this Assembly in 1610.69 It seems odd that a Scottish Assembly which had just passed the 1592 act supporting Presbyterianism is now passing not twenty years later such conservative Episcopal legislation. These acts declare “all presentationis be direct heirafter to the Bishop” for inquiries and judgements into the ministry while allowing only “the visitatioun of ilk dyoice to be done be the Bishop himself.”70 There is a significant amount of power given just to the bishopric office in a nation where many subjects wanted a pure Presbyterian form. The Scottish desire for a pristine Presbyterian functioning church did not suddenly disappear with the restoration of the Episcopate. Melvilles simply became more alienated from the Stuart government over the direction of their national church and religion. The Episcopalian direction seemed to go against their Presbyterian dream. However, the Melvilles allowed cooperation with the Crown in 1610, yet soon events would lead them to the direct opposite in 1637. One of the first events which catalysed the opposition came in 1618 with the Five Articles of Perth.71

James’s Five Articles of Perth

The Five Articles of Perth were part of James’s dream to bring together a “reunited Christendom” where he would be remembered as the Constantine who envisioned it all.72 With the passage of his royal agenda at Perth, James hoped to bring the Kirk and the Anglican church closer together in alignment. The first introduction of the Five Articles, however, was vehemently rejected by the General Assembly in St. Andrews during November 1617. Nonetheless, by royal decree, the privy council decided to push on and implement parts of the Articles that following January. Their second attempt in August 1618 during the General Assembly at Perth resulted finally in success. James attained the ratification of the Five Articles by only allowing the General Assembly to vote on all the articles together and not separately. This method would also be used to pass the articles in the Parliament of 1621. Yet to even pass with his method, James had to promise his subjects he would no longer attempt to introduce any new measures on the religious front. The articles, though, still only passed by only a twenty-seven vote, eighty-six to fifty-nine.73

The doctrine approved at Perth hit upon very speciﬁc ideals that countered the Calvinistic religion ﬂourishing in many places of Lowland Scotland. The first point of the legislation required “no minister...[to] have the inmemoration of the inestimable beneﬁts received from God by and through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ his birth, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and sending down of the Holi Ghost, upon the days appointed for that use.”74 Hence, observance of holy days, including Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitnun-
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Presbyterian dissidence in Scotland became the outright resistance which would create a common thread for a majority of dissenters and would allow them to rally together against a shared cause. In the Parliament of 1621, opposition arose from all ranks, from the nobility to the shire and burgh. High ranking nobles openly criticised and opposed the king’s endorsed Five Articles in governmental parliametary session. The hostility felt towards the articles became even clearer when one realises the passing of them was the first issue, excluding taxation, on which Scottish MPs openly opposed James in parliament.77

Four years after the Articles of Perth were ratified by a divested parliament, Charles I inherited a Scotland where conflicting doctrine between the established Scottish church and the growing Calvinistic faction already had a heated coexistence. Consequently by his coronation date in 1625, Charles would have known of the disidence created by the Five Articles of Perth and the tarnishing effect it had on his father’s reign. Thus in 1637, a Scot must have been perplexed to read in the new Book of Common Prayer some of the same articles which were also stated in the Five Articles of Perth. These ranged from sanctioning private baptisms to observance of holy days and the demand of performing a specific religious act in a particular required posture. On the other hand however, Charles’s own Coronation Parliament of 1633 ratified the Articles a second time, to the dismay of the Melvillean dissenters of the Kirk and thevarious publications also detailed their oppositions from August 1637 to 1638. So well was the reaction against the centralised clerical structure by ignoring legitimate Scottish institutions established to protect the Scottish voice.

The Earl of Rothes’ A Relation of proceedings concerning the affairs of the Kirk of Scotland from August 1637 to July 1638 illustrates in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentionned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was introduced infringed upon their liberties as Lowland Scotsmen produced in 1637-1638 offer an insight into why in that year of Scottish history such a turbulent atmosphere was created and why the Scottish privy council feared for the safety of their government. While the religious grievances were mentioned, all the publications also illustrated in detail the events mentioned above. The Pamphlets which in the Book of Common Prayer was intro
General Assemblee, the representative Kirk of this kingdom, which hath onlie power, and was ever in use to give directione in maters of Gods worschip; and wanted the warrand of Parliament, which hath bein ever thought necessar in such caises; because the liberties of the Kirk of Scotland, and forme of worship received at the Reformacion, ar establisshed in General Assemblies and ratifed in Parliamant.98 Throughout his writing, this idea is repeated frequently that the book infringed upon the liberties of the general assembly and parliament, which should have sanctioned it before the book’s imposition. However, neither institution approved, consented, nor ratified it. He claims the general assembly is the only body which has the power and the position to make such changes to religious affairs because the general assembly is simply the only national representa- tive of the Scottish Kirk. The assembly is composed of the very men who establish and maintain the local Kirks. Fur- thermore, Rothes declares that historically parliament has a precedent in being involved as well because parliament gives the decisions of the general assembly legal reinforce- ment. It is as if the general assembly and parliament work together to achieve and preserve Scottish liberties on the political and religious front. This would make sense since the Kirk of Scotland was becoming synonymous with the government, not the king’s own council.99 In turn, one could translate his statement as meaning that in part Charles’s governmental instruction is subordinate and answerable to parliament since the privy council’s goal, at this time, was to aid in the king’s governmental wishes. Because they were under the dominion of parliament and the assembly, the privy council had no power to authorise such a book. The earl also mentions the Supplication of Noblemen on 18 June 1637 when he discusses the “introducing of the Book of Canons and Common Prayer, and such other novations as were hurtfull [to his kirk and commonewhon...and would] overthrow the liberties of the subjects.”100 The wrong religion could and, in Rothes’ mind, did impede upon the political privileges of Scots- men. Remember, Calvinism offered many political advan- tages to Scotsmen such as the obligatory duty to superse- de royal authority if needed. By referring to the Earl of Loudoun’s speech before the Council at Dalkeith on 21 De- cember 1637, the “illegal introductione” of the book and its content directly hindered upon the kingdom’s religion and laws which meant it directly hindered upon “the condi- tions of lyff, libertie, and fortune heir, and their happi- ness inherred.”101 The means of introducing solely by the king’s will and desire not only affec- ted the direction of religion in Scotland and the direction of the liberties but also now the direction of one’s own future and happiness. This “illegal introductione” became personal to the nobles.102 They felt as if their very life’s purpose was at stake and the life of their heirs. By having no voice in such a drastic national change and thus no voice in the direction of their country, they hardly had any control in a system which as nobles could bestow or deny them everything. They felt power- less and feared their heirs would be as powerless as well. He even reiterates the fact Scots “had muche patience to bear many former grievous burdeings, but not to be alto- gither smothered; for these their last novations extingu- ished the very lyfe of religione and policie.” They had allowed grievances before but the means to introduce the last set of grievans in 1637 went far in smothering their liberties. Another example would be the pamphlet from 28 June 1638 entitled ‘The Protestation of the Noblemen, Barrons, Gentlemen, Borrowes, Ministers, and Commons, Subscribers of the Confession of Faith and Covenant’ which was read at the Mercate Cross of Edinburgh on the fourth of July. In the document, the authors proclaim Charles’s “diverse innovations, which both in themselves, and in the way wherein they have beene urged doe mani- festly tend to the prejudice of the Kings honour, and of our religion, laws, and liberties.”103 They stress that the manner in which these innovations were introduced had a direct correlation with why the Scots protested against them. The method used to attain these changes were not just a hindrance to the stability of their religion but also to their political stability as well. The procedure of the service book’s introduction went against the consent of their political con- sciousness, or more importantly their perceived political independence from the crown. Throughout the writing, the authors accentuate the idea Charles infringed upon these Scottish political liberties for “establish[ing] laws and service books, without consent of the Assembly and Parliamant...is contrare to the maine ground of all our Sup- plications, against the manner of that introduction.”104 The protesters specifically state that the lack of involvement on the side of the assembly and parliament is one of their main grievances against the liturgy book. Again, this writ- ing illustrates the depth of resentment the Scottish felt against the crown for not seeking their approval. This fact offended them deeply and their pamphlet was not shy in letting Charles know it.

Calvinism offered many political advantages to Scotsmen . . .
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making their complaints known to the crown, the authors were attacking the institutions which denied them of their rights as Scotsmen to have a say in national activities through the general assembly and parliament. They saw the High Commission’s existence as an infringement of their liberty just as much as the saw the imposition of the liturgy book as an infringement. Both shut the protesters, who saw themselves as ordinary Scotsman, out of national power and influence. It is important to remember that the writers of this pamphlet were composed of noblemen and ministers who were used to having a direct influence in the transactions of their kingdom. Yet now progressively during James’s and Charles’s reign, the atmosphere in the parliament and the general assembly was mentioned at least seven times in a roughly twelve page pamphlet. It was harmful “to the Lawes and liberties of this church and kingdom, and destructive of other lawfull judicatories.” The introduction completely invalidated the laws and liberties of Scotsmen and, thus the Presbyterian ranking of the Kirk, the general assembly had the right and duty to oversee religious innovations. They were the highest religious representation in Scotland and a liturgy book by nature fell under their jurisdiction. Presbyterian Calvinism gave them that power. He goes on to declare the book should not have been “urged by Anti-christian Prelates upon Gods people, without consent of any Generall Assembly or Parliament, against the will of all men.” Going against the consent of parliament and the general assembly is now linked with going against the consent of “the will of all men.” This statement supports ideas floating in previous documents in terms of how the assembly and parliament represented the national subjects on a certain scale. As formerly mentioned, these institutions were outlets to protect and further the interests of Scots, religiously and politically. So if something went without the consent of these two institutions, it went without the consent of the Scottish subjects. The fact that the liturgy book was not sanctioned by parliament nor the general assembly was not overlooked by Scotsmen for the countless religious variances contradicting Scottish Calvinism. Both pamphlets along with Rothes’ writing stress this fact repeatedly. The complaint is not solely religious, political issues are also extremely crucial.

Scottish Stress on Scottish Liberties

Scottish dissidents were determined that the king and his government would not forget that the 1637 service book was passed by neither the general assembly nor parliament. They reworded this sentiment, harked back to it in countless publications. There was no allowance for public discussion surrounding the possibility of its introduction in Scotland. The ministers and laypeople of the Scottish Kirk had no say in the matter whatsoever. The compilation and implementation were handled through bishops, who already had a precarious position in the church, and Englishmen. Charles’s determination to impose his book in his native kingdom fed into the Scottish fear of his arbitrary ways. Unpopular liturgical innovations had been imposed on the Scots before, but had at least been approved by Scottish institutions. The Episcopal agenda from Glasgow 1610 confirming power of bishops was approved by the General Assembly. Aspects of Episcopalianism were legally embedded into the Scottish Kirk, accomplished by government consensus. James’s Five Articles of Perth were widely disliked for its perceived Anglican impositions on the Calvinstic Scottish Kirk, but no one revolted. They were approved by the General Assembly in 1618 and Parliament of 1621 and 1633. No one rioted because they decided to initiate an act declaring he could choose ministerial apparel simply because he was king. Even though it demonstrated his belief in his own prerogative, it was approved by the Parliament of 1633. Not religiously based on the Calvinist tradition. Charles I’s, had no say over this matter. Instead, the political part of this issue was decided by parliament. Thirteen enactments of the Renovation Act were not only sanctioned but prolonged in the Coronation Parliament of 1633.107 Because the book was never rati- fied, perhaps Scots felt as if their privileges as Scotsmen were being completely eroded by a king who simply cared less for his northern kingdom. The publications voice the concern that Charles viewed their parliament and national assembly as worthless and meaningless since he did not need their consent to do his wishes in Scotland. So they
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had for centuries embodied the identity and hope of Scotsmen who traditionally possessed a voice in the governing of the country no longer had a say in its establishment. The liturgy book during a time when the king was being superintended by the high and sudden abandonment of their liberties.

