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THE WAR THAT SHAPED ME

NICOLE MILLER
Dedicado a mi mamá y abuela María
INTRODUCTION

The United States has played a dominantly powerful role in the entirety of the North and South American continents since the European discovery of the ‘New World’ in the 15th century. Once the Spanish Empire gained control of South and Central America, the U.S. eventually picked up that power as a means to provide goods for their own country through agriculture, and the development of a working class from emigrants throughout the Americas. However, Central America is not a significant study in the U.S. education system, causing Americans to know very little, if anything, about this region of the world. Negative stigmas have been placed on the heads of those who emigrated from these regions due to the normalization of perceiving immigration from the Latin Americas as foreign invaders. In the case of El Salvador, which according to Walter LaFeber was the world’s fifth worst-fed country up until the early 1980s, the United States depended on the coffee trade market from the land that the civilians fought for. In return, the U.S. provided military aid for the country.¹ The following is a graphic biography of my mother, a refugee of the Salvadoran Civil War, and her experience assimilating and acculturing herself to American society, carrying with her the trauma which Central Americans typically have an extremely difficult time coping with out of fear or paranoia. The dialogue is based on an interview that I did of her, and no words outside of her own have been added. In light of the recent DACA, Dreamers Act, and Temporary Protected Status removal, the need to educate the masses on immigration is rapidly becoming dire.

The United States has played a dominantly powerful role in the entirety of the North and South American continents since the European discovery of the 'New World' in the 15th century. Once the Spanish Empire gained control of South and Central America, the U.S. eventually picked up that power as a means to provide goods for their own country through agriculture, and the development of a working class from emigrants throughout the Americas. However, Central America is not a significant study in the U.S. education system, causing Americans to know very little, if anything, about this region of the world. Negative stigmas have been placed on the heads of those who emigrated from these regions due to the normalization of perceiving immigration from the Latin Americas as foreign invaders. In the case of El Salvador, which according to Walter LaFeber was the world's fifth worst-fed country up until the early 1980s, the United States depended on the coffee trade market from the land that the civilians fought for. In return, the U.S. provided military aid for the country. The following is a graphic biography of my mother, a refugee of the Salvadoran Civil War, and her experience assimilating and acculturating herself to American society, carrying with her the trauma which Central Americans typically have an extremely difficult time coping with out of fear or paranoia. The dialogue is based on an interview that I did of her, and no words outside of her own have been added. In light of the recent DACA, Dreamers Act, and Temporary Protected Status removal, the need to educate the masses on immigration is rapidly becoming dire.

"They were going to the schools and pulling young kids out to join them.

"All I could think was...

""We were friends."

"We started learning of the people we knew that were murdered. We thought our families were next.

My grandma and I were walking and saw a person hung on the side of the road.

"I remember holding my grandma’s hand tight. I was scared."
"When you're sleeping, in the middle of the night...

You can hear people cross your yard...

But don't talk loud...

...you don't want them coming inside your house...

...they can hear you.

"I always thought my blankets were going to protect me."
I was never a kid. I had to grow up fast.

Moving to Los Angeles was really hard at the beginning.

"I cried for months."

I felt very lonely, and I wasn't able to talk to anybody.

*Literally, in a language barrier sense as well.
"I felt alienated, like I came to a different planet. Growing up with my grandparents..."

"... and not knowing my mom that well."

"I missed my family."

"As time went by, I started to see things a little bit different."

"I tried to be strong, and not feel like I was missing something."

"Living the life that I lived, that should've been enough for me not to want to go back."
Polish Succession Struggles of the 10th - 12th Centuries
The Context for the Testament of Boleslaw III

Undergraduate Winner of the Joseph Mullins Prize in History

Jordan Pituley

When the Duke of Poland, Boleslaw III, died in 1138, he left a testament that divided his country between his five sons and created a political division in Poland known as the “feudal disintegration” that would last for almost 200 years and result in the loss of much Polish territory to the neighboring Bohemians and Germans. Later chroniclers and modern scholars have been critical of Boleslaw for this decision. The Polish chronicler Jan Długosz, writing in the 15th century, described the results of the feudal disintegration: “Thus is Poland torn into parts, so that, when in course of time, disputes arise between the dukes, Poland will take up arms against herself; arms meant to be used against an enemy will be thrust into Polish guts and, in the madness of anger, swords will be drawn to maim Polish limbs and bodies.”¹ This assertion can be taken as emblematic of what the attitude has been towards Boleslaw’s testament in the years since. In the Historical Dictionary of Poland, compiled by George J. Lerski, the assessment given of Boleslaw’s testament is that its ultimate effect was to “turn Poland from a relatively strong state into a conglomerate of weak principalities.”² Chroniclers like Dlugosz as well as modern historians have portrayed Boleslaw’s decision as resulting in an inevitably fragmented and

conflict-ridden Poland, but it is far from clear that this would have been Boleslaw’s understanding. There are reasons to believe that Boleslaw may not have expected this long-term political division of Poland to be the result of his testament and that allowing a civil war to break out between his sons without attempting to prevent it would have appeared the worse alternative. This paper argues that there is a tradition of sharing political power within ruling families in the Slavic lands of Eastern and East-Central Europe, and given Boleslaw III’s own experience of coming to power through a divided and contested succession, he need not have expected that his testament would result in a long term divided Poland.

In Poland, the tradition of sharing political power within ruling families can be traced back to the first historically verifiable ruler of Poland, Mieszko I, the struggle for power that accompanied his death, and, ultimately, the succession of his eldest son, Boleslaw I. We do not know anything verifiable about the origins of Mieszko or his dynasty, but we do know that by the early 960s he was already the ruler of a large, wealthy, and militarily powerful polity based in the area around the cities of Gniezno (his capital) and Poznan. This region would later come to be known as Greater Poland, in contrast to Lesser Poland, the area around Krakow which would succeed Greater Poland as the political power center in Poland by the early 12th century. Historians have named Mieszko I’s dynasty after one of his putative distant ancestors, Piast, a common but virtuous farmer. Mieszko converted to Christianity in 965 when he married his first wife Dobrawa of Bohemia, with whom he had one son, the future Boleslaw I. After Dobrawa’s death, Mieszko remarried to a German woman, Oda of Haldensleben, with whom he had a further three sons. The two different cultural backgrounds and geographic powerbases of his children created problems on Mieszko’s death. A struggle broke out between Mieszko’s second wife, Oda, and his

5. Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, Central Europe in the High Middle Ages, 118-120.
eldest and most powerful son, Boleslaw of Mieszko’s first marriage, over whether Boleslaw or Mieszko’s eldest son by Oda (also called Mieszko) would succeed.⁶

Literacy was not widespread in 10th century Poland, and there is only one extant document from the reign of Mieszko I that we can use to study the succession from Mieszko to Boleslaw: an excerpt from an 11th century papal record summarizing a 10th century message from Mieszko I and his family to the papacy of John XV known, from the first two words of its text, as the “Dagome Iudex”.⁷ Polish medievalists have traditionally argued that the Dagome Iudex was a summary of a message from Mieszko I confirming his recent conversion and loyalty to the papacy and asking for direct papal protection from German eastward expansion, though Krystyna Łukasiewicz argues that the original letter that the Dagome Iudex records may date from later in Mieszko I’s reign, and closer to the succession struggle.⁸ The relevant section of the Dagome Iudex reads as follows:

Dagome, lord, and Ote, lady, and their sons Misico and Lambert, were supposed to give to Saint Peter one state in whole which is called Schinesghe, with all its lands in borders which run along the long sea, along Prussia to the place called Rus, thence to Kraków and from said Kraków to the River Oder, straight to a place called Alemure, and from said Alemure to the land of Milczanie, and from the borders of that people to the Oder and from that, going along the River Oder, ending at the earlier mentioned city of Schinesghe.⁹

It is unclear how the name “Dagome” came to refer to Mieszko I in this section of the papal record, but George J. Lerski proposes that Dagome is

---

⁶ Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages*, p. 144.
possibly a Latinization of Dzigoma, which may have been Mieszko I’s pagan name, used before he was baptized. From the descriptions of the borders of the kingdom, however, and by the correct identification of his wife, Oda, and his sons by her, Mieszko and Lambert, it is certain that the Dagome Iudex does indeed refer to Mieszko I’s Poland in the 10th century. The Dagome Iudex is significant because of what it tells us about how the ruling family in Poland approached the succession and division of power. Notably, Mieszko’s first wife Dobrawa and her son Boleslaw, are completely absent. Łukasiewicz suggests that this means that Mieszko I had not intended for Boleslaw to succeed him automatically, and that Polish rulers of this time had considerable leeway in choosing their own successors. Most importantly, in naming three co-rulers in this message to the Pope, Mieszko I revealed that he does not find it alien that political power would be shared among the members of his dynasty.

Łukasiewicz argues that Mieszko I had intended for Oda and his sons by her to succeed him on his death, but that Boleslaw used his existing power base in the country to quickly defeat Oda and her German supporters and have himself crowned sole ruler of Poland in 992, the same year that Mieszko died. Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski come to the same conclusion, and emphasize that Boleslaw prevailed not because he was seen as more legitimate for being the older son, but rather that his position as the only adult son gave him military and political strength that he could use against his step-mother and half-brothers. This interpretation is further supported by the writing of the contemporary German chronicler, and

11 Schinesghe perhaps refers to Mieszko’s capital of Gniezno, though this does not seem to fit with the geography described above, as Gniezno is in central Greater Poland, and not near to any of Poland’s 10th century borders.
12 Łukasiewicz, “‘Dagome Iudex’ and the First Conflict Over Succession in Poland,” 410.
13 Idem, 417-418.
14 As Mieszko and Lambert were minors (probably around eleven and two years old, respectively) Oda is also named as a regent.
15 Idem, 408.
16 Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages*, 144.
strong critic of both Mieszko and Boleslaw for their stubborn independence from the German Emperor, Thietmar of Merseburg, who wrote a history of the German Ottonian dynasty in the 10th century. Mieszko’s death and Boleslaw’s succession are described in chapter 57, book 4 of Thietmar’s “Chronicon”, where he writes that Mieszko died “leaving his kingdom to be divided among many claimants. Yet, with foxlike cunning, his son Boleslav unified it once more in the hands of one ruler, after he had expelled his stepmother and brothers, and had their familiars Odilien and Przibiwoj blinded.” Jan Długosz, writing almost 500 years later, makes no mention of the contested nature of the succession from Mieszko to Boleslaw, but reading from the evidence provided by the Dagome Iudex and Thietmar’s much more contemporary account, it is likely that the first historically verifiable succession in Poland was not a smooth one. Contrary to Długosz’s implication that the feudal disintegration was uniquely violent, Polish monarchs struggled violently for control of the Kingdom from the very first historically verifiable succession.

Jean Sedlar argues in her history of East-Central Europe in the Middle Ages that Poland was hardly alone in lacking clearly defined succession principles and experiencing frequent succession conflicts or periods of divided rule. The principle demonstrated by the Dagome Iudex, that the right to succession was held more broadly by the entire ruling family and not solely the eldest son, was a common feature of dynastic politics in Slavic societies. The principle of justice for each member of the dynasty, what Sedlar terms a “patrimonial” model of politics, privileged notions of dynastic rights over those of the unity and well-being of the polity as a whole. This was visible in many other societies besides those of the Poles, such as the Rus, the Hungarians, the Serbians, the Bulgarians, and the Bohemians. There were specific features that varied across time and from culture to culture, but Sedlar identifies the principle that all male

18 Idem, 192-193.
children of a ruler were entitled to inherit, with only a slight advantage given to the eldest son, as a commonality.\textsuperscript{21} This would remain the pattern in Poland after the transition from Mieszko I to Boleslaw I, but through a series of strong rulers and not a little bit of luck, this would still usually result in an ultimately unified Poland until the death of Boleslaw III in 1138.\textsuperscript{22} This principle of succession was even more successful in Bohemia, where a series of rulers from the 10\textsuperscript{th} to 12\textsuperscript{th} centuries were lucky enough to be survived by only one son, leading to relatively clean successions. The Hungarians, employing a similar principle, gradually saw the region of Transylvania become effectively independent by the late middle ages, but otherwise successfully held together a large polity.\textsuperscript{23}

Indeed, the Poles under Boleslaw III can be seen as perhaps singularly unlucky. Unlike the Bohemians, Boleslaw was faced with the unenviable task of managing a succession – where no immutable succession principles existed, remember – between five sons and a widow. Sedlar argues that Boleslaw’s testament failed because it took the otherwise functional principles of East Central European succession to their extreme. Because of the degree to which the country was divided, with the important and populous regions of Greater Poland, Lesser Poland, Silesia, Kujavia, and Mazovia each passing to a different son, the nominally senior son, ruling over Lesser Poland and the capital of Krakow, was too weak to enforce his rule on his younger brothers.\textsuperscript{24} Rather than reunifying Poland under one ruler after a contested succession, as Boleslaw I was able to do in 992 and Kazimierz I did by 1039 (more on him below), Boleslaw III’s eldest son, Władysław II, was left with too small a territory from which to draw support and to achieve what his ancestors had. Instead of the orderly and legalistic succession that Boleslaw III had hoped for, this succession system resulted in a 200-year period of disintegration and civil war in Poland which saw the country split into five de-facto independent duchies, with most of Poland’s territory in Pomerania and Silesia lost to the German Empire. Poland’s

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{21} Sedlar, \textit{A History of East Central Europe}, 30.
\bibitem{22} Ibidem
\bibitem{23} Ibid.
\bibitem{24} Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, \textit{Central Europe in the High Middle Ages}, 174; Sedlar, \textit{A History of East Central Europe}, 30.
\end{thebibliography}
subjection to the power of the Germans and their emperor in this period is underscored by the fact that, before Boleslaw III’s testament, three of the eight rulers of Poland (Boleslaw I, Boleslaw II, and Mieszko II) managed to get themselves acknowledged as King of Poland. During the feudal disintegration, no Polish duke, as the rulers of Poland were then known, was ever strong enough to force the German emperor to recognize them as king until the country was reunified in the early 14th century by Władysław Lokietek.25

Poland’s experience with the extreme worst-case scenario of the common Slavic succession practices that Sedlar described did not, however, end these practices in Eastern and East-Central Europe. Sedlar notes that succession principles developed only gradually in Poland and other areas of East Central Europe. This can be seen in the 14th century testament of Ivan I of Moscow, written between 1339 and Ivan’s death in 1340.26 Much like Boleslaw III did 200 years before, Ivan adhered to the Slavic succession custom of satisfying the dynastic ambitions of each one of his sons, giving only a slight preference to the eldest. In the testament, Ivan first divided his lands between his sons, and then stipulated that all three of them - Simeon, Ivan, and Andrei - were to share the capital of Moscow, with Simeon enjoying a position of guardianship over his brothers, much as Boleslaw III’s eldest son Władysław II was meant to have over his brothers in Poland.27 Ivan I, importantly, himself came to sole power in Moscow after succeeding his elder brother Yuri, and this was another striking similarity to Boleslaw III of Poland, who won out over his half-brother Zbigniew. In both instances, a ruler, having come through a period of power-sharing to achieve sole power, did not expect this arrangement to result in the kind of state failure that characterized Poland during the feudal disintegration. We will turn now to the specifics of the dynastic successions of Boleslaw III’s family that he and his father lived through and which must have informed at least some of his thinking in the formulation of his testament of 1138.

After Boleslaw I defeated his half-brothers, Mieszko and Lambert,

27 Idem, 53-54.
and his stepmother Oda to become sole ruler in Poland in 992, he continued Mieszko I’s military successes and greatly expanded Poland into Pomerania, Silesia, and some of the Bohemian and Hungarian lands to the south. Whereas Mieszko I struggled against the powerful Germans to his east, Boleslaw I was secure enough in his position to risk offending the German emperor by having himself crowned king. The Dagome Iudex demonstrates that Mieszko I attempted to make some sort of provision for the succession while he was still alive, but because Boleslaw I died suddenly in 1025, he did not have time to make similar plans. As a result, Boleslaw I’s children, the future Mieszko II and two other sons, Otto and Bezprym, struggled over who would succeed in the manner that their father had - namely, as sole ruler, having got rid of his brothers. Mieszko II, as the eldest, and following from the principles described above by Sedlar, should have succeeded as the senior ruler among his brothers, and as such, received the backing of a majority of the Polish nobility. Otto and Bezprym were thus forced to recruit foreign backers for their claims, with Otto finding support among the Germans, and Bezprym having more luck with the Rus to the east. These three rulers, each with a powerful coalition behind them, created the conditions for a long and violent civil war that effectively destroyed the centralized power of both the monarchy and the church after 1031.

Jan Długosz makes a mention of this civil war in his chronicle, though he reserves his stronger condemnations for the wars following the death of Boleslaw III. The war also shows up in the much more contemporary chronicle of Gallus Anonymous, writing in the early 12th century. Gallus Anonymous, who, unlike the more critical Długosz, is a strong defender of

28 Mieszko I had only ever ruled as Duke, as most rulers of Poland would until the 14th century. Boleslaw I, Boleslaw II, and Mieszko II were the only titular Kings of Poland before the 14th century.

29 Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, Central Europe in the High Middle Ages, 161.

30 Ibid.

Boleslaw III,\textsuperscript{32} writes that during the civil war between Mieszko II and his brothers,

the neighboring kings and dukes had been riding roughshod over the portion of Poland nearest each of them, adding the cities and castles near the borders to their dominions or capturing them and leveling them to the ground. Yet at the same time as Poland was suffering this devastation and ruin at the hands of foreigners, her own inhabitants were doing even more senseless and ghastly things to her… In the end foreigners and her own people had between them reduced Poland to such desolation that she was stripped of almost all her wealth and population.\textsuperscript{33}

This language, comparable to that employed by Dlugosz in describing the civil wars of the 12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} centuries, suggests that in Boleslaw III’s own time, the devastation created by a civil war brought on by a chaotic and unmanaged succession was seen as just as much a problem as Dlugosz would later describe the devastation brought on by Boleslaw III’s over-managed succession, and that Boleslaw III would have wanted to avoid the fate for his country that his great-grandfather Mieszko II had suffered.

Gallus Anonymous then went on to describe how Mieszko II’s son Kazimierz I, was forced, after Mieszko II’s assassination in exile in Bohemia in 1034, to fight against the powerful nobles who had supported his uncles in order to regain his throne.\textsuperscript{34} In 1039, Kazimierz was able to cement his position as sole ruler of Poland but spent the remainder of his reign suppressing a Pagan reaction to the church and independence movements from the magnates in Pomerania and Mazovia. For this achievement in returning stable government and the Catholic Church to Poland, he is credited

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Gallus’ chronicle was almost certainly composed in defense of Boleslaw III’s actions in his civil war against his half-brother Zbigniew. See Zbigniew Dalewski, “A New Chosen People? Gallus Anonymus’s Narrative about Poland and Its Rulers,” in \textit{Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery} (Brepols Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe. Brepols Publishers, 2011), 145, 149.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Gallus Anonymous, \textit{Gesta Principum Polonorum}, 79.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Idem, 83; Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, \textit{Central Europe in the High Middle Ages}, 161.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
by later historians with the title of Kazimierz the Restorer. Kazimierz died in 1061, and his children, Boleslaw and Wladyslaw, managed to produce one of the only clean successions in Poland in the High Middle Ages. Kazimierz I’s younger son, Wladyslaw I, negotiated a settlement with his older brother where Boleslaw would rule as Boleslaw II over all of Poland, but Wladyslaw would have a large degree of autonomy as Boleslaw’s vassal in Mazovia. This prevented a succession conflict like the one that Boleslaw II and Wladyslaw’s father Kazimierz had to resolve and had the added bonus of not dividing the realm into independent polities, as Boleslaw III would unintentionally do in 1138.35

Boleslaw II’s reign began inauspiciously enough - in 1066 losing Pomerania to the pagan Slavs that his father had never quite successfully subdued. However, he was saved early in his rule by his strong relationship with the papacy (much like how Mieszko sought papal protection from German control) when he agreed to support Pope Gregory VII in the investiture conflict with his rival, the German Emperor. Unfortunately, relying on the church to keep the Polish nobility in line backfired after Boleslaw II, reminiscent of Henry II in England, had the Bishop of Krakow, Stanislaw, murdered in his church for allegedly plotting against him in 1079. Pope Gregory VII placed Poland under an interdict, and the powerful wojewod36 of Lesser Poland, Sieciech used this as a pretense to raise a rebellion against Boleslaw II and install Wladyslaw in his place. Having lost the support of now both the nobility and the church, Boleslaw II was forced to flee to Hungary, where he died in exile two years later.37 The Polish nobility wasted no time in replacing him with his brother Wladyslaw I, who was well positioned from his base of power in Mazovia to take over as leader of the country, though Wladyslaw would struggle on and off over who really exercised power in the country until the Lesser Poland-based

35 Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages*, 172-173.
36 A Wojewod (sometimes translated in English as Palatine) was the most senior political appointment in Poland until the 14th century. The wojewod served directly under the King as his deputy in a given province, with control over the army and the judiciary in that province. The of Lesser Poland, as the wealthiest region of Poland and the location of its capital and only major city, Krakow, was particularly powerful.
During Władysław’s reign of 1079-1102, the Polish church first tried to impose some order on the succession by declaring that Władysław’s younger son, by Judith of Bohemia, the future Bolesław III, would be the legitimate heir. However, Władysław I’s elder son, Zbigniew, born of a woman that Gallus Anonymous terms a “concubine”, had the greater support of the increasingly powerful and important Polish magnates who had helped Władysław himself come to power. They now contested Władysław’s succession plans. This led to a period of sporadic conflict between Władysław, Zbigniew, and Bolesław III, who made various tactical alliances with each other as necessity demanded. By 1096, they had finalized a plan whereby on Władysław I’s death, Zbigniew and Bolesław would avoid a devastating civil war by dividing the country roughly in half - the north to Zbigniew and the south, containing the capital, to Bolesław as the legitimate son in the eyes of the church. Gallus Anonymous relays the reported words of Władysław I on this subject, portraying him as genuinely interested in a power-sharing arrangement between his sons:

As an old and infirm man, it is my duty to divide the realm between them...However, to set the one before the other… is not something in my power, it belongs to God Almighty. Still, I can reveal to you the one desire of my heart: that after my death I would have you all with one accord obey the one who is wiser and better in defending the land and striking the foe. But in the meantime, let each of them keep the part of the realm as it has been divided between them.

This settlement was unlikely to last. Piotr Gorecki argues that, because of the variety of scenarios through which power was passed on in 11th century Poland, a single settled principle of succession that proved agreeable to all

38 Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, Central Europe in the High Middle Ages, 173.
39 Ibid.; Gallus Anonymous, Gesta Principum Polonorum, 123.
41 Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, Central Europe in the High Middle Ages, 173; Gallus Anonymous, Gesta Principum Polonorum, 123-135.
42 Gallus Anonymous, Gesta Principum Polonorum, 133-135.
did not exist at this time. Zbigniew, as the eldest, believed he had the right to succeed as the superior ruler, while Boleslaw III believed he had the same right, as the Church had designated his mother’s marriage to Władysław I as more legitimate.\footnote{Gorecki, “Ambiguous Beginnings,” 208.} Gallus Anonymous describes how, before Władysław was even dead, Bolesław and Zbigniew were already “bitter[ly] quarrel[ing] about the division of the treasury and the kingdom.”\footnote{Gallus Anonymous, \textit{Gesta Principum Polonorum}, 157.} The Czech chronicler Cosmas, writing roughly contemporaneously to Gallus Anonymous, also commented on the unlikelihood of Poland being able to long endure in a divided state between Zbigniew and Boleslaw. Cosmas wrote that “according to the Lord’s word, every kingdom divided against itself will be brought to desolation and house upon house will fall – or as is commonly said, two cats cannot be held in the same sack at the same time.”\footnote{Cosmas and Lisa Wolverton, \textit{The Chronicle of the Czechs} (Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 199-200.} Cosmas and Gallus also both agree that Zbigniew likely acted first in the conflict with Bolesław but that Bolesław was able to prevail with the support of the Rus and the Hungarians against Zbigniew’s Czech and Pomeranian backers.\footnote{Ibid.; Gallus Anonymous, \textit{Gesta Principum Polonorum}, 191.} Zbigniew Dalewski argues that this conflict was initially very mild in the period from 1102-1106, but constituted a “major political crisis” by 1106-07.\footnote{Zbigniew Dalewski, “A New Chosen People?,” 145; Zbigniew Dalewski, \textit{East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450-1450}, vol. 3, \textit{Ritual and Politics: Writing the History of a Dynastic Conflict in Medieval Poland}. (Boston: Brill, 2008,) 42.} By the end of 1107, Bolesław had decisively defeated Zbigniew and seized all of his territories. The Polish magnates, who had been split in their support for Zbigniew and Bolesław, negotiated a peace, allowing Zbigniew to stay on as ruler of Mazovia under Bolesław III, much as their father Władysław had for their uncle Bolesław II before his deposition in 1079.\footnote{Dalewski, \textit{Ritual and Politics}, 77.} Gallus Anonymous reports that Zbigniew was unable to tolerate this state of affairs, and was forced into exile for several years before being allowed back into Poland in 1111. Upon Zbigniew’s arrival, Bolesław heard rumors that Zbigniew was again plotting against him, and Bolesław, Gallus argues,
was forced to take action. Gallus Anonymous does not comment on the nature of what was done to Zbigniew, (Cosmas suggests that he was blinded and then executed) only that it was sufficiently shocking to require Boleslaw to do public penance and make a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Adalbert in Hungary. After this, Boleslaw’s reign was secure, even productive and expansionist. However, the issue of the principles of succession was still not settled so that all power brokers in Poland could agree.

Having lived through the brief civil war with his own half-brother, and through his father’s succession of his deposed uncle Boleslaw II, not to mention the living memory of the devastating civil war that his grandfather Kazimierz ended, Boleslaw III would have understood that, by the time of his own old-age in the 1130s, there was still no single agreed upon succession principle in Poland. Seeing that he had five sons and remembering that a war between only three sons had nearly destroyed Poland 100 years before, the potential consequences of this would have been clear to him. In light of these experiences and traditions Boleslaw’s decision in 1138 to take the unprecedented course of action, later to be so lamented with the benefit of hindsight by Dlugosz and others, could well have seemed to him to be an attempt to avoid the same kind of conflict that he and his ancestors had lived through.

The succession struggles of the early Polish monarchy began from, as Gorecki and Sedlar have highlighted, the fact that there were no universally agreed upon rules for deciding how the right to rule, which was believed to rest with the entire ruling family, would be passed down in practice. Beginning with the first king of Poland, Mieszko I, and his three sons, violent conflict had been the rule by which these struggles had been decided. Boleslaw I, as the German chronicler Thietmar documented, defeated his stepmother Oda to assert his right to rule over that of his half-brothers. Gallus Anonymous, writing during the lifetime of Boleslaw III in the early 12th century, provided an account of the next few generations.
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of succession conflicts, where the tension between the desire to maintain a unified polity and the patrimonial principle of succession repeatedly pitted fathers, sons, and brothers against each other. While the 15th century historian Jan Dlugosz reserves his harshest criticism for the protracted civil wars of the feudal disintegration of the 12th and 13th centuries, these earlier struggles also sometimes featured violent and immensely destructive wars which were just as significant for the people who lived through them as the later wars were for Dlugosz and his sources. Dalewski described the conflict between Boleslaw III and Zbigniew as a “major political crisis”, and Gallus Anonymous relayed the way in which all of Poland was laid to waste and central authority completely broke down during the civil war of the 1030s. Without the ability to see into the future, to the disastrous wars of the feudal disintegration, Boleslaw III could only look at what had come before.

Gallus Anonymous’s chronicle demonstrates that Boleslaw III would have known about both the wars that his predecessors had fought, and the circumstances that led these conflicts to arise. On top of this knowledge, Boleslaw III had the first-hand experience of first his conflict with Zbigniew, Wladyslaw, and Sieciech during his father’s lifetime, and the second war he had fought with Zbigniew after Wladyslaw’s death. Presented with the option of either risking the outbreak of another war like that which followed the sudden and unexpected death of Boleslaw I in 1025, or attempting to manage the succession to prevent war while he still had the chance, Boleslaw III chose to innovate. The system that he devised, the seniorate, seemed to mostly satisfy the both competing principles of patrimonialism and political unity that perplexed all of the regimes of East Central Europe during this period. Each of his sons would receive control over a major province, while still owing formal allegiance to the eldest, in a manner similar to how Kazimierz the Restorer had successfully avoided war between his children Boleslaw II and Wladyslaw. While it may seem obvious to us in hindsight that the seniorate system would create the sort of political fragmentation that ultimately did emerge, Boleslaw III, in the late 1130s, would have no historical precedent for this. Fearing unmanaged successions, and with some inclination that a well-executed settlement of the type he was attempting could work, Boleslaw III did not see his
testament as the inevitable ruin of Polish unity, but as a reasoned attempt to preserve it.
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The 1960s paved the way for a different type of values to become the social norm – social justice, revolution, and equality. However, not everyone looked upon the ‘60s in the same way. The older generations refused to change their perspective and chose to keep the values of the past very much in their present. Those who held the loudest opposition were the youth. Organizing became a large aspect of the college experience at San Francisco State College (SFSC). The young, conscious minds that attended higher education during the late ‘60s yearned to alter their world and have it reflect back in their communities. SFSC was the epicenter of change for such youth. Students of color and their allies faced discrimination, abuse from police and arrests in order to obtain what is now known as the College of Ethnic Studies, the first and only in the country. Many students and staff risked their entire careers and futures for a chance to be heard and have their histories told.

Looking through documents and personal accounts, the strike was not as successful as it was made to appear. The disruption of campus life was necessary for change provided by the Third World Liberation Front to combat and end the elitist, capitalistic, patriarchal, and racist standard that was academia. However, it had its faults. Despite the problematic present-day romanticizing of the student movement, the strike was extensively draining to the organizers resulting in tension among the students, brutal physical attacks by police, and an inability to maintain leadership over economic and administrative details that would later impede its success. This paper will dive into what began the strike, discuss the student organizations involved, some of the complications they faced within the movement, and how it has
affected the future of the College of Ethnic Studies.

According to William H. Orrick Jr., the author of a staff report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence titled *Shut It Down! A College in Crisis*, he argues that the draft for the Vietnam War was a large issue on the campus in ’67. Orrick describes the overall feeling of students on campus before the strike, “…supporters and opponents of the Asian conflict clashed in marches, demonstrations, and name-calling sessions…The campus mirrored the tension in the society at large; ‘the war’ and ‘racism’ were the issues…”¹ Conflicts in society are often reflected back into the school systems. The war in Vietnam intercepted a younger, more educated generation being forced to put themselves on the front lines of a colossal war they mostly disagreed with. This helped them see the hypocrisy in their own homeland a little clearer. John Summerskill was president of SFSC at the time and dealt with anti-war protests almost daily.² Students were upset with the war and how detrimental the draft had been within their communities. Many men of color that were drafted never came home, as they were very often sent to the front lines where the rates of casualties was the highest. Many hypocritical aspects of society were brought to the surface, and the privileged youth could no longer look past them.³

Many scholars’ writings in the decades after the strike critique the overall effectiveness and process they worked to change. In Angela Ryan’s *Counter College: Third World Students Reimagine Public Higher Education*, she explains the revolutionary perspective and how difficult it was for the students to truly achieve it. She focused on two student-led college strikes that occurred during the late ‘60s, in San Francisco and New York. Communities of color were speaking loudly against the aggressive institutionalized racism they faced on a daily basis. Through the changing consciousness, revolutionary thought was coming forth and with that came
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the Experimental College and the Tutorial Program. The argument she poses is that these students constructed a new ideology, a new method of education ran by and strictly for the students, specifically focused on students of color.\textsuperscript{4} With a similar view of Ryan’s, Merle Woo writes in \textit{What Have We Accomplished? From the Third World Strike Through the Conservative Eighties}, she adds that regardless of these inducing efforts by the students and their allies, capitalism was the overall destruction of the strike. No matter how forceful and progressive the students were, capitalism would never allow such revolutionary progress. The education system and those who hold high positions within it is dependent on capitalism. In their minds, losing money or control would never be allowed in a capitalist society. The large underlying issue that the strikers combated against was how difficult it is to make change when one battles capitalism in society.\textsuperscript{5}

The 1960s birthed a different political and social consciousness. Social justice reform was being fought for from coast to coast. It was a time of great hostility, both on and off campus. Due to racism heavily prevalent in society, students were still facing social exclusion and harsh discrimination based on their culture and the color of their skin. The pull between generations was stronger than ever with the protests against the Vietnam War, the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, the Chicano Movement in Los Angeles and the Civil Rights Movement all over the country. The Black Panther Party was founded just across the Bay in Oakland, and much of the rhetoric spoke to the Black youth. They began pushing for equity in classrooms and schools from elementary education to college. One of the foundational goals throughout the Black Panther organization was education and an equitable means of access to it. The Panthers devoted many hours into educating the public on issues of politics and laws that affected their communities. The Panthers believed in Black empowerment and one step to achieving that was through education. Through scientific studies, they realized that a healthy breakfast lead to an increase in a student’s ability to learn, retain knowledge,
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and overall helps them to further succeed in life. Due to these findings, they implemented a free breakfast campaign to feed hungry students before school throughout their communities. This type of community building effort was instilled within many youth of color trying to change the gross inequality of children of color.

Along with the Black Panthers, many other communities of color saw a wave of political and social outreach. The focus was to elevate their communities by recognizing the struggle and fighting the capitalistic, “democratic” structure of the U.S. government. In an article by Karen Umemoto, she notes that even though many communities of color at this time were pulling from the Panthers, each group “was unique to their cultures and respective experiences in the United States. [They] promoted pride in national heritage; they sought ‘self-determination’ and ‘power to the people’.”

All of this was reflected in the social-political climate on college campuses across the United States with students gathering together to fight the social norm. De Vere Pentony in Unfinished Rebellions, reflect on this particular type of new generation and how college campuses are the central location for these mindsets:

A lack of inhibition, a willingness to risk, a freer attitude toward sex and other taboos, a deep drive for fulfilling and intimate human relationships, a revulsion against a societal hypocrisy and establishment power, a yearning for peace and racial harmony, an a capacity for personal involvement and commitment: all of these tendencies appear to be documented as reflecting a variant culture. …[these] attitudes…threated the value system of those in power, and that produce conduct which – in the minds of some – should be disciplined.


Eventually this ideology lead to the formation of the Third World Liberation Front made up of students of color at San Francisco State College in 1968. They organized the longest student strike in United States history dating from November 6th, 1968 to March 21st, 1969. As an organization they came up with a list of fifteen demands encompassing community related courses, student democracy, rehiring of professors of color, and the formation of a Third World College.⁹

Margaret Leahy, a student at San Francisco State College during the 1968 strike, also began to recognize the racial tensions within the state system. She states that the assassination of Malcolm X, the Watts riots, and the Experimental College at SFSC all played a role in the emergence of the student led strike and the developing consciousness that she saw within her community, “More students began working with community groups to alter the social and economic barriers that hampered the educational potential of poor and minority students as much as poor schools did”.¹⁰

The Experimental College was a creative space that allowed the students to create their own courses and curriculum and hire those they sought fit to teach such as community members that had firsthand experience. It began offering classes to students whose histories were never told, whose histories did not meet the white, Eurocentric standard. This shifted their perspective of themselves, their past and their families. The Experimental College allowed for ethnic studies-based courses to be created that focused on cultural histories, languages, and community based issues. The Tutorial Program was a community organizing program that shifted from white focused leadership to students of color meeting the needs of certain communities – Black students in the Fillmore, Latinx students in the Mission, etc.

Leaders of the ’68 strike like Mariana Waddy (Black Student Union), Jimmy Garrett (Black Student Union), and Roger Alvarado (Latin American Student Organization) emerged from the program to begin the fight and
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demand for Ethnic Studies.\textsuperscript{11}

When the school began to release students’ academic standings to the military, protests erupted on campus. On May 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1967, sixty students demonstrated a sit-in in Summerskill’s office.\textsuperscript{12} This began Summerskill’s routine of listening to the students’ concerns without developing any sort of change. Nothing had been done on his part to help reflect that he considered their opinions valid; the students wanted an end to the indoctrinated education-military nature of the past. He writes in his memoir, \textit{President Seven}, of his short presidency\textsuperscript{13}, “Discussion got nowhere, it was not supposed to, it was a confrontation. The students wanted change, not talk. They were convinced that talk was only rationalized and delay on the part of those in power, ‘the establishment’.”\textsuperscript{14} This was an accurate representation of the lack of concern by the administration and the institution to address the student’s issues. Administrators solely saw the students as agitators that would eventually die out. The animosity and tension only grew on campus and began to expand through other organizations.

The roles played by these young college students were extremely important to the shifting of social and political consciousness in their communities and on campus. The Experimental College, the Tutorial Program, Anti-War demonstrations, and a push for a more culturally inclusive curriculum brought students from all types of backgrounds together to eventually become an entity on campus – The Third World Liberation Front (TWLF). According to the S.F. State Bulletin produced by the third world students, “The Third World Liberation front at SFSC consists of Black, Mexican, Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, and Indian students.”\textsuperscript{15} On campus, the ethnic organizations banned together, named themselves the TWLF and created a twelve member central committee that worked side by side with

\textsuperscript{11} Leahy, “On Strike! We’re Gonna Shut it Down: The 1968-69 San Francisco State Strike.”, 17.

\textsuperscript{12} San Francisco State University. “The San Francisco State College Strike Collection: Chronology of Events.” sfsu.edu, accessed April, 16, 2017

\textsuperscript{13} He was president from September, 1966 to May 24, 1968.

\textsuperscript{14} Summerskill, \textit{President Seven}, 91.

\textsuperscript{15} #7 “S.F. State strike bulletin”. Third World Liberation Front folder, box # 3 0750 02138 7455. San Francisco State University Archive.
their brothers and sisters of different backgrounds to develop a curriculum based on their histories, struggles and revolutions. TWLF encompassed organizations such as: Black Student Union (BSU); La Raza, comprised of the Latin American Students Organization (LASO) and Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC); Philippine American Collegiate Endeavor (PACE); Native American Student Organization (NASO); Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action (ICSA); Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA). White students involved were asked to participate as allies, recognize their privilege within the system of oppression that is the United States and to not “raise any demands of their own, [be in] adherence to the principle of third world self-determination, and [agree] to work within whatever strategy the TWLF devised.” Many of the white allies also participated in the Civil Rights Movement, advocating and organizing for voting rights for the Black community. Some ended up becoming “Freedom Riders”, an activist group named for their refusal to abide by laws that designated bus seats by race. All of these students battled the administration, the hierarchy of the education system, and the government in order to achieve the creation of the only College of Third World Studies at any higher-level education institution - a small step toward racial equality in California.

Before students of color pushed for an equitable education “by all means necessary”, by walking out on classes, marching throughout the school demanding for administrative change, facing police brutality and being arrested – there was the Tutorial Program. In 1964, the student government, Associated Students (AS), funded a student-sponsored program to help bridge the gap between higher education and students of
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color. It began in the Fillmore District, an area in San Francisco that had a high Black population. Hundreds of volunteers promoted the importance of education and having leaders that resemble themselves. The SFSC Tutorial Program was ensured by SFSC’s Community Involvement Program, which also developed a discussion on other issues within the community that might affect one’s educational development, such as housing and employment. The Black Student Union organization at SFSC, influenced heavily by the Black Panthers, saw the Fillmore District Tutorial Program as a prime example as to why Ethnic Studies, specifically Black Studies, was necessary. They began to vocalize their frustrations and discontent with the schools inability to address a true Black history, discuss issues relating to Black life, and a lack of Black administrators, staff and faculty. Other students of color were reaching out to their communities in the San Francisco districts: Latinx students working in the Mission and Asian American students working in Chinatown. These students were able to see the great importance of their labor and efforts. Many students involved in the strike and the demand for a Third World College realized the necessity for it through these programs where they also developed their beginning stages of organization and effecting change within their communities.\(^{21}\)

Another major influence to the strikers was the Experimental College. It not only affected students of color, but white students as well. The classes proposed a different type of thought process and outlook to develop a radical conscious on political and social identities. Margaret Leahy, in *Ten Years that Shook the City: San Francisco 1968-78*, describes the benefits of the college,

> Some white students began to question the relevance of their education through exposure to new ideas…a few faculty members who also questioned the “truths” of academia, and through the questions of a national and international social movement that no longer simply accepted what it was told by those in positions of authority.\(^{22}\)


\(^{22}\) Idem, 17.
The ideas and topics that were being facilitated in these classrooms were some students’ first time exposure to perspectives that did not solely focus on the vast “achievements” of the white man. This was a space for different voices and histories to be heard and told. Barlow in *An End to Silence*, states that the student who is most credited for the creation of the college, Jim Nixon, believed, “the value of the [it] would lie in its enabling students to test our their critique of the established educational system, to test their vision of the Utopia they hoped to replace it with, to persuade other students… to organize them to fight for that goal.”

The discussion of Black Studies program or department had been started in 1967 with a small amount of classes being taught on the subject at the Experimental College. Jimmy Garrett organized “Urban Action”, Ira Sandperl taught “Black Nationalism” and other courses based on revolutionary mindsets were made available. The College was a large step for the BSU to recognize the value of their education and gave them groundwork to develop on.

As time passed and the push for Black Studies was at a steady, slow pace, the Black Student Union, led by Mariana Waddy and Jimmy Garrett began producing a larger political conscious and began searching for support. In an effort to build on their demands of the college, they reached out to other ethnic organizations on campus. A leader for ICSA, A. W., first viewed the work of the BSU to be exclusive and benefitting only the Black students on campus. He reflects back to a conversation with a BSU member:

“Okay fine, you Blacks need to go to school, so you guys fight it, and I won’t go against it. But I’m not for it because what am I getting out of this?” And he said, “What about all your Chinese who can’t get into school?”... And I said, “Okay convince me what you can give me and my people”... And he said, “We’ve got counseling, tutoring service, we have special admissions”... So I said, “All right, I’m in.” That was the first time in my life that somebody, not Asian, was willing to share with me their pot of gold. So I had nothing to lose,
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and all to gain, and then I got involved.  

They began focusing on the comradery of other students of color and gathering other communities into the conversation. An “all or none” type of mentality began to form, which pushed the students to work tirelessly for their goal. However, it was not always as easy to sway others to join. Before the strike, Roger Alvarado, a Latino student attending SF State, worked passionately to establish the Mission District’s Tutorial Program in efforts to propel students into the college sphere. Through this, he was able to push the Latin American Student Organization (LASO) into developing a Latin American Studies Program for the TWLF. William Barlow in _An End to Silence_ remarks on the struggle to obtain a strong coalition before the strike began, “…but up until September of 1968, the Latin students participated only marginally in the third world student organization. Part of this was because they felt that associating with the alliance might jeopardize their chances of getting…Latin American studies.” In an interview with Dan Gonzales, former ’68 striker and current professor at San Francisco State University, he noted that Roger Alvarado, an eventual leading figure for La Raza, had an impeccable way with people; he remembers him as, “the coolest guy with the least ego.” Alvarado faced resistance when LASO and the MASC merged into La Raza mostly due to different personalities coming together to organize under one affiliation.

With the help of Alvarado, the Latinx community believed that although coming from different countries, their experiences on campus and in the highly Eurocentric world that is the United States helped them merge together to become one. In a document addressing the student body titled,
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Third World Liberation Front’s Position on the faculty’s “Task Force” the Latinx students stated, “[We] have come together in Latin American Student Organization because, for our survival, both as individuals and as a people, it is necessary for us to unite.” The students from LASO and from MASC organized as “La Raza” under TWLF. The development of La Raza created the camaraderie necessary to reach their objectives and propelled student Roger Alvarado to the forefront of the organization.

Complications arose almost immediately. Gonzales states that there were three main issues that were seen amongst the strikers: ideological differences, large personalities, and economic means. Many of the strikers were forced to meet a middle ground between the ideological routes they wanted to take. Some students were criticized for being too radical or not enough. Barlow analyzes this behavior through the process of the emergence of LASO in TWLF, “…but also LASO was also still somewhat uneasy with the militant revolutionary stance of the Black Students Union.” This impeded on their progress in the beginning. Gonzales refers to these complications as a time of “the reformists versus the revolutionaries.” Many white students were participants of the Students for a Democratic Society, which conflicted with other students’ ideologies that focused on Trotsky, Mao, Marx or Lenin. At times this would pose friction on what became “relevant education” according to the strikers. They were all battling the “destructive effect of the ‘typical liberal education’ offered by the college” and had difficulties unanimously agreeing on what that looked like.

Along with their ideologies, people’s personalities made their way into the organizing, which at times also made it very difficult to work with. According to Gonzales, this was evident during the collaboration between
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LASO and MASC to create on entity through La Raza as stated previously. Economically, the means were not distributed equally or equitably. BSU, being the organization fighting for an inclusive education the longest, gathered the most amount of funding. BSU was granted 12.3 positions to fill within their department, La Raza was given 3-4, and both Asian American and Native American studies was given 2.4-2.5. Gonzales stated that many arguments arose due to these numbers. BSU was the organization that pushed the discussion for Ethnic Studies, which resulted in them holding the majority the funding from the college. In order to keep their funding, students would need to regularly fill all the classrooms. Until the general education requirements were tied to ethnic studies classes, it was difficult to ensure minimum capacity in classrooms. Without minimum capacity the classes would be cut and funding lost. This inevitably hurt the Black Studies Department when President Hayakawa repeatedly attacked them for its lack of attendance and threatened to cut the program. This is still a tactic used today by higher education officials in present day.

Not only did the strikers face complications from within, they endured great attacks from the administration, each President of the school from ‘67-’69, and from the government. Gonzales stated that many of the strikers became extremely paranoid and were most likely targets of the FBI. Many of the Panthers were on this list, so logically any persons affiliated would lengthen the list. Ronald Reagan, the 40th president and California state governor at this time, was decidedly against the strike at SFSC. In An End to Silence, his perception of the movement and of himself in regards to it, speak volumes to the type of position the administration posed:

Governor Reagan demanded of President Smith that the BSU have no part in the Black Studies Department if it were to be instituted.
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“I’ve travelled up and down this state talking to responsible Negro leaders…and I know I speak for the 98 percent of the Negro community which wants no part of the Black Students’ Union when I condemn them for their tactics of violence and disruption…we’re here to determine the reopening of the that school…and to rid the campus of those who cause disruption.”

Reagan and the presidents of the college were in support of the large amount of police presence on campus that was used in effort to destroy the strikers. The strikers used a tactic referred to as “War of the Flea” – guerilla warfare that “seeks to aggravate social and political tensions to raise the level of political consciousness and revolutionary will.” They disrupted campus life to try and acquire a level of understanding of frustration with other students.

The terminology used to vilify the students was clearly evident in the newspapers articles written during the time period. This was a tactic used by the opposition to discredit the strikers at every chance they could. In the New York Times, John Bunzel paints the strikers in a very negative light and focuses strictly on their militant and disruptive behavior. He condescendingly provides his opinion of the strike,

President Smith had announced the creation of a new Department of Black Studies in the first week of the fall semester, two weeks before the strike begun. One does not make a black studies department like instant potatoes. But if those who were in charge of its planning had been more interested in getting down to serious business…instead of playing revolution, they would have met with far more success and the program would be much farther along today.

There were small strides made for a Black Studies program by the
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administration, however, not in a manner that BSU accepted. George Murray, Minister of Education for the Black Panther Party, a member of BSU and a lecture professor in the English Department at SFSC, was fired due to his affiliation with the Panthers and a trip to Cuba. BSU called for his rehire and placement into the Black Studies Department or they would strike on December 6th, 1968. He was never rehired.

The administration was congratulated by higher officials for its effort to dismantle the strike. Many students, some faculty and sympathizers were beaten, arrested and sentenced for time in jail for expressing their frustrations. They were mostly processed as a failure to disperse, however during these confrontations many police used excessive force to try and draw out the crowds. On January 23rd, 1969, two months into the strike, 380 people were arrested in what the *Los Angeles Times* called an “illegal S.F. State rally” and concluded that this was the largest mass arrest in San Francisco’s history, “…it took three hours for the 380 to be searched, photographed and loaded into paddy wagons and a sheriff’s bus for 17 separate trips to the city jail.”

According to Barlow in *An End to Silence*, 150 highway patrol officers were gathering at the library and roughly the same amount of S.F. police officers were lined in front of the science building, “[They] used their clubs aggressively to close the circle, and very few students were able to escape.” Barlow states that roughly 450 strikers were arrested that day and some 200 women had high-pressure water hoses used against them if they objected in any way. He goes on to describe the jailhouse conditions as “abominable” and extremely overcrowded. The strikers went eighteen hours without any food, very few were allowed their phone call, and most had to sleep on the concrete floor. At this point in time, roughly 700 students, faculty and other strikers had been arrested. One of the TWLF demands were to protect the faculty that participated (TWLF demand #5) and that no disciplinary action be administered to the student participants subsequently

---
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(BSU demand #8). Many of the faculty did not receive their jobs back and students who were found with “violent acts” were subject to suspension.\textsuperscript{44}

The TWLF concentrated on organizing a curriculum focused on communities of color: Black, Mexican American/Chicanx, Latin American, Filipino American, and Chinese American studies. The document titled, \textit{The Institute for the Development of Ethnic Area Studies}, found in the SFSC strike archive, gave detail about each of the areas of study and specifically focuses on these communities of color in efforts to change the dialogue on campus. It stated,

> The institute clearly intends to be involved in exposing the racism, poverty and misrepresentation imposed on minority peoples by the... United States...The process of such clarification and exposure will be developed through the collection, organization and presentation through ethnic areas of studies of all information relevant to the historical and contemporary positions of the minority peoples...\textsuperscript{45}

Within the course list document, Latin American Studies has a great deal of information and criteria that is used to define what exactly is expected of the program. The class titled “Latin American People in the Bay Area” focuses on “identifying similarities and differences with regard to the exploitation and colonization suffered by Latins in the Southwest as well as Latin America.”\textsuperscript{46}

The reading list focuses solely on male Latinos: Juan Jose Arevalo, a former Guatemalan president; Oscar Lewis, Mexican author; Octavio Paz, another Mexican author and poet; Julian Samora, a Chicano activist; Che Guevara, born in Argentina but advocated for the Cuban revolution; and Fidel Castro, a Cuban revolutionary that became the dictator. The voices chosen exclude many other countries in Latin America.

The research seminar was based off of the study of some native


\textsuperscript{45} #3: “The Institute for the Development of Ethnic Area Studies is specifically organized and operated... n.d.”, Third World Liberation Front folder, box number 3 0750 02138 7455. San Francisco State University Archive.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
indigenous communities in Latin America. The class focused primarily on three: The Maya, native to some southern states in Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, El Salvador and Honduras; the Incas, native to Peru; and the Mexica (Aztecs), native to central Mexico. The classes seemed to be androcentric and focus primarily on Mexico and some Central American countries. Another class offered was the “Introduction to the Study of Creole”, which broadened the scope to include Latinxs from the Caribbean. Although this was a great first step toward a larger conversation to be had about Latinxs and their origins, historical struggles and achievements, the program’s curriculum was heavily focused on Mexicans and can be seen as an erasure to other Latinxs.47

One of the focuses of the newly developed Ethnic Studies was a “theory to action” system. The students would focus on developing themselves through knowledge of history, community organizing, and furthering their political consciousness’s. Once they have achieved that they could use their privilege and access to high education by returning to their communities to further address issues within. The Ethnic Studies College was very interested in implementing a “Serve the People” type of system where students can critically analyze their histories, struggles and appreciate their achievements and use it as a tool to enforce positive change in their communities.48 What many students wanted to witness on campus, and eventually all of society, was social and political change. Gonzales describes the need for “relevant education” based on the access to humanize rather than dehumanize education, a means to grow institutions that legitimize working class people, people of color, single mothers, etc. The strikers strove for an intersectional recognition of identity and produced discussions on imperialism, colonialism, racism, sexism and how they all tied together. Merle Woo reflects that all the strikers read Paulo Freire’s, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and were following by example of other Third World liberation movements; they too demanded the “right to autonomy,

---

47 #3: “The Institute for the Development of Ethnic Area Studies is specifically organized and operated… n.d.”, Third World Liberation Front folder, box number 3 0750 02138 7455. San Francisco State University Archive.

democracy, and self-determination.”49

Under the new formation of Ethnic Studies, these types of discussions would become the standard and produce critical minds to hopefully help develop their communities and shed an old perspective on new eyes. The four main divisions of study that the TWLF created were: Asian American, Black, Native American, and La Raza. These became the departments in the future College of Ethnic Studies. Gonzales was a part of the committee that proposed the curriculum for Asian American Studies within the Third World College back in 1968. This included classes specific to Filipino, Chinese and Japanese communities and a “Pan Asian” course to include more of the Asian communities. Many of the Filipino students on campus gathered with Chinese and Japanese students to discuss and create their future Asian American department.50

Originally, many of the professors were graduate students with similar philosophies. Gonzales reflects that it was difficult to trust and uncover like-minded higher educated professors due to their conservative perspectives. He stated that camaraderie was key in the development of the curriculum. Gonzales and other developers wished to see Ethnic Studies grow as an entity of radical minded individuals that would push for a better environment on campus and in society.51

In Angela Ryan’s Counter College: Third World Students Reimagine Public Higher Education, she focuses primarily on the face that with such a capitalistic state – the strike never had a chance to truly succeed. Looking through the demands and the resolutions, she was quite correct. Although the students, faculty and other strikers fought for four and half months to obtain their revolutionary college, they were unable to fully fulfill their expectations. The students were given their College of Ethnic Studies, however, they did not fulfill their demand for autonomy and were given “no legal authority” despite the community board that the administration

49  Merle Woo. “What Have We Accomplished? From the Third World Strike Through the Conservative Eighties.”: 82.
produced. They demanded that their professors that stood by them would be reinstated and “forgiven” by the administration; this was not achieved. They demanded that all students of color applicants be allowed a chance at a college education; SFSC agreed to potentially accept 128 Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students. The most crucial demand was not met – “Demand #9: That the California State College Trustees not be allowed to dissolve any Black programs on or off the San Francisco State College campus”; no resolution was ever implemented. This was Hayakawa’s way of viciously attacking Black Studies year after year until his time at State was over.\(^{52}\) This resolution became the groundwork for the administration’s attack on the Ethnic Studies College; an aspect of the university that they love to manipulate through the media as their most prized possession solely to gain the liberal public’s admiration. Because of this overlooked demand, students mobilized in 2016 to save their college from collapse.

In 2016, the continued existence of the College of Ethnic Studies was under attack. The College’s budget had been threatened severely, which could potentially have dismantled decades of hard work to maintain the College. Student organizers, like back in ’68, gathered together to face the administration as “Defend and Advance Ethnic Studies”; however, like in ’68, many younger strikers felt that their concerns were not being addressed and were pushed aside. The senior organizers had placed a lot of the work on themselves and inevitably excluded many in the process. The younger strikers took it upon themselves to combat the administration without heeding the warning by older organizers to wait until all other options were exasperated. The hunger strike, headed by four freshman and sophomores, did not end quite as planned. Many of the demands that were placed forward still have not been addressed two years later and the betrayal many organizers feel is still abundant.\(^{53}\) The overall necessity of a second strike in 2016 results from the lack of funding and support from the administration and overall acceptance of the College of Ethnic Studies dating back to 1968; although it seemed like a win for students of color, as


time passed, one can develop a hypothesis that more was needed to be done in order for the college to be a truly successful and thriving entity.

To many people, Ethnic Studies is redundant; why have another history department? The reality is that students of color were not taught their histories growing up; they were not taught why the society excludes them – a society built on racism and capitalism, thus the exploitation of people of color’s bodies and minds. Attacks against this knowledge are anything but new. A member of LASO and a striker stated,

The educational system is no accident…it’s not simply a matter of not including what our culture is about, what our history is about… It’s a process of miseducation. It has a purpose…to teach us not how to change our community, or even live in it, but how to escape it by denying that we are part of it.54

The students of the ’68 were striving to decolonize the mindsets of the institutions, their communities, their peers and themselves. They discovered that one’s history is important and relevant not only to themselves but to the world. They realized that the institution they were feeding their minds into was missing a large part of history and they intended to bring it to the forefront.

Looking back on his days as a campus organizer and a ’68 striker, Dan Gonzales wishes they pushed for this on a grander to scale to help support the overall struggle. If he could go back and change anything, it would be to have infiltrated the younger generations and the institutions that controlled their educations.55 Decades later California has passed AB 2016 that implements Ethnic Studies as a part of the high school graduation requirements beginning 2020 statewide. San Francisco City high schools have begun including Ethnic Studies classes as part of the curriculum to be taught as freshman and senior classes. However, the fight is never


The future of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State, in California, and nationwide is dependent on those who will fight the continuous battle against institutions who wish to silence them. The strikers came together to try and combat the institution for the betterment of future generations. Many of them never were able to take the classes they fought for, however many returned back into the community and some came back to teach Ethnic Studies. The essence of the strike was brotherhood and sisterhood – building coalitions to help combat the institution and gaining knowledge from those past. The legendary Assata Shakur speaks to her people:

> It is our duty to fight for our freedom.
> It is our duty to win.
> We must love each other and support each other.
> We have nothing to lose but our chains.  

---
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Domestic Social Change and Development in the Second World War on the American Home Front

Alesha Sohler

During World War II, the United States called out to American women to join the cause against the axis powers by leaving the home and going to work in the factories to fill the void in employment left behind by enlisted men. Although there were women who had been employed prior to the war, this call to action brought an influx of women to the workforce from all over the country at unprecedented rates. These large numbers of people joining the workforce led to the development of boomtowns across the nation including the city of Richmond, California whose population increased exponentially and at such a rate that had made it seem as if it were overnight according to historian Gerald Nash.1 Richmond would be forced to overcome housing shortages for those who came to be employed by the fifty-six different war time operations offering employment opportunities that for so many had not been previously available. Education historian Charles Dorn points out that with the increase in working adults, especially women, demand for schools and education surpassed what Richmond could sustain in the pre-war era and something had to be done.2 Henry J. Kaiser put into motion the childcare centers and schools in which children of his employees could receive around the clock care and education.3 Opening these centers directly for working mothers allowed them the opportunity to hold employment without the worries that their children would be destitute and on the streets as historian, William Tuttle Jr. explains was a common

3 Ibid.
belief during the war’s early years.\(^4\) Within the ranks of employment in Richmond, segregation was an issue during the early developmental years. However, integration in many areas became a part of the complex social changes that took place in the Bay Area.\(^5\) Employees were needed in every defense industry and people of many races and ethnicities found jobs in Richmond while their children had a place within the city’s schools.\(^6\)

Questions come up when dealing with the complexities of a city that developed almost overnight and was filled with people who had an increase in opportunity that they had not previously enjoyed. Where did the thousands of Americans migrate from to fill these war industry jobs that were available and what were their socioeconomic backgrounds? Why did the acceptance of women into the ranks of employment during the war years not replace the idealized vision of the housewife in the post war years? How did the city of Richmond cope with the large influx of people over such as short time and how did they accommodate the new residents? What effect would this type of boom have on a small farming community, not only during the 1940’s, but in the years following the end of the war? Through personal testimony and varied documentation, I will aim to answer these questions while proving that the war’s industrial needs came to a head within the gender bias of the time, the socioeconomic differences of the women and the families who came to Richmond for work, and the creation of unique government programs such as childcare were catalysts for immense social changes that would go beyond the war era and have a lasting impact in the Bay Area.

Historians have long looked at how World War II affected the world be it through the politics surrounding the war, the physical warfare and how it reshaped the world, and the millions of men and women who served all across the world. Battles have been analyzed and movies have been produced recreating scenes portraying these horrific times as patriotic events, but the

---


\(^5\) Dorn, *American Education*, 113-123.

focus has been primarily on the battlefront all while the home front remains to be the understudy. The women who stayed behind and continued to supply the United States military with the planes, vehicles, and weapons have been sidelined as they are not the usual focus. Donna B. Knaff described that popular advertisements of the time—whose intent was to recruit women—were often rather conflicting and confusing. This is outlined in her book *Beyond Rosie the Riveter: Women of World War II in American Popular Graphic Art*, which explains that women did not suddenly pick up and start working, as opposed to the popular belief. Instead she argues that it was a gradual progression into the workforce. Many industries already contained many working women who had no other choice but to work to support their families and themselves.7 Maureen Honey outlines how the women who worked in the defense industries were supplanted back into the kitchens upon the return of the men and how the war failed to successfully liberate women into retaining positions that they had performed so well in during the war. Honey uses propaganda in popular culture from the period to explain how “traditional ideas” of the American housewife were unaltered by the war and that the barrage of propaganda was a contributing factor to creating the idealized womanhood that did not include women filling positions of employment traditionally held by men.8 Charles Dorn examines the city of Richmond and its war era daycare and education systems that were initiated by Kaiser and federally funded. He focuses on the need for these centers for the working population while looking at the demographics of the emigrants whose children attended and how anti-discriminatory practices were put into place. Public education in Richmond was believed to be available for all regardless of race or ethnicity as this was student’s democratic right especially during a war that was being fought against tyranny.9

Historian Sherna Berger Gluck, over the course of three years, interviewed women who actively held roles during the world war and were considered “Rosie’s.” Gluck describes how these different women all


held similar views when it came to their own accomplishments and roles they held within that era, and how these women changed through their experiences. Additionally, Gluck puts forth the idea of social change and how it is measured through the telling of these women’s oral histories. Although these women still labeled themselves as wives and mothers much like they did pre-war, Gluck states “their experiences during war time showed that they were more than that.”

William Tuttle Jr. takes on the issue of latchkey children and the perception that many had of working mothers as being neglectful parents. He dissects the popular view during the war that the women who were employed in the defense industry in Richmond abandoned their children and disproves this belief by providing key examples of mothers who were “defend[ing] their country by working in the nation’s shipyards and factories” while also being highly aware of their roles as parents. Tuttle provides four specific examples of how the children of the defense production employees were educated and cared for through child centers, education, and parents themselves.

Gerald Nash traced the expansion of the western region of the United States and how the war “transformed” the west through industry developed during the war which would quickly lead to an economic boom through the growing population in Richmond. Nash also touches on how the increase in population affected the urban development in Richmond which lead leading to housing shortages during the war.

Mark S. Foster details the life of Henry J. Kaiser as an American entrepreneur who shaped the west through his various business ventures while contributing to developing Richmond through his shipyards and later with the schools and child centers he pushed for his employees.

Richmond represented the “quintessential war boom town in America” according to historian Gerald Nash and proved to be the ideal location for industry development and population growth.

---


11 Tuttle Jr., “Rosie the Riveter and Her Latchkey Children,” 83.


location for its war defense industries. Richmond was a city ripe for war production and held the potential to become a key part of the United States’ war on the axis powers. Although the Great Depression had hit the area hard, as it had all over the country, Richmond’s economy was not as negatively hard felt as other parts of the United States such as the South. The city was home to a Standard Oil refinery that arrived in 1904 and a Ford assembly plant, proposed in 1928, which provided residence with industrial positions of employment outside the rural farming community in which they resided. In 1940, Richmond was selected to be the site for one of Henry J. Kaiser’s first ship building yards as there was a deep-water port that was ideal for ships to be built and deployed through. Although the war had been waging in Europe for some time, the United States had largely remained out of it on an official capacity, but entrepreneurs like Kaiser saw opportunities for business. He signed a contract for sixty cargo ships to be built for the British as they were losing ships quickly to German U-boats historian, Mark Foster describes. This brought an additional 4,500 jobs to the mostly blue-collar population halfway through 1941 and began with little to no fanfare other than residents that were pleased with the additional employment.

The Richmond School District in the pre-war years was divided into an elementary school district and a high school district. Dorn details that Walter Helms held the position of superintendent to both districts that served between the two districts, 6,417 students by the year 1940. Although the students had schools to attend, many of the schools were lacking modern functions such as electricity, and many were already a quarter of a century old and needed repairs and updating that the superintendent would not take care of. Helms would later go on to defend the lack of updates such as not having electricity and would win the argument between both of the districts to the dismay of the parents who broached the subject. According

15  Foster, Henry J. Kaiser, 70-71.
16  Idem, 72.
17  Dorn, American Education, 99-100.
18  Idem, 99-103.
19  Idem, 101.
to Fortune magazine, in the months leading up to the war, Richmond had “good schools and a good government” and would be unprepared for the waves of migration that would be coming to their “law-abiding, financially sound” city.\textsuperscript{20}

December 7, 1941, the day of the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, ignited a fuse amongst the people of the United States that could not be put out. The following day, America joined the allied forces in World War II and quickly, men across the nation were joining up to fight and the nation’s needs for war materials increased exponentially. The wartime needs boosted the country’s economy and led to a massive mobilization of forces within the United States including the development of extraordinary job opportunities for women that previously had not been accessible in the years prior. Mass migrations of families and individuals to industrial areas quickly developed “boom towns” such as the city of Richmond where mass scale job openings called out to people who previously did not have employment opportunities available such as the ones presented during the war era.\textsuperscript{21} Dorn notes that California received $35 billion of the $360 billion in federal defense contracts alone and attained more defense contracts during the war years than any other reported state within the country.\textsuperscript{22} Industrial cities throughout the country were facing increased populations that had never been seen before while not having the resources to support the increased population. Within a span of three years, the city of Richmond, California went from a relatively smaller population of 23,642 residents to 93,738.\textsuperscript{23} The homefront mobilization efforts set the stage for unprecedented social changes that would have long lasting effects in American history and as David M. Kennedy stated, “[the war] had shaken the American people loose and shaken them up, freed them from a decade of paralysis and flung them around the country into new regions and new

\textsuperscript{20} “Richmond Took a Beating.” \textit{Fortune}, (February 1945), 262.
\textsuperscript{21} Nash, \textit{The American West Transformed}, 69.
\textsuperscript{22} Dorn, \textit{American Education}, 18-19.
\textsuperscript{23} Idem, 95.
ways of life.”