The Gr...in 1603. Perhaps the hearts of its congregations. Perhaps the influence, power among ordinary Lowland Scottish subjects. The Kirk was now looked upon as the true Scottish glue in a country which had no other substance to band it together. The king who looked upon subjects, in custom to be ruled by the lawes," Charles spawned a war fueled by Scottish determination and the course of everything that was to come had been irrevocably altered. And the course of everything that was to come had been irrevocably altered. The very paradigms through which people in the West evaluated their own species shifted as the looming threat of nuclearArmageddon that had hung ever present over the lives of an entire generation suddenly vanished into thin air. Everything had changed with the fall of the Soviet Union, and the course of everything that was to come had been irrevocably altered. But what caused the Soviet Union to collapse in the first place? And for that matter, how exactly has its collapse affected life in the present day? The answers to these questions vary considerably depending on who is asked.

Yet many aspects of the world as it exists today were shaped, either directly or indirectly, by the collapse of the Soviet Union. Governments rose and fell with its demise. Decades-old globes and maps of the world suddenly became obsolete as whole nations split and fragmented. Nations reunited. Theories that had been the topics of heated political, economic, and social discourse for almost a century lost their legitimacy overnight. The very paradigms through which people in the West evaluated their own species shifted as the looming threat of nuclearArmageddon that had hung ever present over the lives of an entire generation suddenly vanished into thin air. Everything had changed with the fall of the Soviet Union, and the course of everything that was to come had been irrevocably altered. But what caused the Soviet Union to collapse in the first place? And for that matter, how exactly has its collapse affected life in the present day? The answers to these questions vary considerably depending on who is asked. In the years since its collapse, countless historians, political scientists, and economists have struggled to piece together the chain of events that ultimately doomed the Soviet Union, and countless others have sought to understand the repercussions of its demise, both in terms of its immediate effects in the years thereafter and in the long-term picture of human civilization. So vast is the body of literature on these subjects that a comprehensive examination of each of them is unfeasible. Thus, the following discussion will focus on the relevant information provided in five different books: The Cold War: A New History, by John Lewis Gaddis; The World Transformed: 1945 to the Present, by Michael H. Hunt; The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, by Samuel P. Huntington; The Return of Depression Economics and the Crisis of 2008, by Paul Krugman; and The Return of History and the End of Dreams, by Robert Kagan. Through an analysis of these authors’ writings, and through a comparison of their conclusions, we will seek to understand the underlying reasons behind the Soviet Union’s collapse and the event’s lasting effects, both within Russia and in the world in general.

Before we delve too deeply into the larger reasons for the Soviet Union’s demise, a more basic question begs asking: was its collapse inevitable? Most authors seem to be in agreement that, yes, the Soviet Union’s self-destruction was bound to happen sooner or later. Krugman and Kagan both make this assertion in their respective books; Krugman describes the Soviet Union as “a sort of ramshackle affair, doomed to eventual failure,” while Gaddis...
denounces not only the Soviet Union itself, but the very ideology upon which it was founded as “a sandpile ready to slide.”2 Looking back on the events leading up to its demise, and armed with the knowledge gifted to us by the countless authors, political scientists, and others who have painstakingly pieced together the events of the U.S.S.R.’s last few years, we can come to the conclusion that its death was only a matter of time. However, as both authors also take care to point out, our modern day perception of the Soviet Union’s collapse as an inevitability is possible only because we have the benefit of hindsight. At the time, the event cannot be a tremendous shock to virtually everyone on the Western side of the Iron Curtain. Gaddis recounts the fumbling, uncertain efforts of a dumbstruck Bush administration to rework their own policies and perspectives in the wake of what was obviously a wholly unexpected turn of events. At a summit in Malta in 1989, Bush admitted to Mikhail Gorbachev that his administration had been “shaken by the rapidity of the unfolding changes” in Eastern Europe, and that he had been forced to reverse his own position “by 180 degrees”; now his only goal was “to do nothing which would lead to undermining [Gorbachev’s] position.”3

What were the factors, so obvious to the modern scholar but completely unnoticed by scholars and politicians at the time, which led to the Soviet Union’s collapse? Krugman offers explanations grounded primarily in the U.S.S.R.’s “economic woes in the last years of its existence: the hideously expensive and unproductive war in Afghanistan and the tremendous burden placed on Soviet industry by the attempts to keep up with Realism, and that he had been forced to reverse his own position “by 180 degrees”; now his only goal was “to do nothing which would lead to undermining [Gorbachev’s] position.”3
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which had humiliated the nation. When it became clear that Gorbachev did not intend to object to the report, the Hungarian government organized a ceremonial reburial of the leader of the failed uprising, whom Khruščev had ordered executed. In an equally shocking development in Poland in 1989, Lech Wałęsa, the leader of Solidarity, a banned non-communist-party-controlled labor union, was invited along with the rest of Solidarity’s representatives to participate in a national election for a new bicameral legislature. To everyone’s surprise, Wałęsa and the other members of Solidarity won by a landslide—apparently, there had been no attempt made by the Soviet authorities to rig the vote in their favor. Even more surprising, when officials in Moscow asked Wałęsa what should be done about the situation, one of Gorbachev’s top aides informed them that “this is entirely a matter to be decided by Poland.” Thus, Wałęsa’s election stood, and the first non-communist government in Eastern Europe since the end of the Second World War came to power without incident.

Given the events that took place under his watch, it is not difficult to make the argument that Gorbachev had a tremendous effect on the course of the Soviet Union during his time as Politburo chief. Additionally, given the repercussions of his actions, it could easily be argued that Gorbachev’s actions as Politburo chief finally sent the ailing U.S.S.R. spiraling into the abyss. A more difficult question to address is how Gorbachev’s actions can be interpreted. Was Gorbachev’s new position from the day he took office, Gaddis and Hunt both recount the story of how, on the night of his appointment as Politburo chief, Gorbachev lamented the state of the Soviet Union to his wife, saying, “We can’t go on living like this.” Given the near-absolute power that came with Gorbachev’s new position, it would have been a simple matter for him to sit back and enjoy the fruits of his success. Instead, he strove to solve many of the problems that he saw plaguing the Soviet Union. His efforts to bring free speech and self-determination to the Soviet people made him extremely popular in the Soviet satellite states (though he was reviled at home), and the fact that he encouraged these kinds of reforms when so many of his predecessors had violently suppressed them is truly remarkable. But his methods for achieving these reforms left much to be desired.

How exactly the fall of the Soviet Union changed the world is a difficult question to answer with any degree of certainty, largely because the answer tends to change dramatically depending on who you ask. Even when addressing the much simpler question, “How much did the fall of the Soviet Union change things?”, authors’ opinions seem to reflect the full gamut, ranging from “completely to not at all.”

Krugman and Kagan, for example, express widely different views on the lasting effects of the Soviet Union’s collapse in their respective books. In The Return of Depression Economics, Krugman depicts the fall of the Soviet Union as a paradigm-shifting event that completely and utterly destroyed the legitimacy of the principles upon which the Soviet Union had been founded. As he sees it, “this end of the era of the Soviet Union” did not merely bring an end to the oldest and most powerful of the world’s communist nations, it “destroyed the socialist dream” itself.

While Karl Marx’s ideas on socialism had not actually originated in Russia, it was nonetheless the first country to officially integrate them into (what, at least from the outside, appeared to be) an effective national system. The (apparent) success of socialism in Russia inspired countless would-be revolutionary intellectuals around the world who had become disillusioned with the capitalist system. The fact that this system not only survived the Second World War, but actually increased in power and size with the addition of the Soviet Bloc countries until it stood toe-to-toe with the very capitalist nations it opposed, was a beacon of hope to anyone who sought to overthrow the bourgeois capitalist rulers of their own countries and establish a new, socialist system in its place.

When the Soviet Union collapsed, the communist movements around the world that it had supported collapsed with it. Krugman lists several examples. Cuba, that tiny island nation a stone’s throw from American shores, had been regarded by supporters of communism as “a heroic nation, standing alone with clenched fist confronting the United States.” Once the Soviet Union fell, however, and the island home of Fidel Castro’s glorious communist revolution began to fall into disrepair, it became obvious to everyone that “the heroic stance of the past” had only been possible thanks to enormous subsidies that had been funneled into Cuba from its Soviet backers in Moscow. Another, though less romantic, example is North Korea, which, “for all its ghastliness, held a certain mystique for radicals,” er, though less romantic, example is North Korea, which, “for all its ghastliness, held a certain mystique for radicals, particularly among South Korean students.” With the loss of aid from Moscow in the wake of the U.S.S.R.’s collapse, however, and the resulting widespread starvation in the North Korean countryside, the “thrill” once provided by South Korea’s communist northern neighbors is now a thing of the past.

Everywhere, impossible dreams were suddenly becoming reality.
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As Krugman sees it, the destruction of the Soviet Union destroyed the credibility of communism itself because it destroyed the main ideological and financial backer of the entire movement. Even if advocates of communism had been able to write off the Soviet Union’s collapse as a fluke, or discredit the country’s system itself as not representing “true socialism,” the dramatic decline of so many of the communist nations that had been the U.S.S.R.’s greatest success stories made it painfully obvious to people around the world that communism was not the pinnacle of human societal development that its proponents had claimed it to be. With the loss of their movement’s greatest champion, the vast majority of those who had held socialist ideals in high esteem shifted their own views in favor of capitalism and democracy. The grand socialist experiment, so many decades in the making, had ultimately failed, and democracy rose triumphant as the uncontested champion of world politics. As far as Krugman is concerned, that’s where the story ends.

Kagan begs to differ. Where Krugman ends his discussion with the disgrace of the socialist system and the end of the Cold War, Kagan continues to trace the course of world events after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and as a result he comes to a conclusion that is the polar opposite of Krugman’s. Whereas Krugman believes that the numbers of people who embrace the values regarded as “capitalist” have been on a rapid, continuous decline since its collapse, Kagan sees no such decline, but a return to these values.

In Kagan’s view, Krugman’s worldwide paradigm shift at the end of the Cold War did indeed occur, but in the long run it has proved to be mere wishful thinking. As he puts it:

The years immediately following the end of the Cold War offered a tantalizing glimpse of a new kind of international order, with nation-states growing together or disappearing, ideological conflicts melting away, cultures intermingling, and increasingly free commerce and communications. The modern democratic world wanted to believe that the end of the Cold War did not just end one strategic and ideological conflict but all strategic and ideological conflicts. People and their leaders longed for “a world transformed.” The emphasis on this statement is on the phrase “wanted to believe.” By Kagan’s estimation, the pro-democracy, pro-union, and pro-peace rhetoric that was repeated so widely in the years immediately after the fall of the Soviet Union was not so much excitement over the changes that had already happened as it was excitement over what was expected to happen as a result of the Cold War’s end.

Given the context of the time, it is easy to see why so many people were optimistic about the future. On the Eastern side of the Iron Curtain, people were optimistic because they had finally managed to regain control of their own countries after decades of foreign rule and social oppression. On the Western side, they were excited because the country that had loomed like a dark cloud on the horizon for half a century had evaporated seemingly overnight, and, for the first time in a generation, there was no threat of a nuclear war erupting at any moment. Perhaps most significant for people on both sides of the Iron Curtain was the realization that these changes had been brought about by the people; they were brought about by the average person. This was the scenario for anyone who wanted to be a candidate in a national election, then watched in astonishment as he was sworn into office; and by the East German citizens who had picked up sledgehammers and personally dismantled the Berlin Wall with their own two hands. Everywhere, impossible dreams were suddenly becoming reality. Why should other equally impossible dreams like universal freedom and peace on Earth be off the table? In a world where the Soviet Union could be dismantled by the people, why couldn’t the whole of human aspirations seemed to be up for grabs.

But what caused the lofty ideals of the immediate post-Cold War years to be lost? A major factor was the realization that the economic hardships that the former Soviet states had endured under the old regime were not going to simply disappear with that government’s demise. Krugman recounts how Russia’s economy remained stagnant for years after the Soviet Union’s collapse, and how its leaders were unable to establish a new, functional market system from the ashes of the old, centrally organized Soviet system. In a humiliating turn of events, the nation that had once used its tremendous wealth to fund communist movements around the world was forced to turn to the United States for financial help. Playing on fears in the U.S. that Russia’s colossal stockpile of nuclear weapons might be sold to interested buyers if the economic situation became serious enough, Russia’s leaders managed to convince the United States to pressure the International Monetary Fund into lending Russia enough money to stabilize their economy until a new economic plan could be implemented—notwithstanding the fact that such a plan did not yet exist. For a time, the plan worked. Russia’s economy was still teetering on the brink of collapse, but its apparent ability to use its Cold War nuclear stockpile to acquire international aid was enough to encourage high-rolling investors who by any reckoning did not have the time and good, until the Russian government actually did try to implement an economic plan. Their solution—devaluing the ruble—quickly cascaded out of control, with the ruble becoming essentially worthless overnight. At that point, Russia’s western backers threw up their hands in disgust, refusing to throw any more money into Russia’s econ-
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omy. Even the threat of nuclear terrorism could only coerce so much funding out of a nation’s leaders.