Although women had held positions in the job market for decades, women seeking employment had been primarily for those who needed work to support themselves or their families financially and had been traditionally filled by women of color. According to Betty Soskin, a Rosie who worked in Richmond during the war, “black women had been taking on jobs and employment since slavery.”

Demographics in Richmond before the war were “predominantly white working-class and middle-class communities” with an Italian majority and with a mixed western European population, the second largest percentage, and African-Americans holding the smallest portion of the population. As migration to Richmond increased, the diversity of the population increased alongside. Migration of African-Americans, mainly coming from the South, increased the population of black Americans from below 20,000 to over 60,000 in Richmond during World War II.

As the defense industry forged ahead, positions held in production increased from 271,290 to 530,283 in the years between 1939 and 1947 according to Albert Davis. These increases in jobs held meant that the city of Richmond was facing a losing battle on the shortage of available housing. People who traveled to Richmond for work ended up living in their vehicles if they had them, outdoors in the fields, and even took up renting beds during their off hours. These rented out “warm beds” were in constant use and when the worker went to their job, someone else would occupy the bed according to Betty Soskin. Warm beds were a better alternative to having to sleep

25 Betty Soskin, Park Ranger Betty Soskin discusses her experience as a young African American woman during WWII during a presentation given at the Rosie the Riveter Museum National Park in Richmond, Ca., May 18, 2017.
29 Soskin, Park Ranger Betty Soskin discusses her experience as a young African American, May 18, 2017.
outside exposed to the elements. The federal and local governments stepped in to help with the creation of temporary housing such as those located in North Richmond like the Atchison Village projects. Over thirty thousand units were developed to provide the growing population of Richmond with adequate, but temporary housing during the war. Segregation within the units was common as much of the North Richmond area was deemed suitable for the black migrant workers as many came from the impoverished south looking for better opportunities in the west. Industrialization during the war re-developed the nation socially as migration from the south to these industrial areas like Richmond would affect how people viewed one another within gender, race and ethnicity.

As the United States joined the war, a government advertising campaign reached out to women to join the ranks of employment as it was their patriotic duty and these women responded in unprecedented numbers. Posters calling out to women to take on nontraditional roles that were typically viewed as masculine were successful because of the way in which this propaganda was displayed. One such poster played on the country’s need to preserve democracy while appealing to women reading “your right to decide for yourself is one of things we’re fighting for.” Gender roles were established since the Great Depression in which masculinity was dependent on the earned wage. Propaganda efforts by the government used this context to fuel the call for women into joining the forces supporting the war. More women than ever before joined the ranks of employment during World War II and though American women had been employed previously, the demand for skilled workers in industrial fields increased to meet demand while women who were brought into these trades led to a 460 percent increase of women in the defense industry. Before the war, most women found employment in domestic roles and out of financial
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need as “public opinion was lined up solidly against them [wage-earning wives].” During the Depression era, the family was centered as the focus and family life was popularized as a way of distracting from the crisis of the economy. However, this only furthered the gap between gender roles within employment. The shift from domestic roles to industrial positions created opportunities for increased wages not only within the industrial fields, but also in positions traditionally held by women previously as wages were being driven up. Equal pay policies that had previously been attainable by males were opening to women through unions and government agencies. Kaiser’s view on women working was progressive for the era and he was an “enthusiastic advocate of a woman’s right to work at any time” where the government believed that it was a “woman’s patriotic duty to work outside the home during wartime.” Barber points out that although women had been working outside the home, the shift to industrial positions with such a large portion of the female population going to work in these jobs would come to change the social construct in which these women had been born into.

Many of those who migrated were women and had, until the start of the war, been considered housewives. With so many men off fighting on the European front, however, it was left to the women to provide for their family. With the massive shift in trends in women’s employment, the issue was raised that there was a shortage of childcare in the country and that these women who were going to work would need support in that area if they were to build and supply the resources for the country. The federal and local government stepped in with the push from Kaiser, and in 1942, emergency nurseries were being established through the federal funding of the Lanham Act which provided war-related grants to fortify the country against foreign
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threats, writes Knaff. Barber details that women, having made up 27 percent of Kaiser’s employees within the shipyard, led Kaiser to testify on behalf of these women in front of Congress in 1943. He argued that “essential services for women in war industry, including child care facilities... were essential to improve the manpower situation.” This program had some of the biggest impact in California as the state held the largest number of Lanham Centers in the country while many were concentrated in the Bay Area resulting from the booming shipyard industry. Following the Japanese surrender in 1945, federal funding for child care ceased and women were again forced to face uncertainty where their children’s welfare was concerned. The grassroots movement in the Bay Area began to continue to provide the necessary child care for female workers and carried early child development into the spotlight of the American consciousness. The war and the American home front efforts created the ideal climate for the funding and creation of the Lanham Centers whilst also providing an opening for women to emerge on to the work scene in unprecedented numbers. These opportunities, through the various programs for working mothers and their families, would later develop into a movement that focused on early child development and continued into the post-war years in which a grassroots movement began to continue operating these daycare centers in the Bay Area.

Although only a third of the industrial war efforts workforce had been former full time housewives, this was still a sufficiently large number of people who still had children at home that required daycare or education. This brought about questions regarding responsibility within the home life of the American woman, as to how a mother could join the workforce logistically and morally while leaving young children in their wake. A representative from the U.S. Women’s Bureau, Mary Anderson, stated in 1941 that “We would not urge … women with small children to

41 Dorn, American Education, 128-129.
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The government responded with the creation of Child Development Centers that included daycare and education for the children whose parents were involved in the American Home Front movements. Through funding provided by the Lanham Act, these development centers were created to provide the necessary care for early child development and opened the door for early child development as a field of study. Success of these centers is in large part because of their military beginnings, as they were structured within the military style and were run similarly to the shipyards and military forces with precise structure. Mary Hall Prout, a former teacher for the child centers, details how she took a position in 1944 in one of the centers as they were looking for teachers for the over twenty centers available. Prout, in her interview with Ben Bicais, explained how the centers were operated around the need for various shifts such as graveyard and swing-shift. The children whose parents worked non-traditional shifts would still receive the care and meals needed, especially as the children were facing times of uncertainty. Tom Powers, the son of one of the head teachers, Ruth C. Powers, was a student during this time and he remembers in an interview with Sam Redman that he would arrive at the child center in the early mornings with his mother to prepare for the day and the “children began coming in with their parents at six.”

The well run centers were meant to be a place for the children of the working parents to go to receive not only a well-rounded education, but to also maintain structure in their health and diets. According to Barber, nutrition was a vital part of the child centers and Alice Leet who held the position as “the original nutritionist for all the Richmond nurseries” administered “daily doses of cod liver oil and fruit juice” along with “a day’s full quota of


protective foods.” Powers, who received these doses of cod liver oil stated that “all the kids would hold their nose and take the cod liver oil, because you got orange slices and apples right after.” Margaret Loverde explained how meals were served to the children at set times throughout the day and that should a child be scheduled for breakfast, there was an additional cost entailed in their fee for care. She detailed how the children were expected to try and sample everything they were served and that she believed “a lot of children learned to eat well in the children’s centers.” Patricia Wilson, a teacher in one of the child centers, believed that many of the children were not accustomed to fresh food and that the children would look at her with a “dumbfounded look” and not know what to do. Nutrition was a main concern for the centers and the regimented way in which meals were administered along with the work of the nurses was similar to the way in which Kaiser ran his shipyards as assembly lines and also to that of the American military.

Education in the centers was based on the various age groups as children were dispersed according to their age. Art was introduced into the centers on a large scale as easels were set up for the children to use and lessons were provided by Monica Haley who was formally trained in art and whose husband was the head of the Art Department in the neighboring UC Berkeley, according to Powers. He and Loverde remember the setup of the art easels within the centers lined up, back to back, for the children to

47 Barber, “Maritime Child Development Center,” 27.
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use as a way of mentally getting away from the war torn world. With the increased population from varying parts of the nation, diversity within the city expanded. Students were integrated from the beginning and teachers took on a stance of “civic professionalism” which according to historian Dorn, was the belief amongst the education professionals that they should be “class-blind,” which meant that the public institutions would accept all races and ethnicities and that every child would be treated with the same fairness as if they were the educators’ own child. The acceptance of all in the Richmond public school system would come years ahead of the supreme court’s Brown v. Board of Education decision and would set the groundwork in the Bay Area for future movements against discriminatory practices. As Wilson pointed out, humans were not born to discriminate, and she saw this in the children she taught as they were “quite oblivious... [they think] everybody in the world is a different color, and they adjust to that... it’s when they get older and pick it up from their parents, that they begin to distinguish differences and develop opinions and attitudes.” The children who grew up in these racially diverse centers were exposed early on to the reality that integration was a part of a system that could and would work. These experiences would further the progressive beliefs in the Bay Area and have a lasting effect in the years to come. This would set the groundwork for not only the Bay Area, but the state to be a place of tolerance in comparison to that of the rest of the nation.

With war ending, the child centers funding was eliminated by the federal government and it became the responsibility of the public to continue the centers. According to Barber, parents and educators lobbied in the state capital to fund the centers as many believed they were not just a necessary tool during the war, but had become a staple in the community of Richmond. The California state legislature moved forward with the school districts acquiring and taking over the running of the child centers as “to meet

---


54 Dorn, American Education, 117.


56 Barber, “Maritime Child Development Center,” 31.
a need which became acute during the war and is as great today as during wartime due to the increase and shift in population in California.”

Many of the schools continued in the post-war years, but in the 1960’s and 1970’s, schools were cut off from funding and closed. The temporary housing that had been developed met a similar fate and was mostly demolished in the years following the war with few exceptions. These “projects” that continue to stand to this day have become areas of poverty-stricken neighborhoods where lower income residents reside. Jeanne Reynolds, a teacher during the war, recalls the years after the war and what became of Richmond as the men came home from abroad, stating, “Just seemed like a different city when everybody came home. Shortage of housing, hard to find places to live.”

The women who worked in the defense industries faced mass layoffs as ships for military use were no longer needed on such a large scale. However, women who wanted to remain in the work force began to press for new opportunities of employment in the following years and has continued through to the present.

Richmond and the Bay Area, in the modern mind, is thought to have always been a place of progressive notions where people from all over still flock to areas known for their movements and shake ups. World War II provided the catalyst the nation needed to allow women into the workplace for reasons other than for just survival and led to the development of early childhood education. With the educators who preached “civic professionalism” for racial tolerance within the schools, Richmond and its surrounding areas have had the unique opportunity to have taken a leap into positive change while the rest of the nation has still struggled to this day to form accepting views. The war provided the groundwork for these changes to take effect and the women and children of the era have proved that these social changes have created opportunities that were not available prior to the war.

57 California State Department of Education, 4.


59 Foster, Henry J. Kaiser, 89.
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Generations of Love
The Homoeroticism of Phillip II and Alexander III

Kevin Bogzaran

By the summer of 336 BCE, Philip II of Macedon had consolidated a once fractured kingdom and spread its sphere of influence and rule across mainland Greece. Through the failed attempts of the once dominant Athenians and Thebans\(^1\) to withstand his northern force, Philip II was appointed leader of the Greeks at the head of the newly founded Corinthian League.\(^2\) However, in October of the same year, Philip II, surrounded by thirteen larger-than-life statues depicting the twelve Olympian gods and himself, entered a Macedonian theater filled with his subjects to celebrate the marriage of his daughter where he was assassinated by a blow through the ribs from a jilted lover.\(^3\)

Roughly twelve years after the death of his father Philip II, Alexander III had surpassed the goals of his father by further conquering the kingdoms of the Persia and Egypt, establishing himself as the respected ruler of the eastern Mediterranean and Middle Eastern world. When the commander of

---

1 Situated between Athens and Macedon in the region of Boeotia.

2 The main goal of this league was to unite the Greek city-states in a common peace and to use this Hellenic force to retaliate against the Persian empire.

3 This account of the assassination of Philip II was taken from Diodorus Siculus, *World History* 16.91.2-16.94.3, trans. E.I. McQueen. The exact details are difficult to distinguish because documents covering it were written centuries following the event, including Diodorus’ account. However, it is key to note that Diodorus identified authors whose work he drew upon. Unfortunately, the original sources are lost. Aristotle, a contemporary of Philip II, does recall the attack by a “Pausanias . . . because he [Philip] allowed him to be insulted by Attalus and his friends,” which will be covered later in this paper. Aristotle, *Politics* 5.1311b, trans. H. Rackham.
his hetairoi⁴ and most trusted somatophylake⁵ Hephaestion died of fever in Ecbatana in 324 BCE, Alexander III fell into a drunken stupor mixed with uncontrollable grief and bouts of furious rage, dying not much later.

Although homoeroticism and homosexual tendencies were intimately intertwined with Archaic and Classical Greek culture, the focus of this paper is to analyze how traditional Greek homosexuality influenced the lives of these two individuals. Moreover, pedagogical pederasty was certainly omnipresent in everyday life within the Archaic and Classical periods, yet the institution seems to have opened up into something more broadly defined than strictly being a relationship between an erastes and eromenos.⁶

Prior to Philip II establishing himself as basileus⁷ of Macedon and hegemon of the Corinthian League,⁸ at the age of fifteen, he had been sent as a royal hostage to the city-state of Thebes where he remained roughly from 368-365 BCE. At this time, Thebes had formally replaced Athens and Sparta as the dominant power across the Greek mainland, parts of the Peloponnese, and was experiencing the height of its own prestige under key generals and statesmen Pelopidas, Epaminondas, and Pammenes.

These three men were crucial in the development of Philip II, who was a mere prince at the time, not only into the brilliant strategist and king he would eventually become, but also as the ideal, Greek man. Much of his youth was spent in captivity as a political bargaining chip by his brother and then king of Macedon, Alexander II,⁹ as the kingdom disintegrated into a shell of its once powerful self under their father Amyntas III. Consequently,

---

⁴ An elite companion cavalry that served directly under the king in battle.
⁵ A personal bodyguard to the king. This position consisted of men from Macedonian nobility who held command positions ranging from Satrap (governor) to military general.
⁶ That is to say a relationship between an adult lover and a teenaged beloved.
⁷ Although the role and meaning of basileus had evolved from Mycenaean to Hellenistic times, for this paper’s sake, it will be used interchangeably with the conventional English rendition “king.”
⁸ Derived from the Greek word ἡγεμονία, hegemon in this sense can be translated as Philip II having sole authority, rule, and political supremacy over the Greek city-states participating (unwilling or not) in the league.
⁹ Before Philip II had arrived at Thebes, where he stayed roughly from the ages of 14 to 17, his brother was forced to send him as a royal hostage to the Illyrians c.370.
it is safe to assume that Philip II did not receive formal military or political training until he had reached the city-state of Thebes, where he trained under Epaminondas, commander of the Boeotian army, and Pelopidas, general of the Sacred Band, both of whom educated him in Theban war tactics.

While living in Thebes, the future king was placed under the care of the statesmen and the commander of the Boeotian army. After Epaminondas’ death, Pammenes became the commander, and was an enthusiastic advocate of the discipline that defined the Sacred Band. Being exposed to this Theban duality of love and warfare, one has to wonder just how much this influenced Philip II, and if the social aspects of the band affected or introduced him to this way of life. Although there is only one source written three centuries after Philip’s captivity in Thebes stating that he was an *eromenos* of Pelopidas, Plutarch demonstrates that Philip II praised and idol-

---


11 Broad sweeping, yes, but arguable because Philip’s military tactics were largely an adoption of Theban technique. Louis Crompton, *Homosexuality and Civilization* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 73. Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses: A Refusal of the Office of Archon Delivered before the Council* 49.5 (Loeb Classical Library, 1946) states that Philip II was “far superior to those who previously had become kings of Macedonia” because he “witnessed the deeds of Epaminondas” and Pelopidas. Plutarch remarks that Philip II became “a zealous follower of Epaminondas, perhaps because he comprehended his efficiency in wars and campaigns,” *Pelopidas* 26.5. (Loeb Classical Library, 1917), http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/plutarch/lives/pelopidas*.html.

12 Plutarch, *Pelopidas* 26.5. Pammenes had a distaste for Homer’s depiction of Nestor because he arranged the “companies of Achaean tribesmen by tribes and clans and did not station lover beside beloved,” subsequently praising the Sacred Band for doing just that: “It is a fact that men have become their fellow tribesmen and relatives . . . Lover and beloved, when their God [Eros/Aphrodite?] is present, no enemy has ever encountered and forced his way through . . . since the lovers are ashamed to play the coward before their beloved, and the beloved before their lovers, and both stand firm to protect each other.” Plutarch, *Moralia: The Dialogue on Love* 761, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, vol. 9 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1957), 379, quoted in Crompton, *Homosexuality*, 74. Plutarch undoubtedly pulled this partially from the speech of Phaedrus. Plato, *Symposium* 178e-179d.

ized the Sacred Band. After the battle of Chaeronea in 338 BCE, Philip II had come across the bodies of three hundred men. Upon learning that these were the remains of the regiment he had grew to know in Thebes, “burst into tears and said: ‘Perish miserably they who think that these men did or suffered aught disgraceful.’”

Macedonians primarily practiced polygamy, and Philip II, having several wives and numerous mistresses, was also known to have male favorites in his cohort. The Roman writer Justin (c. 100 C.E.) writes that Philip II had a love affair with the younger brother of Olympias, one of his many wives, Alexander I of Epirus. Alexander I was brought to the Macedonian court at an early age and became an object of Philip’s attachment, engaging him with temptation for his father’s throne, and “pretending violent love for

14 Plutarch, Pelopidas 18.1. The geography Pausanias visited the site of the battle four centuries later detailing a memorial dedicated to the Sacred Band: “As you approach the city, you see a common grave of the Thebans who were killed in the struggle against Philip. It has no inscription, but is surmounted by a lion, probably a reference to the spirit of the men.” Descriptions of Greece: Chaeroneia 9.40.8, trans. W.H.S. Jones, http://www.theoi.com/Text/Pausanias9B.html. Some scholars believe that Plutarch also recorded an “offhand remark” by Philip II stating that “It is not only the most warlike peoples . . . who are the most susceptible to this kind of love, but also the greatest heroes of old: Meleager, Achilles, Aristomenes, Cimon, and Epaminondas,” Amatorius 17.286, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0314%3Asection%3D17, which I find incredibly murky and not substantial enough to base an argument as I believe it to be a cross-reference of Plutarch’s Pelopidas and Cimon.

15 Crompton, Homosexuality, 76. This way of life plays an important part in recreating the death of Philip II. Although Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, and Aristotle all confer that it is Pausanias who dealt the killing blow, Plutarch states that “most of the blame attached itself to Olympias on the grounds that she had encouraged the young man in his anger and incited him to do the deed,” even declaring that Alexander III “did not come out of the affair spotless either.” Plutarch, Alexander 10, trans. Robin Waterfield (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008), 320. Also important to note is that Macedonians, like other Greeks, were bisexual. Now, it’s difficult to determine if it followed suit with the pederastic tradition of the mainland, there is, however, evidence from Aristotle that Archelaus, who was king of Macedon half a century earlier, was assassinated by his disgruntled former lover Crataeas, stating, “estrangement was primarily caused by resentment because of the love affair.” Politics 5.1311b. I follow suit in stating that Dorians and all of their descendants openly practice homosexuality, especially among the ruling/aristocratic class. Herodotus lists Macedon as a Dorian state in Histories 8.73. I would even argue further that, contrary to Athens (excluding some incidences), the evidence provided in this paper possibly suggest that homosexual pairs in Macedon could have possibly been lifelong, or at least existed past the eromenos coming of age.
him, in a criminal intercourse.”¹⁶ When Alexander I had become king of the western region of Epirus, the two formed a marriage alliance, where, at the same marriage ceremony, Philip II was murdered.

Pausanias, bodyguard of the king and “most beloved by Philip for his good looks,”¹⁷ was one of Philip’s younger, male lovers. He had become enraged because the gaze of his lover had caught the attention of another younger man, also named Pausanias. Diodorus¹⁸ recounts that the elder Pausanias had abused the second Pausanias by calling him an “effeminate who was willing to submit to the erotic advances of anyone who desired to initiate them,” eventually driving the younger Pausanias to commit a heroic-type suicide by suffering all the blows directed towards the king in a battle with Pleurias of Illyria. After hearing the details of the incident, Attalus, a courtier of the king who exercised a great deal of influence, invited Pausanias to dinner, got him severely intoxicated and “handed his body over to his stablemen to abuse sexually in drunken rape.” Coming to, Pausanias demanded vengeance from Philip II, who was still shaken from the actions one of his lovers took to preserve his life, to which he “was sympathetic, but since Attalus was one of his most valued commanders and the uncle of his [Philip’s] new wife, he did not punish him.”¹⁹ This, paired with the dishonor and offense that had befallen Pausanias, and possible goading from Olympias and/or Alexander, drove him to commit his crime of passion. If this is the case, and the gritty details provided by Diodorus can be believed, then we can safely assume that Philip II was not only a sexual participant with both sexes, but was also something different from what was seen in

---

¹⁶ Justin, *Philippic History* 8.6, trans. John Selby Watson (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853). It is impossible to determine if this relationship has pederastic elements to it. While I firmly believe that it is a possibility due to the “grooming” type elements of being a young member of a royal court, it is still difficult to make that assumption.


¹⁸ Unfortunately, Diodorus provides the only documentation (that I can tell) that involves concrete information into the possibility of Philip’s bisexuality. Due to the ancient Greeks non-binary sexualities (that is to say, anachronistically, homo-or-heterosexual), this shouldn’t be anything substantially out of the ordinary.

¹⁹ Crompton, *Homosexuality*, 76.
Accounts of Alexander III portray a man dissimilar to his father. From a young age, he seemed to have been well aware of his own destiny which made him very idealistic and extremely superstitious, but also brash and ambitious. However, two distinct differences are crucial to understanding the individual who conquered the world: he was not as interested in women as his father was. Although he had three wives, one of whom he fell passionately in love with at first sight, Alexander III still preferred the company of his male counterparts, specifically Hephaestion and Bagoas.

Plutarch and Arrian relate several instances exemplifying the bond...
between Alexander III and Hephaestion, yet determining if their relationship was based on a modern conception of homosexual, active and passive desire, or Socrates’ ideological platonic love can be quite difficult. However, that there was undoubtedly a homoerotic element and an intense homosocial desire\textsuperscript{23} that underlined their partnership. The pair grew up together, both having studied under Aristotle in Macedon,\textsuperscript{24} and formed something that far exceeded the physical. Together they conquered foreign empires in the east and founded cities named after one another; after the conquest of Persia, Hephaestion was named Alexander’s grand vizier, and, after the death of Hephaestion, Alexander III attempted to have him deified.

It is easy to see that there was something different about Alexander III and Hephaestion’s relationship, especially when put into contrast with the other relationships the king held with his companions. Craterus was a general under Alexander the Great, and part of the Diadochi, who played an integral administrative part in Alexander’s conquered kingdom. However, hostilities began to arise between the Macedonian commanders as they attempted to gain favor with the king. Plutarch notes that Alexander III “loved Hephaestion best, but respected Craterus most; as he was constantly saying that in his opinion while Hephaestion was loyal to Alexander, Craterus was loyal to the king.”\textsuperscript{25} Not only does this explain brewing rivalries within the ranks, but also two different personifications of Alexander III: on one hand there was the individual, who was shared with Hephaestion, and on the other the king, who Craterus appealed to more. This could also explain why Alexander III felt so passionate about Hephaestion as they were lifelong

\textsuperscript{23} For a complete understanding of homoeroticism and homosociality, see: Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, \textit{Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire}; K.J. Dover, “Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behaviour;”

\textsuperscript{24} A key component to their education was the introduction to Greek epics, specifically Homer’s \textit{Iliad}, which influenced Alexander’s ambition greatly, not only on warfare, but how to be the ideal man. Onesicritus, through Plutarch, informs us that Alexander III “carried about with him Aristotle’s recension of the text. . . and always kept [it] under his pillow.” Plutarch, \textit{Alexander 8}. The impression the \textit{Iliad} left on both Alexander III and Hephaestion can be seen in their visit to the ancient site of Troy. Alexander III had paid homage at the tomb of Achilles, while Hephaestion did the same at Patroclus’ tomb. Plutarch, \textit{Alexander 15.2}; Arrian, \textit{Anabasis} 1.11-12. Surely romanticized, yet, in spirit, it encapsulates how ancient scholars viewed their sense of “oneness.”

\textsuperscript{25} Plutarch, \textit{Alexander 47.4}. 
friends and had a deeper connection to each other, whereas Craterus viewed Alexander III as the king due to their lack of intimacy.

It is difficult to trace the level of oneness that embodied both Alexander III and Hephaestion to a point where historians can pinpoint exactly where their friendship ended and sexual love began. Paul Cartledge describes their closeness almost as if one was an “alter ego” of the other, which is certainly echoed in the ancient texts, yet ancient biographies referring to the two never suggest outright that they were lovers. However scant, Lucian and Plutarch relate two incidences insinuating sexual intimacy between the two. Eumenes of Cardia, writing to Antipater describes an occasion where Hephaestion had entered Alexander’s tent at dawn, but used the evening salutation, implying that he had spent the night with him. On another occasion, Hephaestion had seen the exposed contents of a secret letter from Olympias to her son. Alexander III did not stop him, “but slipped off his ring and applied the seal to his lips,” signifying a romantic intimacy between the two as well as their incredible connection with one another.

In other instances, Alexander III saw Hephaestion as an extension of himself and vice versa. Following the battle of Issus, Sisygambis, the wife


27 See footnote 22. Patroclus was said to have been older than Achilles. If this were the case, then that would mean, if we were to hold on to pederastic tradition and accept that this was a lifelong pairing, then Hephaestion (assuming the role of Patroclus) would have been, technically, the *erastes* of the relationship, whereas Alexander III (assuming the role of Achilles) would have been *eromenos*. To understand why that complicates, even problematizes, pederastic relationships, see my previous work, “A Shifting Attitude Towards Pederasty in Classical Athens”. There is, however, Diogenes of Sinope who writes to Alexander III stating that, “if you wish to be beautiful and good, throw away the rag you have in your head and come to us. Yet you will not be able to do so, for you are held fast by Hephaestion’s thighs,” quoted in Andrew Michael Chugg, *Alexander’s Lovers* (Lulu.com, 2006), 18. There are multiple avenues of interpretation for Diogenes’ meaning that I reserve for you, the reader.


of Darius III and queen of the Persian empire, knelt before who she thought was Alexander III to plead for her and her family’s life, but the person she knelt for was in fact Hephaestion. Distressed, she then begged Alexander III to forgive her mistake, but was pardoned by him: “Never mind, mother. For actually he too is Alexander.”\(^{30}\) He esteemed and thought so highly of Hephaestion that he elevated him into the royal caste by having him marry Drypetis, a princess of Persia and sister to a wife of Alexander’s, with the intention of having their offspring be cousins.\(^{31}\)

Alexander III had also come into the possession of a eunuch slave of “remarkable beauty and in the very flower of boyhood,\(^{32}\) who had been loved by Darius and was afterwards to be loved by Alexander.”\(^{33}\) This eunuch, named Bagoas,\(^{34}\) had become a known object of affection of Alexander III and offers us insight into another male favorite of Alexander III. Plutarch relates a story of Alexander III traversing a week’s journey into the Gedrosia satrapy to celebrate a festival, where he watched his beloved Bagoas perform in a dancing competition. Bagoas, after winning the contest, “made his way through the audience...and sat down beside him [Alexander]. At this sight, the Macedonians applauded and called out for Alexander to kiss him, until he put his arms around him and gave him a loving kiss.”\(^{35}\) If this indeed is the case, then we see something different with their relationship than that of Alexander III and Hephaestion: there is a sexual element of pure physicality, one which is being publicly acknowledged. In fact, “even


\(^{31}\) Arrian, 7.4.5. It is plausible that Alexander’s end goal was to ultimately unite their bloodlines by having the continued marriages between the two-family trees until an heir was descended directly from both Alexander III and Hephaestion.

\(^{32}\) See footnote 19.


\(^{34}\) A common name for eunuchs, and more particularly, a eunuch of the Great King.

\(^{35}\) Plutarch, *Alexander* 67.2. Athenaeus also cites the same event from a contemporary historian of Alexander III, but from the standpoint of the king: “He was so overcome with love for the eunuch Bagoas that, in full view of the entire theatre, he, bending over, caressed Bagoas fondly, and when the audience clapped and shouted in applause, he nothing loath, again bent over and kissed him.” Athenaeus, 603b: 6:251, quoted in Crompton, *Homosexuality*, 77.
more striking,” Crompton states, “is the enthusiasm with which the Macedonians applauded the Persian, considering the distaste his troops showed for Alexander’s adoption of Persian dress and customs.”

The emotions and actions showed by Alexander III upon Hephaestion’s death may be the foundation of modern historians’ argument that their friendship was something more than platonic. No doubt Alexander’s grief was spectacular, but over half of their lives were spent together; campaigning together for years on end, living in close quarters, and seeing each other every single day, so it is quite possible that the emotions felt and demonstrated by Alexander III were not as extreme or unusual as popularly believed. From the available ancient accounts, scholars are given an extremely intimate view of just how Alexander III the king and the individual viewed his most beloved companion:

Alexander’s grief surpassed even Achilles’. He hanged the doctor who had attended the sick man, refused to eat or drink, cut his hair and the manes and tails of his horses, dismantled the battle ments of cities, and sent to the oracle at Siwah to ask for divine honors...Hephaestion’s enormous funeral pyre was a Babylonian ziggurat, an eighth of a mile square at the base and two hundred feet high, tier after tier decorated with magnificently ornate wooden statues. His cremation, which cost

36  Crompton, Homosexuality, 77-78.
37  Arrian makes a valid point, which I believe adds to the sense of ambiguity historians feel when discussing the intimate nature of Alexander III and Hephaestion’s relationship. The depicted response of Alexander III at the death of Hephaestion undoubtedly hints at something far more than simply platonic. As Arrian assessed: “Different authors have given different accounts of Alexander’s grief on this occasion. . . As to what was done in honor of Hephaestion, they make diverse statements, just as each writer was actuated by good-will or envy towards him, or even towards Alexander himself.” Arrian, Death of Hephaestion 7.14, trans. E.J. Chinnock.
38  Alexander had become a student of Aristotle at the age of 12 or 13. While Hephaestion’s exact age is unknown, it is believed that youth being sent to this “Pages Corp” were generally between the ages of 14 and 18, thus, it is safe to say they had been friends at least nineteen years. Jeanne Reames-Zimmerman, An Atypical Affair? Alexander the Great, Hephaestion Amyntoros and the Nature of Their Relationship, 1999, 88, 92. This could also be evidence that Hephaestion was at least 1 year older than Alexander III.
ten thousand talents,\textsuperscript{39} was arguably the most spectacular funeral in history.\textsuperscript{40}

The event of Hephaestion’s death, among other reasons, contributed to the failing health of Alexander III and he died a little under a year later. Be that as it may, the evidence supporting a homosexual relationship between the two is incredibly circumstantial. It is certainly possible that they were more than friends, insinuating both sexual intimacy and/or life-long pairing, especially when put into contrast with the gritty details of Alexander’s father’s relationships. However, coming to a concrete conclusion based on the evidence provided and the sexual practices of his forefathers is an oversimplification of this remarkably unique individual and, ultimately, inconclusive by nature. Nevertheless, there was unquestionably an element of homoeroticism that the two felt for each other.

In the case of Philip II and his successor Alexander III, both of whom were raised with a duality of Macedonian and Athenian/Theban life, male-male homoeroticism was simply a part of their lives. They, like the Greeks before them, did not view these types of pairings as atypical, nor was there a strict binary to subscribe to. This, however, does not mean that they were homosexual; this notion of a permanent sexual identity simply did not exist and love could include both men and women alike. Where Philip II and Alexander III differ from their ancient forefathers, though, is the lack of the pedagogical desire underlining a typical pederastic relationship, opting for a more permanent companionship, especially in the case of Alexander III and Hephaestion. There certainly were instances in Athens of men pairing together for life, but traditionally speaking, the relationship ended as the youth grew into adulthood. Thus, it is possible that Macedon, like the various city-states of mainland Greece, had different standards than that of Athens; yet that does not speak on the fact that Alexander III, having been well-educated in Athenian school of thought, would not follow suit with their principles of sexuality.