If you found it odd that the preceding story of how the economic misery of post-collapse Soviet Russia persisted for years after the U.S.S.R.’s dissolution was recounted by the very same author who had earlier excoriately excoriated so many of the ways in which the Soviet Union’s collapse had changed the world so entirely, then you are not alone in your confusion. At first glance, Krugman’s assertions early in the book about capitalism emerging triumphant from the ashes of the Cold War seem to be directly undermined by his own story of how Russia’s economy continued to falter even after its conversion to capitalism. It is important to remember that Krugman is writing about the collapse of the Soviet Union from the perspective of an economist. As such, The Return of Depression Economics has a much stronger emphasis on the economic factors that were at play in the post-Soviet years than on the ideological shifts that were occurring at the same time. Be that as it may, Krugman nonetheless addresses the contradiction between ideology and economic reality in post-Soviet Eastern Europe. In one section he writes:

Several hundred million people who had lived under Marxist regimes suddenly became citizens of states prepared to give markets a chance. Some what surprisingly, however, this has in some ways turned out to be the least important consequence of the Soviet collapse. Contrary to what most people expected, the “transition economies” of Eastern Europe did not put anything new in the world market...only now, almost two decades after the fall of Communism, are a few countries starting to look like success stories.

As an economist, Krugman readily acknowledges that the fall of Communism did not suddenly bring financial order and stability to Eastern Europe. He simply disagrees with Kagan’s assertion that the fall of communism ultimately did nothing to change the world. Rather, Krugman sees the collapse of the Soviet Union as a dramatic first step
have connected it with Europe, but the country is no more united with Europe than it was during the Cold War. Kagan, for example notes that rather than striving for greater cooperation with its European trade partners, Russia has used its newfound leverage within Europe’s energy industry to pressure the nations of Europe into acquiescing to its demands as the major determinant of energy prices and playing individual nations against one another (and dividing the European Union against itself in the process). Huntington takes a different approach, examining instead Russia’s attempts in recent years to re-establish its economic and political connections with its former Soviet member states. Given the enthusiasm with which the people of these countries strove for independence from Russian control during the glasnost years, and the jubilation that ensued once that independence was finally achieved, one would expect that these countries would be the last places that Russia would be able to find allies in the years thereafter. However, that does not seem to have been the case. Huntington recounts how, one by one, many of the former Soviet satellite states begrudgingly turned to Russia for help once times got hard. In Moldova, for example, people had initially been excited at the end of the Cold War over the prospect of finally being reintegrated into Romania. Yet the Soviet Union’s collapse brought economic hardships to both countries and enthusiasm for reunification with Russia waned. In the end, Moldova’s situation became so bad that Moldova finally yielded to pressure from Russia and joined the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), greatly expanding trade with Russia in the process. In the years thereafter, Moldovan economic ties with Russia increased, and in the 1994 parliamentary elections in Moldova, pro-Russian candidates were elected by an overwhelming majority.
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The re-emergence of Russian control was much more dramatically accomplished in Georgia. When the Soviet Union collapsed, Georgia declared independence, and they replaced their Soviet government with a new Georgian one. But this government soon became as repressive as the old Soviet government it had replaced and it was violently overthrown. A new leader was elected, but he in turn was challenged by a separatist movement in the region of Abkhazia (a movement which, incidentally, was directly financed by Russia). Unable to defeat the separatist movement on its own, the new Georgian government was finally forced to ask Russia for military assistance. Russia agreed, on the condition that they would be allowed to establish three military bases in Georgia and to maintain these bases indefinitely. In this way, Russia thus managed to effectively conquer and occupy Georgia without a word of protest from the Georgian government.

Clearly, then, after languishing economically and politically in the last years of the Soviet Union and in the years immediately following its collapse, Russia is once again on the rise, but what implications does this have for the rest of the world? Should the West be worried about a return to the Cold War? Again, the answer seems to depend on whom you ask.

Huntington views the situation as a sign of Russia’s continuing feeling of being isolated from the West, primarily by cultural differences. As he views it, Russia has re-established its Cold War connections with the Eastern European nations largely because it has historically had more in common with these nations than it has with the rest of Europe. According to Huntington, the primary factor linking these nations (economic and military dependencies notwithstanding) is their common Orthodox heritage. The prevalence of an Orthodox belief structure in Russia and in the countries of Eastern Europe leads them to side with one another, rather than with Western Europe, when there is a need to do so. This is a reasonably plausible answer. A similar explanation could be offered for the United States’ support of Israel over the course of its existence.

On a cultural level, the United States feel compelled to defend Israel because of its status as a tiny bastion of (mostly) Western civilization in a region otherwise filled entirely with Muslim nations. Of course, the Israeli analogy also applies in another context: it is an invaluable strategic ally in a region where military support for Western operations would otherwise be uncertain at best. From this perspective, by expanding its influence into its neighboring countries, Russia is “creating a bloc with an Orthodox heartland under its leadership and a surrounding buffer of relatively weak Islamic states.” If the map of Russia’s expanding sphere of influence bears an uncanny resemblance to its own Soviet holdings, Huntington says that this is because many of the countries in proximity to Russia also share cultural and political ties with Russia, in much the same way that the nations of Europe (once they grew tired of killing each other) decided to form a union of the various nations in the region that shared a common general culture. Russia’s new ties with its neighbors, as Huntington sees it, is not a prelude to a second Cold War, but more of an effort by Russia to re-establish—in its own, distinctively Russian way—its own little clique of like-minded friends.

Kagan is not convinced, however. He sees the

Everything had changed with the fall of the Soviet Union, and the course of everything that was to come had been irrevocably altered.
I believe this fear of a return to the Cold War is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of what the Russian people want. Russia has always been a proud, independent nation—not truly European, but not Asian either—and it has never been more successful than it was during the years of the Soviet Union. Granted, the Soviet years brought a great deal of hardship and oppression to the Russian people, but hardship and oppression have always been a part of Russian life, and Russians pride themselves on their ability to endure what other peoples could not. The Soviet Union was by no means a perfect system, but in terms of national prestige, there has never been a greater era in Russian history. That this greatness came at the expense of individual freedoms was an unfortunate side effect of the Soviet system. It is doubtful that any Russian who was alive during the Soviet years would want a return to totalitarianism, but some aspects of the old Soviet system—standing toe-to-toe with the arrogant nations of the West, for example—are nonetheless quite appealing. If the elements of the Soviet system that made Russia powerful and respected could be replicated in the modern system, without a return to totalitarianism of the old days, then that would be ideal. This, I believe, is what modern Russians actually want: not to return to the Soviet way of life, but to regain the international respect they lost those many years ago, when the Soviet Union fell.

25 Ibid., 13.
Confucian Virtue

Kongzi (551 – 479 BCE), known in the West as Confucius, developed a comprehensive system of ethics, a philosophy that influenced—at least to some extent—all subsequent Chinese thought. Essential Confucian texts, such as the Five Classics and the Analects, have been rewritten, amended, and augmented over time, not only by ensuing scholars who built and expanded upon Confucian ideas, but also by government influences. The Qin dynasty’s (221 – 207 BCE) emphasis on imperial standardization established a long-lasting legacy. Everything from weights, measurements, currencies, roads, and, most importantly, the written language were simplified and standardized. The newly standardized writing system instituted a single, state-sponsored system of Chinese characters for the entire empire.1 That standardization allowed scholars access to many more documents and texts; it also allowed scholars to more easily disseminate their own writings. Yet, in order to prevent philosophical fragmentation and political dissidence, the First Emperor heavily regulated what was written. He protected and preserved Legalist texts, as well as histories of the feudal Qin state, but he destroyed most other histories, as well as most philosophical writings (including important Confucian works). Practical books, covering useful topics such as medicine, agriculture, and divination were spared from destruction.2 Despite widespread annihilation, scholars managed to restore many of the classic texts in the later Han period. Harold Tanner points out that:

one of the fundamental cultural acts of the Han dynasty was to reconstruct the classical texts of the Zhou period. . . . During the Western Han, scholars wrote down the classics as recited from memory by older scholars. These versions came to be referred to as the “New Text” versions of the classics because they were written in the style of Chinese character current during the Han. In the late Western Han, alternative versions of a number of the classics appeared. These versions, said to have been discovered hidden in the walls of houses (including the walls of Confucius’ old home in Shandong province), were written in the archaic Chinese characters of the late Zhou, and thus were called the “Old Text” versions. There were significant discrepancies between the New Text and Old Text versions of the Zhou classical texts, as well as differences between alternative New Text versions of the same classic. During the Eastern Han, the government would attempt to resolve textual (and philosophical) discrepancies by commissioning and adopting a single New Text version. Although the Han state would not destroy documents wholesale, it would significantly alter them in order to coordinate competing ideas into a comprehensive philosophy. Despite such discrepancies, basic Confucian morality (or the core Confucian virtues) remained more or less consistent, revolving around several basic virtues, which, taken together, made up the much higher and much broader (perhaps supreme) ideal of Goodness. Even scholars who approached fundamentally break with Kongzi over the inherent goodness or wickedness of human nature, the effectiveness of ethical education, or the reciprocal role of cosmology and human activity (i.e., the development of correlative thinking) retained most of the traditional Confucian virtues.3

Bryan Van Norden identifies seven main virtues present in classic Confucian texts: the lesser virtues of righteousness, dutifulness, trustworthiness, courage, humility, and wisdom, along with the “higher” virtue of goodness. In order to be considered “Good,” one must possess the lesser virtues. Yet, no one virtue is alone sufficient to render a person “Good.”4 Kongzi posits such questions as “(1) What is it to live well? (2) What traits of character (virtues) does one need to live well? (3) What is human nature like (such that one can live well and have the virtues?)? (4) How can one cultivate the virtues (given what human nature is like?)?” This idea of Confucian virtue is essential to Eastern Han dynasty thought to be, rather than “what a person ought to do”—the very foundation of a comprehensive system of virtue ethics.5 For Kongzi, living well meant deriving happiness and simple pleasures from daily life.6 He was concerned with the physical world rather than with a spiritual afterlife. This focus on life rather than death is illustrated in the following passage from the Analects: “Tzu-lu asked how one should serve ghosts and spirits. The Master said, ‘Till you have learnt to serve men, how can you serve spirits? Tzu-lu then ventured upon a question about the dead. The Master said, ‘Till you know about the living, how are you to know about the dead?’”

Further, living well meant possessing several virtues, which together constructed a good or “gentlemanly” character. Kongzi’s primary virtue, ren, in fact translates as “goodness” or “humaneness,” and it manifests itself primarily in one’s compassion for other people.7 Wisdom is another important virtue, and falls just below goodness. Van Norden explains, “One must be Good, which entails caring about the well-being of others, but caring is not enough. One must also be wise, which involves being able to recognize who is upright and who is corrupt. Without Goodness, one lacks the proper motivation; without wisdom, one lacks the skill to achieve one’s goal.”8 Humility is necessary in order to avoid being overly critical; if one is humble, one is able to admit when one is wrong.9 Other important virtues include an appreciation of ritual or proper conduct (li); trustworthiness (xin); loyalty or dutifulness (zhong); filial piety (xiao); sincerity or honesty (yin); and righteousness (yi).10

Han scholars built their own philosophical creation myth, which would heavily influence and unite subsequent generations of Chinese peoples . . . .

6 David Christian argues that the creation myth can be thought of as “a coherent story about the past.” Further, “creation myths provide universal coordinates within which people can imagine their own existence and find a role in the larger scheme of things. Creation myths are powerful because they speak to our deep spiritual, psychic, and social need for a place of existence and a sense of belonging.” It is with this in mind—Christian’s idea of the creation myth as a unifying story which satiates the need for a sense of place within existence—that the term “creation myth” is used here. See David Christian, Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 2-3.
7 Tanner, 89.
8 Ibid., 89-91.
9 Ibid., 126-127.

10 Xunzi, Mencius, and Dong Zhongshu, respectively, differed from Kongzi on these very issues while simultaneously defending Confucian unity of purpose and approach.11 Bryan W. Van Norden, Introduction to Classical Chinese Philosophy (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2011), 38-43.
12 Ibid., 36.
16 Ibid., 40.
17 Ibid., 41.
18 Ibid., 25, 42, 265-271.
Expounded mainly in the Analects, Confucian virtue became sacred. Young students and “all educated people” began to memorize passages from the Analects in an attempt to learn how to live the Good life. Many of those passages became proverbial sayings, unconsciously memorized and repeated by illiterate peasants. Confucian virtues, then, became culturally ingrained ethical mores that cut across every social class, and guided the values and thoughts of the Chinese people for hundreds of years.19

Qin and Han government attempts to destroy, alter, reconstitute, or otherwise regulate classic, philosophically, religious, and political texts were political and cultural efforts to completely quell (or, at the very least, control) the developm, recompose, or otherwise regulate classic, philosophi-
ter, ingrained ethical mores.

A major source of strength was the heart of the state in the Wei Valley, protected by nearly impenetrable mountain ranges.20 These natural geographic defenses, combined with the advantages of an efficiently run Legalist government, an economically viable system of sustained agriculture, and a technologically advanced army, allowed Qin to “sweep aside” her neighbors as little as twenty-five years.21

The Legalist school exercised near-total political power during the Qin dynasty. The Confucian idea of in- stilling virtue through education was thoroughly rejected. Although it was acknowledged that ethical education was not impossible, it was seen as improbable; Legalists ar-gued that, because humans cared little for virtue and even less for the public good (as humans were seen as being pri-marily self-interested), the government must compel rul-ers and citizens alike to act for the public good. Legalists emphasized the potency of a centralized bureaucracy, gov-erned by a coherently written legal code. They believed that rulers must manipulate the “two handles of govern-ment” (i.e., rewards and punishments) in order to bring about and maintain stability and peace.22

Although Confucianism was by no means itself a religion, it did provide a comprehen-sive system of virtue ethics, which made the philosophy similarly influential on a similarly personal level.

This moral system fulfilled a profound need for a shared social, cultural, and political story in the wake of so much fragmentation.

Legalist-Confucian Amalgam

The state of Qin comprised lands repossessed from nomadic Rong invaders, lands that united to form a state.

The state of Qin comprised lands repossessed from nomadic Rong invaders, lands that united to form a state.23

This moral system filled a profound need for a shared social, cultural, and political story in the wake of so much fragmentation.
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by no means itself a religion, it did provide a comprehen-
sive system of virtue and inherent goodness versus the temptation to answer. Confucian virtue established a tradition (or inaction) are questions that every creation myth has at-tempted to answer. Confucian virtue established a tradition of transcendent values and inherent goodness versus the pull of action.23

The state of Qin comprised lands repossessed from nomadic Rong invaders, lands that united to form a state.

The state of Qin comprised lands repossessed from nomadic Rong invaders, lands that united to form a state.

23 Tanner, 90-91; Buckley-Ebrey, 51-53.
24 Tanner, 84.
26 Fairbank, 62.
28 Fairbank, 62.
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that affected all echelons of society." It is this inclination toward philosophical, social, and cultural cohesion that is so astonishing—especially in the face of pronounced geographic, ethnic, and economic diversity. Even after the disintegration of the Han dynasty, there appeared to be an "invertebrate Chinese impulse...toward political reunification," perhaps reflecting not only the desire for peace and stability, but also a desire for storied cultural cohesion.

**Correlative Thinking**

There was a Daoist strain of correlative thinking embodied in the Legalist-Confucian amalgam, which still survives in China's philosophical creation myth. Dong Zongshu believed "the virtues and vices of the ruler would affect all echelons of society." It is this inclination toward philosophical, social, and cultural cohesion that is so astonishing—especially in the face of pronounced geographic, ethnic, and economic diversity. Even after the disintegration of the Han dynasty, there appeared to be an "invertebrate Chinese impulse...toward political reunification," perhaps reflecting not only the desire for peace and stability, but also a desire for storied cultural cohesion.

There was a Daoist strain of correlative thinking embodied in the Legalist-Confucian amalgam, which still survives in China's philosophical creation myth. Dong Zongshu believed “the virtues and vices of the ruler would affect all echelons of society.” It is this inclination toward philosophical, social, and cultural cohesion that is so astonishing—especially in the face of pronounced geographic, ethnic, and economic diversity. Even after the disintegration of the Han dynasty, there appeared to be an “invertebrate Chinese impulse...toward political reunification,” perhaps reflecting not only the desire for peace and stability, but also a desire for storied cultural cohesion.

31 Van Norden, 205.
30 Fairbank, 47.
32 Buckley-Ebrey, 59.
33 Van Norden, 205.
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The Serfs

The landlords

The landlords (or specifically, those putting forth this statute) were part of the landholding class as holders of property, a requirement in order to sit in Parliament. As a member of the House of Commons, he would have been required to front his own travel expenses and was required to live off a certain amount of generated income since the position offered no pay. The House of Commons was not exactly “common” in the present-day sense. It is important to recognize that these Parliament-men were not the same men as the future rebels; they were their enemies. The men in Parliament represented an increasing attempt at a more centralized and less localized government - a government many of the rebels saw as an interference. The Statute of Laborers was an economic attempt to control the new class of workers that had risen up after the “pestilence.” The landholding class saw these workers as men attempting to upset the natural order of things with their demand for higher wages. The old medieval economy was shifting, and landlords were naturally trying to do what they could to hold to an older, more traditional (and more profitable) economy.

The Lumpen Laws of 1363 were similar in intention.2 These laws sought to prescribe certain types of dress and prohibit others depending on social class. We can glean from the existence of these laws as well that significant instances of upward social mobility were taking in a world where the medieval economy and legal system simply could not (or would not) keep up. In 1348 when the Black Death came to England and decimated such a significant portion of the population, the very nature of society changed. Though death tolls vary from source to source, it is seen that roughly one-third of the population died. These laws sought to prescribe certain types of dress and prohibit others depending on social class. We can glean from the existence of these laws as well that significant instances of upward social mobility were taking in a world where the medieval economy and legal system simply could not (or would not) keep up. In 1348 when the Black Death came to England and decimated such a significant portion of the population, the very nature of society changed. Though death tolls vary from source to source, it is seen that roughly one-third of the population died. These laws sought to prescribe certain types of dress and prohibit others depending on social class. We can glean from the existence of these laws as well that significant instances of upward social mobility were taking place. Those who previously could not afford expensive clothes were now able to because they could afford to carve out a new place for themselves in a society with a low population and a new demand for labor. The landlords and magnates felt threatened enough by these new social developments to make legal and aesthetic distinctions between what constituted a nobleman and what constituted a peasant. The class-based tensions would continue to get worse in the years leading up to the Rebellion.
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E B L I E N N S  A R E  N O T  A L W A Y S  R A D I C A L ,  a n d  a r i s i n g  i s  n o t  n e c e s s a r i l y  a n  a s s a u l t .  T h e  P e a s a n t  R e b e l l i o n  o f 1 3 8 1  w a s  a n  s u c h  a n  e v e n t .  T h e  p e a s a n t s  w h o  r e b e l l e d  t h e  f o u r t e e n t h  c e n t u r y  w o u l d  n o t  h a v e  s e e n  t h e m s e l v e s  a s  r a d i c a l s  a n d  m o s t  w e  r e  n o t  g a n g s  o f  r a m p a g i n g  l o o t e r s  o n  a r o n d  r a n c e  s m i r e .  M o s t  r e b e l s  w e r e  m e n  i n  t h e  s u c c e s s  o f  s o c i e t y  w i t h  p r o m i n e n t  p o s i t i o n s  i n  t h e i r  c o m m u n i t i e s  a n d  w e r e  n o t  m e r e l y  g r o u p s  o f  w o u l d - b e  t h e e v e n  t h e  “ p e a s a n t ”  t e n d s  t o  g i v e  u s  t h e  i m p r e s s i o n  t h a t  t h e  s m a l l - m i n d e d  f a m e r s ( o r  s e r f s ) t r y i n g  t o  t r i g g e r  t h e  r e v o l v e  a t h o m e s e l f s  o u t  o f  a n  u n f o r g o i n g  c o u n t r y - s i d e .  H o w e v e r ,  t h e s e  “ p e a s a n t s ”  w e r e  n o t  s o  s i m p l e ,  a n d  i n  f a c t ,  m a n y  o f  t h e m  c a n  h a r d l y  b e  c a l l e d  p e a s a n t s  a t  a l l .  

W h e n  w e  s t u d y  t h e  h i s t o r y  b e h i n d  t h e  e v e n t s  o f 1 3 8 1 ,  w e  c a n  l e a r n  s i g n i f i c a n t l y  m o r e  a b o u t  w h y  t h e s e  r e b e l s  f e l t  t h a t  t h e y  w e r e  r e p r e s s e d ,  w h o  w a s  d o i n g  t h e  r e p r e s s i n g ,  a n d  t h e  n a t u r e  o f  t h e  r e b e l s  t h e m s e l v e s .  

T h e  r e b e l l i o n  i n 1 3 8 1  w a s  t h e  s p a r k  a n d  c u l m i n a t i o n  o f  d i s c o n t e n t ,  b u t  t h e  l e v e l  o f  i n s t a b i l i t y  i n  E n g l i s h  s o c i e t y  h a d  b e e n  t r e n d i n g  u p w a r d  f o r  s o m e  t i m e  b e f o r e  t h e  f i r s t  o u t b r e a k s  o f  r e v o l t  w e r e  e v e r  r e p o r t e d .  T h e  s o c i a l  l a n d s c a p e  o f  t h e  f o u r t e e n t h  c e n t u r y  w a s  e v o l v i n g  r a p i d l y  p r o t e s s i o n  o f  p o o r ,  s i m p l e - m i n d e d  f a m e r s ( o r  s e r f s ) t r y i n g  t o  w r i t e  t h e m s e l v e s  a l i v e  i n  a n  u n f o r g o i n g  c o u n t r y - s i d e .  H o w e v e r ,  t h e  “ p e a s a n t s ”  w e r e  n o t  s o  s i m p l e ,  a n d  i n  f a c t ,  m a n y  o f  t h e m  c a n  h a r d l y  b e  c a l l e d  p e a s a n t s  a t  a l l .  

W h e n  w e  s t u d y  t h e  h i s t o r y  b e h i n d  t h e  e v e n t s  o f 1 3 8 1 ,  w e  c a n  l e a r n  s i g n i f i c a n t l y  m o r e  a b o u t  w h y  t h e s e  r e b e l s  f e l t  t h a t  t h e y  w e r e  r e p r e s s e d ,  w h o  w a s  d o i n g  t h e  r e p r e s s i n g ,  a n d  t h e  n a t u r e  o f  t h e  r e b e l s  t h e m s e l v e s .  

T h e  r e b e l l i o n  i n 1 3 8 1  w a s  t h e  s p a r k  a n d  c u l m i n a t i o n  o f  d i s c o n t e n t ,  b u t  t h e  l e v e l  o f  i n s t a b i l i t y  i n  E n g l i s h  s o c i e t y  h a d  b e e n  t r e n d i n g  u p w a r d  f o r  s o m e  t i m e  b e f o r e  t h e  f i r s t  o u t b r e a k s  o f  r e v o l t  w e r e  e v e r  r e p o r t e d .  T h e  s o c i a l  l a n d s c a p e  o f  t h e  f o u r t e e n t h  c e n t u r y  w a s  e v o l v i n g  r a p i d l y  


The Rebellion was a violent, targeted declaration that the government had gone too far...
the landholding class would not have been eager to grant these exemptions, and it is worth noting that after the Commons’ Petition in 1377, no further exemptions on royal patent rolls are recorded between 1377 and 1381.13 The goal of the petition in denying these exemptions was artistic and economic. But the resistance to it may have helped to contribute to furthering frustrations on the part of those who were appealing to Domesday.