\textsuperscript{39} Roughly equal to 130 million USD. Conversions: 6 oboloi = 1 drachma, 100 drachma = 1 mina, 600 minae = 1 talent (approximately 57lbs. of silver; in 2007, silver was priced at 15 USD/ounce).

\textsuperscript{40} Crompton, \textit{Homosexuality}, 78. I decided to use Crompton’s summary of Alexander’s reaction to the death and funeral of Hephaestion because he encapsulates ancient sources who wrote on the topic, including: Plutarch, Arrian, Athenaeus, and Diodorus.
Both Philip II and Alexander III played pivotal roles in bridging the twilight of the Classical Era in Greece to the beginning of the globalized Hellenistic world that lasted until the Roman conquest of Ptolemaic Egypt in 30 BCE. While not technically falling within the Hellenistic period, both Philip II and Alexander III were quintessential in spreading Greek culture, language, and population to the old world by creating a trans-cultural, hybridized new world that melded together key institutions and ways of life from different, much older civilizations. Even further, the sources on both Philip II and Alexander III provide intimate knowledge of these two great individuals and a foundational starting point to venture into this transitional period between Classical Greece and the Roman Republic.
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Crushing Armor and Bones
A Review of the Potential of War Elephants in the Hellenistic Period

David Hlusak

Within a decade, Alexander the Great swept across the whole of Western Asia with his fearsome Macedonian army, conquering a vast new empire – the largest the world had yet seen. Before reaching the edges of the known world, the humid and sodden forests of Western India had rusted the armor and rotted the clothes off the backs of his weary soldiers. But, just on the other side of a vast, surging river, swollen from the melting snow of the Himalayas, was the fruit of their tribulations, the ambition of their endeavors: The Great Outer Sea.¹ The entire known world was within their grasp. Before them stood one last adversary. As the front lines of Alexander’s army slowly emerged from the treacherous river crossing, the earth began to quake beneath their feet. Ferocious shrieks trumpeted from behind a hazy fog, and suddenly, through the mist, charged a horde of colossal beasts with sharp tusks jutting from their mouths and enormous serpents thrashing from between their eyes.² Crashing into the ranks, these monsters

killed some […] by trampling them under their feet, and crushing their armour and their bones, while upon others they inflicted a terrible death, for they lifted them aloft with their trunks, which they had twisted around their bodies, and

¹ The Great Outer Sea is a concept found in Justin 12.7.4, and commonly attributed to Aristotle. The notion is that the Ancient Greeks only knew Eurasia, as far East as India, and Northern Africa to exist. The areas past these geographic regions was suggested to be encircled by one great ocean. With the Mediterranean Sea roughly located at its center, this world map would have resembled something like a donut.

² Quintus Curtius Rufus, The Life and Death of Alexander the Great, King of Macedon (London: S.S., 1674), 399.
then dashed them down with great violence to the ground. Many others they deprived of life by gorging them through and through with their tusks.³

Still, the Macedonians held their lines. These titans possessed a fatal flaw that could be exploited “if the trainer-rider was killed.”⁴ They managed to force the ferocious bulwarks into close quarters. Protesting violently, the mammoths “spread havoc among their own ranks [...] who were then trampled to death by their own beasts.”⁵ Inasmuch, elephants were largely ineffectual and unpredictable war animals, but they nevertheless became a vital arm of Hellenistic armies, because they represented power, prestige, and functioned as a source of calculated terror which instilled fear in the hearts of man and steed alike.

The topic of war elephants in the Hellenistic world is not one that has demanded much attention. Though the topic is interesting, the Hellenistic period has left a scarcity of primary sources behind, few of which are focused on elephants. In 1967, John M. Kistler took on the challenge of writing a comprehensive history of war elephants from the ancient period to World War II. In his book, War Elephants, Kistler draws upon his own experience of working with and training elephants. His history covers the use of war elephants in all regions of the world throughout human history. Similarly, Kontantin Nossov wrote a history of war elephants in 2008. His book, by the same title, is much more concise than Kistler’s, only about fifty pages in length, and only reviews the use of war elephants throughout the world until the fifteenth century AD. Karl Groning and Martin Saller complied Elephants: A Cultural and Natural History in 1999. This book reads much like an encyclopedia and reviews the history of elephants, including their use in war, but also their anatomy, mating behaviors and cultural influences such as the ivory trade and circuses. H.H. Scullard’s 1974 The Elephant

---


⁵ Arrian in The Invasion of India, 211.
in the Greek and Roman World focuses its scope primarily in the era and region in which this study will be addressing. However, Scullard’s addresses the cultural influences of elephants across the Classic World, not just the Hellenistic period. Because the topic of elephants, especially war elephants in ancient Europe, is so minor, the focus of these historians has been to write linear histories outlining elephants in a broad context of culture. Although these sources do review the use of war elephants in Hellenistic Europe, none of them posit any major claims substantiated by structured arguments. Accordingly, this study aims to take a specific stance on effectiveness of war elephants in Hellenistic warfare. In doing so, it will challenge some of the ideas suggested by these historians, most particularly Scullard’s suggestion that Alexander the Great’s lack of employing war elephants should not be taken as evidence that they were poor weapons.6

To examine the effectiveness and practicality of war elephants in the Mediterranean world of the Third Century BCE, this study will consider their utilization and functionality as beasts of combat. First, elephants will be contextualized into the broader history of the Hellenistic period to provide background on the introduction of war elephants into European warfare. The logistics behind rearing, training, and maintaining war elephants will then be outlined to show the extent of effort necessary to sustain such massive creatures. Next, notable battles in which elephants were employed as weapons will be analyzed to illustrate their degree of success. Finally, the perception of elephants in the Ancient Mediterranean World will be reviewed to demonstrate how formidable pachyderms were held to be in the minds of combatants.

After the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BCE, his vast new empire, which extended from Macedonia in the West to the Balkans in the North, South to Egypt, and as far East as the Indian sub-continent, was left without a successor. Although it is unlikely that Alexander had ever said that his empire should go to kratistos – the strongest, the subsequent wars for supremacy would certainly suggest that that is how his successors, the

Diadochi, interpreted his will. Thus, Alexander’s empire immediately splintered into disparate spheres of influence, each held by one of his leading generals. Nevertheless, “the foot soldiers of Macedon became the first warriors from Europe to face war elephant in combat.” Their grapple with two-hundred war elephants at the Battle of the Hydaspes in 326 BCE, exemplified in the introduction, inflicted a lasting influence upon Alexander and his successors. So much so that, before Alexander’s untimely death, he had amassed a formidable herd of war elephants and designated a new and prestigious command into his military: Elephantarch, the Commander of the Elephants. After this debut of elephants into western warfare, kings and commanders recognized the martial value in an animal of such size and force. Thomas Trautmann has gone as far as to state that “the wars of the successors inaugurated what might be called an arms race… to acquire superior forces of elephants.” Each wished to obtain a sufficient number to defend against the elephants their opponents might field and, preferably, to command a superior force of pachyderms to achieve an advantage of overwhelming, brute force.

The Diadochi, many of whom were present at the Battle of Hydaspes, went to extraordinary lengths to obtain these massive creatures for use in their armies. Seleucus I Nicator commanded the Eastern division of Alexander’s conquests, placing him in an ideal position to monopolize the westward trade of war elephants from India into Europe. Consequently,

---


8 Most notably, Seleucus held the Near East, Ptolemy commandeered Egypt, Antigonus controlled Asia Minor, Lysimachus seized Thrace, and Cassander occupied Macedonia. However, these spheres of power were in constant flux between 323 and 31 BCE.


10 Porus is estimated to have had eighty-five to two-hundred elephants at the Battle of Hydaspes. Estimates of elephants present at any given engagement during the Hellenistic period vary widely. This is either due to the exaggerations of ancient historians or their inability to discern the number of war elephants employed in a battle from those being utilized as draught animals within the baggage trains of the armies.


the Ptolemaic kings of Egypt, opponents of Seleucus, had to find alternative means of obtaining these beasts. They found that elephants were plentiful to the south, in the modern regions of Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia.\textsuperscript{13} Expeditions were sent to these regions to capture elephants,\textsuperscript{14} ship them north via Red Sea harbors, herd them then by road to ports on the Nile River for further transportation. Such waterfronts were equipped with specially built docks and ramps to accommodate the great weight of these behemoths.\textsuperscript{15} The Ptolemies utilized Kushite\textsuperscript{16} elephant drivers to train their captured elephants, but most drivers were recruited from India by special envoys. This is because the Kushites tamed elephants but did not train them for war, as was the case in India.\textsuperscript{17}

Elephants were most often captured because they have always been notoriously difficult to breed in captivity. A cow (female) elephant only births one calf every four years, with a gestation period of eighteen to twenty-four months.\textsuperscript{18} After a calf is born, it must then feed upon its mother’s milk for an additional six years. Only bull (male) elephants were considered for war because they were observed to be more inclined to engage, rather than cower from, adversaries.\textsuperscript{19} Not only is breeding an exceedingly protracted process, but different temperaments between the sexes effectively reduced, by about one-half, the limited number of elephants that could be bred and then considered for use in war. Although elephant can live up to eighty years, the ideal fighting age for a war elephant was about forty years. Thirty years was considered a mediocre fighting age, and twenty was the earliest

\textsuperscript{13} Kistler, \textit{War Elephants}, 71

\textsuperscript{14} For details about the tactics used to capture elephants in the 3rd Century BCE, see Kistler, \textit{War Elephants}, 68-74; and Konstantin Nossov, \textit{War Elephants}, ill. Peter Dennis. (Oxford, UK: Osprey, 2008), 6-7.


\textsuperscript{16} The Kingdom of Kush was an ancient Nubian kingdom located in the region of modern Sudan, within which the Ptolemaic kings were only able to exercise limited influence.

\textsuperscript{17} Nossov, \textit{War Elephants}, 22.


\textsuperscript{19} Kistler, \textit{War Elephants}, 68.
age at which war elephant would be fielded.\textsuperscript{20} Still, the stress of capture and captivity is known to significantly reduce the lifespan of elephants, reducing further the payoff on time and money invested. Thus, an elephant would have to be raised and maintained for at least twenty-two years before being considered for battle. These facts alone point to why elephants, even to this day, have never been domesticated through selective breeding.\textsuperscript{21}

Since elephants have always been – and still are – wild animals, the Diadochi were not simply able to commit these beasts to the battlefield after they were raised to an ideal age or immediately after capture. They had to be tamed and trained for the tasks to which they would be employed. While captured elephants would require less invested time, and were less costly than captive-bred elephants, they still required considerable time for rigorous training before they were considered ready for war. Before any elephant, captured or bred, could be fielded, it first had to demonstrate proper characteristics. If a pachyderm was too nervous or timid, it would be trained for use as a draught animal, hauling goods and equipment or used for construction projects. If it had a fearsome temperament, more likely to fight than flee in the face of danger, it would be primed with draught training. After this point, it would be exposed to more laborious formation drills, indoctrinated into killing men and into fighting other elephants, trained to function as a siege weapon, and even exposed to the din of combat and the pain of battle wounds.\textsuperscript{22} Taming and training these wild mammoths saw

\textsuperscript{20} Nossov, War Elephants, 6.

\textsuperscript{21} Taming is the conditioned behavioral modification of a wild-born animal when its natural avoidance of humans is reduced, and it accepts the presence of humans. Domestication, on the other hand, is the permanent genetic modification of a bred lineage that leads to an inherited predisposition toward humans. Asian elephants are wild animals that taming has manifested outward signs of domestication, yet their breeding is not human controlled, thus they are not true domesticates and are subject to violent and unpredictable fits of rage. See Kistler, War Elephants, 5.

\textsuperscript{22} Nossov, War Elephants, 8.
varying degrees of success by their trainers.\textsuperscript{23}

The men who trained and drove these giants were referred to as \textit{mahouts}. These men became regarded “above all others in Mediterranean armies,” creating a knightly class of elephant drivers, which logically cost kings substantial sums to employ.\textsuperscript{24} Pachyderms developed very personal relationships with their \textit{mahouts} – so much so that they have been recorded defending or carrying the dead bodies of their \textit{mahouts} off the battle field, regardless of the danger facing them. Since elephants have never been suitable for domestication, they remained fundamentally unpredictable creatures. They may violently attack their \textit{mahouts}, anyone, or anything for no apparent reason. Moreover, war elephants were well “known to decline food and die of hunger after killing his rider in fury.”\textsuperscript{25} If a pachyderm killed its own trainer, the king would not only lose the asset of an experienced driver and trainer, but he would also lose his investment capturing, transporting, training, and maintaining the monster.

Accordingly, the training of such creatures is a tribulation, but maintaining them compounds the ordeal. An elephant consumes a massive amount of water, urinating five to ten liters every two hours, and “defecates…approximately two-hundred and fifty pounds per day.”\textsuperscript{26} John M. Kistler does the math, demonstrating that the five-hundred elephants that Seleucus received from the Indian king, Chandragupta Maurya, in 305 BCE would have cost him “110 tons of fodder” per day to feed.\textsuperscript{27} In fact, John D. Grainger suggests that Chandragupta may have been pleased to forfeit these giants, along with their trainers and maintenance teams, to Seleucus so that he would have fewer to feed while marching his army back home across the region of

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{23} There are two species of elephants, Asian, or Indian, \textit{(Elephas maximus)} and African \textit{(Loxodonta Africana)}, with two subspecies of African elephants. The African Savannah, or Bush, elephant is untamable, nor would its Sub-Saharan native location have made it reasonably accessible to the Ancient Mediterranean World. Thus, they were not used for war. The African Forest elephant, on the other hand, was accessible and utilized for war but is smaller and considered to be less aggressive, or warlike, than its Asian counterpart.
\bibitem{24} Nossov, \textit{War Elephants}, 8.
\bibitem{25} Nossov, \textit{War Elephants}, 8; and Kistler, \textit{War Elephants}, 37.
\bibitem{26} Kistler, \textit{War Elephants}, 42.
\bibitem{27} Idem, 65
\end{thebibliography}
modern Pakistan. Grainger’s proposal fits well with our understanding of the modern colloquial expression *white elephant*. Albert Jack asserts that the origins of this idiom lies in the premise that albino elephants had been so highly prized in India that, upon discovery, they would immediately become the property of the king. Therefore, it was a serious offense to neglect, work, or ride them. The king would offer these elephants as royal giftsto those who caused him irritation. Such a gift could not be worked to counter the cost of feeding and maintaining itself, and would thus financially ruin the recipient of the king’s ‘gift’. Nevertheless, Seleucus seemed pleased with this exchange as the *Diadochi* “all pinned their hopes of victory on their elephant corps and looked upon them as a token of victory” irrespective of the difficulties and costs involved.

The role of war elephants in the Hellenistic period has been “described as ‘living tanks’ [...] determined both by their effectiveness and their comparative scarcity.” Keeping with this analog, war elephants are more specifically analogous to the battle tanks of World War I. Such machines reached successes, but these small victories were never able to be exploited to achieve profound victories. Although tanks were massive and terrifying, they were not war-winning tools during the First World War. Tanks were capricious bulwarks and, as new weapons, war leaders did not yet understand what their most effective combat role would be. At the Battle of Gaugamela in 331 BCE, for example, war elephants can be seen in much the same light. Darius III fielded elephants in his front lines against Alexander the Great. Kistler suggests that Alexander knew to take advantage of the fickleness of the beasts by postponing battle – for the first time in his

---


29 This expression is used to refer to something useless that has, or will, become a huge burden to those who possess it.

30 Chandragupta and Seleucus had just signed an armistice with one another, ending a territorial war. The 500 elephants were a part of the gifts they exchanged in their treaty.


33 Idem, 4.
career. On the day of battle, the pachyderms were not present. Alexander’s delay necessitated the removal of the animals because they needed to be rested and watered, thus rendering these powerful weapons useless.\(^{34}\) After acquiring his own, Alexander seems to have understood that the fickleness of keeping elephants in his army posed a hazard. “I have had plenty of them, I would never use them, knowing very well, that they are more dangerous to such as employ them, then to their enemies.”\(^{35}\) Although Alexander had created the prestigious new command of *Elephantarch* within his army, this was only done near the end of his conquests and was largely a figurehead title. To be used to any advantage, war elephants had to be utilized for very specific functions on the battlefield because of their vulnerabilities to smaller adversaries.

Pliny recounts a story of an elephant being tormented by a single dog. Although vastly larger and more powerful, the elephant soon collapsed in frustration and exhaustion from the banes of the dog harassing its ankles.\(^{36}\) Accordingly, A.B. Bosworth contends that there is no evidence that elephants were used to attacking smaller adversaries, such as infantry.\(^{37}\) Instead, elephants were primarily directed against each other or to keep cavalry at bay.\(^{38}\) To be sure, there were instances of elephants engaging troops, though this was not their primary function. The Battle of Hydaspes, recounted by Quintus Curtius Rufus in the introduction of this study, confirms how devastating elephants could be against troops, but also vulnerable to them. When the lead elephant of the general Eumenes fell at the Battle of Gabiene in 316 BCE, the rest of his elephant contingent fled from the fight. His infantry, at great expense, overpowered the elephant forces of their enemy, led by Antigonus Monophthalmus. Antigonus had failed to exploit his initial


advantage with a secondary advance on the exposed flanks of his enemy while they were engaging his elephants; this almost cost him the battle. Nevertheless, this engagement demonstrated the vulnerability of elephants fighting against a committed infantry corps.

Correspondingly, at the Battle of Raphia in 217, Ptolemy IV’s African elephants declined to engage the Asian elephants of Antiochus III. Yet, Ptolemy’s troops overcame the beasts of Antiochus’ army, winning the battle. At Magnesia in 190 BCE, the Romans chose not to field their African elephants against Antiochus III’s Asian elephants, knowing how Ptolemy’s pachyderms had reacted at Raphia. The Romans nevertheless achieved victory by using arrows, slings, and javelins against the elephants, causing them to panic and charge through their own ranks. Once more, in 275 BCE at Maleventum, the Romans fomented chaos among the war elephants of Pyrrhus of Epirus allegedly by coating pigs with oil and pitch, setting them aflame, and releasing the fire-hogs squealing and scurrying wildly between the elephants’ legs. Although war elephants were formidable adversaries, they were undoubtedly vulnerable to swift and clever foot soldiers.

Elephants are seen to be most effective in war only in Bosworth’s second claim – keeping cavalry at bay. W.W. Tarn affirms that “generals meant to use their elephants as screens against the enemy cavalry.” At the Battle of Ipsus in 301 BCE, Demetrius I Poliorcetes led a cavalry charge against that of Seleucus I Nicator, putting Seleucus’ cavalry to flight. Upon returning to attack the rear of Seleucus’ battle-line, Demetrius “faced a wall of elephants” that terrified his horses and prevented him from rejoining the battle, ultimately costing him the engagement. The Battle of Ipsus is “the first recorded battle won owing to elephants.” However, the elephants

39 The only reason that Antigonus did not lose this engagement was the fact that he was able to capture Eumenes’ supply train and camp (including the wives and slaves of the soldiers) while his own lines were crumbling. Antigonus used this as leverage to force Eumenes’ men to forfeit the fight.

40 Karl Groning and Martin Saller, Elephants: A Cultural and Historical History (Germany: Konemann, 1999), 218.


42 Nossov, War Elephants, 22.
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played a passive role in blocking Demetrius’ cavalry. There is no way of knowing if Seleucus placed most of his elephants in the rear for this expressed purpose. Still, most historians believe this must have been a deliberate move, citing Seleucus’ shrewdness in other engagements. Reconstructions of the battle formations, however, place the elephants of Seleucus in a position that protected the rear, but not his flanks, suggesting that he intended to keep his elephants away from his own troops for fear of their unpredictable nature, or situated in a position to react to the movement of his enemy’s cavalry. When considering how much quicker cavalry forces are compared to elephants, the latter explanation seems less likely. Nevertheless, elephants continued to work as an effective tool that instilled fear in horses of cavalry and chariot units.

In 276 BCE, war elephants contributed to Antiochus I’s victory over the Galatians. “They frightened the horses of the scythed chariots into turning back and dispersing their own ranks.”

A similar outcome took place in 222 BCE when Molon, a satrap of Antiochus III, rebelled. Roman cavalry, likewise, struggled against elephants when they fought Pyrrhus of Epirus at Heraclea in 280 BCE. “It was not... the men but the horses, unaccustomed to the sight and smell of elephants, that took flight.”

During the First Punic war, the Romans were effectively encircled at Bagradas in 255 BCE after their cavalry was put to flight by the presence of enemy elephants. Later, during the Second Punic War, Hannibal’s elephants terrified and routed the Roman cavalry forces at the Battle of Trebia in 218 BCE. War elephants were certainly effective in neutralizing cavalry and chariot horses. This advantage, however, was significantly reduced as cavalry leaders began to regularly expose their horses to the sounds and smell of elephants. At such a high-cost and risk for the investment with seemingly little return, it is confounding that any of the Diadochi ever employed these giants in their armies.

The ancient biographers of Alexander the Great tell us that the

---

45 Idem, 24
46 Idem, 28.
47 Idem, 18.
presence of elephants on the battlefield dampened the spirits of soldiers. Engaging such a large and powerful creature with only a spear and shield must have been petrifying, especially considering that a spear is a weapon that would more effectively infuriate the behemoth, instead of killing it. Diodorus confirms how frightful elephants were when stating that “the brutes caused great terror, and their trumpeting... [threw] the men into great confusion.” Porus, at the Battle of Hydaspes, believed his elephants to be so terrifying that the Macedonian army would not engage them. Accordingly, he intentionally placed his elephants before his front lines to “strike the enemy with terror,” a formation that is seen employed in battle after battle. Such massive creatures were undoubtedly used as a means of calculated terror to destroy the morale of their opponents.

Even Alexander had his anxieties. Plutarch states that Alexander dreaded the elephants and did not want to engage them with his cavalry, stating: “I see at last a danger that matches my courage.” Most historians agree that the reports of greater numbers of ferocious war elephants in India were the leading cause of mutiny among Alexander’s troops. The Macedonians did defeat Porus’ war elephants, but evidently, it was a horrifying struggle; “the men were never quite the same again.” When trying to dissuade his troops from revolt, Diodorus has Alexander arguing that, although the size of the pachyderms made them look “like walls,” even greater numbers of mammoths could be surmounted by exploiting their fickleness and unpredictable nature. Similar apprehension is attested

50 Diodorus in The Invasion of India, 274.
52 The ancient historians Polybius, Arrian, Diodorus, and Rufus all give varying accounts of this options. Many modern historians agree, including Fildes and Fletcher in Alexander the Great: Son of the Gods, 130; Freeman in Alexander the Great, 30; and O’Brien in Alexander the Great: The Invisible Enemy, a biography, 164, 172.
53 Kistler, War Elephants, 40.
in stories from Roman Legionaries who survived their first encounters with elephants, which ensured that Rome did not dare confront elephants again for several years. In fact, nearly every treaty the Romans imposed upon their defeated adversaries, who had employed war elephants, contained a clause prohibiting them from employing war elephants in the future.  

In the broader historical context, it becomes clear that the Hellenistic kings of the third century BCE went to exorbitant lengths to obtain elephants to employ in their armies. The rigors of capturing, transporting, breeding, and training elephants suggests that these kings believed them to be weapons worth any cost. Elephants held a significant benefit in their ability to render cavalry corps useless. This was a substantial advantage, but only if exploited with a *coup de grâce*, which was blundered at the battles of Raphia and Magnesia. Nevertheless, this advantage was short lived as cavalry became accustomed to the presence of pachyderms on the battlefield. Soldiers, on the other hand, never became comfortable engaging elephants; the ancient chroniclers attest to soldiers dreading the idea of confronting these colossal beasts. Accordingly, employing such creatures in war acted as a measure of calculated terror that demoralized enemy forces, but their capricious nature could also lead to destroying one’s own troops – a primary concern of Alexander’s. H.H. Scullard warns that Alexander’s lack of employing war elephants should not be taken as evidence that they were unpredictable or poor weapons, cautioning that, “Alexander’s prior and subsequent efforts to obtain elephants for his army” implies that they were understood to be potent war machines. However, they proved unsuccessful in defeating foot soldiers, as noted at the battles of Hydaspes, Gabiene, Raphia, Magnesia, and Maleventum.

These engagements verify that elephants were, in fact, unpredictable, if not poor weapons. Nevertheless, the simple fact that the Hellenistic kings afforded to employ significant numbers of elephants in their armies

---

55 As the Romans gained influence in the Mediterranean, they employed war elephants in every major campaign from 198 BCE throughout the 2nd century BCE; yet, by the 1st century BCE, elephants were largely dissolved from western warfare and would soon disappear entirely. It seems that the Romans appreciated the ferocity of elephants but had no taste for absorbing the cost of maintaining them. Thus, they phased them out of western warfare. Nossov, *War Elephants*, 27, 32.

56 Scullard, *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World*, 72.
attests to the vast wealth, the immense influence, and the awesome power of these kings. War elephants, thus, represented power and prestige more than potent weapons of war. This is precisely why Alexander endeavored to incorporate them into his army, yet never utilized them.\footnote{Q. Curtius, \textit{The Life and Death of Alexander}, 399.} Similarly, the Seleucid rulers, although they still needed to capture new stock frequently, operated elephant breeding programs at Apamea in Syria precisely to demonstrate their wealth and power over other Hellenistic kings.\footnote{Kistler, \textit{War Elephants}, 69.} The war elephant became the symbol of the Seleucids, terrifying their enemies, and “the impression [that they] made on the other generals… was that elephants were an arm to be obtained at any price.”\footnote{Tarn, \textit{Hellenistic Military \& Naval Developments}, 94.} The war elephant of the third century BCE was an enormous creature, powerful, and hideously destructive; but this beast was exorbitantly expensive, vulnerable, and hazardously unreliable in the confusion of war. The ‘arms race’ for the war elephant was as much a demonstration of power by iron-fisted kings as it was a period of experimentation with a psychological weapon in European warfare that would prove obsolete within a century.
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Soundscapes of the Khmer Rouge Labor Camp

Graduate Winner of the Joseph Mullins Prize in History

Scott Pribble

On April 17, 1975, the Khmer Rouge army rolled into Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, after a five-year civil war against the American-backed administration of Lon Nol. It was the beginning of a nightmare that would haunt the nation for decades. Cambodian citizens were evacuated from the cities and marched into the countryside as the leaders of the Khmer Rouge engineered one of the most radical social experiments in world history. Their goal was to create an agrarian, communist utopia and to implement their policies at an extreme pace. The regime burned books, outlawed currency and religion, and murdered any perceived opponents. Stripped of their possessions, people subsisted on meager rations of food and lived in dismal accommodations. From 1975–1979, 1.7 million Cambodians died as part of a perverse attempt to build a new society based on the principles of collectivism, nationalism, and egalitarianism.¹

When the Khmer Rouge took control of Cambodia in 1975, the murderous regime initiated a nationwide effort to destroy the traditions of the country and replace them with new utopian ideals and customs. To build this new culture, the Khmer Rouge sought to control every aspect of society, evacuating the cities and relocating the population to labor camps where they would work to build the revolution. This essay is an examination of the soundscapes of these labor camps, seeking to identify the auditory strategies designed by the Khmer Rouge to control and intimidate the Khmer people and to collectivize them in a new communist, nationalist Cambodia. The first section of the essay will focus on the Khmer Rouge’s intimidation tactics, analyzing the sonic landscape that was prominent in the camps and

identifying the motives of the perpetrators. The second part will show how the regime used various aural strategies to collectivize the Cambodian people and indoctrinate them with Marxist ideology. Finally, the third section will examine the sounds of subversion, the subtle noises of rebellion that the victims of the Khmer Rouge quietly voiced at great personal risk to convey their disdain for the regime. While sonic tactics were employed by captors and captives in a psychological struggle for dominance and survival, the Khmer Rouge weaponized sound as part of a carefully constructed program to destroy the individual and transform the Khmer population into a new collective of utopian citizens.

**Soundscapes**

What is a soundscape and why should historians care about it? In his 1977 book, *The Soundscape*, R. Murray Schafer defined the soundscape as the “acoustic environment” or collection of noises that people encounter within the context of a community. Soundscapes are also a tool that historians can use to broaden our understanding of historical events and settings, a supplement to the visual aspects of history to which we are accustomed. Schafer, a musician, pioneered this concept in the 1970s and several historians have since focused on the acoustic environments of specific eras and regions to give audiences a more complete picture of human history. Schafer’s soundscapes were comprised of three categories of sounds: keynotes, signals, and soundmarks, and the author focused on noises that could be heard by a group or community of individuals, including vocalizations, natural noises, mechanical sounds, and musical instruments. He developed the concepts of keynotes, signals, and soundmarks to give meaning to the components of a soundscape and to identify their impact on a community. “Keynotes” were defined as background sounds “created by its geography.” These noises had a constant presence, but generally went unnoticed unless they ceased. The cessation of a keynote sound was often significant to the community, perhaps signaling cause for alarm. The keynotes of the Cambodian labor camps were the persistent noises generated by workers and their tools. “Signals” were foreground sounds. According to Schafer, these sounds were “listened to consciously” and alerted people to an event that was
about to occur. A mealtime bell was an example of a Khmer Rouge signal. Finally, “soundmarks” were noises that carried a special meaning for the community and represented a cultural symbol that needed to be “protected.” The leadership of Khmer Rouge composed over a hundred songs that served as indoctrination tools, playing them over the loudspeakers in the camps incessantly. These songs were the soundmarks of the regime. This essay will examine and analyze the aural significance of these three concepts in the context of the Khmer Rouge labor camps.²

The Labor Camps

After the Khmer Rouge evacuated Phnom Penh and the other cities, cadres led the citizens into small villages that served as forced labor camps (also referred to as communes or cooperatives). Pol Pot and his comrades created the camps to produce agricultural crops for the revolution, with the goal of making Cambodia completely self-sufficient and a model for communist nations all over the world. Although the cooperatives had different objectives based on their location, the goal for the majority of the labor camps was to produce rice to export to China in exchange for weapons and financial support. Feeding the Cambodian people was a secondary function, as meagre rations were distributed to the villagers. Laborers in the camps planted and cultivated crops, dug irrigation ditches, and built dams. Many of the Khmer Rouge cadres (or yotheas) were teenage soldiers, who were responsible for managing the workforce, enforcing the rules of the communes, and doling out punishments.³

There was a distinct hierarchy in these communes. Cadres were at the top of the hierarchy, ‘old’ people (or neak chas) were in the middle, and ‘new’ people (or neak thmey) were at the bottom of the social ladder. The ‘old’ or ‘base’ people included the rural peasants, Cambodians from the lowest social and economic class in the country. The revolution was carried out in the name of the poor, so these people were generally treated better

than those at the bottom of the social pyramid. The peasants were also accustomed to hard labor and limited food supplies, so they adapted quickly to life in the camps. ‘New’ people were the city dwellers from Phnom Penh and other towns. They were branded as “bourgeois” and despised by the other residents because they had supposedly never struggled or worked with their hands. Many of the Khmer Rouge soldiers had endured miserable existences during the civil war from 1970–1975 and were eager to take out their aggressions on these ‘new’ people, their perceived oppressors. And the ‘new’ people’s limited experience in agricultural labor made them expendable. A person’s position in the hierarchy determined his or her occupation in the communes as well as daily rations and social status.

**Sounds of Control and Intimidation**

*Deceptions and Manipulations*

Auditory tactics were developed for the Khmer Rouge soldiers, numbering only about 50,000 in 1975, to gain a psychological advantage over the population of eight million Cambodians. One of the most effective means of controlling the Cambodian people was through the creation of a mysterious leadership team called Angkar (“the organization”). The leaders of the Khmer Rouge remained anonymous for most of their reign. The theory was that if no one knew who the leaders were, then they could not be subverted or overthrown. Instead, soldiers simply referred to the leaders of the Khmer Rouge (or Democratic Kampuchea, as the regime referred to itself) as Angkar. This was understandably puzzling to Cambodians. Haing Ngor, a survivor who later became the lead actor in the American movie,

---


The Killing Fields, recalled asking one of the less belligerent cadres, “Who is Angkar, comrade brother?” The soldier replied that he did not know and had “never seen Angkar” in all his years fighting for the Khmer Rouge. The organization symbolized an all-powerful deity and the word, Angkar, became a tool of the regime to cow cadres and villagers into submission. A faceless regime with an ominous name was far more intimidating than a group of mere mortals. The broadcasts over the camp loudspeakers from the radio stations in Phnom Penh were the only contact people had with Angkar. These “voices over the airwaves,” dispensing news and repeating slogans, generated an image of a supreme being in the minds of the villagers. The deified voice of the mysterious leaders became an effective tool of the regime, serving as a reminder of its omnipresence to anyone who might be tempted to resist.