The Free Englishman

Serfs were a factor in the Rising of 1381. Like the rest of the peasant class, many were chafing at the bit of their social limitations. However, most of the rebels that participated in the rural part of the Rebellion in 1381 were not serfs. In fact, in Kent, perhaps the most famous staging area, the majority of the rebels were not serfs. While local mis-treatment and injustice in part explain servile grievances that were appealing to Domesday.14

Looking again at constitutive legislation like the 1351 Statute of Laborers, one can see the economic position of the rural peasantry (free and unfree) was improving significantly before 1381. Some of these men were actually on the fringes of the gentry. Many of the southern rebels had an income between £5 and £25. 15 While local mis-treatment and injustice in part explain grievances that were crucial elements in the events of 1381, what were the specific criticisms of the free Englishmen?16

The New Class of Peasants

This new class of peasants that was poised to take its place in the rural risings was not composed of men on the fringes of society. It is clear from later proceedings that most of the participants were comfortably wealthy peasants and not the very poor. Furthermore, those who did take part in the rebellion often had held position in local government or prominent positions in their social hierarchy. John Philip of Suffolk from the earlier example did take part in the rebellion often had held position in local government and was comfortable at best and extremely agitated at worst the way it is in the present day. Taxes were meant to be levied for the defense of the realm, and the biggest problem with the poll tax in the eyes of the peasantry was not necessarily that it was expensive, but that the realm was not being properly defended. Throughout most of the fourteenth century and well into the fifteenth, England was engaged in the Hundred Years’ War with France. Wars were, to say the least, expensive. If taxes were for defense, the peasantry was uncomfortable at best and extremely agitated at worst at the idea of paying for the Black Prince to wage war in France while the coast of England itself was not secure from French pirates. The fact that many peasants were unwilling to pay the poll tax aggravated the already tense situation with the landlords and the House of Commons.

The Poll Tax of 1381

In September of 1380, rebellion broke out in Salisbury. By 1381, the rising had spread throughout England. As we can see, the tension between peasants and landlords had been building for some time. The Poll Tax of 1381 is commonly cited as the primary grievance of the rebels during the Rising, but the poll tax was only a catalyst for underlying social issues. The real problem with the poll tax was that it was a flat tax; everyone had to pay it, and poorer people were disproportionately affected. Furthermore, the tax was in effect and had to be levied. Taxation was not an accepted part of the common, shared experience the way it is in the present day. Taxes were meant to be levied for the defense of the realm, and the biggest problem with the poll tax in the eyes of the peasantry was not necessarily that it was expensive, but that the realm was not being properly defended. Throughout most of the fourteenth century and well into the fifteenth, England was engaged in the Hundred Years’ War with France. Wars were, to say the least, expensive. If taxes were for defense, the peasantry was uncomfortable at best and extremely agitated at worst at the idea of paying for the Black Prince to wage war in France while the coast of England itself was not secure from French pirates. The fact that many peasants were unwilling to pay the poll tax aggravated the already tense situation with the landlords and the House of Commons.

Given the fact that the peasants were using their newfound wealth to hire lawyers to argue for their rights in court and buy land, it is important to note that just because a legislation was deemed necessary, these same landlords felt the peasantery could afford to pay a poll tax. It is a valid argument on the part of the Commons, and it is worth noting that the fight against the poll tax was not really about the money. For the first time in English history, the peasants and serfs had money. Those who were the most vocal against the government during the rebellion were drawn from the wealthier peasants, not the poorest. These men wanted their say. It was about what the government was doing or rather not doing, with the money. The Rebellion was a violent, targeted declaration that the government had gone too far in their pecuniary extraction without living up to contemporary definitions of responsible government.

Wat Tyler and the Rebels’ Demands

On June 14th, 1381, Wat Tyler presented the demands of the rebels to King Richard II. He required there should henceforth be no law except the law of Winchester.17 The desire for the return to this law is significant, because among other things, it stated: that every man have in his house arms for keeping the peace in accordance with the ancient assize; that every man between fifteen years and sixty be assessed and sworn to arms according the amount of his lands and chattels...and in each hundred and liberty let two constables be chosen to make the view of arms: and the aforesaid constables shall, when the justices assigned to this come to the district, present before them the defaults they have found in arms, in watch-keeping, and in highways... And the justices assigned shall present again to the king in each parliament and the king will provide a remedy therefor.18

14 See Dyer, “Social and Economic Background to the Revolt of 1381.”
15 Ibid., 21, 35.
17 Ibid., 36.
18 Ibid., 38.
When Wat Tyler, as the leader of the rebels, demanded a return to this Winchester law, he was suggesting that was what was laid out in the statute should be all the interaction any community should have with the royal government. The rebels would have found the idea of a return to a community-based system extremely appealing after years of what they saw as unnecessary government interference through excessive fines by local lords, injustices in the court system, and the poll tax. The statute would have meant that the community only called upon the national government to execute all lawyers, escheators and others who had been trained in the law or dealt in the law because of their office. He believed that once all those learned in the law had been killed, all things would henceforward be regulated by the decrees of the common people.21 Watching the uprising in London, the bishopric of Walsingham was certainly not interested in the demands of the rebels. However, considering Tyler’s other demands, we can see that there may be some truth to these words, and that a request for a commission like this might not have been out of the realm of possibility; the rebels were demanding English justice, and that meant a just king. Tyler also demanded that “Holy Church ought not to be in the power of Holy church but these should have their sustenance easily and the rest of the goods be divided between the parishioners; and that there should be no bishop in England but one.”22 While referring to Canterbury as the singular bishopric, this demand also implies that there were similar feelings by other religious courts. Church courts were said to be more oppressive than lay courts, which was an issue that went back further than the Constitutions of Clarendon and the reign of Henry II.23 The demand for equality is part of a greater demand for justice. He believed the king’s justice should be free and of one condition.24 While serfs participated in the rural rebellion and certainly desired their freedom from local landlords, being free also had an alternate meaning. The rebels wanted their own independence and the ability to pursue their own livelihood without undue interference from a distant royal government. This was freedom in the most traditional English sense. Rural English rebels wanted the national government to intervene in local affairs only if the locality was suffering from an economic deficit or if its justice system needed to be rectified. They were not interested in being constricted by the Statute of Laborers or the Summons to Deliver Walle.25 Wat Tyler wanted a return to the poll tax. The demands made by Wat Tyler on behalf of the rebels, though radical at first glance, actually show that the Rising was conservative and traditional in nature. The rebels wanted a return to the old, community-based system upon which the Statute of Winchester was based. The rebels specified a return to the old ways, which were perceived as better. The idea of returning to an older golden age would become the blueprint for nearly all future English “revolutions.” The rural rebels resented the government’s intrusion into their lives and what they perceived as an abuse of power, and their specific choice of targets represent this hostile sentiment. The urban rebellion is different in some ways; the lower classes in the cities did not share precisely the same economic membership. Both landlords, the price of food, work, and land-based serfsdom. However, we will see that the mentality of the rebels in the city and the countryside shared some common characteristics. Both sets of rebels were moderately wealthy, moving up in society, and in fact, many of them could hardly be called peasants at all.

Thomas Walsingham, Historia Anglicana, in The Peasants’ Revolt of 1381, ed. Dobson, 177.
26 Ibid.

The Urban Rebellion

These “peasants” were not so simple, and in fact, many of them came to a community-based system extremely appealing after years of what they saw as unnecessary government interference through excessive fines by local lords, injustices in the court system, and the poll tax. The statute could not provide all the interactions that were laid out in the statute should be all the interaction any community should have with the royal government. The rebels would have found the idea of a return to a community-based system extremely appealing after years of what they saw as unnecessary government interference through excessive fines by local lords, injustices in the court system, and the poll tax. The statute would have meant that the community only called upon the national government to execute all lawyers, escheators and others who had been trained in the law or dealt in the law because of their office. He believed that once all those learned in the law had been killed, all things would henceforward be regulated by the decrees of the common people.21 Watching the uprising in London, the bishopric of Walsingham was certainly not interested in the demands of the rebels. However, considering Tyler’s other demands, we can see that there may be some truth to these words, and that a request for a commission like this might not have been out of the realm of possibility; the rebels were demanding English justice, and that meant a just king. Tyler also demanded that “Holy Church ought not to be in the power of Holy church but these should have their sustenance easily and the rest of the goods be divided between the parishioners; and that there should be no bishop in England but one.”22 While referring to Canterbury as the singular bishopric, this demand also implies that there were similar feelings by other religious courts. Church courts were said to be more oppressive than lay courts, which was an issue that went back further than the Constitutions of Clarendon and the reign of Henry II.23 The demand for equality is part of a greater demand for justice. He believed the king’s justice should be free and of one condition.24 While serfs participated in the rural rebellion and certainly desired their freedom from local landlords, being free also had an alternate meaning. The rebels wanted their own independence and the ability to pursue their own livelihood without undue interference from a distant royal government. This was freedom in the most traditional English sense. Rural English rebels wanted the national government to intervene in local affairs only if the locality was suffering from an economic deficit or if its justice system needed to be rectified. They were not interested in being constricted by the Statute of Laborers or the Summons to Deliver Walle.25 Wat Tyler wanted a return to the poll tax. The demands made by Wat Tyler on behalf of the rebels, though radical at first glance, actually show that the Rising was conservative and traditional in nature. The rebels wanted a return to the old, community-based system upon which the Statute of Winchester was based. The rebels specified a return to the old ways, which were perceived as better. The idea of returning to an older golden age would become the blueprint for nearly all future English “revolutions.” The rural rebels resented the government’s intrusion into their lives and what they perceived as an abuse of power, and their specific choice of targets represent this hostile sentiment. The urban rebellion is different in some ways; the lower classes in the cities did not share precisely the same economic membership. Both landlords, the price of food, work, and land-based serfsdom. However, we will see that the mentality of the rebels in the city and the countryside shared some common characteristics. Both sets of rebels were moderately wealthy, moving up in society, and in fact, many of them could hardly be called peasants at all.

The Urban Rebellion

The introduction of Dobson’s edited volume suggests that the rebels in urban society only took advantage of the rural rising to further their own particular aims, but that is not the case. Like in rural England, there had been significant demographic change in the urban centers during the post-plague years. The mortality rate was significantly higher in the cities (estimates put the death toll closer to 50% in urban areas an even higher in some cases) and so the towns had to deal with replacements for positions, changes in rent, services, and a new demand for labor just as many new opportunities for the lower classes to rise through the ranks, the--thereby creating a new class of wealthier commoners who were gradually becoming frustrated with their over- lords. The main difference was in the cities was the existence of a wealthy merchant oligarchy as opposed to rich landlords or magnates, but in some ways the social struggle was similar. Furthermore, there was not as much of a disconnect between urban centers and the rural countryside as many historians have often assumed.

Those who initially study medieval English history often assume that individual communities were extremely isolated. While lows, customs, and treatment often varied from parish to parish, and while it is sometimes difficult to identify with their own community rather than the concept of “England,” there was actually a great deal of interaction between townspeople and rural citizens. People would come into the towns to trade, visit fairs, and to stay in inns. Rural artisans would also apprentice their children to urban craftsmen. Townspeople often invested in rural

23 Thomas Walsingham, Historia Anglicana, in The Peasants’ Revolt of 1381, ed. Dobson, 177.
26 Ibid.
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hgs. All of these ventures required interaction and conversation between different groups of people, and it makes sense that they would have talked politics. If we remember that most of the men who fought in the rebellion were moderately well-off and at least somewhat educated for the period, we can comfortably assume that the state of affairs of the realm would have at least occasionally entered common discussion. After all, wars affect trade, and trade and money were what motivated many of these men to travel to the towns from the countryside and vice versa in the first place. Furthermore, the regular taxes levied by the Crown in this period were the great equalizer among the urban and rural population. The servants of the Crown were often considered a common enemy. The Great Rumour of 1377 is a good example of the potential interaction between rural and urban; rural tenants would have needed to acquire royal writs and patents under the Great Seal and hire lawyers, and they would have needed to travel to do so. With towns so widespread there was a great deal of concern that the process was too widespread and that there was greater trouble in the House of Commons. The news would have easily travelled the kingdom.

We know that the rebels living in the urban centers would have heard and understood the complaints of the rural rebels, but what about their own grievances? The evidence that is left to historians for understanding the causes of the urban rising is much more difficult to decipher. Much of it is left by chroniclers like Edward Walsingham, and as we have seen, his testimony must be treated as somewhat suspect because of his contemptuous view of the rebels. Most of the remaining documents that have survived come from indictments from local jurors compiled by royal clerks after the rebellion took place, and are thus also suspicious due to the allegiance of the clerks. In order to attempt to discover some of the motives behind the urban rebels’ actions, this section will see two centers of urban activity during the Rising of 1381.

York

King Richard II considered the northern boroughs dangerous, and perhaps rightfully so. After Wat Tyler’s death, the king sent letters patent instructing the boroughs to prohibit illegal assembly of any sort. 29 In an appeal for a writ to Grant burgesses in Beverley in 1382, Richard wrote, “From the uncertainty of good government, many insolences are committed among the inhabitants and commons of cities and towns, evils arise as well as scandals; and peacefull rule is disturbed by the occurrence of divers kind of dangers.” 30 York was an enormous urban center with a large population during this period, and in many ways the London of the north. Historians have written before that if there were ever any possibility of transferring the political capital, it would have been to York. 31 After the Revolt, York became the third borough in the kingdom to receive county status. According to R. B. Dobson, editor of the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381, the city became increasingly autonomous throughout the fourteenth century and maintained a legal authority to manage the affairs of the city. In the period leading up to the Revolt, urban populations everywhere were gradually becoming frustrated by a controlling oligarchy that was increasingly tampering with their livelihood, and York was no exception.

When we look at one of the major documents from the Rebellion in York, it can almost be read as merely a band of armed men looting the local Guildhall. However, this outbreak of resistance was embarked upon on a far bigger scale, targeted one very specific individual. According to a Parliamentary Petition in November-December of 1380, 32

31 Beverley corporation Archives, Town Cartulary, fol. 17b, in Dobson, 112.

men chased the elected mayor, John de Gysburn, from the city and “forcibly broke down by means of their axes and other arms the doors and windows of their Guildhall, entered it and made a certain Simon de Quixlay swear to be their mayor - against his will and that of the good men of the city.” 32 The petition writes that these events took place against Quixlay’s will and that of the “good men of the city;” but given who is presenting the petition and the position we know the House of Commons has traditionally taken against the rebels, this statement is suspect. It is worth noting that the rebels forced their way into the Guildhall on the 26th of November did not engage in a riotous, looting rampage of the city, but very specifically targeted the former mayor, de Gysburn. We also must consider the state of affairs in urban centers during the risings in 1381. Many people in York were frustrated with the wealthy merchant oligarchy, and the deposed mayor would have been part of that group. His forcible deposition speaks to the mentality of the rising as a whole.

Of further interest is the fact that part of the petition includes a request for a writ demanding that the bailiffs of York respect the previous, original mayor, John de Gysburn, under a penalty. Item, a writ should be sent to the bailiffs, good men and all the commonalty of the said city, commanding them to respect the said John, their mayor, as the person who represents the state of our lord king in the said city, under penalty of forfeiting their goods, chattels, and everything else.

And the king wills that a proclamation to this effect should be made within the city so that no one can excuse himself by ignorance, etc. 33

This section of the petition informs us of two things. Primaƣly, it could easily indicate that the bailiffs of York were, in fact, supporting Quixlay, and had to be ordered to support the original, elected mayor. Again, this speaks to the nature of the Rising as a whole. The people participating were not the common rabble, but rather prominent, often elected officials taking part in an overthrow of social structure. But, we also should not forget that the petition requests that a writ be sent to “all the commonalty of the said city,” implying that more were interested in replacing de Gysburn than the petition had initially implied when it suggested that Quixlay was put in place against the will of the “good men of the city.” The request for a writ indicates that the attack on the Guildhall may have had widespread support, and this is supported by the fact that even though he was ordered to step down, Quixlay was elected mayor of York the following year. 34

Scarborough

While significantly smaller than York, the northern port town of Scarborough still had a role to play in the Rising of 1381. According to King’s Bench records, the news of the rebellion in the south inspired the rising in Scarborough. Robert Galoun was designated the leader of the local rebels, which numbered at least 500. Like the other prominent rebels all over England, Galoun was wealthy - he had enough money to found a perpetual chantry in the local parish church the year before. 35 The rebel leader’s

34 R. B. Dobson, “The Riots at York: Elsewhere in England,” in The Peasants’ Revolt of 1381, ed. Dobson, 284. Quixlay had support from the lesser craftsmen of the city, and was elected mayor in February of 1381. The nature of his support further reinforces the argument that the previous mayor, de Gysburn, had not attracted the support of the up-and-coming lower classes. In 1381, de Gysburn and his followers attacked Bootham Bar and attempted to reassert political power. De Gysburn and his men were accorded city status in November of 1382, the city was required to pay a fine of 1,000 marks for a general pardon.
The Peasant Rebellion of 1381

The Peasant Rebellion of 1381 tells us some important things about the mind of the politically active medieval Englishman. Almost all that participated in the rebellion were a new class of moderately wealthy, intelligent, politically active peasants that did not live on the fringe of society with nothing to lose. We see here that even if a rebel was a rural serf, he was gradually gaining the opportunity to be wealthy after the Black Death. Rebellions from both urban centers and the countryside often felt they shared a common bond. Rural peasants had to contend with a somewhat different situation with local landlords and magistrates regarding food prices and a land-based economy, but both free and unfree were frustrated with the constraints placed upon them by their social superiors in the government and urban settings. As peasants all over England found themselves capable of gaining wealth in ways that had not been open to them before the plague decimated the population, landlords and the urban wealthy were in a panic to cling to their traditional roles. The entire structure of society threatened to shift in the mid-fourteenth century, and legislation like the Statute of Laborers and the Sumptuary Laws proved that the rebels were trying their hardest to make sure nothing changed.

The backlash against government imposition is the real essence of the risings in 1381. The government attempted to tempt peasants’ livelihoods in parliament, and whatever differences existed among all of the communities and between urban centers and the countryside, the rebels were all loosely committed to the idea that the king’s men were not doing their sworn duty to protect the realm and administer justice. The Rolls go on to declare that the Scarborough rebels “foliously took” and Scarborough rising took us to the point where they felt that they were not performing their duties properly.
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A Broad and Sweeping Federal Power: Birmingham Barbecue and Southern Culture in the Crosshairs of the Commerce Clause

Nicholas C. Hosford

Introduction: The Culture Targeted for Change

Ollie’s Barbecue, a local, family owned restaurant in Birmingham, Alabama, experienced a year of firsts in 1964. That year marked the first time that a black person entered Ollie’s Barbecue and demanded service. Before this happened, Ollie’s Barbecue never had an occasion to explicitly refuse service to anyone based on their race. It did so in this case, however, and the restaurant’s seemingly law-abiding owners found themselves in open violation of federal law.

Ollie McClung and his son, Ollie McClung, Jr., soon began contemplating a lawsuit that eventually led to the acceptance of desegregation as an irreversible reality in the American mind. Until the U.S. Supreme Court ended that lawsuit in December 1964 with its decision Katzenbach v. McClung, desegregation remained an uncertain struggle.

Ollie’s Barbecue opened in 1926, and for thirty-eight years, Ollie McClung never served blacks inside of his restaurant. Although McClung offered blacks a carryout service, he prohibited these blacks from eating on the premises. Ollie McClung never planned to change this policy, having confirmed his position with all of his employees - white and black - during a meeting in 1964, which took place in anticipation of the new, imminent civil rights law. At the meeting, none of the employees expressed any dissent.

Perhaps nobody thought the matter would materialize into a larger issue. Blacks had many objections about segregation generally, but in reality these grievances never developed into a situation that involved Ollie’s Barbecue. This reality changed, however, on July 3, 1964. The day after President Lyndon Johnson signed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, of which Title II sought to prevent discrimination in places of public accommodation, several blacks entered Ollie’s Barbecue and demanded service. Upon refusal of service, these blacks immediately recited a “spiel” about how the new civil rights law compelled the restaurant to serve them.

Title II specifically targeted private businesses such as Ollie’s. This section of the law provided for injunctive relief against instances of discrimination (based on race, color, religion, or national origin) in places of public accommodation that “affect commerce.” The commerce provision implicitly asserted that the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution gave Congress the authority to regulate discrimination in the private sector. Ollie’s Barbecue, a private business that participated in commerce, held its facilities open to the public, operated in the South, and discriminated based on race. Everyone understood the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to address this specific type of racial discrimination in the South.

The first blacks who entered Ollie’s to test Title II no doubt thought that the restaurant amounted to an appropriate target. Situated on the corner of Seventh Avenue South and Ninth Street, Ollie’s maintained a patently segregated premises in a predominately black neighborhood, which featured three black schools as well as several industrial businesses that employed many blacks. Many black schoolchildren passed by Ollie’s on a daily basis. These facts lend themselves to the notable irony that, when he testified in the U.S. District Court, Ollie McClung actually argued that his business would decline by “75 or 80 percent” if the court forced him to desegregate.

9 Katzenbach v. McClung, 379 U.S. 294 (1964), Transcript of Record
Plain intuition could have led him to conclude that catering to the majority of potential customers in the area would be good, not bad, for business. Yet McClung, as well as his employees who seemed to assent to his reasoning when he confirmed the policy with them, assumed otherwise. McClung’s testimony here provides valuable insight into the culture. 

The McClungs believed business could not succeed in a mixed restaurant. McClung assumed that the vast majority of potential customers in the area would be to the majority of potential customers in the area; for the most part, because of the culture, at least initially. This critical point helps to illustrate the process, and the limits, of cultural change. Katzenbach v. McClung gave new meaning to federal power. The decision effectively stripped patronage to its knees. It constrained the ebbing intellectual and cultural legitimacy of segregation. At the same time, it further bolstered and liberated the swelling assent to desegregation. In this manner, the court’s interpretation of the law, as an act of government, not only strengthened the government’s reach into the economy, but also constituted an effective catalyst to the transformation of culture.

Katzenbach v. McClung, an often overlooked case, could not change the hearts and minds of people. McClung believed business could not succeed in a mixed restaurant. McClung assumed that the vast majority of potential customers in the area would be to the majority of potential customers in the area; for the most part, because of the culture, at least initially. This critical point helps to illustrate the process, and the limits, of cultural change. McClung was lost no business after the U.S. Supreme Court decided to desegregate his restaurant, but Ollie’s nevertheless remained segregated, for the most part, because of the culture, at least initially. This case Katzenbach v. McClung. Ollie’s maintained the assumption implied that many, if he offered blacks the same level or type of service that  he would not oblige to the majority of potential customers in the area; for the most part, because of the culture, at least initially. This critical point helps to illustrate the process, and the limits, of cultural change. McClung was lost no business after the U.S. Supreme Court decided to desegregate his restaurant, but Ollie’s nevertheless remained segregated, for the most part, because of the culture, at least initially. This case Katzenbach v. McClung. Ollie’s maintained the assumption implied that many, if he offered blacks the same level or type of service that  he would not oblige.

People went from having, at best, a limited faith in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to regarding further holdouts of segregation as futile. When blacks entered the restaurant and demanded service in July of 1964, Ollie McClung’s son, Ollie McClung, Jr., refused to serve them. He believed that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 constituted an unjust law that amount ed to “governmental tyranny.” He did not stand alone in this sentiment of an oppressive federal government. In the midst of his 1964 presidential campaign, Alabama Governor George Wallace determined what he felt added up to the “best deal” for the South: “a repealed or at least modifi ed or amended” version of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 accomplished by an initiative for the South that “pledged better treatment from the federal government” than had been experienced “in recent years.” In fact, achieving these ends was the stated motivation behind Wallace’s entire campaign. At this point, between the Civil Rights Act of 1964 taking effect and the issuance of the McClung decision on December 14, 1964, many white Southerners did not yet believe in the permanence of the new law. For them, a legal or political opposition to the law could still bring about its demise.

These white Southerners only emphasized what many other people suspected as well. The overall response after the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 indicated that Americans, and Southerners in particular, did not have much confidence that the law would affect any permanent, immediate change. This doubt spread quickly, penetrating the minds of many different Americans. The media, both Southern and national, and either intentionally or unintentionally, facilitated it.