One of the immediate goals of the Khmer Rouge was to eliminate any potential opposition. Soon after the establishment of the cooperatives, soldiers were instructed to interrogate families in the camps in an attempt to identify members of the previous regime and other perceived threats. This task was executed by various forms of verbal deception. At first, cadres asked for members of the previous administration to identify themselves, under the guise that experienced officials were needed to help with the reconstruction of Phnom Penh. The first Cambodians who volunteered to help disappeared, never to be heard from again. Villagers quickly figured out what was going on and stopped volunteering information about themselves, so the Khmer Rouge changed their tactics. The interrogators then asked individuals about their family background, so that the cadres could “help” them find relatives that they had lost contact with during the evacuation of the cities. Cadres used more aggressive tactics if they felt that people were not being honest. As a result of the constant deceptions, unsettling

8 Ngor, Survival in the Killing Fields, 123.
9 Criddle and Mam, To Destroy You Is No Loss, 71.
10 Idem, 37.
12 Ngor, Survival in the Killing Fields, 259.
rumors began to circulate among the camp inhabitants about missing people or impending violence. These auditory tactics generated panic and an “unlifting sense of doom” throughout the cooperatives.\(^\text{13}\)

Other forms of sonic deception were a common feature of daily life in the cooperatives as part of the constant effort to disorient and intimidate. Sometimes soldiers executed suspected enemies out in the open, forcing villagers to listen to the horrifying noises. Other times, suspects would be rounded up. The village loudspeakers would then play music to muffle the sound of the murders, even though camp residents knew what was happening.\(^\text{14}\) This was psychological warfare being waged on the Cambodian people, who were left wondering what the different tactics meant. The contrasting methods of execution seemed random, but this was most likely a deliberate attempt to confound the villagers. In one anecdote, soldiers at a labor camp ordered older men and women to remove stones from a nearby temple to build a bridge. When some of the elder Khmers objected to destroying the sacred temple, the soldiers calmly told those individuals they could go home. Those protesters disappeared that night and as a result, no further complaints were voiced. Work on the temple resumed the next day.\(^\text{15}\) The Khmer Rouge were always on offense and their captives in the communes remained in a constant state of paranoia.
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Threats and Taunts

“Whoever protests is an enemy. Whoever opposes is a corpse.”

One of the most effective auditory strategies for controlling the population was through the use of constant threats of violence and cruel taunts. Some of these threats were embedded in slogans created by the Khmer Rouge leadership to strike fear into their captives and keep them in line. One of the most common slogans of the regime was “Angkar has eyes like a pineapple. It sees everywhere. So you must behave correctly.” This was a warning to remind villagers that they were under constant surveillance. Also, many survivors recalled hearing variations of the slogan, “to keep you is no benefit. To destroy you is no loss.” This quotation had two purposes. The obvious aim of the saying was to demoralize the villagers, informing them of their insignificance and expendability. The secondary purpose was to impose upon the young Khmer Rouge soldiers the idea that they needed to rid the communes of any lazy or rebellious laborers, because they could easily be replaced. Historian Henri Locard, who interviewed survivors of the regime in the 1990s, compiled hundreds of these slogans in *Pol Pot’s Little Red Book: The Sayings of Angkar*. Their constant repetition was an essential component of the aural strategy to control the population.

Taunts and laughter were also used to demoralize the Cambodian people in the camps. While laborers toiled in the fields, the teenaged Khmer Rouge soldiers routinely criticized their work, a tremendous insult to the elders in a traditionally patriarchal society. Taunts like, “your parents cannot stop us or help you,” terrorized children and young cadres used the sounds of laughter to insult their captives. When a villager was
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punished with a beating, the victim was often times laughed at and mocked throughout the ordeal. One account described a scene in which a woman asked of the whereabouts of a relative. The soldiers laughed at her, claiming that her mother was now fertilizer.\textsuperscript{21} Another woman claimed that she was forced to marry a Khmer Rouge soldier, who raped her repeatedly as part of a deliberate effort to provide the next generation of children for \textit{Angkar}. Her attacker’s fellow cadres reportedly watched the hideous ordeal and then jokingly remarked “that it was good that they could produce children, laughed and left.”\textsuperscript{22} Laughter was an especially cruel form of abuse as the intended audiences were too intimidated to respond knowing they could be killed for the slightest infraction.

Tone of voice was another means of auditory control. Director of the Documentation Center of Cambodia, Youk Chhang, stated, “the Khmer Rouge used the tone of their language to intimidate people.”\textsuperscript{23} The Khmer Rouge did not make requests. They told the camp inhabitants where to go, what to do, and when to do it, and their vocal tone reinforced the hierarchy of the commune. Cambodian culture generally frowned upon people who spoke to each other harshly, so the rude tone of the cadres was disarming to its audience.\textsuperscript{24} Villagers described the soldiers’ voices as “shrill hisses,” “roars,” and “snarls.”\textsuperscript{25} One survivor recalled being forced to watch the execution of several men. The Khmer Rouge soldiers shouted at the men, “bend your head down now,” before killing them with a blow to the back of the head with a farming tool. Victims were so overwhelmed by the power and tone of the voice that they submitted to the demands of their executioners even in their final moments.\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Patricia McCormick, \textit{Never Fall Down} (New York: Balzer + Bray, 2012), 41.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Youk Chhang, Director, Documentation Center of Cambodia, e-mail message to author, March 16, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Chanrithy Him, \textit{When Broken Glass Floats: Growing Up Under the Khmer Rouge} (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001), 97.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Idem, 110–85.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Idem, 247.
\end{itemize}
In addition to the threats and taunts, other sounds terrorized the inhabitants of the labor camps. Cambodians heard the screams and cries of other villagers frequently. Some Khmer recalled hearing crying children at night, interrupting their sleep. “One little boy next to me, always he cry for his mother. No way you can sleep with this sound.” There were screams for help and groans of agony when executions or beatings took place. One survivor recalled hearing the shrieeks of a woman losing her sanity after her family members had died. Another account vividly described the anguished sounds of parents begging soldiers not to take their child away. “Her mother fell to her knees, palms together, and pleaded with them not to take her only daughter. The father, still on his knees, lowered his head to the ground, banged his forehead on the dirt, and also pleaded with the soldiers.” Survivors often felt tremendous guilt after hearing people pleading for help and realizing that they could not offer the slightest assistance. This was an essential component of the demoralization process. Camp inhabitants were helpless, and the soundscape was a constant reminder of their vulnerabilities.

Many people in the camps also experienced non-verbal, violent sounds on a regular basis. Gunfire was heard in the cooperatives, but it was not a common occurrence because the Khmer Rouge leaders insisted that cadres did not waste bullets on people. Ammunition was needed to fight external enemies like the Vietnamese. Some villagers remembered hearing executions routinely, as soldiers smashed their victims with the back of an

---


29 Um, *From the Land of Shadows*, 87.


31 McCormick, *Never Fall Down*, 42.

axe or a garden hoe to the back of the head. The sound of the execution was compared to the “cracking of a coconut”33 or described as the inanimate noise, “phoas.”34 These noises created a culture of fear in the labor camps, cowing audiences into submission, and would haunt survivors for the rest of their lives.

Silence

The inevitable outcome of persistent systematic intimidation was silence. The collective goals of the revolution did not include the voices of individuals. One of the common sayings among the ‘new’ people was to “plant a kapok tree,” a Khmer colloquialism for “keep your mouth shut.”35 Silent villagers never said the wrong word and therefore, limited the probability of punishment. Many survivors recalled being reprimanded by the cadres for speaking or crying.36 In many cases, children were not even allowed to speak to their own parents without permission from the soldiers.37 Those who risked using their voices had to be careful to watch out for informers, mostly villagers and younger cadres, listening carefully to private conversations so that they could report any speaking infractions to camp leaders.38 This created a culture of paranoia in the camps and people quickly learned to self-censor, as “normally lively villagers were turned into silent automatons.”39 Silence was a logical survival strategy for most camp inhabitants.

33 McCormick, Never Fall Down, 53.
34 Um, From the Land of Shadows, 45.
35 Ngor, Survival in the Killing Fields, 253.
36 Kiernan, Genocide and Democracy in Cambodia, 54.
37 Um, From the Land of Shadows, 53.
38 Ung, First They Killed My Father, 64.
39 Kiernan, Genocide and Democracy in Cambodia, 55.
Language Control

When villagers were permitted to speak, their language was restricted. New words were imposed upon everyone, replacing the traditional Khmer language. The Khmer Rouge had “better words for eating, sleeping, working, stranger; all designed to make us equal.”\(^{40}\) The regime wanted to eliminate class and hierarchy in their utopian communist society, so words that denoted class were extinguished. Under the Khmer Rouge, Cambodians were not allowed to use customary titles like “Mr.,” “Mrs.,” or “Sir.” Instead, they were instructed to use the word, *met* (“comrade”), to address others. For children, father had to be called *poh* instead of the more familiar *paa* and mother became *meh* instead of *mae*. *Angkar* was supposed to replace the mother and father, so more formal words were needed to diminish the bonds between biological parents and their children.\(^{41}\) Ngor described a scene where he was scolded for calling his wife “sweet” and told that affectionate language was forbidden.\(^{42}\) By controlling the language of the population, the leaders of the Khmer Rouge believed that they could eventually control the thoughts of the people and convert some of them to a revolutionary mindset.

Sounds of Collectivization

Labor

Collectivization was the ultimate goal of the revolution; individualism was the enemy. The collectivization effort involved 12-hour workdays and the noises it generated were the “keynotes” of the camp. Survivors recalled hearing the constant sounds of digging, plowing, and pounding the land as the laborers spent most of their days in the fields.\(^{43}\) Breaking the hard soil of the rice paddies with hoes made a “chop chop chop” noise that was ubiquitous

\(^{40}\) Ung, *First They Killed My Father*, 60.

\(^{41}\) Ibid.


\(^{43}\) Idem, 174.
in the camps. There were few machines available, so hoes were also used to build irrigation canals and to dig graves. Since speech was prohibited, the only sounds came from tools hitting the earth for much of the day. The intense group labor was intended to create a revolutionary bond between workers, while destroying the spirit of the individual. The soundscape of human labor was a daily reminder that everyone worked together for the revolution.

Bells were the “signals” for many of the camps, representing different events at different times of the day. Bells were sounded to wake up the camp inhabitants at four o’clock in the morning, creating “a penetrating, relentless noise. A command to be obeyed.” A long work day ensued. Camp bells were sounded in triplets, similar to the Buddhist monks’ rhythmic drumming that called Cambodians to prayer. “The monks had beat their drums in the same pattern, dull, single booms at first and then faster and faster into a drum roll.” Since the Khmer Rouge leaders wanted to replace Buddhism with the worship of Angkar, the derivative cadence was probably intentional. Bells were also rung in the evening to summon the prisoners to the political meetings, dreaded by camp residents. The sounds of the bells were not always negative, however. Soldiers rang bells to call the workers to meals. Though rations were meager in most camps, a short break from work in the intense heat to eat was welcomed. The sound of the bells also signaled the end of the workday, usually at midnight. Again, this regimen was part of the collectivization process. Everyone worked, ate, and slept at the same time every day, in an effort to create a sense of community in the cooperatives.
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Re-education Meetings for Adults

Several times per week, villagers were “treated” to hours of political lectures called *bonns*. In Buddhism, a *bonn* is a religious celebration; at the labor camps, it was an indoctrination session to celebrate the new civilization that was being imposed upon the Cambodian people.\(^{50}\) This was another example of the regime co-opting a Buddhist religious concept, suggesting to the attendees that the revolution was a new form of spiritualism. The adult meetings (children attended separate revolutionary schools) were run by male and female cadres, who espoused the virtues of the new culture and successes of the regime. Many of these sessions focused on the evils of capitalism and the sins of the previous administration. Soldiers often boasted about the Khmer Rouge victory against the American-backed regime of Lon Nol in the civil war. In the minds of many Khmer Rouge cadres, their soldiers had defeated the United States militarily, evidence that the tiny regime possessed godlike powers. One cadre proclaimed that “we were like an ant that bit an elephant!”\(^{51}\) The leader of the *bonn* would congratulate the laborers on their good fortune, using unfamiliar communist jargon. “How lucky you are! Under the arch-fascist, arch-imperialist, arch-feudalist Lon Nol, you were oppressed!”\(^{52}\) Under *Angkar*, Cambodians were assured a much better future, which was supposedly just around the corner.

The *bonns* were another element of the collectivization strategy. Villagers were encouraged to participate in the meetings with enthusiastic cheers and raised fists after each declaration.\(^{53}\) The attendees had been socialized to respond passionately or face some sort of penalty. The *bonns* often began with revolutionary songs “that no one dared refuse to sing with gusto.”\(^{54}\) Another important aspect of the meetings were the criticism and self-criticism sessions, a practice that was borrowed from Mao Zedong. Villagers were asked to criticize themselves and admit the ways that they
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failed to live up to revolutionary standards, so they could remain humble and learn from their mistakes. At the same time, individuals had to be careful to confess their sins without admitting to any serious offense that might lead to punishment. Camp inhabitants were also encouraged to criticize other residents at these meetings. This practice was especially frightening, since false accusations could lead to death sentences. The criticism sessions taught Cambodians to keep to themselves and be wary of other villagers, undermining the possibility of revolt.\footnote{Criddle and Mam, \textit{To Destroy You Is No Loss}, 92–93.}

\textit{Revolutionary Schools for Children}

Creating the next generation of Khmer Rouge devotees was probably the most important function of the camps. Children under the age of fourteen were sent to revolutionary schools called \textit{kong komar}, where they would be aurally indoctrinated by the cadres.\footnote{Susan E. Cook, \textit{Genocide in Cambodia and Rwanda: New Perspectives} (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2006), 142.} As the Minister of Culture and Social Affairs, Ieng Thirith, stated, “only children can purely serve the revolution and eliminate reactionism, since they are young, obedient, loyal, and active.”\footnote{Peter Maguire, \textit{Facing Death in Cambodia}, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 51.} Pol Pot and the other leaders of the Khmer Rouge realized that the vast majority of adults was never going to be re-educated as true believers. The \textit{kong komar} was intended to program the first generation of the new civilization. Children were “subjected to political socialization carried out through the almost daily meetings” and brainwashed with repetitive praise of the revolution.\footnote{Um, \textit{From the Land of Shadows}, 63.} As in the adult sessions, kids were urged to make grand displays of enthusiasm for the new society with shouts of “\textit{Angkar! Angkar! Angkar!}” each time teachers praised the regime.\footnote{Ung, \textit{First They Killed My Father}, 125.} New words replaced traditional language in order to destroy any vestiges of the
old Khmer culture. There were also musical plays and dances to entertain the young audiences, creating an atmosphere of a communist pep rally, and the curriculum of these schools was designed carefully to engage the students.

In addition to instilling revolutionary fervor in the children, the primary goal of the kong komar was to replace the bonds of the biological family with Angkar. Cadres often told young kids that their parents did not love them. They ordered the children to distrust and hate their families, even encouraging them to spy on their own parents to make sure they exhibited proper revolutionary behavior. Children learned that only Angkar truly loved them because they were the “saviors” of the new civilization. The youth were also taught about the hero of the revolution, Pol Pot. “Given the most Cambodians had never heard Pol Pot’s name during the Khmer Rouge years, this revelation underscored the special status of these young recruits.” Although Pol Pot generally preferred anonymity, the new civilization needed heroes, so the regime manufactured a virtuous new hero, using his name. Mothers and fathers of these children had to be replaced in order for the revolution to succeed. The children of the regime would be taught that Angkar was their new family and Pol Pot was their revolutionary godfather.

Slogans

As stated in the previous section of this essay, slogans were tools of intimidation. But, they were also used to promote the regime and group solidarity. The slogans that were often part of the propaganda spewed at the re-education meetings were also repeated during work hours, meals, weddings, and other celebrations. Hundreds of slogans covered a wide range of topics. Some were simple expressions of admiration for the new civilization.
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“Long live the resplendent Democratic Kampuchea!” Other slogans were rejections of the old culture, infused with a healthy dose of communist jargon. “Completely get rid of all the castoffs from imperialist, feudalist, and reactionary days.” Many of the sayings were intended to indoctrinate the audience, replacing the biological family with the state. “Angkar will nurture and provide.” The leadership intentionally constructed slogans that consisted of few words, making them easy to remember. Villagers were so bombarded with these slogans that survivors could recall them decades later, evidence of their efficacy.

Music

Music was an essential component of the Khmer Rouge’s propaganda machine. In fact, music was so important to the regime that Pol Pot took it upon himself to write some of the lyrics for the revolutionary songs. Members of the regime composed these songs to supplant the old values of Cambodia, as traditional songs were no longer permitted under the Khmer Rouge. It is unknown how many songs were written (the Documentation Center of Cambodia collected over one hundred), but it is clear that the revolutionary music was intended to communicate carefully considered messages to its audiences. According to some, it was the regime’s “most effective tool of indoctrination,” blaring over the loudspeakers while inhabitants of the camps labored for hours in the heat. And this strategy of “educating” the Khmer clearly worked. Ngor remarked, “I knew every word. The rise and fall of every phrase, the timing of every gong and
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Music was the “soundmark” of the labor camps that was sacred to the regime, played over the loudspeakers and sung at re-education meetings and the occasional festival.

The lyrics of these revolutionary songs were both ominous and celebratory and included much of the new jargon that was frequently heard in the camps. The lyrics of “We the Youth are Committed to Following Revolutionary Kampuchea Forever” contained several examples of the new language that was imposed upon the Khmer people.

Because the revolutionary Kampuchean Angkar is robust, it has led us to persevere together to fight against the evil capitalist regime. To indoctrinate the ideology of great revolution; the political consciousness of Angkar’s strategy; with sturdy hands in every respect.

The national anthem, “The Dazzling Victory of 17 April,” was heard on a regular basis in the camps. The lyrics of this song were a dark reminder of the sacrifices that needed to be made to create the new society.

Glittering red blood which blankets the towns and countryside of the Kampuchean motherland!
Blood of our splendid worker-peasants!
Blood of our revolutionary combatants, male and female!
Blood that was transmuted into seething fury, into fierce struggle,
On 17 April, under the revolutionary flag!
Blood that liberated us from slavery!

Reminiscent of the “La Marseillaise,” the French revolutionary anthem, the repeated references to blood implied a threat to anyone who was not
compliant, while celebrating the heroic nature of those who struggled to build the glorious, new nation. One line that seemed to taunt the listener, “blood that liberated us from slavery,” was striking in its irony, since the laborers in the camps were literal slaves. Other songs were explicitly intended for children.

“The Great Angkar”
We children love Angka limitlessly.
Because of you we have better lives and live quite happily.
Before the revolution, children were poor and lived like animals,
We were cold and suffered,
But the enemy didn’t care about us.76

These lyrics reinforced the concept of Angkar as the caring mother and father, who saved and protected the children from a life of misery. The Khmer Rouge leadership knew that in order to achieve their goals they had to focus much of their energy on the next generation.

While the lyrics of the songs were often violent, the music and the melodies were sprightly and almost joyful. The songs included high-pitched male and female voices and repetitive melodies, accompanied by traditional Cambodian instrumentation. Locard referred to the dichotomy of the lyrics and the music of the national anthem as “paranoiac delirium (that) soars into the air, carried by the innocent voices of the young singers,”77 an apt description. Some camps had live bands comprised of camp inhabitants who would travel to other villages to perform. Being in a Khmer Rouge band had many benefits, including additional rations and limited work in the fields.78 One survivor claimed that his inclusion in the revolutionary band saved his life.79 Talented band members could not be easily replaced; the songs were too important to the revolutionary movement to use poorly
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trained musicians.

Discrimination

Ethnic slurs and other forms of verbal discrimination were prevalent in the cooperatives. Adults with foreign accents, Chinese, and especially Vietnamese, quickly learned to remain silent. The revolution was both a communist and nationalist movement, and foreigners were often targets of violent discrimination.

One of the survivors remembered being called a “stupid Chinese-Youn.” Youn was a derogatory Khmer term for the Vietnamese, the historical rivals of Cambodia, and a demeaning slur that was used regularly. Re-education sessions often included angry rants about Vietnamese enemies, even though they were fellow communists. In one of the Khmer Rouge newsletters, Pol Pot wrote the following about the Vietnamese: “there are none in Democratic Kampuchea territory; formerly there was over one million.” Uncooperative captives or disobedient soldiers were referred to as having a “Vietnamese head with Cambodian body.” The message was clear-these people could not be trusted. The movement needed Khmer nationalists that would unite against foreign enemies and ethnic discrimination reinforced this concept.

Racial bigotry was not the only form of discrimination in the camps. The Khmer Rouge afforded the ‘old’ people, the impoverished rural peasants, a higher status in the camps, encouraging class resentments against their supposed oppressors, the ‘new’ people from the cities. It was not difficult to identify a ‘new’ person in the camp. First, the ‘old’ people
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were generally darker in complexion from years of working in the fields under the hot sun. The peasants called the city dwellers “lazy white people” because of their fair complexions and their limited experience with physical labor.\(^{86}\) The ‘old’ and ‘new’ people also had different accents.\(^{87}\) To avoid being ridiculed by the people they considered to be of lower social status, many of the ‘new’ people kept quiet. This form of classism taught the ‘new’ people that they had to conform and become ‘old’ people or perish.

**Sounds of Subversion**

The soundscape of the labor camps also included a few quiet sounds of rebellion, signifying the strength of the human spirit under extreme duress and, at the same time, serving as a reminder of the immense power that the Khmer Rouge possessed. Insults to the regime were whispered delicately when revolutionary soldiers were absent or preoccupied. The fact that these offenses were only uttered when cadres were out of earshot was also an indication of the effectiveness of the Khmer Rouge’s intimidation campaign. Some villagers never dared to make any disparaging remarks about the regime, even among family. As stated previously, children were encouraged to spy on their parents and report any behavior that was perceived as a challenge to *Angkar*. Informers also eavesdropped on private conversations, listening for verbal infractions that they could use to gain favor with their captors. Despite the perils, there were many men and women willing to risk their lives to express their disdain for the regime privately. Under extremely oppressive conditions, these individuals rebelled to protect or assert their dignity while they were being abused and dehumanized by the Khmer Rouge. Perhaps these psychological games were essential for survival in this environment. In other words, the regime’s campaign of terror was effective, but their indoctrination efforts were unsuccessful, “denounced as a sham by the vast majority of Cambodians, who were not duped.”\(^{88}\)

These subtle agitations also provided levity to the victims of the
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Khmer Rouge at a time when their entire lives were engulfed by despair. Sometimes the villagers would create songs with lyrics that were seemingly supportive of the revolution but had a subversive meaning. “Often Communist leaders and old villagers, ignorant of the double meanings, didn’t even know that an insult was intended.”89 The laborers would hum or sing these songs as they worked.

On the surface, it was a song about planting, but ling-go, meaning sesame, is similar to the word for stupid, and kor, the kapok tree, also means silent or mute. The song’s lyric said: “You know you must plant trees. /To do well you must plant ling-go and kor.” The double meaning was: “You know you must plant trees. /To stay alive you must be stupid and mute.”90

While this was by no means open defiance, any form of disobedience was subject to severe punishment, so these miniature subversions were still very daring. Singing lyrics that ridiculed the regime could easily have led to a death sentence, and many Cambodians died for lesser offences.

Other acts of rebellion included numerous counter-slogans that ridiculed and disparaged the regime. These sarcastic phrases were muttered under the breath or shared with other villagers when soldiers were absent. In Pol Pot’s Little Red Book, Locard compiled fifty-four of these counter-slogans from interviews with victims of the regime, many of them clever and humorous. Some counter-slogans belittled the speeches given at re-education meetings. “Listening to the words of leaders is like pouring water onto a duck’s head.” Locard wrote that this slogan indicated the villagers “understood nothing at all of the jumble of nonsense of Marxist theory,”91 but this missed the point. Many Cambodians understood that these slogans were a tool of indoctrination and they were ridiculing the cadres’ pathetic attempts to manipulate them. Other counter-slogans mocked the popular sayings of the Khmer Rouge. “The Angkar has the many eyes of
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a pineapple, but none of them has an iris.”92 One of the most frequently heard counter-slogans ridiculed the unrealistic production goals of the regime, which was to cultivate three tons of rice per hectare of land in Cambodia per year. “We must produce three bushels per hectare.”93 Another sound of subversion came from radios. Possession of a radio was extremely dangerous, so the most daring villagers stored these devices under the floorboards of their huts. People appointed a lookout while quietly listening to the Voice of America or BBC for any news that someone from the outside world might help them.94 Unfortunately, no one came to their rescue for three years, eight months, and twenty days, when their ancient rivals from Vietnam invaded Cambodia on Christmas Day in 1978.

Conclusion

Based on the evidence presented, it is clear that the Khmer Rouge designed specific auditory strategies to intimidate and indoctrinate their Cambodian captives in the labor camps. While there is no documentary evidence to prove that all of these aural tactics were developed by the leadership of Angkar, similar practices were reported by residents of various labor camps from all over Cambodia. The use of these tactics was too widespread to be coincidental. Khmer spirits had to be broken through verbal deceptions, threats, taunts, and sonic violence. The voices of the unenlightened ‘new’ people were restricted or silenced altogether. All of this was intentional and meticulously planned. To rebuild these individuals into a collective, the Khmer Rouge created an aural program of revolutionary songs and re-education sessions that would provide children and adults with the proper perspective and attitude. Constant verbal slurs directed at non-Khmer were part of a nationalist strategy to unify the Cambodian people against their external enemies. Though they may not have been intentionally designed by the regime, the noises produced by the labor force, the “keynotes” of the camps, generated a soundscape of the collective, as men and women
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pounded the soil in rhythmic patterns. Even the sounds that were used to subvert the regime were proof of the efficacy of the terror campaign, as the victims’ criticisms of the revolutionaries were cleverly disguised or voiced when they could not be heard. To build their agrarian, communist utopia, the Khmer Rouge went to great lengths to develop sonic tactics that would eliminate the individual and build a collective of true believers. Fortunately, millions of Cambodians survived the horrors of 1975-1979 and exposed the secrets of one of the most fanatical regimes in the history of the world.
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Khamene’i and Al-e Ahmad:
Roots of the Islamic Republic’s Fear of Western Culture

Kiarash Mosayeri

The Iranian nuclear deal of 2015 represented one of the few periods of productive diplomacy often beset by mutual distrust between Iran and the United States. Although, through the tiresome process of these negotiations we were once again reminded of the depth of the animosities between the two states. The American public subconscious still seems to be tainted with the memories of the Hostage Crisis while the political establishment is quick to remind the public of Iran’s active defiance of an American hegemonic agenda in the arena of world affairs. On the other hand, the conservatives in Tehran use any pretext to remind the rest of the country why the Americans should not be trusted.

The officials themselves are not forgetful of the patron/client relationship the Americans had with the Shah. Neither are these officials forgetful of the constant attempts or promises made to undermine their revolution. The anti-American sentiments of the Iranian public is not even near what the regime portrays it to be but, the Iranian public is not forgetful of the past either. One does not have to spend much time discussing politics in Iranian taxi cabs—as it is common to do—to be reminded of the West’s friendly assistance to Saddam Hussein during the Iran-Iraq War, or the role of the CIA in the 1953 coup that brought down the democratically elected government of Mohammad Mosaddegh to install Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi. As observers, we too shall not forget that one of the original promises of the 1979 Revolution came in the form of putting an end to the ever-growing American imperialism in the region. Thus, it is not surprising that no common ground exists for establishing trust between the two states. In this paper, we shall discuss one of these issues: the Islamic Republic’s fear of the western culture.
The issue worth research and discussion is not merely the loathing that the Iranian officials have for Western culture itself. Rather, it is their view that a secret agenda is at work to introduce elements of Western culture to the Iranian youth, which requires our attention and discussion. This phenomenon is best understood through reviewing what Ayatollah Khamenei, the Supreme Leader of the country calls “cultural incursion” or *Tahajom-e Farhangi*. Ayatollah Khamenei’s website has, so far, published close to 170 of the leader’s speeches categorized with the keyword *Tahajom-e Farhangi*, the oldest of these speeches going back to 1989. In this paper, I will discuss this concept and its conspiratorial disguise along with its relevance and prominence within Iranian intellectual thought prior to Ayatollah Khamenei. The argument is that this political discourse and practice has a past. To be able to move past this problem, it is necessary to understand the roots of the issue and be mindful of the concerns that brought this discourse into practice.

First, we shall review Ayatollah Khamenei’s views regarding the subject. The Leader’s speeches are a remarkable source for decoding his line of thought regarding any subject. The Ayatollah does not hold interviews with the press but, his frequent speeches clearly and bluntly lay out his position on any given topic at hand. These speeches are much more frequent than anything the Ayatollah publishes in writing, often given on weekly bases to audiences of Friday Prayers, different youth organizations, or gatherings of government officials. The speeches can be used to achieve a deep understanding of his views and thoughts. Later, we shall trace the origins of this discourse that is present in these speeches to intellectuals who have written on the same themes prior to Ayatollah Khamenei. These writings, which range from the 1940’s through the 1970’s, cover similar themes, such as the effects that imperialism, consumerism, and the imitation of western culture had on Iran’s loss of cultural identity. The origins of this dialogue can be traced back to a 1948 book by Fakhr-al-Din Shadman, called *Capturing the Western Civilization*. Shadman’s ideas were then significantly expanded upon by Jalal Al-e Ahmad in his famous book *Westoxication*, or *Gharbzadegi* in Persian. Studying these texts and the thought behind them will provide the context necessary for understanding Ayatollah Khamenei’s discourse.

To be able to understand this phenomenon best, we need to under-
stand Ayatollah Khamenei’s concept of *Tahajom-e Farhangi*. Ayatollah Khamenei first used this word, meaning cultural incursion, in a speech in 1989. Ever since then, he has been constantly mentioning this concept in his speeches. The concept is best explained in an August 12, 1992 speech titled, “Statements in a Meeting with a group of Cultural Bureaucrats,” published by Khamenei’s official website.\(^1\) It should be pointed out that this topic does not constitute the major bulk of Ayatollah Khamenei’s speeches. It is remarkable, though, that this concept has stayed a relevant topic in his speeches throughout the years, during which the Ayatollah has stayed quite coherent in his position.\(^2\)

In this speech Ayatollah Khamenei gives a definition of *Tahajom-e Farhangi* for the first time, and compares it to cultural exchanges, or *Tabadol-e Farhangi*. Iran’s leader first indicates that he agrees with the importance of cultural exchanges. He explains that a cultural exchange is when a group of people find a positive cultural trait in another group and willfully adopt this trait into own their culture.\(^3\) He believes cultural exchanges to be, not only helpful, but necessary for nations. In this speech he even points out that there are a number of great traits that the Iranian people could learn from the Western culture, such as the sense of punctuality, scientific curiosity, and work ethic.\(^4\) On the other hand, Ayatollah Khamenei points out that, unlike these cultural exchanges, *Tahajom-e Farhangi* is not a willful act, thus, his use of the word “incursion.” He says, “*Tahajom-e Farhangi* is when a political or economical entity attacks cultural foundations of another nation for its own political goals.”\(^5\) In other words, in cultural incursion, a set of cultural.

---


2 In general, Ayatollah Khamenei stays very coherent with the positions he takes on the topics that he likes to bring up in his frequent speeches. If one traces the Ayatollah’s position on any given topic in these speeches, one would get the impression of a well thought out and a well-read opinion, even though it might be an opinion that one disagrees with. The Ayatollah does not strike someone as a politician who is relying on the opinions of advisors and analysts or one who switches positions based on public opinion.
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traits chosen by the attacking party is imposed on the culture of a nation in a set agenda. Throughout the many years that have passed since Khamenei first laid out his concept of *Tahajom-e Farhangi*, he has always used the contrast between cultural incursions and cultural exchanges to point out the forceful nature of these cultural impositions.

Khamenei points at Iranian intellectuals and Pahlavi policies as the origins of these incursions. Khamenei says that the West first imposed its dominance over the Iranian society through the Iranian intellectuals. He believes that through the last phases of the Qajar period the Western powers expanded their influence in Iran through the Iranian intellectuals by sponsoring thinkers that were intellectually dependent on Western ideas. Among these intellectuals, he names Malkom Khan. Not only did Al-e Ahmad have a similar view of the intellectuals but, he too, in particular names Malkom Khan out of that generation of thinkers.