The Birmingham News, the McClungs’ local paper, described some provisions of the law in terms that could have easily aroused resentment among Southern whites. By describing the law as “unprecedented” and “far-reaching,” the paper subtly reinforced the notion, held by Wallace and other like-minded Southerners, that the law promoted novelty or injustice.16 Some white leaders in the South attempted to fo-


so its constitutionality can be tested.”19 Under a headline that read “South’s Leaders Hold Bill Illegal,” the New York Times quoted Governor Johnson as saying that there would be “tremendous dangers in the enforcement” of the law.20 When publicly addressing the federal government about the “implementation” of the law, Governor Wallace be- gged the federal government to use it as the “so-called civil rights bill.” He further remarked that “it should and will be tested in the courts on constitutional grounds.”21 Governor John J. McKeithen of Louisiana contended that the law would “hurt the racial situation.” These negative statements about the bill indicated that the bill had not yet fulfilled its objective to persuade the culture to accept desegregation. Furthermore, civil rights leaders had not yet accomplished their task of wearing down resistance to change. 22

A Broad and Sweeping Federal Power

The New York Times and other leading newspapers often described the bill as the “enactment” of the law, Governor Wallace boasted that the law was “workable,” and the “implementation” of the law, Governor Wallace boasted, “would soon be struck down.”23 These types of state- ments substantiated the sentimentality that the law could be nullified, or at least should be contested. Other groups also recognized that the law opened the floodgates for dissent, if not outright hostilities. Only two paragraphs after a headline declared, “Long battle over rights ends today,” the Birmingham News paradoxi- cally predicted that prompt testing of the public accommo- dations provision would take place in the same spirit as the “sit-ins by Negro students in Southern lunch counters that helped launch the Negro drive for equality that contributed to passage of the bill.”24 The New York Times predicted this as well. It reported that Birmingham civil rights leader Fred L. Shuttlesworth’s “organization would begin prompt testing of the new act.”25 The fact that they felt it neces- sary to test the law suggested that blacks, like whites, had a limited faith in the law’s ability to end segregation. They had to show it to believe it.

Martin Luther King appeared to share in this lim- ited faith. Black civil rights activists had more to do before they could declare victory over segregation. In the first few days after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, they had many reasons to be hopeful, having observed that “‘White folks act like they intend to do right by this Civil Rights Bill,’”26 it only took a couple of weeks, however, before King acknowledged that a “record trail of violent setbacks and mixed results” clearly, and continuously, im- peded the objectives of the civil rights legislation.27 In his Letter from Birmingham City Jail, King urged that just laws represented “sanesens.”28 However, the most appar- ent similarity that resulted from the Civil Rights Act of 1964, “judging by its apparent applications but found that the reaction it brought about among whites and blacks. Both communities shared a common belief that segregation had not succumbed to the new law. In their minds, the “battle” had not ended. Contrasted with King, who surely felt somber over this shared belief, some white Southerners could have felt hope in light of the apparent resistance to the law. Declining an offer from the Johnson administration to participate in “conferences concerning implementation of the civil rights law,” Governor Wallace stated, “my po- sition on this bill is well known.” He expressed his be- lief that “the legislation is unconstitutional and if unchal- lenged will result in the destruction of individual liberty and freedom in this nation.”29 Legislators debating the bill made similar constitutional arguments.30 Ollie McClung, Jr. actually used the term “close mindedness” to describe supporters of the civil rights law, at least in respect to the support for public accommodations.31 Civil rights activists considered their cause a “struggle towards freedom,” yet at the same time opponents of the civil rights legislation as- serted that they were defending constitutional freedoms.32 Basing their opposition on a constitutional founda- tion, opponents of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 felt their cause beamed of righteousness. They likewise showed no regard for the majority of black Americans who anticipated resistance just after its passage. Further augmented the belief that the new law’s future seemed uncertain, if not in jeopardy. Apparently, the government assumed and anticipated non-compliance with the law. “Officials charged with enforcing the law are hoping for widespread voluntary compliance,” the Birmingham News reported. The paper then acknowledged, in the very next sentence, that “the government is preparing for courtroom battles and the Justice Department soon will ask Congress for more money to add more lawyers to its civil rights division.”33 Reporting under a headline that read “Rights Law Promptly Tested; Some Resistance Remains,” an As- sociated Press article in the Birmingham News reported that Mississippi Governor Paul Johnson “expected some real trouble there when Negroes seek applications for public accommodations.” The same article described the objections of an Atlanta restaurant operator who said “he would go to jail before he would serve Negro customers.”34 It seemed that everyone believed the country had not yet settled the issue. Both parties prepared to fight for their “rights” in the courts and on the streets.

One need not dig deep to find signs of anticipated resistance, however. The headlines said enough. “Rights law reaction ranges from praise to misgiving,” claimed
the *Birmingham News* stop an Associated Press article.36 “South’s Leaders Hold Bill Illegal” and “Johnson Pleads for Compliance, but Vows Rights Enforcement” read two headlines in the *New York Times.*37 A subheading in the *New York Times* described the Civil Rights Law of 1964 as an “Unfinished Task.” “Rights law now in effect; quick challenge indicated,” declared the prominent front-page headline for the *Birmingham News* after President Johnson signed the bill.38

Indeed, the challenge did seem quite quick. “Barley was the President’s signature dry,” the *Birmingham News* reported, “before civil rights organizations announced that they intended “to test the new law quickly.”41 The vulnerability of the new civil rights legislation. The or- ganization’s annual convention happened to fall on the day Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which Farmer said was “no magic carpet that’s going to take us to the promised land.”42 He encouraged his listeners to rec- ognize their “responsibility (to see) that this law becomes more than a scrap of paper the 13th and 14th amendments have become.”43 This grave description of the new law highlighted the role the government had to play in order to affect real cultural change. Until the people saw the law as persuasive and imperishable, there remained the potential that it might never become truly effective.

**Government Action: Policing the Economy**

The distinction between ending the institution of segregation and the ending the habit of segregation helps us explore the tactic employed by the federal government to achieve its ends, necessary for identifying the specific way or ways in which government may influence culture. Discrimination by state action (in the public sector) gener- ally ended with The Civil Rights Cases of 1883. More than half a century later, Brown v. Board of Education became the most seminal case in the crusade to route dis- crimination completely out of the public sector. In argu- ing Brown on behalf of the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall persuaded the Supreme Court to overturn the “separate but equal” doctrine, which the Court originally proclaimed in the notorious 1896 decision Plessy v. Ferguson.44 In formu- lating his argument, Marshall declared that there existed “a denial of equal protection of the laws, the legal phrase- ology of the clause in the Fourteenth Amendment.”45 By this he meant that state sponsored segregation in public schools fundamentally betrayed the notion of equal protec-

Perhaps nobody thought the matter would materialize into a larger issue.


49 Ibid., 369.


supporting the decision.52 Dating all the way back to 1824, when Chief Justice Marshall issued the opinion for the very first Commerce Clause case, Gibbons v. Ogden, the Court almost never departed from the trend of affirming that the Commerce Clause meant more than it said.53 The Constitution simply granted Congress the power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”54 In 1942, the Court greatly expanded this scope in the Wickard v. Filburn case, which held that even a private person’s “activity be local, and though it may not be regarded as commerce, it may still be seen as relevant to the national economic conditions.”55 Using this precedent, Ollie McClung had little hope of turning the tide against desegregation by arguing that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 “applies only to conduct in isolation from articles or activities directly in commerce” and that the government effectively argued that “the rights of the individual to liberty and property are in dire peril.”56 Then, in the Supreme Court case, McClung’s lawyers admitted to the Supreme Court that there exists “a conflict between the concept of human equality and individual rights under the Constitution.” Although the Civil Rights Act of 1964 said that the former trumped the latter, too much legislation did not make it so. “[I]t has never been held,” McClung’s attorneys argued, “that Congress may by legislative fiat merely say that it is acting under granted power and thus foreclose judicial inquiry on the subject.” For the opposition to the law, the Constitution preferred individual rights over racial equality, at least so long as the Court remained silent on the matter. The Supreme Court’s reasoning in 1964 shatter the legal standing of leaders such as Governor Barnett and shop owners such as Ollie McClung with no further hope of reversal after the nation’s highest court voted and rejected their main contentions. This provided the public with a sense of finality on the issue of segregation. As Roy Wilkins of the NAACP said, “This decision reinforces homogenous) had several repercussions, not the least of which meant a confirmed end to the doubt and debate over whether the law would ever have full force and effect.

Opponents to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 based their opposition on principles of limited government. Ollie McClung, Jr. believed his lawsuit could have stopped “the economic war which is now upon us.”57 When issuing its opinion on McClung’s case on October 5, 1964, the federal district court found in his favor and held that, “If Congress has the naked power to do what it has attempted in title II [sic] of this act, there is no facet of human behavior which it may not control.” The court further stated that “the rights of the individual to liberty and property are in dire peril.”58 Then, in the Supreme Court case, McClung’s lawyers admitted to the Supreme Court that there exists “a conflict between the concept of human equality and individual rights under the Constitution.” Although the Civil Rights Act of 1964 said that the former trumped the latter, too much legislation did not make it so. “[I]t has never been held,” McClung’s attorneys argued, “that Congress may by legislative fiat merely say that it is acting under granted power and thus foreclose judicial inquiry on the subject.” For the opposition to the law, the Constitution preferred individual rights over racial equality, at least so long as the Court remained silent on the matter. The Supreme Court’s reasoning in 1964 shattered the legal standing of leaders such as Governor Barnett and shop owners such as Ollie McClung with no further hope of reversal after the nation’s highest court voted and rejected their main contentions. This provided the public with a sense of finality on the issue of segregation. As Roy Wilkins of the NAACP said, “This decision reinforces public confidence in the orderly processes of the law.”

Reporting on the decisions in December of 1964, newspapers suggested an overall conclusion to the long battle for civil rights. Although initially the Birmingham News clung to the notion that many still doubted the law’s effectiveness, on December 16, 1964, two days after the decision, with a front-page editorial, the newspaper reported that the McClungs would comply with the decision after meeting with their attorney. The McClungs observed that “many of our nation’s leaders have accepted this edict, which gives the federal government control over the life and behavior of every American” and complained that the law “could well prove to be the most important and disastrous decision handed down by this court.” However, they also said, “As law-abiding Americans we feel we must bow to this edict of the Supreme Court.” In plain truth, they had little choice. If the McClungs had refused to desegregate, the restaurant may have been (more) forcibly desegregated by a court order.59 Having “lost in an effort to have the high court uphold a lower court ruling that the law could not be constitutionally applied,” the McClungs realized the battle had ended.

The fact that the court in 1964 might have surely put additional pressure on the McClungs and other opponents to relent. A Birmingham News editorial speculated, “Unanimity of the court as to the public accommodations section probably means there is no real prospect of judicial overturning of the law.”60 In June 1964, Robert McDavid Smith, one of the attorneys for McClung, admitted after reading the opinion that the only way around the new law was to “amend the Constitution,” an unlikely event considering the law did not originate with judicial activism but rather in Congress.61 Some, but not all, political leaders remained head-
strong in their objections, but their reactions hinted at the desperation they experienced. Although he called for more resistance, Governor Wallace said the ruling dealt “a staggering blow to the free enterprise system and the rights of private property owners. Mayor Ivan Allen of Atlanta expressed his assent to the ruling. The New York Times reported that he believed “it was obvious the Congress had the full right to take steps to eliminate discrimination against individuals on an interstate basis.” Mississippi Senator James Eastland said “the Constitution means only what the temporary membership of the Supreme Court says it means,” implying either that his side could perhaps one day overturn the law or that he fought for a lost cause because the Constitution no longer mattered.64

Perhaps the most compelling evidence of the “battle” over segregation ending with McClung and Heart of Atlanta can be found in the December 20, 1964 issue of the New York Times. On this day, the Sunday after the decisions, the newspaper included a multi-page spread that chronicled the history of the civil rights struggle up until that date. With headlines such as “Civil Rights: Decade of Progress” and “Civil Rights: South Slowly Yields,” the paper chronicled all the events leading up to the climatic decisions issued six days earlier. One of the articles declared, “That a corner has been turned is evident not only from this week’s decisions but also from the actual racial situation in the country. Resistance to the law is no longer the basic consideration.” This comprehensive piece, which the paper only printed after McClung, not simply after Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, gave little indication that there would be any further hesitation to accept desegregation as lasting.65

64 Ibid.

Conclusion

McClung had an undervalued influence on American culture. Martin Luther King believed that “the key to everything is federal commitment.”66 Full, true commitment necessarily consisted not only of the legislative process, but of judicial validation of civil rights laws as well. The McClung decision provided that judicial validation. It completed the process of government action needed to legitimize desegregation, both in the laws and, more importantly, in American culture. With the publication of this court decision, people went from having, at best, a limited faith in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to regarding further holdouts of segregation as futile. Widespread and diverse facets of American culture, from civil rights activists to Southern white politicians, all shared in the changing tenor of thought. McClung therefore squashed resistance by unequivocally affirming the authority of the federal government to regulate economic matters.

The American federal government constitutes the most formidable state power in the country. Supreme Court interpretations of the Commerce Clause and Supremacy Clause have reinforced this power. The government did modify American culture by spawning a new way of thinking about desegregation. However, its authority over its citizens did not extend beyond regulating outward actions, such as racial discrimination in the transacting of business.

Nevertheless, because of this ability to manage interstate commerce, a broad and sweeping concept, on top of state action, as described in the 14th Amendment, the federal government curbed the institution of segregation in America. Public reactions to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and McClung v. Katzenbach indicated that the government, by way of the Commerce Clause, had changed Ollie’s Barbecue, and the rest of Southern culture, from that point forth.

The decision effectively brought segregation to its knees.

The Deep South remained determined to maintain their “southern way of life” and deeply resented this invasion of activists. The riders represented much of American geography including California, the Northeast, and the Midwest, and the volunteers represented a diverse cross-section of American liberalism. Riders comprised black and white, with varying religious beliefs. Members of the clergy, teachers, and students were represented; dominated, but many other professions could be counted among the volunteers. All shared a common bond of sacrifice and a determination to end racial discrimination for black bus riders through non-violent direct action.

Jackson became the end of the line for the “Freedom dom” of the riders as virtually all riders ended up in Mississippi jail cells. More than 400 riders participated in the rides in the summer of 1961. By August, CORE became financially strapped as legal costs mounted and the Mississippi judicial system, wanting to make a point, did little to expedite adjudication of the cases. Handicapped by Mississippi’s creative justice, and running short of money, CORE faced a bleak situation. But just as CORE considered its next move, victory emerged by way of a surprising ruling by the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC). As the federal agency that regulates interstate business, including bus and air travel, Robert Kennedy had petitioned the ICC in late May for strong regulations regarding interstate travel that would neutralize Jim Crow law in the South and effectively protect black bus passengers against discrimination. At the time, it was a long shot for Kennedy. The ICC, whose eleven member commission mainly consisted of conservative Republican appointees (and only one member had been appointed by President Kennedy). But on September 22, 1961, just as Jim Farmer and other movement leaders deliberated over the successes of the Freedom Riders and contemplated the movement’s future, the “ICC issued a unanimous ruling...
prohibiting racial discrimination in interstate bus transit.” Stating that, “beginning November 1, all interstate buses prohibiting racial discrimination in interstate bus transit.”

**Book Review: Freedom Riders**

 commerce commission out regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission” (271). Armed with a fairly comprehensive and timely ruling, CORE wasted no time in announcing that they would commence “test rides” beginning as soon as the new regulations went into effect.

Initial success was neither universal, nor immediate, but the test rides revealed significant improvement in most of the South. It would take a couple of years before every vestige of Jim Crow vanished from the buses and their facilities. The author provides scant details connecting the dots between the Freedom Rides and the ICC ruling. How much did the Kennedys influence the ruling? Nevertheless, it is impossible to assume that the ICC would move so quickly to issue such commanding regulations, without the dramatic efforts, and the national and international enlightenment, brought about by the brave cadre of the Freedom Riders.

Author Raymond Arsenault’s account is riveting. It is hard to put down. The author’s portrayal of some of the actors provided this reader with much enlightenment. The Kennedys focused on international threats, the recent failure at the Bay of Pigs, and an upcoming meeting between JFK and Nikita Khrushchev. Arsenault intimates that neither Robert Kennedy nor the President wanted to be bothered by this domestic issue. One can sense Robert Kennedy’s frustration on this point. The interactions of civil rights groups like the NAACP and Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) as shown by Arsenault, were far from monolithic in their respective strategies. As the Civil Rights Movement’s backbone, the NAACP was gradualist and not disposed toward direct action. While CORE’s leader, Jim Farmer, contended the cost of continued legal defense in September, however, NAACP legal counsel, Thurgood Marshall, offered to foot the bill. Farm- er’s first consideration was at what cost to CORE and its disposition for direct action? Moreover, after a violent standoff in Montgomery at which King was present (and contributed much in the way of leadership as well as celebrity), the riders asked him to join them on their next leg from Montgomery to Jackson. After much consideration, he declined. How this decision might have affected civil rights history is anyone’s guess.

The author writes in clear and concise prose. He ob-viously has command of this story. The abridged version is without footnotes, sources, or even an index. But these academic shortcomings can be ignored for the moment in favor of strong story telling. Freedom Riders is not only an essential book for students of American history, but an essential book for every enlightened American.

Instead of thwarting the Freedom Riders, the violence in Alabama and the intransigence of the South’s massive resistance emboldened the movement.

**Three Veils.**


“If the heart is forced to do something against its will, it will go blind.” Three Veils

While growing up in a conservative Muslim society in the Middle East, writer-director Rolla Selbak often felt unable to freely discuss the injustices faced by women in her community. Her response to this former suppression of her voice was the 2011 film, Three Veils. The film quite literally “unveils” many controversial subjects that forever remain sealed in traditional Muslim societies.

The constructs of culture, race, gender, and reli- gion often shape our identities before we can even begin to process our personal needs and desires. Selbak’s film chal- lenges this very premise in its presentation of the overlapping stories of three Arab American Muslim women. As the personal struggles endured by Leila (Mercedes Masoño), Amira (Angela Zahra), and Nikki (Sheetal Sheth) slowly unfold, viewers experience an unraveling of their precon- ceived notions about controversial subjects such as race, gender, and religion; Leila, Amira, and Nikki face their own realities in the forms of sexual abuse, violence, sub- stance abuse, and sexual identity struggles.

The film opens with Leila’s story. The daughter of a well-to-do family in Southern California, Leila has always known that she will marry a boy of her parents’ choosing. In her case, that boy is Ali (Sammy Sheikh), who is from a good family, is very successful, and is also allegedly a very devout and practicing Muslim. Despite his perfection on paper, even after their engagement, Leila never feels like Ali is ultimately “the one” for her. Rather, she finds herself inexplicably drawn to a waiter in her father’s restaurant, who also happens to be Amira’s brother (Jamal, played by Garen Boyajian). Nikki, Leila’s best friend, watches as Leila continually ignores these signs of incompatibility for the sake of her family and society. Unfortunately, this re- jection of her gut instincts culminates in tragedy for Leila.

Amira, an outsider enviously looking in on Leila and Nikki’s friendship, enters the film as an unwilling out- cast and involuntary loner. At a young age, Amira struggled with feelings of attraction towards her female playmates, and her mother immediately forced her to attend hours and hours of Islamic school on a daily basis in order to stamp out any residual homosexuality in her young daughter. In this manner, Amira learns to find solace and comfort in her faith and in her relationship with God until her long-repressed feelings are suddenly rekindled by Nikki’s en- trance into her life. Unable to ignore her growing attrac- tion to Nikki’s magnetic personality and desperate to help save Nikki from her self-destructive ways, Amira faces her most difficult challenge yet. Will she submit to her moth- er’s perpetual push into an arranged marriage with a well- to-do Arab man or will she accept and acknowledge her feelings for Nikki?

By the time the film shifts its focus to Nikki’s story, viewers will assume they already know enough about her character: her flirtatious nature, her questionable clothing, her drug problems, her difficult home situation, and her emotional dependence on Leila and Amira. Human na- ture leads viewers to inject their own brand of judgment into this already questionable portrayal of a Persian American Muslim girl. Yet, this very judgment will shame viewers once Nikki’s tragic childhood experiences come to light. Her story brings the

**Film Review**

Three Veils.


“If the heart is forced to do something against its will, it will go blind.” Three Veils

While growing up in a conservative Muslim society in the Middle East, writer-director Rolla Selbak often felt unable to freely discuss the injustices faced by women in her community. Her response to this former suppression of her voice was the 2011 film, Three Veils. The film quite literally “unveils” many controversial subjects that forever remain sealed in traditional Muslim societies.

The constructs of culture, race, gender, and relig- ion often shape our identities before we can even begin to process our personal needs and desires. Selbak’s film chal- lenges this very premise in its presentation of the overlapping stories of three Arab American Muslim women. As the personal struggles endured by Leila (Mercedes Masoño), Amira (Angela Zahra), and Nikki (Sheetal Sheth) slowly unfold, viewers experience an unraveling of their precon- ceived notions about controversial subjects such as race, gender, and religion; Leila, Amira, and Nikki face their own realities in the forms of sexual abuse, violence, sub- stance abuse, and sexual identity struggles.

The film opens with Leila’s story. The daughter of a well-to-do family in Southern California, Leila has always known that she will marry a boy of her parents’ choosing. In her case, that boy is Ali (Sammy Sheikh), who is from a good family, is very successful, and is also allegedly a very devout and practicing Muslim. Despite his perfection on paper, even after their engagement, Leila never feels like Ali is ultimately “the one” for her. Rather, she finds herself inexplicably drawn to a waiter in her father’s restaurant, who also happens to be Amira’s brother (Jamal, played by Garen Boyajian). Nikki, Leila’s best friend, watches as Leila continually ignores these signs of incompatibility for the sake of her family and society. Unfortunately, this re- jection of her gut instincts culminates in tragedy for Leila.

Amira, an outsider enviously looking in on Leila and Nikki’s friendship, enters the film as an unwilling out- cast and involuntary loner. At a young age, Amira struggled with feelings of attraction towards her female playmates, and her mother immediately forced her to attend hours and hours of Islamic school on a daily basis in order to stamp out any residual homosexuality in her young daughter. In this manner, Amira learns to find solace and comfort in her faith and in her relationship with God until her long-repressed feelings are suddenly rekindled by Nikki’s en- trance into her life. Unable to ignore her growing attrac- tion to Nikki’s magnetic personality and desperate to help save Nikki from her self-destructive ways, Amira faces her most difficult challenge yet. Will she submit to her moth- er’s perpetual push into an arranged marriage with a well- to-do Arab man or will she accept and acknowledge her feelings for Nikki?

By the time the film shifts its focus to Nikki’s story, viewers will assume they already know enough about her character: her flirtatious nature, her questionable clothing, her drug problems, her difficult home situation, and her emotional dependence on Leila and Amira. Human na- ture leads viewers to inject their own brand of judgment into this already questionable portrayal of a Persian American Muslim girl. Yet, this very judgment will shame viewers once Nikki’s tragic childhood experiences come to light. Her story brings the
entire film full-circle as the audience revisits earlier scenes from Nikki’s perspective and learns that beneath her façade of indifference lies an incredibly fragile heart. Surprisingly enough, with Nikki’s discerning eyes as the final lens into the lives of Leila and Amira, Three Veils ends on a hopeful note.

Selbak does an amazing job of fulfilling her director’s mission statement, in which she aimed to present Leila, Amira, and Nikki as “humans first, women second, and their culture and religion as merely shells that dictate how the lives of Leila and Amira, Three Veils ends on a hopeful note.

Selbak does an amazing job of fulfilling her director’s mission statement, in which she aimed to present Leila, Amira, and Nikki as “humans first, women second, and their culture and religion as merely shells that dictate how much of their inner-self is revealed.” Selbak makes no attempt to make religious or cultural statements through these characters, and she gracefully portrays the individual experiences happiness, and will similarly shed tears when she experiences tragic heartbreaks. Sheth stands out as one of the best actors in the entire film, and she capably holds the film together with her captivating and unforgettable performance.

Three Veils is by no means an easy film to watch. In fact, it can be downright depressing. Yet, one would expect no less from a film that tackles the subject matter at hand. Women’s rights, sexual abuse, sexual orientation, substance abuse, and sexual violence have never been easy topics to openly discuss, but confronting these difficult subjects allows us to move one step closer towards breaking down the social barriers that perpetually cloud our judgment.

The constructs of culture, race, gender, and religion often shape our identities before we can even begin to process our personal needs and desires.
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