Khamenei believes Reza Shah’s policies to be the most severe of these cultural incursions. He particularly points out the dress codes of this period as something aimed at destroying the Iranian culture. He explains that everywhere in the world, different nations and cultures have their own native clothing, which they are proud of. But, he says, Reza Khan shamed the Iranians from wearing their traditional clothing and even outlawed the wearing of them. He further says that this has led to a point where Iran, a country with a long history, has no national dress today. This, again, is something that Al-e Ahmad also discusses in *Gharbzadegi*.

Reza Shah’s dress codes started with the introduction of the Pahlavi hat in 1927, which was to replace the more traditional headgear of Iranians through an obscure ceremony. Then, Reza Shah passed a law in 1928 that enforced a European-style clothing for men and, by 1935, enforced the un-
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veiling of women. These reforms aimed to literally make Iran look more European. Reza Shah also on other occasions forbade the traditional turban and cloak attire, except for the clergy.

In his speeches on historical topics such as the role of the intellectuals and the dress codes of Reza Shah, Ayatollah Khamenei sees the western-educated and The Shah as the agents of this blind imitation of the outlook of the west. When talking about the contemporary era though, he portrays the Western governments as heads of a plot against his country. He points out the demoralization of the Iranian youth as the main goal of the current wave of cultural incursions sponsored by the West. He says the backbone of the Iranians is their faith. For example, he argues that Iranian families were able to bear the losses of so many Iranian youth during the eight years of war with Iraq through their faith in Islam and Shi’ism. Therefore, Islamic faith is the backbone of Iran’s struggle in their resistance against Western imperialism. He explains that the Westerners were not able to defeat the Revolution militarily in the Iran-Iraq war. Neither were they successful in defeating the Revolution through economic sanctions. Ayatollah Khamenei believes that the Western countries’ last resort in the fight against the Revolution is alienating the Iranian youth from the regime by attacking their faith and therefore, breaking the backbone of Iran’s resistance.

The Islamic Revolution in its essence is an ideological regime. If the youth in Iran have an ideological fallout with the regime, then the regime will not only lose the support of its most loyal followers, but it will also lose its legitimacy. Ayatollah Khamenei believes this ideological fallout would happen if the youth adopt Western cultural habits, which would distance them from Islam. Therefore, Khamenei believes that the Western countries have a set agenda in promoting their culture in Iran to weaken the support
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for the Islamic Republic. This explanation infers that the American movies or music floating in Iran are brought to Iran under a systematic work. For him, there are only the Western elements that act as agents of this spread of Western cultural products in Iran. He does not see any sort of agency or willful gravitation toward these cultural products from the people themselves. A casual observer of the Iranian society would probably see much more agency in the people. This trend might also be attributed to globalization, but the Ayatollah portrays globalization itself as part of a conspiratorial agenda of western imperialism.

There are three distinct points in this speech that tie what Ayatollah Khamenei calls *Tahajom-e Farhangi* to thinkers that wrote on these topics prior to him. First, the Ayatollah puts an emphasis on the role of the Western-educated intellectuals. Blaming the Western-educated elite for Iran’s loss of cultural identity certainly goes back to Shadman’s book, *Capturing the Western Civilization*. Later on, Al-e Ahmad also expands this topic in his book, *On Service and Treachery of Intellectuals*, covering the subject in a lesser degree in *Westoxication*. In the following pages we shall trace the origins of the disdain for Western-educated scholars, first to Shadman and then to Al-e Ahmad.

Second, Ayatollah Khamenei emphasizes the westernizing policies of the Pahlavi Dynasty. Again, this topic is heavily covered by Al-e Ahmad in *Westoxication*. After covering the intellectuals, this paper further discusses these Pahlavi era policies and Al-e Ahmad’s critique of them. The third and, perhaps, most important topic of similarity between Ayatollah Khamenei and Al-e Ahmad is the role of conspiracy in their explanation of this topic. Here at last, I shall discuss the role of conspiracy thinking in the Middle East to address the conspiratorial tone of both Al-e Ahmad and Ayatollah Khamenei.

The Ayatollah’s constant communication of the importance of this topic has inspired a number of policies aiming to counter the Western plot. A few examples of the repercussions of this discourse include the internet-filtering program, the crackdown on satellite dishes, and the heavy censorship of western cultural products. To move past discourse, it is important to trace the origins of it to understand the roots of the Ayatollah’s concerns, whether one agrees with the policies he sponsors or not.
The factor that received the most attention regarding Iran’s rapid move towards Westernization was the generation of Western-educated intellectuals. With the technological superiority of Western countries becoming more and more obvious to Middle Eastern rulers throughout the nineteenth century, rulers of Iran, the Ottoman Empire, and Egypt all sent young men abroad to become educated in Western methods. This group of Western-educated scholars would then return to Iran and form a new class of young, educated, urban professionals that had never before existed in Iran. From this class, quite a few intellectuals arose. Historically, most Iranian intellectuals were from the Ulama classes, having their education in jurisprudence and Islamic philosophy. Because of their exposure to Western ideas, this group of secular intellectuals was, for the most part, westernized. The role of these intellectuals and their Western ideas was most notably recognized during the Constitutional Revolution of 1905–1911, with individuals like Malkom Khan demanding such concepts as constitutional law.

Fakhr-al-Din Shadman (1907-1967) is the first Iranian intellectual who wrote a critique of both the Western educated and the Ulama. He also set a precedent for future intellectuals to criticize both the blind imitation of the West and, on the other hand, the absolute rejection of the Western advancements. Shadman was born to a clerical family in Tehran. He received a diverse education starting with the traditional religious curriculum, continuing on to secular schools such as Dar al-Fonoun and Madrese-ye Ali-ye Hoquq, where he received a Bachelor’s Degree in Law. Later, Shadman served in London as an oil commissioner for fourteen years. During this period in Europe, Shadman received a doctorate in Law from Sorbonne.

16  Ulama is a plural word used to refer to the body of Muslim scholars, in this case we are mainly referring to Shia and Iranian scholars of religion.
17  Nikki Keddie, Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 179.
18  Idem, 175.
19  Idem, 54
20  Idem, 81.
21  Idem, 54.
His years in Europe made him well aware of the advancement of Western Civilization and its implications for Iran. So, he was receptive to the idea of adopting Western methods, but he feared the danger of going beyond the adaptation of scientific and philosophic ideas.

In his book *Taskhir-e Tamaddon-e Farangi*, which translates to “Capturing the Western Civilization,” Shadman argues that Iran’s last resort against the West could be the willful adaptation of Western ideas and culture through the Persian language. Otherwise, the Western Civilization would forcefully impose its cultural values on Iranians, destroying the Iranian culture in the process. Shadman places his main argument on use of the Persian language. He argues for translation of primarily Western works like Greek and Latin classics to enrich the Persian language and prepare it for translation or writing of more complex and contemporary works.

Shadman believes that the West’s superiority rests in their scientific view and not necessarily in their moral convictions. Iran then, only has to adopt this scientific approach and Western knowledge through the translation of European books. Shadman then argues that despite what many people believe, adopting the outlook of the Europeans or their moral conduct will not be necessary for materializing European progress in Iran. He believes that Iran faces two challenges in this route, from two groups of people. First, the traditionalist Ulama, who reject these Western accomplishments all together on the bases of morality. On the other hand are the Western-educated pseudomodernists, who want to transform the outlook of Iranian society to look more Western, believing the Western outlook alone will bring progress to Iran. Shadman refers to this second group as *Fokolis*, rooted in the word faux-col, a term used to refer to someone who wears Western attire.

Shadman is a key figure in this anti-Westernization intellectual movement for connecting the generation of Westernized and Western-edu-
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cated before him to the generation of intellectuals that come after him. In a way, his critique of the traditionalist Ulama and the Fokolis set a precedent in this intellectual movement. This next generation of intellectuals who arrive on the scene after him, such as Al-e Ahmad, Samad Behrangi, and even Ali Shariati—whose ideas are not explored in this paper—inherited this view from Shadman, believing that Western accomplishments are to be learned by Iranians, though not through blind imitation of Western outlooks. This line of thinking even continues to influence Ayatollah Khamenei through Al-e Ahmad. Al-e Ahmad’s main concern in Westoxication, though, is the loss of Iranian identity through what has been conducted by the fokolis. Al-e Ahmad’s angle of critique—as will be discussed shortly—is very similar to that of Shadman; they both see the imitation of the western culture as an unproductive act which will result in Iran’s loss of cultural identity. Ayatollah Khamenei also shares this view, though, as a member of the clergy, he also recognizes that the social role these Western-educated classes assume in society has historically been reserved for the Ulama.

The next point of contention for Al-e Ahmad is the Pahlavi regime’s implementation of a series of westernization policies with the hope of catching up with the west’s progress. Western advancements of the eighteenth and nineteenth century guaranteed the dominance of the European nations over the Middle East. This process caused Middle Eastern states to go into defense mode. On the basis of “losing ground against the more powerful,” Middle Eastern states turned to Western methods of modern education, armed forces, and the judiciary system, alongside other areas. Some of these areas like the judiciary and education system were previously dominated by the Ulama, due to their expertise as the traditionally educated class of the Islamic world. Al-e Ahmad points out that there is no real linkage between these modern practices and the Iranian culture, since such policies are being blindly imported rather than locally arrived at.

Another point of contention for Al-e Ahmad and Khamenei is what they see as a subtle denial of Iran’s Islamic history by Pahlavi state officials and some intellectuals. Reza Khan’s 1921 coup, which installed the common
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army officer as the Shah of Iran, acted as a catalyst in Iran’s transformation from an empire to a modern nation-state. In such circumstances, promotion of a sense of modern nationalism seemed quite necessary for easing Iran’s transition to a nation-state. Two different goals would simultaneously be achieved if the narrative behind this nationalist program also legitimized the rule of the army officer and his son. Azadeh Kian and Gilles Riaux argue that this sense of nationalism that the Pahlavis, especially Mohammad Reza, attempted to create was Western-oriented, mostly focusing on Iran’s pre-Islamic, ancient past and embracing Western ideals. Al-e Ahmad and Khamenei and their discourse believe this to be an act of undermining the true identity of Iranians. They argue that the Iranian identity is entangled with Iran’s Islamic past and less dependent on the pre-Islamic era.

An example of promotion of this narrative by the Pahlavis is the celebration of 2500 years of the Persian Empire. This celebration included a carnival in Persepolis, which glorified the reign of the pre-Islamic dynasties of Iran, especially the Achaemenids. In a speech made during these ceremonies, Mohammad Reza Shah attempted to portray himself as the inheritor of Cyrus’ throne. While one might think that such attempts were necessary for Mohammad Reza to legitimize his throne as a new dynasty, it should be highlighted that such a branding completely undermined Iran’s Islamic past, practically creating a historical gap between the Muslim conquest of Iran and Reza Khan’s coup in 1921. This theme was predominant during Mohammad Reza’s rule. The majority of Iran’s population knew nothing about Iran’s pre-Islamic past and was therefore alienated from the ruling regime. Al-e Ahmad was vocal against this state-promoted narrative.

Al-e Ahmad (1923-1969) was born into a religious family in Tehran. Both his father and grandfather had been respected clerics. Therefore, Jalal too, was sent to Najaf, the capital of Shia jurisprudence, to complete his clerical education. After only a few months, Al-e Ahmad returned to Tehran and decided to complete his secular high school education at Dar

---


In high school he was known as a pious student, sporting his religious turban. The pious Al-e Ahmad soon took a turn in his views. In 1943, he started to become attracted to Ahmad Kasravi’s ideas and inner circle. Kasravi, a social reformist, was widely known for his anti-clerical views. Kasravi’s radical views against Islam was in huge contrast with Al-e Ahmad’s religious upbringing. Kasravi only proved to be a gateway for Al-e Ahmad to Iran’s communist party, the Tudeh. In 1948, Al-e Ahmad fell out with the Tudeh party as well. Just like his writings and ideas, Al-e Ahmad’s background was very incoherent and inconsistent; ranging from Shia jurisprudence to communism.

The biggest, long lasting legacy of Al-e Ahmad is his short book, Gharbzadegi. This book was highly circulated in Iran among university and high school students in the 1960’s, bringing the Iranian youth into political consciousness. Other than having an audience among the university and high school students, Al-e Ahmad is one of the only secular Iranian writers who also had a vast following among the clerical students of Qom. In an incident when publication of Al-e Ahmad’s travelogue to Israel caused an uproar of discontent in Qom, a young Seyyed Ali Khamenei was sent to Tehran to discuss the matter with Al-e Ahmad, and to kindly register this dismay in Qom. Al-e Ahmad provided a link between the clerical students and secular classes that had never existed before in Iran.

Al-e Ahmad’s main idea in Gharbzadegi is that the Iranians are losing their cultural identity because Western cultural ideals are being imposed on them. He believes this to be caused by the glorification of the West in Iran by the intellectuals and the government. Al-e Ahmad explains that, to him,
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East and West are not simply geographical concepts but economical ones.\textsuperscript{39} Even though Latin America is in the West and South Africa is in Africa, Al-e Ahmad considers the first to be of the East and the latter, belonging to the West.\textsuperscript{40}

One of the most prominent themes that Al-e Ahmad engages with in \textit{Gharbzadegi} is imperialism and consumerism. To him, the “Western” countries want to impose their culture upon the Eastern ones, just so the Eastern countries would learn to consume Western products.\textsuperscript{41} To explain this concept, Al-e Ahmad heavily relies on the word “machine.” To him, machines are technologically-advanced Western products that Easterners do not have the ability to build, but still consume. In \textit{Gharbzadegi}, for example, he heavily criticizes the state sponsored importation of tractors. Nikki Keddie explains in her book, \textit{Modern Iran}, that in the 1950’s and 1960’s the government heavily imported Western agricultural tools without paying much attention to their use in Iran, relying solely on the argument that, “what is modern and Western is good.”\textsuperscript{42}

One might think that Al-e Ahmad is simply against Western technologies or achievements, but that is not the case. Al-e Ahmad views this technological achievement of the West to be a product of a two-hundred-year-long process of progress.\textsuperscript{43} Al-e Ahmad does not see these machines as suitable for Iran because Iranians have not gone through this process and are skipping a two-hundred-year-old process of progress by simply consuming these machines.\textsuperscript{44} He points out that relevance of such consumer products, which do not have a cultural or industrial pretext in Iran, comes through blind imitation of the outlook of Western culture. Al-e Ahmad believes that such mindless consumption causes Iranians to be emptied out from within, and to lose their cultural identity to blind imitation of the West, hence, to be “westoxified.” Al-e Ahmad is not really the “man with the plan” when it
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comes to the issues he raises. He only points to places where the problem could have been prevented or possibly solved without proposing direct solutions.

Al-e Ahmad’s main focal force against westoxication is the role of Shi’a Ulama in Iran. He believes that Shi’ism has a special place in the Iranian culture.\(^{45}\) He saw this special role of Shi’ism as a “vaccine” against westoxication for preserving the Iranian identity.\(^{46}\) Al-e Ahmad saw the Ulama as the vessels of Shi’ism in this fight against westoxication. However, Al-e Ahmad’s take on religion is contradictory at times. Throughout his life, there are multiple phases where Al-e Ahmad distanced himself from Islam and religion at times and at other times he emphasized the role of religion. In *Gharbzadegi*, he has a favorable view to the role that Islam can play against the threats he sees. Even though, in certain passages in the book he shows discontent with Shi’ism or religion altogether, he does understand the magnitude of the role that religion plays in Iran.

Al-e Ahmad believes that religion has historically played a significant role in Iran and cannot be dismissed now. For example, he points out that during the Sassanid and Safavid period, religion played an important role in politics, and that reality has now become a part of the Iranian political thought. He expresses his dismay with this fact, but he also copes with the reality of religion in Iran. He says now that religion and government are separated in the Pahlavi regime, the country is even worse off than the time when they were united.\(^{47}\) He builds his argument on the premise that the government is now alien to ninety percent of Iran’s population because the government is alien to its religion. He is highlighting the fact that ninety percent of Iranians are deeply religious and their religion is not really represented in the government. As previously pointed out, Mohammad Reza Shah was branding himself as a secular, European-style king. Al-e Ahmad is well aware that this branding has made the Shah alien to the population. Al-e Ahmad views this as a shortcoming, both on the side of the Shah as well as that of the Ulama, but believes it is the Ulama’s duty to fix the prob-
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Gharbzadegi marks a turning point, in a way, within the Iranian clerics. Prior to this period of the early 1960’s, the theme of the Shia clerics was dominated by traditionalist Ulama and their quietist approach to the politics. These quietists believed in separation of religion and state and in minimal interference of Ulama in political matters. This traditionalist trend was led by Ayatollah Boroujerdi, who was the sole marja of Shias from the late 1940’s until his death in 1961. With the death of this firm, quietist marja, the door was opened for a new movement of clerical activities in politics, led by Boroujerdi’s highest ranking student, Ayatollah Rouhollah Khomeini—not to be confused with his successor Khamenei.

Because Al-e Ahmad believed Shi’ism to be a “vaccine” against Gharbzadegi, he highly condemned the quietist approach that the Ulama have taken since the Constitutional Revolution. He points out that during the events of the Constitutional Revolution the Ulama were marginalized and, from then on, there has been a pressure on them to not participate in anything but religious affairs. He blames the Ulama for this too, pointing out that instead of reacting, they simply accepted this pressure. For example, he believes that instead of boycotting the modern media outlets like radio and television, the Ulama should have joined these outlets, setting up their own channels or programs and fighting against westoxication.

This active role for the Ulama that Al-e Ahmad promoted came into reality with the Iranian Revolution, which occurred soon after his death; the Revolution changed the faith of Iran forever. We cannot only credit Al-e Ahmad for this revival of the active political role of the Ulama. As

48 Keddie, Modern Iran, 186.
49 Marja or source of imitation, is highest level of Shia clergy. The rulings of the marja are expected to be imitated by his followers although, choosing which marja to imitate is completely up to the individual. Marjas who are dead can no longer be a source of imitation. Therefore, at any given moment in time, there are only a limited number of marjas.
50 Keddie, Modern Iran, 146.
51 Al-e Ahmad, Gharbzadegi 24.
52 Ibid.
53 Ibid.
mentioned above, this revival was part of a movement in the 1960’s that the death of Ayatollah Boroujerdi catalyzed. On the other hand, when one looks at the Islamic Republic today, it is hard not to be reminded of Al-e Ahmad, especially when one looks at clerics hosting television programs on the state channels.

The last point of similarity between Al-e Ahmad’s and Ayatollah Khamenei’s approach to the topic is the presence of conspiracy thinking in their arguments. Ayatollah Khamenei sees what he calls cultural incursion as sponsored by Western governments to undermine his revolution. Al-e Ahmad sees what he calls westoxication as sponsored by Western capitalism to sell consumer products in the East. This supports Marvin Zonis and Craig Joseph’s statement that, “conspiracy thinking is an especially familiar mode of reasoning in the Middle East.”\(^{54}\) Personal experiences or academic approaches would unanimously contest the role of conspiracy thinking in the Middle East. Existence of such modes of thinking has even become subject of works of comedy such as Iraj Pezeshkzad’s praised novel, My Uncle Napoleon, in which the protagonist’s uncle relates all the problems of the family or neighborhood to a British plot aimed to undermine him personally.

In their article, Zonis and Joseph attempt to find the reasons for prevalence of such modes of thinking in the Middle East. Among other reasons, Zonis points out that rapid social or political change can disrupt an individual’s capacity to “use existing cultural construction to account for the new realities.”\(^{55}\) On the other hand, one cannot ignore the existence of actual Western plots in the history of the Middle East, such as the American-sponsored coup in 1953. There is a clear sign of appeal to conspiracy in the arguments of Al-e Ahmad and Khamenei. As discussed above, they both see a Western plot behind their concerns; Al-e Ahmad thinks the plot is backed by a capitalist agenda while Khamenei describes his version of the plot to be motivated by imperialism.

The lazy approach to such information would be to assume that Ayatollah Khamenei has also been affected by this mode of thinking, although,
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that would seem inconsistent with the Ayatollah, who is a calculated, well-read, thinker. It would not be outside the realm of possibility to consider that the Ayatollah uses conspiracy thinking to appeal to his audience because he is aware that they think in such a conspiratorial frame. After all, as discussed above, Ayatollah Khamenei sees a legitimate threat from this angle. The Islamic Republic is an ideological state so, losing touch with Islam will in fact alienate the most important base of the regime—the youth—from ideals of the Revolution and the state. Losing touch with the Shia-Iranian identity could very possibly occur as a result of adopting a foreign identity or culture. One does not have much luck arguing against the above statements versus the Ayatollah, though; it is in his conspiracy thinking that we cease to connect with the Ayatollah Khamenei’s logic. Considering it is not the outside observers who he tries to convince, but the common people of Iran, one would realize that it is not impossible to imagine that appealing to conspiracy thinking is the Ayatollah’s intentional method.
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Flushed Unions Down the Drain

Michael Hephner

When Austrian immigrant John Michael Kohler enamel-coated a horse trough for people to bathe in in the late 1880’s, it was the beginning of a business that has since lasted for 142 years¹. Almost thirty years later when the Kohler Company introduced the built-in bathtub it soon became the standard for home builders throughout America. No home without one was considered “modern.” Located just outside of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, the Kohler Company quickly rose to become the second largest manufacturer of bathroom fixtures in the United States. Control of the Kohler company has never passed outside the Kohler family. Founded by John Michael Kohler in 1873 the company was headed by his son Walter J. Kohler Sr. from 1905 to 1940. Walter’s younger brother Herbert V. Kohler assumed control in 1940 and ran the company until 1962 when Herbert’s son Herbert Jr graduated from Yale and took on increasing roles in the company until he was named Director in 1972. Up until the labor unrest of 1934, the Kohler family enjoyed the reputation of a model employer in Sheboygan. This was due in large part to the attractive village constructed by the company for Kohler employees to live in. “Happy Workmen Success Secret of Big Experiment,”² read the headline of an article about the Kohler Company in The Wisconsin State Journal in 1928. The village of Kohler, wholly owned by the Kohler Company for its employees to purchase houses in, had wide tree-lined lanes with stylish homes surrounding a recreation center complete with an Olympic size swimming pool and well-equipped schools. The Kohler Company took an active interest in the lives of its employees,


² Wisconsin Historical Society, Wisconsin Local History & Biography Articles; Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, WI. July 7, 1928.
offering English language courses at night and helping them attain U. S. citizenship. However, this outward appearance of industrial tranquility was not quite as peaceful as it seemed. Despite the Kohlers’ attempts to appease their workers they were plagued with workplace issues.

Through an examination of National Labor Board documents, accounts of journalists, and Kohler company documents, this essay will argue that the Kohler family, although pretending to abide by the U.S. labor laws, actually did not. Beginning with the founder of the company and extending down through three generations, the Kohlers refused to accept the legitimacy of a union’s role in the employee-employer relationship. The Kohler company in their unique position as a privately-owned business chose to lead the conservative fight against organized labor by consistently refusing to negotiate with employee unions over hourly wages and workplace conditions, and instead challenged the unions’ legitimacy. By the 1950’s U. S. conservatives were convinced that the time was right to reverse many of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Walter J. Kohler, the son of founder John Michael Kohler, and his descendants were determined to reject employee unions and their right to collective bargaining. The Kohler family was willing to sacrifice their company’s financial success in order to lead the conservative ideological fight challenging the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Board.

Scholar Walter Uphoff, who was raised in Sheboygan County not far from the village of Kohler, wrote his master’s thesis at the University of Wisconsin on the 1934 strike. He eventually became a professor of economics and wrote a book that encompassed all of the strikes. Uphoff writes that the conservative politics of Herbert V. Kohler, the younger son of the founder, were instrumental in the intensity and length of the second strike at Kohler: “When their conservative views on unionism and the role of the government in the economy are understood, it is not difficult to see why the Kohlers should be drawn into supporting right-wing movements and, in turn be made the heroes of some of these groups.” In Uphoff’s opinion, Herbert V. Kohler and those around him vigorously fought the role of government in labor-management relationships.

Historians Nelson Lichtenstein, George Lipsitz and David Plotke have suggested that the right to collective bargaining was much more than just the right to discuss day to day issues with management. Lichtenstein argued that, “The responsibilities and expectations of American citizens – due process, free speech, the right of assembly and petition would now find their place in factory, mill and office.” These scholars believed that Industrial Democracy in the workplace was the logical extension of the overall American Democratic philosophy. Lichtenstein further argued that small, family-owned firms like Kohler “were the shock troops in capitol’s battle to undermine union power and trans-industry labor standards.” Scholars agree that the Kohler company did not merely wish to settle disputes with their employees quickly and with the least impact on operations.

When Congress passed the National Industrial Relations Act in 1933, and in 1935 the Wagner Act, it ushered in a new era in labor relations. These two pieces of legislation were revolutionary for the labor movement in the United States. Provisions of these bills encouraged collective bargaining and protected the exercise of freedom of association. It also defined and prohibited five unfair labor practices by employers, including interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees against their rights; interfering with the formation of a labor organization; discriminating against employees to encourage or discourage forming a union; discriminating against employees who file charges or testify; and refusing to bargain collectively with the employees’ representative.

In August of 1933 the workers at Kohler applied for and received a charter from the American Federation of Labor for a union. It was christened Federal Labor Union No. 18545. Unfortunately, the creation of this union marked the beginning of thirty years of labor strife at Kohler because the company officials refused to recognize the legitimacy of the union. After several attempts to get the Kohler Company to recognize their union, the

5 Ibid., 138.
workers went on strike. Two weeks into the strike, violence erupted at the plant resulting in the death of two workers, the injury of forty-seven others, and National Guard Soldiers deployed around the perimeter of the plant to keep peace. Once the threat of violence had subsided, although the union was still on strike, the company hired replacement workers and shortly after production rebounded to pre-strike levels. The union diligently kept up a small picket line outside of the fence for eight years until the company finally settled with the union in 1941. For the next ten years the Kohler employees worked quietly but they never forgot the violence, and in 1952 the growing dissatisfaction flared up again. In April 1952 Kohler workers voted to affiliate themselves with the United Auto Workers union. After a tumultuous two years under the U.A.W. another strike was called, and it was one of the longest and most acrimonious strikes in the history of American labor relations. Beginning in April 1954, it was not until the Supreme Court ruled in the union’s favor in 1965 that it was settled. Because this strike has the dubious distinction as one of the most fractious labor disputes in history, it has had no shortage of scholarly interest.

The Kohler company was wholly owned by the Kohler family and did not have to answer to either a board of directors or a group of stockholders. This total command of the company allowed them to take an ideological stand and disregard the financial loss that such a position would entail. In her essay, “Plumbing Strikes” that appeared in Encyclopedia of Strikes in American History, Kim Phillips Fein argued that “Kohler was willing to undertake a vigorous campaign against the union for ideological reasons that larger companies would likely have eschewed.” The shareholders of a larger company were motivated by profit and they were willing to negotiate with labor to minimize financial loss even if it meant that a greater percentage of revenue went to laborers.

The three generations of the Kohler family were against unions from the start and they never accepted the legitimacy of a union role in the employee-employer relationship. John M. Kohler, founder of the company

---


and father to Walter and Herbert, who would each deal with labor problems of their own, set the tone that the Kohler Company would take toward their employees from the very beginning. He displayed the intractability of not negotiating once he set out on a course of action and paternalism toward his employees that his sons would expound on during their reigns as President of the company.

On March 13, 1897 John M. Kohler informed the twenty-five workers at his company, Kohler, Hayssen & Stehn Manufacturing, that their pay would be cut in half. He explained that a down turn in business necessitated this move and gave each employee a free bathtub to ease the pain of the wage cut. He also told them that if they did not accept the wage cut that he would close the plant. The workers, who belonged to the Molders’ Union No. 286, talked it over and decided to go out on strike. Mr. Kohler, true to his word, would not negotiate his decision and closed the plant for six weeks and then re-opened it, ignoring the striking workers and hiring new workers. The striking workers picketed the plant every day and the National Molders Union paid strike wages, but the strike fell apart during the fall of 1897.10

John M. Kohlers’ eldest son, Walter J. Kohler, refused to recognize the union’s right to collective bargaining in the 1934 strike when he was director of the company. His successor Herbert V. Kohler, who in the labor disputes of the 1950s refused to submit disputes with the union to arbitration, launched a public relations campaign against labor’s right to form unions and maintained that the National Labor Relations Board was unconstitutional. Kohler and other conservatives nation-wide challenged the legitimacy of administrative law which involved the exercise of power by the executive arm of government. These courses of action by three generations of Kohlers demonstrate that the entire Kohler family never recognized that unions had a legitimate place in employer/employee relations and tried to destroy each union that their employees formed rather than negotiate with them.

Walter J. Kohler, President of the Kohler Company from 1905 to 1940 lived his life like an English Lord of the manor. In 1921 he built Riverbend, the Kohler family home, in the style of an English manor house, complete with servants’ quarters and an artificial stream. He was

the 29th governor of Wisconsin as a Republican and was active in business organizations like the Organization of the Paul Reveres and the Durable Goods Industry Committee.\textsuperscript{11}

Mr. Kohler considered himself an enlightened paternalist. The Kohler Company instituted many of the welfare capitalist programs that were popular with industrialists in the 1920’s. With the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act by Congress in June of 1933, which gave employees the right to have a union, Kohler again followed the lead of many industrialists and created a worker’s association that he could control to forestall the creation of an independent union. Although this association handled minor shop floor grievances they never negotiated contracts with the company; instead they accepted the company’s offer. Like many other employers around the nation, Kohler tried to circumvent this New Deal legislation by sponsoring the creation of an “employee association” which handled employee grievances, but curiously always accepted the contracts that the company proposed.\textsuperscript{12}

On October 4, November 21, and November 28 of 1933 meetings were held between Local 18545 members and the Kohler executives, but nothing was accomplished. On June 22, 1934 the union presented Kohler management with a 14-point proposal, with the first item being recognition of their union. Four days later the company announced the shutdown of the entire plant.\textsuperscript{13} It had been the Kohler custom to shut down the plant for a couple of days around the 4th of July holiday and sponsor a picnic for all employees, but this shutdown came without warning and was termed indefinite. Workers were told they would be called back as necessary. This was the atmosphere when another meeting was called between the union and company representatives.

This July 6, 1934 meeting was held between Federal Labor Union 18545 representatives and the Kohler company management. This was the fourth meeting since the Union’s inception and the first since Kohler had

\textsuperscript{11} “FORMS ‘PAUL REVERES’ TO FIGHT SCHOOL REDS; Col. Hadley, in Chicago, Says the Group Will Oppose Any Recognition of Russia,” \textit{New York Times}, April 9, 1933, 62.

\textsuperscript{12} Uphoff, \textit{Kohler On Strike}, 27.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
shut the plant down indefinitely on June 22nd. Below is an excerpt of the meeting transcript:

Mr. Heymanns: “The Company agrees to confer with a conference committee named by Federal Union number 18545 on any and all matters affecting the workers of the Kohler Plant.”

Mr. Kohler: “We are discussing with you now, are we not?”

Mr. Heymanns: “Yes, we are discussing…”

Mr. Kohler: “We are meeting with you and we are meeting with individuals. If anyone wants to see me I am willing to see him and find out what he has to suggest.”

Mr. Heymanns: “As you know, our local has by far the majority of the men in the Kohler Co. and those men desire relationship with the company. We have by far the majority and we are doing this for these men.”

Mr. Kohler: “You are doing this for the men you represent, whoever they are. Some are now working in the Kohler Co.”

From this exchange it is apparent that Walter was not going to engage in the give and take with the union that would lead to a settlement of differences. His awkward phrasing sounds scripted and planned. In the above exchange and further on in the same meeting, Mr. Kohler’s position is that the company does not recognize the union’s right to engage in collective bargaining at all. Further, he is hinting at something that appeared two days later in a statement that Mr. Kohler released to the Associated Press – claiming that outsiders or men who never worked at Kohler were in the Union.15

Later after the 1934 strike had begun, Mr. Kohler defended his refusal to bargain with the union by saying that the people on the picket lines were breaking the law and they were not all company employees. “How can there be any bargaining with the law violators who have never worked for us?”16 The union filed a complaint with the National Labor Relations Board


charging that “the [Kohler] company had no intention of endeavoring to arrive at any agreement, but merely sought to go through the outward form of bargaining by inclusive discussion.” After the violent summer during which two strikers were shot, on September 16, 1934 the NLRB released its findings and found that because there was some doubt as to who the true representative of the majority of was for the Kohler employees, they could not “definitely establish” that section 7(a) was violated. They recommended an election be held to determine who the true representative of the Kohler employees was. The election was won by the company sponsored union who “represented” Kohler employees up until the 1950’s.  

When the 1954 strike began, the United Auto Workers, who were now representing the Kohler Company workers, instituted mass picketing that ensured no one would be able to enter or leave the plant although the union pledged to let office workers come and go. Several hundred Kohler employees were able to live inside the plant because management had assembled a large amount of food and supplies including guns and teargas. This “close picketing” effectively shut down the plant for 54 days. Herbert Kohler and his lawyer Lyman Conger refused to negotiate with “lawbreakers,” and they refused to negotiate on weekends.  

While the Kohler Company officials were not interested in negotiating with the employees’ union over the issues that caused the 1954 strike, they did want to speak to other business owners on the subject of unions. In the fall of 1955 Herbert V. Kohler, Lyman C. Conger, chairman of the Bargaining Committee, and other company executives launched a multi-pronged campaign of public speeches and appearances in front of like-minded organizations on the topic of unions and the place that they had in America. “The attempts of these union leaders to gain political domination of the entire country are not collective bargaining – they represent only sheer arrogance and unbridled lust for power,” Lyman Conger told an audience in Vermont.  

Herbert Kohler gave a speech to the Freedom Club at the First

17  NLRB, Matter of the Kohler Company.

18  Uphoff, Kohler On Strike, 149.

Congregational Church of California on April 16, 1956, entitled “In Freedom’s Cause: The Menace of the UAW-CIO Coercion.” Pamphlets were printed for the occasion transcribing Mr. Kohler’s talk for the audience to take home. In the talk he said, “Unless the citizens, the professional people and the working people of this country take action to curb lawlessness, they eventually will be little more than pawns of a few union bosses.” It seems that the audience for his intended message was the entire country, and his message was “we must do away with unions.”

It was during this campaign that Herbert V. Kohler made a recording to be aired on The Manion Forum of the Air radio program. The ultraconservative Manion Forum, was broadcast on the Mutual Network from 1954 to 1957. In this recording Kohler asserted that the United Auto Workers used terrorist tactics against Kohler, warned the business owners of “going along with the philosophy of force,” and urged resistance to the “coercive union monopoly.” Mutual Broadcasting Network had agreed to air the speech, but later felt that it might be considered defamatory and would expose stations who broadcast it to libel lawsuits and refused to air it. The Kohler Company was furious and offered to defend any radio station for free against any lawsuits that might result. Clarence Manion, the forum’s host and the former Dean of the University of Notre Dame law school said that, “In my judgement the network’s action is inherent of the problem of getting the facts of the conservative side of questions before the public.” This too belied the mindset of the Kohler management. Clearly Mr. Kohler was addressing other businessmen across the country and not the leaders of the United Auto Workers Union, that were representing his workers in this dispute. Kohler was trying to enlist support for his campaign against unions.

In 1959 the Kohler Company contacted Sylvester Petro and promised him that if he would write a book telling their side of the events of the 1954

---

20 Herbert V. Kohler, In Freedoms’ Cause: The Menace of UAW-CIO Coercion (Los Angeles, 1956).
strike and would address the broader issues of the labor in the United States, they would buy 200,000 copies of it to distribute to like-minded companies. Petro was a Chicago area lawyer who became a professor of law at New York University. In the book that he produced for Kohler, *The Kohler Strike: Union Violence and Administrative Law*, Petro relates every transgression that union members committed during the seven-year strike and does not address any Kohler misbehavior. He also calls for the repeal of the National Labor Relations Act and advocates for the abolishing of the National Labor Relations Board. He further laments the “special rights” of unions and the compulsion of companies to negotiate with unions.23 Once this book was completed Petro became an “expert” on the Kohler Strike and was quoted in many newspaper articles on labor issues, especially the Chicago Tribune where he proclaimed that the United States would be better off without any unions.24

Kohler officials recognized that there could be an economic advantage by taking the lead in the movement against unions. They became a cause célèbre among conservative business owners. The Kohler Company was in the unique position of being able to absorb a monetary loss in order to make an ideological point, since Kohler did not have a board of directors or stockholders to report to like larger industrial concerns. John T. Ward, writer for the Baltimore Sun, said that the Kohler Company has “the belief that it is ‘carrying the flag’ for American business against socializing tendencies.”25 Larger companies who were hamstrung by being publicly traded companies sympathized with the Kohler Company and bought Kohler products whenever they could. “Many of our customers became customers because of the position we took, “ said Herbert V. Kohler Jr.26

“The Kohler Company has had definite labor policies,” said Walter


J. Kohler in his opening statement in the NLRB hearing on September 1st, 1934. Indeed the company had definite ideas about labor and about running a business; these ideas started with John Michael Kohler and were handed to his sons, Walter and Herbert. They believed that in their company no one could tell them how to run it including whom to hire and fire, and that if someone had the gall enough to attempt to do so then they were the enemy. Compromising and working in partnership with their employees were not the issues that the Kohler family was interested in once their thirty-year labor war began. They were concerned with extinguishing the spirit of unionism that any of their employees might possess. When labor unrest came to Michael Kohler’s company in 1897, he simply closed the company down, waited until the strikers moved on, and reopened with new employees. When labor unrest next came to Kohler in 1934, the legal advantage had shifted away from capital and Walter Kohler had to abide by the provisions contained in the National Labor Relations Act. He pretended to negotiate, as his own words in sessions with the union demonstrated that he was not willing to bargain collectively with his employees. When labor troubles once again visited the Kohler Company, Herbert V. Kohler simply abandoned negotiations altogether and launched a public relations campaign. The campaign aimed to change the role of labor in the United States and to prolong the strike by every means possible while simultaneously advocating for a repeal of the Wagner Act. These were the “definite labor policies” that Walter J. Kohler was referring to.

The Kohler strike transcended the bread and butter issues that the Sheboygan, Wisconsin employees felt so passionate about. Other union members across the nation felt a solidarity to the striking Kohler employees and tried to encourage other businesses not to use Kohler products. The Kohler family became a cause celebre among conservatives around the country and especially among other small manufacturers. To the class of manufactures in America the issue was one of control. As Herbert Kohler asked in his many speeches to conservative audiences, “Who runs this country?” It was this struggle for power that motivated John M. Kohler in 1873 and his descendants throughout the twentieth century.
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Bismarck and the European Order:  
A Diplomatic Legacy

Miles Theodore Popplewell

The legacy of Otto von Bismarck’s tenure as Chancellor of the German Empire and Foreign Minister of the Kingdom of Prussia has long been a point of contention amongst historians and political scientists.\(^1\) A figure of complexity, he has been portrayed as either a vehement reactionary in service of conservative monarchism or a ground-breaking revolutionary who pledged his life towards unifying the German people and establishing a balance of power in Europe.\(^2\) Aspects of these two different assessments of Bismarck’s legacy are compatible. Otto von Bismarck is one of the most important figures in European history, yet his legacy has often been mischaracterized as being a contributing cause for the escalations in Europe that eventually led up to the First World War.

A trend has arisen in the recent decades, especially in popular opinion, in which Bismarck is portrayed to be not merely an actor who failed to prevent an inevitable war among the great European powers, but as a figure whose diplomatic policies directly laid foundations upon which the causes of the first and second World Wars in Europe were grounded.\(^3\) This assessment

---

1 The office of State Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the German Empire was not considered the paramount position in determining and enacting foreign policy during the early decades of Germany. Bismarck, in continuation as the Foreign Minister of Prussia, served as the premier diplomat of Germany, while the office of Foreign Secretary, which would be occupied by many during his tenure, largely fulfilled administrative and clerical duties for the Chancellor.

2 Jonathan Steinberg in *Bismarck: A Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), sums up the peculiar nature of the Chancellor’s sovereignty over German affairs with the opening declaration that “Otto von Bismarck made Germany but never ruled it.” (p. 1)

has largely developed following the defeat of Germany in 1945, which then led many historians, both German and non-German, to reevaluate the legacy of Bismarck in the wake of two conflicts that both proved disastrous for Germany. The argument that still lingers today has been that Bismarck, through his opposition to republican liberalism, his antagonism towards France, and his wily alliance system, laid out the foundations for conflict in Europe and, eventually, most of the world. In short, Bismarck’s oversight of the unification of Germany proved to be the most destabilizing event in European history.

However, even though certain aspects of this criticism are justifiable, such as Bismarck’s vehement anti-democratic policies, the claim that Bismarck should be viewed as a figure primarily responsible for the actuating circumstances of the First World War does little justice to the actual factors that led to the conflict. This paper argues that the legacy of Bismarck’s diplomatic policies was abandoned by his political successors, under the guidance of Kaiser Wilhelm II, following his dismissal in 1890, and that had Bismarck’s diplomatic arrangements and intentions been enforced, then the various contributing factors of the First World War would have been successfully diminished to the point that escalation towards a continent-wide conflict might well have proven unlikely.

Under his leadership and supervision, the various principalities, duchies, and kingdoms that were composed of German-speaking peoples were unified into the German Empire. His role in the unification of Germany, which has proven to be one of the most significant events in modernity, should help to establish Bismarck as one of the most important figures of the 19th century, if not of the late-modern era. In an unprecedented moment of international adjustment of power, the German Empire became, at the very moment of its conception, the most powerful state in continental Europe. It had become an archetype of economic and military might. Also, despite the lack of significant colonial projects that many other European powers possessed, Germany proved to have a truly significant impact on world politics, maintaining powerful army, as well as a stable central government

---

and an industrialized economy as well. Bismarck’s leadership as the director of Prussian (and later Imperial German) policy, proved crucial for maintaining a diplomatic system in Europe that would benefit Germany.

Among his greatest diplomatic achievements was the German Empire’s victory over France in a war that lasted from 1870-1871 without exposure to military intervention from any of the other European powers. By 1870, France had politically isolated itself to the point that when it engaged in a major war with Prussia, no European power felt compelled to come to its aid. Bismarck, through careful political engagement with the other states in Europe, took advantage of this isolation to finalize German unification. In order to maintain all of the progress that the new Germany had made under his leadership, Bismarck was determined to establish a system of alliances that was dedicated towards maintaining both the peace in Europe as well as the newly established dominance of Germany in Continental Europe. However, such a system that was developed by Bismarck is often regarded to have been unsuccessful in the long run of history, largely because forty-three years after the founding of the German Empire, the entire continent of Europe would be plunged into a world war, with Germany as one of its main instigators.

Much had happened between the years of 1862 and 1871. In 1862, a crisis in the Kingdom of Prussia erupted in which the liberal-controlled Diet had refused to fund the reorganization of the army that was being pressed for by the new king, Wilhelm I and his war minister, Albrecht von Roon. Following advice from Roon, Wilhelm I decided to appoint Otto von Bismarck as his new prime minister as well as foreign minister, granting Bismarck his wish to have control over Prussia’s diplomatic affairs. In less than a decade, the Kingdom of Prussia rose from being the weakest of the great powers in Europe to becoming the dominant state in a new, united German Empire. The unification of Germany was largely achieved over the course of three wars that Prussia and the bloc of German states that followed her waged against various other European powers. In Bismarck’s view, achieving actual German unification was only possible through military

---

5 Imperial Germany did have colonies in Africa and the Pacific rim, but had acquired these territories quite late following its unification. However, the economic and political importance of these colonies to Germany, compared to the relationship of other European powers with their possession, was minimal.
force. This ‘realist’ strategy was best expressed by Bismarck in his popular quote claiming that such problems that were posed to Germany could only be solved through “blood and iron.”  

Under Bismarck’s leadership, and with his diplomatic skills, Prussia was able to successively defeat three powers and avoid military interventions from other great powers at any time. In 1864, Prussia and Austria defeated Denmark, taking as territorial spoils the lands of Schleswig-Holstein. Arguments over the administration of these territories led to the Austro-Prussian War in 1866. This was also known as the Six-Week War for the speed in which Prussia was able to defeat Austria with its advanced military and logistical mastery. In 1870, after intense diplomatic feuding about a Prussian prince’s possible succession to the Spanish throne, France declared war on Prussia, which had, under Bismarck, established the North German Confederation in 1867.

France’s declaration of war and the diplomatic isolation it suffered at the time served Bismarck’s political aims perfectly. On September 1st, 1870, the French Army was decisively defeated at Sedan. The following day, Napoleon III, Emperor of the French, surrendered to Prussian forces. Without Napoleon, the Imperial government in France collapsed in a quick and bloodless revolution and was replaced by a provisional government that would become the Third Republic of France. Despite the republic’s continuation of war with the German states, it would ultimately sue for peace following Paris’ capture in January of 1871. As stated previously, these three wars that contributed to German unification did not incur military interventions from other major powers such as Russia or Britain largely due to the foreign policy that had been developed by Bismarck, which prioritized short, expedient conflicts, albeit with relatively large numbers of casualties. Once the purposes of such conflicts was achieved (i.e. the increase of Prussian political influence over the other German states), then peace would be established and Prussia would then reconsolidate its power and influence through diplomatic strategies.

On January 18th, the German Empire was declared in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles, and King Wilhelm of Prussia was

---

declared its emperor. On May 10, 1871, the Treaty of Frankfurt was signed, ending the Franco-Prussian war. The treaty had four major terms:

1. The French would cede to Germany portions of territory that was then to be referred to as the Imperial Territory of Alsace-Lorraine.7
2. The French would pay an indemnity of 5 billion francs to Germany.
3. German troops would be allowed to occupy certain parts of France until these indemnities were paid.
4. France would recognize Prussian King Wilhelm’s new title as German Emperor.

When the war began, it was between one empire and a confederation. When the war ended, the empire had become a republic and the confederation had become an empire.

In 1871, the primary goals of Bismarck’s unification policy had been achieved. Germany was now the strongest power in Europe and he was its Chancellor. With the unification of the German states now a reality, Bismarck hoped for ensuring a sense of stability and peace throughout Europe. He believed that Germany should pursue peaceful and friendly relations with all the states of Europe. Germany’s unification was complete; the Empire was now satisfied with its territorial gains.8 However, the one state that Bismarck feared might pose a threat to this peace was France, which held a bitter resentment towards Germany ever since 1871. Though they had paid off their indemnities by 1874, the French were still resentful over their loss of Alsace-Moselle. Fearing that France would attack Germany out of vengeance, Bismarck was determined to isolate France by establishing a system of alliances with all the powers of Europe. The system would be constructed in such a way that would keep France from gaining a crucial

7 The specific naming of this body of administrative territories has been a point of contention between France and Germany. When under German control, it was commonly referred to as Alsace-Lorraine. French governments, however, have commonly referred to it as Alsace-Moselle.
alliance with any other power.

The first major diplomatic arrangement that would help to develop this system was the Three Emperor’s League. In 1872, Czar Alexander II became suspicious of the growing closeness between Germany and Austria and decided to come to Berlin at the same time that the Austrian Emperor, Franz Joseph, would be visiting. The three emperors, Wilhelm, Alexander, and Franz Joseph, met together in September of 1872. Bismarck took advantage of this meeting and advised the establishment of a tripartite alliance between Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary. Later in life, Bismarck laid out his intent with this arrangement in his memoirs:

The triple alliance which I originally sought to conclude after the peace of Frankfort, and about which I had already sounded Vienna and St. Petersburg, from Meaux, in September 1870, was an alliance of the three Emperors with the further idea of bringing into it monarchical Italy. It was designed for the struggle which, as I feared, was before us; between the two European tendencies which Napoleon called Republican and Cossack, and which I, according to our present ideas, should designate on the one side as the system of order on a monarchical basis, and on the other as the social republic to the level of which the anti-monarchical development is wont to sink, either slowly or by leaps and bounds, until the conditions thus created become intolerable, and the disappointed populace are ready for a violent return to monarchical institutions in a Caesarean form.9

Bismarck’s political problems with France went beyond a mere political dueling between two European powers. With Napoleon III removed from power in 1870, France had become a republic once again. Adolphe Thiers, a lifelong republican and political opponent of Napoleon III

and other conservative monarchists (with whom Bismarck had ideological sympathies), became the first president of the new republic, which reignited the tense conflict in Europe between two types of political regimes: liberal democratic forms of government and conservative monarchies. Bismarck was a lifelong opponent of democratic and liberal movements as well as Marxist and socialist movements. These two competing ideologies, liberal republicanism and conservative monarchy, provided an underlying foundation upon which politics in and between the great powers of Europe were conducted at the time. This added to Bismarck’s opposition to the French Republic regaining political power and spreading republican influences in monarchical powers such as Germany. This factor made Bismarck understand that this proposed Three Emperor’s Alliance, or League, was more than just a geopolitical arrangement, but a reconsolidation of an ideological bloc in Europe that prioritized autocratic monarchies over constitutional democracies. Despite the fact that both Germany and Austria-Hungary had elected parliaments, conservative monarchists such as Bismarck were often in greater positions of power.

Another reason behind the pursuit of this policy, as George Kennan explains, was “the preservation of a reasonable balance of power between Austria and Russia and the avoidance of any major conflict between the two powers.” 10 The challenge to this policy came from the various entanglements that Russia and Austria-Hungary found themselves with regards to the Balkan region and the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. These tensions over competing influence in this region proved to be the essential challenge towards stability. However, establishing an alliance between the two, brokered by Germany through Bismarck’s diplomatic savviness, could be achieved and would mitigate the tensions to a level sustainable by negotiation as opposed to escalation.

Most scholars agree that the first meeting between the three emperors was not as productive as it could have been in securing any kind of permanent alliance between the three powers. The three empires organized these talks with the understanding that they would join in solidarity against the rising threat of socialist and republican revolutions in Europe. In 1873,

---

the three empires would meet again for more permanent agreements. In May, the Germans and the Russians signed a military convention, whereby each power would send 200,000 soldiers to the aid of the other power if it was attacked. In June, the Russians and Austrians signed their own accord, the vague Schönbrunn agreement, in which both powers merely promised to “take counsel and work out a military convention if action became necessary” in any crisis that these two countries might face.11 Some scholars see the League as having failed because its member powers assumed the desire of one another to strive for a geopolitical harmony amongst themselves. A.J.P Taylor, for examples, claims that “the League was supposed to keep Europe at peace; in reality it could exist only so long as Europe remained pacific. It was a fair-weather system as the Holy Alliance had been before it.”12 Norman Rich shares a similar judgment in Great Power Diplomacy, in which he gives a brief analysis of the league. After two paragraphs summarizing the League and its creation, Rich states that,

The league, which was joined by Italy in September 1873, was based on little more than a presumed mutual interest in preserving international peace, suppressing revolution at home, and preventing the formation of hostile coalitions against any one of its members. It worked as long as the interests of the conservative powers in harmony; it cracked the moment their interests began to diverge.13

However, such judgements seem to ignore the true intentions behind Bismarck’s own support for the league. The agreements of the league were in no way the primary goal of Bismarck’s diplomatic mission, nor did he wholly endorse them as part of his own diplomatic strategy. There appears to be some debate as to the level in which Bismarck actually influenced establishment of the league. While Rich might claim that Bismarck was a

great proponent of the agreements, William Langer, in *European Alliances and Alignment*, offers a different viewpoint. Langer explains that in Bismarck’s discourse with Russian diplomats in 1873, Bismarck presented himself as having an anti-English opinion. However, Langer goes on to add that this may have been a ploy to please the Russians, who had been in a bitter disagreement with Britain over issues of regional influence in the Near East and Central Asia. In fact, Bismarck did not sign the agreements, possibly out of fear that it would show him as having an anti-English policy. For all the League’s shortcomings, it did not interfere with Bismarck’s plans for the time being. He was able to maintain stable relations with both Great Britain and Russia.

Great Britain had a mixed position of being both diplomatically isolated from the continental powers, but also as a world power that could serve as a moderator and broker over tense political crises. Bismarck had no plans to drive Britain into an alliance with France (for Bismarck, an alliance between France and any other power would have been a nightmare). Bismarck wanted France to remain isolated and he wanted Britain on good terms with Germany in order keep any agreement between the two countries from happening. Bismarck, along with leaders of the German military, like Albrecht von Roon and Helmut von Moltke, was increasingly convinced that another war with France was becoming more inevitable.

Moltke was in favor of a ‘preemptive war’ against France. Bismarck,
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14  Langer, *European Alliances and Alignments*, 25

15  Moltke and Roon, together with Bismarck, are often viewed altogether as the triumvirate responsible for founding modern Germany. Roon, who served as the Minister of War for Prussia, and Moltke, served as the chief of Staff for the Prussian (and later German) Army, led the major military reforms in the key decades leading up to German unification. While Bismarck’s abilities as a diplomat and political strategist were crucial in this process, Moltke and Roon have proven equally invaluable to the German Empire’s development into a military power.

16  Moltke’s anti-French reputation has been well established. Historians would trace this sentiment back to his formative years in the early 19th century, during which he was alive when the French Empire under Napoleon I had defeated and occupied Prussia. Moltke’s family home in Lübeck was burned down by French forces in 1805, when Moltke was 5 years old. The psychological impact of this event no doubt left its mark on him in his later years, when he was leading German forces into France in 1870 and insisted upon besieging Paris, even after the defeat of most of the French Army at Sedan. See David Wetzel, *A Duel of Nations* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012), 21-25.
on the other hand, had a much less jingoistic attitude and insisted that a diplomatic policy should be taken in order to limit France’s political power in Europe without resorting to another military conflict. Bismarck was also aware that none of the other powers, especially Britain and Russia, would allow Germany to defeat France to the point of devastation. However, with Russia and Austria-Hungary now in a diplomatic league with Germany, Bismarck saw no benefits in destroying France entirely. In his view, so long as France had no reliable allies, it would remain a weak and secondary power in the continent, and Germany would have little to fear from any French policy driven by a desire for vengeance for its defeat in 1871.

In 1878, a new major diplomatic crisis erupted as a result of Russia’s victory in its war with Turkey. Russia was able to gain independence for Serbia and get autonomy for the Principality of Bulgaria. These provisions were laid out in the Treaty of San Stefano. However, the other great powers, for fear of expanded Russian influence in the Balkans and its associated support for the pan-Slavic movement in that region, were not satisfied with this agreement. The pan-Slavic movement was a growing concern, not just to Austria-Hungary, but also to Britain, who worried about growing Russian influence spreading into the Mediterranean and the Near East. Most powers did not want to see Russian gains made at the expense of a weakening Ottoman empire. Bismarck saw this as an opportunity for Germany to host a congress of the great powers in order to reach a resolution on these issues. The Berlin Congress met from June 13 to July 1, with its primary purpose being the organization and recognition of these new Balkan states.

Bismarck took to supporting Russia’s claims, especially for the independence of Bulgaria. However, neither Austria-Hungary nor Britain were interested in seeing this come to fruition. Rather, the congress settled upon splitting Bulgaria into two states (the Principality of Bulgaria in the north and Eastern Rumelia in the south), both of which would be autonomous.

The historical impact that pan-Slavism had on European affairs in the 19th and 20th centuries cannot be underestimated. Occurring within the same temporal framework as other forms of nationalism in Europe, pan-Slavism came to prominence by the time of the 1848 revolutions and became a significant factor in Imperial Russia’s movements towards establishing a sphere of influence in regions like the Balkans and the Caucasus. This particular movement of political nationalism called for independence for the Slavic-speaking peoples, and eventually their unification, not dissimilar from Germany’s own political unification, which was also greatly influenced by pan-Germanic sentiments.
but under Turkish administration. Gyula Andrassy, the foreign minister for Austria-Hungary, was able to procure an agreement from the congress that would grant Austria-Hungary the right to occupy and administer the province of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Russian delegation, under the leadership of the foreign minister Alexander Gorchakov, left the congress feeling betrayed over having lost so much of the gains it had made at San Stefano. Seeing that the rest of the great powers had turned against Russia and her ambitions in the Balkans, Bismarck realized that a better alignment could be sought with some other country. He saw that Germany, being a great power in central Europe, should pursue a relationship of alliance with Austria-Hungary, the other central European power. The estrangement between Austria-Hungary and Russia over the issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina would drive Austria to seek Germany’s help as a moderator between the two nations.\(^{18}\)

The Treaty of Berlin served some of Bismarck’s political purposes, but not all. At the same time, we must understand that Bismarck never saw treaties as documents of posterity, but as agreements made during the *status quo*. Ignorance of this viewpoint seems to be prevalent in many critics’ works where they point out the flaws of in Bismarck’s agreements and diplomatic strategies. As Bismarck saw it, politics was ‘the art of the possible.’\(^{19}\) Every political move had to be made with the current existing conditions, and policies should change just as the conditions change. Taylor, who tends to be more critical of Bismarck, does acknowledge this when he explains Bismarck not pursuing an alliance with Great Britain in 1879 against Russia.\(^{20}\) At that time, an Anglo-German alliance may indeed have been possible and worth no loss to Bismarck, but he also saw nothing to gain from it. If such an alliance were to go to war against France, for example, Germany would nonetheless bear the brunt of such a conflict, while Britain’s maritime strength would have little impact in what would no doubt be a land-based war.

In 1879, a defensive alliance was agreed between Germany and Austria-Hungary, in which both pledged to aid one another if one of them

\(^{18}\) Langer, *European Alliances and Alignments*, pp. 165

\(^{19}\) Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man and the Statesmen, Vol. 2*, 248

\(^{20}\) Taylor, *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe*, 265
was attacked by Russia. The alliance seemed to be the most advantageous for Bismarck’s plans at that time. Even though it further alienated Russia, it did little to marginalize any other European power. The Dual Alliance proved quite valuable and did not result in any major crisis with Russia during Bismarck’s tenure. In fact, the League of the Three Emperors was revived again in 1881, though it would ultimately lapse in 1887, after another falling out between Russia and Austria-Hungary over the Balkans. In 1882, Italy joined the Triple Alliance as well. However, Bismarck feared further alienating Russia to the point that she might turn to France for diplomatic aid. In 1887, the secretive Reinsurance Treaty was signed between Russia and Germany, in which both countries assured one another’s neutrality should they go to war with a third country, except if Germany attacked France or Russia attacked Austria-Hungary.

Peace in Europe was a reality that essentially everyone had taken for granted during Bismarck’s time as Chancellor, as it was his primary goal during his tenure. Some scholars have called this period of Bismarck-led peace the Pax Teutonica, in reference to Germany’s service as a diplomatic broker under Bismarck’s leadership. During the wars of German Unification, he had applied his ‘realpolitik’ in a very skilled manner, proving that he could possess both aggressive and pacific stances, depending on who he was dealing with. Bismarck’s alliance system worked for the situation at the moment, and Bismarck knew that it would have to be constantly revised over the course of time if Europe was to remain at peace. His attitudes, however, soon came into conflict with those of the new German Emperor, Wilhelm II, who had taken the throne in 1888.

While Bismarck had taken a more pro-colonialist stance by the mid-1880’s (he hosted another conference in Berlin in 1885 to settle the division of Africa among the great powers), it was Wilhelm II who supported an even more drastic global expansion of power for Germany. Unlike Bismarck, who had supported a Eurocentric strategy that focused on Germany developing its strength as a land-based power on the continent, the new Kaiser was proposing a transformation of German empire into a world power that

would operate in much the same way as Britain or France. Bismarck did not agree with this kind of policy at all. In his view, it was too aggressive, too unpredictable, and would no doubt cause animosity among the powers who felt that Germany was overstepping its limits and aspirations.

This was not the only point of contention between the two figures. Another issue, and one which would prove to be a political defeat for Bismarck, was the kulturkampf policies that his ministry had developed in order to curtail Catholic political influence in Germany. This struggle, which Bismarck took up with zealousness, served to only invigorate Catholic political movements, as well as garner criticism from both the Kaiser and international opinion. Odo Russell, a British diplomat and a Protestant like Bismarck, opined that “if Bismarck secured the Catholic vote of the Central party by large concessions to the Vatican, he might get a majority, but he shrinks before the humiliation, as he says himself, ‘of going to Canossa.’”

This criticism of a peculiar lack of pragmatism that is often associated with Bismarck is shared by Wilhelm II, who writes that “there can no longer be any possible doubt today that this struggle was a crushing disaster for the spiritual unity of Germany.” The kulturkampf is largely considered to be one of Bismarck’s more infamous, and largely misguided, policy decisions, and it did serve to garner a certain level of distrust of Germany under Bismarck, especially among Catholic-majority powers in Europe. Wilhelm’s approach to the Catholic body in Germany was, admittedly, more pragmatic towards the aims of unity. His own views of foreign policy, however, did not possess the same level of pragmatism or strategic tactfulness, and this would prove to be the greatest point of tension between Bismarck and the Kaiser.

Wilhelm, however, was determined that this new foreign policy, which was termed Weltpolitik, would help Germany rise from merely having an influence beyond the state of European politics, but also global affairs. In Wilhelm’s view, Germany had, after all, a unique position of being one of the most powerful nations in Europe, with the best land army
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and one of the strongest economies (despite the tremendous economic depression that had hit Europe in the 1870’s), yet at the same time not as prominent as an imperial power as France, Britain, or even Russia. The young emperor’s plans were not in line with Bismarck’s system of alliances, and he was keener on seeking an alliance with Britain rather than anything with Russia.\textsuperscript{24} In March of 1890, the Reinsurance treaty with Russia was under consideration for renewal, possibly as a permanent agreement. While Bismarck was strongly supportive of this renewal, Wilhelm was not as openly willing to endorse such a renewal.\textsuperscript{25} Ever since his ascension to the throne, Wilhelm II and Bismarck engaged in further disagreements over a range of issues regarding both foreign policy, military priorities, and domestic legislation. Bismarck quickly found himself to be alienated by the young Emperor’s apparent erraticism and lack of tact in his pursuit of his Weltpolitik strategies.

On March 20, Bismarck resigned the office of Chancellor, a post he had held for nearly 20 years. The diplomatic system that he established proved to be successful in keeping France out of any serious agreement with any other power. However, by the time he had resigned, Kaiser Wilhelm and his subordinates were not willing to use this alliance system as their primary means of making Germany strong. Instead of being at the forefront diplomatically, they argued, Germany should be at the forefront militarily and territorially. Also, they saw no need for a renewal of the Reinsurance treaty with Russia, and in fact feared that such a renewal would lead to a straining of their relationship with the British, a relationship that they were always trying to improve.

With Bismarck gone, Kaiser Wilhelm instructed the new German government, under Leo von Caprivi, to reject the Russians’ offer for renewal of the 1887 Reinsurance Treaty. Much to Bismarck’s disappointment, this move to turn down renewal would drive Russia away from alignment with Germany and onto the side of France. Since the signing of the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, the Russian leadership gradually began developing relations with France. During the 1880’s these relationships were largely of a

\textsuperscript{24} Langer, \textit{European Alliances and Alignments}, 498

\textsuperscript{25} Taylor, \textit{The Struggle for Mastery in Europe}, 326
financial nature, as the French government began providing loans to Russia. Bismarck, during that time, had been able to satisfy Russian aspirations for stable alliances during that period with the Three Emperors’ League and subsequently the Reinsurance treaty, thus assuring France’s political isolation.26

Following the dismissal of Bismarck and the discontinuation of his diplomatic strategy, however, the relationship between the French and Russian governments began to formalize to a degree of military cooperation. In 1892, the two powers signed a military convention in which both pledged to mobilize should any member of the Triple Alliance mobilize their armies. Once this convention had been signed, the Bismarckian system failed. However, the reason for its failure has more to do with it being ignored by the successors to Bismarck and less with its implementation having had any negative consequences. As Kennan explains, the maintenance of the diplomatic network that Bismarck had established and overseen possibly proved to be “too much for the simpler, more direct, and (it was implied) less devious men that his successors held themselves to be; for the latter, the only recourse was to a more open, less intricate set of relationships.”27

This assessment is also shared by Henry Kissinger, whose scholarship on Bismarck helped to develop his own realist style of diplomatic strategy. He writes:

“Bismarck’s less imaginative successors failed even when they strove for ‘calculability’ or ‘reliability.’ These qualities seemed more easily attainable by rigid commitments than by the delicate, constantly shifting balancing of Bismarck’s policy. Bismarck, it can be argued, based his diplomatic prowess on the ability to improvise and skillfully build diplomatic relationships on a situational basis.28 Thus, Germany wound up with the unconditional commitment to the ‘worm eaten hulk’ of Austria

26 Kennan, The Decline of Bismarck’s European Order, 401
27 Idem, 408.
which had been the whole thrust of Bismarck’s policy to avoid.”

The conclusion herein implies that the successors to Bismarck’s chancellorship did not take into consideration the grave necessity to factor the delicate, and oftentimes ambiguous, nature of diplomatic positions in Europe into their policy-making. Bismarck understood the crucial nuances that existed in the aspirations of several European powers, and his European order possessed this complexity in order to appease these shifting nuances. Without such complexity in diplomatic arrangements, the delicacies of the European order would inevitably collapse into another conflict. The abandonment of Bismarckian tact in favor of establishing a bloc which linked Germany to two weakened powers, Italy and Austria-Hungary, would prove the beginning of the downfall of Imperial Germany and its paramount position in European affairs.

Kaiser Wilhelm, and the cabinet that he appointed pursued a policy that would alienate Russia, driving it into an alliance with France. Russia turned out to not be the only power which had enough problems with Germany to turn to France. Ironically, the Germans had given up alignment with Russia in order pursue an alliance with Britain, only to have Britain itself turn down Germany’s advances and engage in the Entente Cordiale with France in 1904.

There should be no doubt that a major contributing factor to this decision by the British was Wilhelm’s own decision to invest in the expansion and improvement of the German navy to the point that it could sustain an operational presence on most of the oceans of the world. This policy, combined with Germany’s colonial expansion, brought great alarm to other European powers that had already established spheres of influence, through colonial territory and naval power. These policies also directly negated the strong assurance that Bismarck had made to the other powers when the


30 Following Bismarck’s departure from government, Germany would acquire what it called German East Africa in 1891, and German West Africa in 1896, as well as Tsingtao in 1891. The acquisitions in China would be further expanded in 1898 to possess more territory on the Shandong peninsula, and thus give Germany a more prominent sphere of influence in China.
German Empire was first established: that Germany, upon its unification, was now a saturated power, and therefore no other states need compete with this new entity over questions of further territorial expansion.\textsuperscript{31} Even when German colonies were established in Africa and the Pacific during the 1880’s, Germany pursued new overseas territory delicately, selecting land that had largely been unclaimed\textsuperscript{32}. The \textit{Weltpolitik} strategies, however, no doubt troubled and antagonized British policy-makers, driving them to realize that the new global ambitions of Wilhelm needed to be curtailed. At the urging of France, both Britain and Russia entered into their own agreement together in 1907, effectively establishing a Triple Entente amongst these powers. As Bismarck is said to have noted, such a circumstance would put Germany in a disadvantageous strategic position should war break out with any three of those powers, most especially France. According to Bernard von Bülow, and with remarkable clairvoyance, the future German chancellor, Bismarck stated: “An English attack would only be thinkable if we found ourselves at war with both Russia and France, or did anything so utterly absurd as to fall upon Holland or Belgium, or block the Baltic by closing the sound, or some nonsense of the kind, which is out of the question.”\textsuperscript{33}

Upon ascending to the throne, Wilhelm was insistent upon inserting his presence and influence into the decision-making process for Germany’s national policies. However, not only did he begin interfering with the decision making that had, until then, been dominated by Bismarck. He also did not share the same views as Bismarck in either foreign or domestic policy. It took less than two years following Wilhelm’s rise to the throne for Bismarck to resign out of frustration. The status quo had essentially changed against Bismarck and his system. Had Bismarck’s network of diplomatic engagement continued to be supported by Wilhelm II, Caprivi, and Bismarck’s other successors, who instead pursued a much more aggressive foreign policy of imperial expansion, any alliance between France, Russia, Russia, Russia.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Orlow, \textit{A History of Modern Germany: 1871 to Present}, 55.
\item \textsuperscript{32} During this early phase of German colonialism, in fact, Bismarck took opportunity to offer diplomatic brokerage, hosting other European powers at the Berlin conference in 1884 to 1885 to settle disputes over territories in Africa.
\end{itemize}
and Britain would have likely been prevented.

For nearly two decades, since the founding of the second Reich, Bismarck had managed to maintain a carefully balanced order among the European powers. His policies have often been mischaracterized, due to the common interpretation of realpolitik as a cynical and sardonic political philosophy, as being interested solely in the advancement of German interests over the interests of other powers, but his true political intentions were more nuanced than what is presented with that narrative. It is important, however, to remember that a primary reason for Bismarck’s work in maintaining a peaceful status quo between the great powers of Europe was to subvert any rising of leftist politics during that period. According to Bismarck, specifically in his opinion of the Three Emperors’ League, war between these great powers would be mutually disastrous. “The only real victor,” he added, “would be the revolution (i.e. republican and Marxist movements).”

Thus, a major conflict between the powers was the primary outcome which Bismarck’s policies sought to avoid. The Three Emperor’s League, and then the subsequent reinsurance treaty, had a measure of effectiveness that allowed certain a certain level of appeasement of Russian interests, while simultaneously alleviating concerns of pan-Slavic influence in the Balkans.

The establishment and legitimacy of the German empire in 1871 has been characterized as being without ‘generally accepted basis.’ The unification of Germany, in effect, has been criticized as being a primary cause of instabilities in Europe which eventually culminated into the two World Wars. However, rather than being a destabilizer from the beginning, Imperial Germany under Bismarck proved to have stabilizing influences on the rest of Europe through its position as a host for diplomatic negotiations, in adherence to its model of ‘power brokerage.’ It was only after Bismarck’s dismissal in 1890 that we began to see diplomatic alliances and partnerships falter or collapse between Germany and other important powers, namely Russia and Britain. The post-Bismarck era of German diplomacy adopted

---


a more revisionist approach to world politics, which further unsettled other European powers that would have otherwise pursued more amicable relationships with Germany. Therefore, instead of being viewed as an instigator of European instability that lead to the Great War, Bismarck’s legacy should be one of a herald of European stability in what was an otherwise troubling political era.
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Tsar Piotr¹ the Great laid the foundations for the city of Saint Petersburg in 1703 as a fort during his war against the Kingdom of Sweden. His defeat over Sweden allowed Piotr to develop the fort into his new imperial capital, St. Petersburg. The city served as the Russian Empire’s capital from 1712 to its collapse in 1918, when the capital was once again transferred to old Moscow. St. Petersburg served as Piotr’s capstone in his efforts to Westernize Russia. From its architecture, court and social life, and geography, Piter² reflected Piotr the Great’s strong desire to abandon Muscovite traditions in favor of Western ones. The city’s soundscape is a manifestation through sound of Piotr’s efforts to Westernize Russia and his disdain towards old Moscow. The import of Western culture, such as tuned bells and royal processions, as well as Piotr’s rejection of Moscow, created a unique sonic experience as it mixed with traditional Russian sounds. The amalgamation of soundscapes represent that St. Petersburg is not an exclusively Western city, but a combination of Russian and Western. Sounds that showed the city’s mixed identity ranged from the most obvious, such as clashing bells, to subtler, such as the city’s evolving social and public life.

Harmonizing with Historiography

R. Murray Schafer’s The Tuning of the World initiated conversations on the disciplinary field of Sound studies and more specifically the term “soundscape.” The text invited its readers to pay attention to the audial world, not just the visual, although it read more as an attack on the modern

¹ For the sake of clarity, I will refer to Peter by his Russian name, Piotr.
² Locals refer to St. Petersburg as Piter, either with affection or with disdain.
soundscape than it read as a foundational text. Since *Tuning's* publication in 1977 sound studies has fully developed into a field. Jonathan Sterne’s *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* contributed immensely to the field with the text’s analysis on the cultural implications of sound recording and reproduction. Architecture is not immune to soundscape theories either, as seen in Emily Thompson’s *The Soundscape of Modernity: Architectural Acoustics and the Culture of Listening in America, 1900–1933*. Although it faced a rocky start with scholars questioning its premise, sound studies, along with history of the senses, has found itself as a mainstream field in historiography.

At least, in Western historiography. In Russian historiography, sound studies is in a fledgling state compared to Western historiography. This is not so much a rejection of sound studies in the Russian academic world, as much as it is a symptom of a larger trend in Russian historiography. Russian historiography is orthodox, in that Russian scholars are hesitant to venture outside traditional political history. This is amplified by the Russian government’s interference in history by deciding what is published and what is translated. For instance, gender studies, while nothing new to Western scholars, is a contested and recent trend in Russian academic circles.\(^3\) It is not this paper’s place to debate whether this is an issue with the Russian government’s overreach into academia and its rejection of Western-origin studies, but rather, an explanation as to why sound studies has seen a sluggish adoption in Russian academic circles.

This is not to say that sound studies and the soundscape are unheard of in Russia. The soundscape, for instance, is commonly referred to as *zvukoe landshaft* (literally, sound landscape), *zvukoiyshaft*, or transliterated into the Russian as *saundskeip*. One major adopter of soundscape studies is the anthropologist and musicologist Evgenia Donovna Andreevna. In her article, “The Soundscape as a Real Object and Research Problem,” Andreevna argues that the soundscape should not be ignored, but rather, serve as a complement to cultural studies.

Andrei Vozyanov is another Russian scholar who uses sound studies as the foundation for his research in anthropology. Although new to aca-
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\(^3\) Valerie Sperling, *Sex, Politics, & Putin: Political Legitimacy in Russia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 212.
Vozyanov has contributed to Russian sound studies through “listening cultures” in the urban soundscape. In his article, “Vinyl in the Big City: Between Sound and Spectacle,” Vozyanov argues that the visual has hegemony over urban studies, and that the urban soundscape has largely been ignored. His article explores the upsurge of vinyl’s popularity in today’s St. Petersburg, and its use in what he calls cultures of listening. His work is not historical however, as it focuses on today’s St. Petersburg. His article demonstrates that soundscape methodology is present in Russian literature but does not address St. Petersburg’s urban development through sound.

While sound studies are gaining traction in Russian scholarly circles, there has been extensive academic work in St. Petersburg’s history and culture. Compared to other Russian cities, St. Petersburg’s unique blend of Western and Russian cultural motifs pique the interest of those abroad and within Russia. As Emily D. Johnson shows her readers in How St. Petersburg Learned to Study Itself: The Russian Idea of Kraevedenie, St. Petersburg has a strong foundation for urban history. Johnson argues that the discipline of kraevedenie, which translates to local studies, is a twentieth century creation that has roots in St. Petersburg’s founding. Piotr’s realized desire to build a new capital on hostile geography on the backs of thousands of serfs gave St. Petersburg a unique founding myth that “no other Russian city or region can claim the same kind of developed cult.”

Her work relies highly on the visual, however. As kraevedenie had its foundation in city guidebooks and amateur historians’ narratives on the city, Johnson argues that the discipline is united by its literary nature.

While Johnson analyzed guidebooks to create her own literary argument, others have looked to St. Petersburg’s writers. Julie A. Buckler’s Mapping St. Petersburg: Imperial Text and Cityshape analyzes St. Petersburg’s cityscape through prominent writers, such as Fyodor Dostoevsky. St. Petersburg, in its gilded glitz and glamor, not only became imperial Russia’s literary capital, it became “its own favorite literary subject.”

5 Idem, 217.
Petersburg is a city that is read, not heard.

Outside of academia, St. Petersburg today is host to the St. Petersburg Museum of Sound, Sankt-Peterburgskii Muzei Zvuka, nestled comfortably in the city’s historic center. The museum began as an exhibit in 1999, titled Exhibit on Experimental Sound. The exhibit mainly focused on experimental music, but its evolution from interactive exhibit to an interactive museum has allowed it to expand to sounds outside of experimental music. For instance, one of its exhibits is a “Sound Map of St. Petersburg,” where it invites patrons to take on active listening in hearing a “sound portrait of the city.”

While St. Petersburg has a strong urban history background, thanks to kraevedenie, there is a lot of work to be done for historical soundscapes in Russian historiography. However, as Andreevna and Vozyanov’s work shows, sound studies is becoming more popular in Russian academic circles. Granted, there is not a lot of work on “historical” soundscapes or works dedicated entirely to soundscapes. Andreevna sees sound studies as a complement to cultural studies, rather than an entirely standalone field. Vozyanov’s work on cultures of listening, while based on sound studies and soundscapes, focuses on today’s Piter.

**Piotr the Great and Western Ambitions**

Which then takes us back to the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, long before vinyl’s entrance into the soundscape. To understand St. Petersburg, we must not just understand Piotr’s motivations in Westernizing the Tsardom, and eventually the Russian Empire. We must also understand his utter disdain and contempt with old Moscow. As a child in Moscow’s court, Piotr was witness to tumultuous revolts at the hand of the Streltsy (or, “musketeers”), the corrupt palace guards. During the May 7, 1682 Streltsy Uprising, Piotr watched as “the ruffians impaled Arteem Matveev on the raised pikes below,” while his mother tried to defend him and his brother Ivan V.7

Sophia’s rule as regent and her paranoia towards Piotr added to his
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disdain towards Moscow. Sophia had suspicions that Piotr and his play regiment of soldiers were conspiring to depose her from the throne.\(^8\) She ordered Fyodor Shaklovity to kill Piotr to assure that he would not contest the throne in the future. Once Piotr was tipped off to his imminent assassination, Piotr fled to the woods and met with his mother, wife, and one of his regiments.\(^9\) Angered by this assassination attempt, Piotr rallied his regiment and marched back to Moscow. While he did not kill Sophia, he deposed her from the throne and became the tsar of all the Russians. Sophia was politically silenced; she was sent to live the rest of her life in a convent where she could not exercise power.

As tsar, Piotr made extensive visits to Western Europe as part of his Great Embassy, mainly to learn the craft of shipbuilding from coastal states. Although Piotr travelled throughout Europe incognito, the sounds of Muscovite processions followed him. In his 1697 visit to the Baltic states, Riga’s gates opened to the “clarion blast from trumpets and drums,” and the tsar’s guardsmen.\(^10\) In the Prussian town of Königsberg, Piotr was known to have invited Germans over to his quarter, where the “beer flowed and voices roared.”\(^11\) Even travelling incognito, the rambunctious All Drunken Synod\(^12\) did not stop its alcoholic festivities.

While Piotr visited other European cities, the city that had made the most significant impression was the Dutch city of Amsterdam. Amsterdam and Holland “formed his tastes, sartorial [and] architectural.”\(^13\) It was there that Piotr could exercise his love of sailing by learning shipbuilding from Dutch masters, as well as hiring Dutch and Venetian shipbuilders for his
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\(^8\) Piotr’s “play regiments” were groups of nobles, and often, close friends who Piotr would use to practice his military maneuvers.

\(^9\) Montefiore, *The Romanovs: 1613-1918*, 75


\(^11\) Idem, 115.

\(^12\) The All Joking, All Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters was Peter’s club of his closest associates, along with acquaintances sprinkled in. Also known as the Jolly Company, the Synod’s celebrations were fueled by alcohol. Aside from stirring contempt from the Russian Orthodox church, death by alcohol poisoning was common.

nascent navy. The city’s architecture and fashion sense left an impression on him that would later be seen in St. Petersburg.

Two things shaped St. Petersburg’s Western cultural orientation. The first was Piotr’s traumatic experience as a young tsarevich and tsar. Piotr was convinced that his witnessing the Musketeers’ uprising and their assassination of the tsardom’s statesmen was the root of his epilepsy. The second was his fascination with western Europe during his expedition with the Great Embasy. Western Europe’s fashion, cultures, and scientific explorations laid the foundations for Piotr’s imperial reforms, as well as shaping Petersburg’s cityscape and soundscape.

Despite Piotr’s disdain towards Moscow, Moscow is critical to the construction of the Petersburg soundscape. Moscow did not disappear in 1712 with the capital’s move to Petersburg, as there were traces of Muscovite tradition in St. Petersburg. While the city may have lost some prestige to St. Petersburg, Moscow continued to serve as the empire’s financial center. St. Petersburg housed the tsars and government, but Moscow continued to exhibit “far more of the real stir and bustle of commercial life” than the new western city.14 Alongside the empire’s finances, the city continued to uphold Muscovite traditions. As will be discussed later, the Romanov heirs after Piotr retained the tradition of having their coronation ceremony in Moscow. Moscow remains important to this paper, although not the focus, because it retains Muscovite traditions, creating a stark contrast between St. Petersburg’s soundscape and the soundscape of the “real” Russia.15

From the Timeless Bronze Voice of Orthodoxy to Petersburg’s Carillons

Much like in early modern England, church bells in Moscow and St. Petersburg “functioned as the most obvious ‘sound marks’” in the acousti-


15 Foreigners visiting the city often recommend its readers to visit Moscow and eastward to see the “real” Russia.
cally dense cities. Bells also functioned as a major audial marker of Piotr’s drive to westernize the Russian Empire, as well as differentiating the St. Petersburg soundscape to the traditional Muscovite soundscape. While Orthodox churches did and still exist in St. Petersburg, their bells had to compete with Dutch carillons in the city’s soundscape.

In the traditional Muscovite sense, bells are important because of their association with the Russian Orthodox church, and in turn, the Church’s own association with the Eastern Roman Empire. With Constantinople’s collapse to the Ottoman Turks, the bronze voice of Orthodoxy “declared the presence of the Third Rome” in the wooden village of Moscow. The Russian Orthodox Church, due to its Byzantine inheritance, places an emphasis on the visual. Both at home and at church, religious icons don buildings’ walls. The bells in an Orthodox church functioned as “singing icons,” establishing “the acoustic space of an Orthodox temple,” and the Orthodox community.

Orthodox church bells are rung with specific intent, such as “calling believers to the divine services; expressing the triumph of the Church and of her divine services,” but more importantly in our case, “strengthening Christians in piety and faith by its sound.” Orthodox church bells could also be used for “assembling people during emergencies,” or for warnings of natural disasters. In a recent example, the bells of the St. Michael’s Orthodox Church in Kyiv, Ukraine, were rung during the Euromaidan riots of 2014. The last time the church had rung its bells was in 1280 during the Mongol invasions of Kievan Rus, pointing to the direness the nation was
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19 “Typikon for Church Ringing” (Editorial Board of the Russian Orthodox Church, 2002).

20 Ibid.
 Aside from being a call to action, the loudness of church bells served to remind its followers that God is everywhere. For instance, if a person is not able to take part in a service, the bells allowed for the absentees to “mentally and spiritually participate in the services.”

Unlike Western Christian churches, the “foundation of Orthodox bell ringing lies not in melody,” but in the rhythm and its resulting acoustic interaction between the different bells; a melodic chaos. Since the Church emphasizes rhythm over harmonic melody, Orthodox bells are not tuned to a specific note. This, in turn, is the result of another Orthodox tradition that influences how bells are cast. Bell casting as an art is passed down between generations of casters, thus limiting any experimenting or changes in the bell’s form. Tradition, then, dictates the casting as well as the bell’s contribution as a timeless sound marker.

The fixed and timeless sound of Orthodox bells were a contrast to the tuned and adaptable carillon, or the tuned Western Christian church bells. Western bells during the Middle Ages, and particularly during the Renaissance, were influenced by Europeans’ desire to create the “most resonant sound and pleasing timbre.” In search of this pleasing timbre, western European bell casters grounds and shaped their bells to tune them to the right note. Russian bell casters, by contrast, refused to alter the bell’s shape to fix its tuning as it “would ruin the bell’s ‘personal’ distinctiveness.” Indeed, each individual Orthodox bell was cast with beautiful and ornate inscriptions. At first glance, beauty is something related to the visual. But in this case, the ornate inscriptions and bells’ distinct personality lend its chaotic contribution to the city’s soundscape.

The ceremonials in prepping a bell also contributes to old Russia’s Orthodox soundscape. We can imagine in our mind’s ear that foundries cast-

23 Synodal Commission for Divine Services, “Typikon for Church Ringing.”
24 Williams, The Bells of Russia: History and Technology.
ing these bronze bells must have been very loud. However, the blessing and mounting of a bell to its tower is a much more powerful image (audioge? Soundage?) than the casters’ grunts and hammers’ smashes. Ceremonies in blessing bells follow a strict routine involving Orthodox priests. First, they bless the bell with consecrated water. The rest of the procession, however, is spoken and sung.26 With priests singing songs and readings psalms, Orthodox bells contribute to a city’s soundscape before it is struck.

The sound of an Orthodox bell and its emphasis on rhythm-over-melody was ingrained in the Russian ear. In fact, when Aristarkh Izrailev, an Orthodox priest and campanologist, proposed the soon to be consecrated Cathedral of Christ the Savior in Moscow have tuned bells, the church declined.27 The Orthodox clergy saw Izrailev’s ideas to change the Orthodox Church’s bells would be too “deleterious to the deeply rooted tradition” of Russian bell ringing.28 It was not until his advocacy for more Western, tuned church bells that a Russian “had given serious though to the characteristic clash of untuned colors,” and rhythmic church bells.29 Melodic bells in Russia were seen as “both artificial and unsuitable” for the otherwise rhythm-focused ringing.30

Another quirk in the Orthodox churches that is not seen in Western Christian churches is the consistency of its acoustics in other locations. In a 2014 study conducted in the “Russian church” at Bari, Italy, Luigi Elicio and Francesco Martellotta found that the church in Bari’s acoustics matched that with other Orthodox churches in Russia and the Balkans. The architecture of the church has not changed significantly, because of “the strict adherence of liturgy.”31 The writers conclude that the similar acoustics in the numerous churches, thanks to the church’s staple design, shows that acoustics “must

26 Williams provides an in-depth and step by step instruction as to how Orthodox priests blessed bells in 124-125 of Bells of Russia.

27 Williams, The Bells of Russia: History and Technology, 89.

28 Idem, 88.

29 Idem, 90.

30 Ibid.

be considered a cultural heritage.”

Thus, no matter the location, a traveler can expect to experience the same acoustic experience in a different church. Aside from cultural heritage, the sameness and timelessness of the Church’s acoustics remind followers of God’s omnipresence.

Outside Orthodoxy, bells also had secular purposes. The Moscow Kremlin’s gates are adorned with clock towers, with chimes serving as audible complements to the towers’ clocks. This allowed for townspeople far from the Red Square to be able to tell time. Clocktowers not only served to tell time, but they also served as tools for Russian-Western European interaction. The bells used in the clocktowers were not like Orthodox bells, rather, they were chimes imported from Western Europe.

The first bells that rung in St. Petersburg were unlike the untuned and rhythmic Orthodox bells, they were imported Dutch carillons. The first Dutch carillon in St. Petersburg was placed in the Saints Peter and Paul Cathedral in 1720, three years before the building was officially finished. In the visual sense, the spired Peter and Paul Cathedral does not resemble a domed Orthodox church because of its bells; the acoustic influenced the visual. The Protestant style was designed to “accommodate the bells and mechanism of the Dutch carillon,” but also had to be designed to accommodate traditional Russian bells.

The carillon installed in the Peter and Paul Cathedral, as well as elsewhere in St. Petersburg, did not follow the rhythm-over-melody characteristic of Orthodox bells. Instead, each bell in the carillon was tuned to a specific note, emphasizing melody over rhythm. The set came with a “carillon with a keyboard and a clock mechanism” that allowed the bells to be struck at different times of the hour. Keyboards hint at precision, as melodies require precise tones to create harmonies. Orthodox bells, on the other hand, are rung using a system of ropes tied to the bells’ clappers. St. Petersburg’s bells, then, created a sense of an imported soundscape. Much
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like the clock towers of Moscow, the clock tower in Peter and Paul were used to demarcate time. However, most of the cathedral’s bells were not of Russian origin but were tuned Dutch imports.

Bells were the loudest and most obvious markers of a Western city in the Russian Empire. Court and social life, however, present a subtler shifting soundscape in St. Petersburg. From processions to celebrations, to the people seen and unseen, the public space in St. Petersburg looked and sounded differently from the social life of old Muscovy.

**Women in the Petersburgite Soundscape**

Women’s presence in the streets of St. Petersburg and their involvement in court life creates a stark contrast between the Window to the West and Moscow. A British surgeon wrote in his journal of seeing “several well-dressed women” walking around Nevksy Prospekt, Petersburg’s main street.\(^\text{37}\) Women walking in nineteenth century Petersburg was in stark contrast to women’s involvement in Muscovite social life. Johann Korb notes in his 1698 journal, *Scenes from the Court of Peter the Great*, the strange absence of women in Moscow’s social life. Women of dignity or social standing are “urged not to be present at banquets,” nor do they sit at the table with their husbands.\(^\text{38}\) They can only be seen, Korb notes, “when they go to church or drive out to visit their friends.”\(^\text{39}\) Granted, they can only be seen because Piotr relaxed the rules of women’s visibility in public, as he repealed the “jealous old rule which required women only to go out in carriages” that made it impossible to see them, let alone hear them.\(^\text{40}\)

While the writers comment more on the Russian women’s dress and complexion than their sound production, we can deduce that Petersburg’s gender soundscape was more diverse. The women the British surgeon de-
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scribed were not heading to church, as Korb’s Muscovite women would. Rather, they went on a pleasant stroll in the Gostiny Dvor, the city’s high-end shopping center. Women had a bigger role in St. Petersburg’s social life than they did in Moscow, with their voices and the ruffles of their dress contributing to the city’s imported soundscape.

Women’s presence in public was just one of the signs of Petersburg’s evolving court life. Russia’s aristocracy evolved alongside it, affecting the city’s soundscape. Prior to Piotr’s rule, the aristocratic court kept to themselves, leaving the tsar alone to his own space. An isolated court fell victim to Piotr’s reforms, however. Korb describes a court dinner with Piotr’s fondness of “conversing and dining with his advisers, with German officers, with merchants,” and the like.41 The boyars, the Russian aristocracy, however preferred the old Muscovite tradition of eating alone. “Though this be sovereignly displeasing to the Muscovites,” Korb notes, “they must needs obey,” going as far as forcing a smile if asked.42 The Romanov court was slowly evolving from a monastic silence to a loud and active conversation.

Piotr’s changes in the Muscovite court foreshadowed the court and social life that thrived in St. Petersburg, even after Piotr died. His changes on how people conversed and interacted changed the court life’s soundscape not just by having a conversation, but by the shifting landscape that came with it. St. Petersburg’s architecture developed with an active and social court in mind, influencing how public spaces were created, as well as shifting perceptions on the private space.

New Court Life, New Social Spaces, Celebrations and Processions

One of the institutions that evolved starting with Piotr was the procession of feasts and banquets. While Orthodox feasts are typically celebrated and called with a continuous bell ringing, Piotr’s Muscovite court announced feasts quieter than the church. Korb, in his experience dining with Piotr’s court, noted that when the table was being laid for dinner, one

41 Korb, Scenes from the Court of Peter the Great, 84.
42 Ibid.
of the courtiers “cries out in a stentorian voice, ‘the Grand Duke wants to eat!’” Korb appears thrown off that it is not “the flourish of trumpets” that summons the tsar’s guest to the table, but rather a voice. Although Korb does not mention whether it is an Austrian tradition to begin feasts with flourishing trumpets, or whether a call to dinner is a Russian tradition, or if a trumpet call was a Muscovite tradition that Piotr abandoned, his reaction gives us a hint of a contradicted sonic expectation.

Each new tsar’s continuing Westernization was seen in their feasts’ and celebrations’ sound level. Feasts became part of the coronation ceremony, and their procession became just as loud and ornate. In the celebratory banquet for Elizabeth’s coronation, Elizabeth left the cathedral in her full regalia, accompanied by the “thunder of the troops’ guns on the square, the musical sounds of horns and drums, and the tolling of church bells.” However, unlike Piotr’s dinner as described in Korb’s journals, the beginning of Elizabeth’s dinner was silent. First in order was Elizabeth awarding medals to key members of the court and clergy. Once that was done, she “then gave the signal to be seated.”

Thus, Elizabeth’s coronation banquet was both loud and silent. The coronation was loud in that the blast of trumpets, muskets, and bells gave prominence to the celebration and let all of Moscow know that there was a new empress ruling the nation; this was not Sunday brunch, after all. On the other hand, processions could be muffled and quiet. Whereas a voice called in Piotr’s hall to come to the table to eat, Elizabeth’s was marked by fanfare. At the same time, the banquet, aside from small talk and chatter, was a silent affair. Neither a voice nor a trumpet signaled the invited to take a seat, it was Elizabeth’s silent gesture that did so. Moscow was let known that there was a new empress, but only the privileged few could dine with her, and to an extent, hear her voice.
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The sound paradox in Elizabeth’s coronation dinner shows us that power can be represented through noise and silence. There is only so much a person can do to tune out clattering bells, and this serves as a reminder that the tsar rules as autocrat. At the same time, a simple silent gesture is just as telling as a flourishing of trumpets. Power expressed through sound is volatile; it can be loud and silent. When it is expressed loudly, it reminds the public who has power, in this case the tsar. But at the same time, when it is expressed quietly, it demonstrates that the audience is privileged, yet weaker than the tsar.

Catherine II’s coronation banquet was just as bombastic as Elizabeth’s, although the banquet itself differed vastly. Whereas Elizabeth’s banquet was highly ordered and centralized, Catherine’s was not. Granted, the entrance was just as dramatic, but the dinner itself was a “scene of little solemnity,” as the courtiers were “preoccupied with their own repast and conversations” to grant the same air of seriousness that was in Elizabeth’s banquet.48 We can imagine Catherine partaking in conversations herself, as opposed to giving silent signals and gestures as Elizabeth did.

The Romanovs’ numerous palaces in Petersburg and its suburbs grew grander and grander to accommodate the emperors’ increasingly social lifestyle. The Winter Palace, host to today’s Hermitage Museum, reflects the Romanovs’ increasingly social lifestyle as it absorbed the palaces and buildings next to it.49 During Elizabeth’s tenure as tsarina, she asked that a theatre be built in the palace. Once it was completed, Elizabeth was satisfied, for “no other palace in Europe had such a majestic theater.”50 The Winter Palace and other palaces went through numerous renovations to “reflect the grandeur of the Russian court and the increase in social activities.”51

The private space was affected by the burgeoning palaces. The main victim of an active social life were the transplanted boyars from Moscow. They found that their residences were next to the ever-growing palaces,

48 Wortman, Scenarios of Power, 118.
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51 Idem, 24.
a spatial organization that was not found in Moscow. Not only did the boyars find themselves hosting larger social gatherings than they were accustomed to in Moscow, they found themselves having to tolerate the city’s party noise. Even after Peter’s death, it seems that he came back to haunt the city with the All Drunken Synod.

Celebrations and processions were another sign of a uniquely Petrine soundscape. With the capital moving to St. Petersburg, coronations became a complicated matter. The site of coronation remained in Moscow, where celebrations were marked by various sounds. However, the new tsar’s return to the western capital was also an occasion for celebration, though the march back to St. Petersburg was more glamorous than the coronation ceremonies at Moscow.

Fireworks and musket shots were a common instrument to let the surrounding area take note that celebrations are in order. John Bell writes in *A Journey from St Petersburg to Pekin, 1719-22*, that in his return to Moscow he found that “preparations were making for grand fire-works” to mark Russia’s peace with China. Fireworks were used in Elizabeth’s return to St. Petersburg as she marched down Nevsky Prospekt, but less as instruments for celebration but more so for signaling others. During the procession, “three rockets were to be fired to signal cannon salutes,” along with musket salutes from soldier. At the end of the procession, there was still a “large volume of gunfire throughout the day” to make sure that the rest of the city was aware of the occasion. Catherine II’s coronation and celebration, although not publicized, let the public celebrate through a firework display over St. Petersburg’s Tsaritsyn Meadow.

Bell ringing played a major part in celebrating a tsar’s coronation, and perhaps was the most effective sound marker in letting the public know that there was a new ruler. Bell ringing in Romanov coronations began with the dynasty’s first tsar, Mikhail Romanov, where the Kremlin’s central
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square was marked with “a baldaquin of wildly ringing bells.”

While bell ringing continued to be a staple in coronations, its Orthodox context peeled away slowly. As the tsars took on more secular imagery in their coronation, the bells became markers of celebration, rather than God providing the Russian people with a new ruler. In her coronation, Elizabeth “removed the crown from the hands of the archbishop and crowned herself,” signifying that she ruled under her own volition, not from the Orthodox Church’s authority.

A Multilingual City

In his travel journal from St. Petersburg to Samarkand, Dobson writes that if a foreigner wants to see the real Russia, they should visit Moscow. He begins his journal stating that while his journey began in St. Petersburg, “I felt that my long journey through Russia was really to begin at Moscow.” He explains to the reader that St. Petersburg is a polyglot city, and “has nothing about it distinctively and exclusively Russian.” Where Moscow is authentically Russian, Petersburg was “made to be something of a sham, to suit the taste and impress the minds of Western Europe.”

While Dobson’s comments on St. Petersburg’s cosmopolitanism is slightly caustic, it is nonetheless, very true. This is not entirely unique to St. Petersburg, however, as Dobson must have been unaware that Moscow has had a tradition of housing foreigners in the city. Piotr was known to venture into Moscow’s German suburbs and one of his confidants was a Scotsman. The Russian court, in fact, spoke in French rather than in Russian until Pushkin’s poetry made the language fashionable.
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It is inevitable for St. Petersburg, excuse the determinism, to have “different speech communities” as it served as one of the empire’s hubs of trade and commerce. St. Petersburg’s main role to the economy was its service as a port city. Its more convenient location, although still prone to winter freezing, made it the empire’s main port, at the expense of Archangelsk. The unknown travel surgeon who wrote A Voyage to St. Petersburg makes a sardonic comment about the English Quay. He quips that “it is a source of pride to a true-born Briton, to know that, even in a foreign land, his countrymen are sufficiently wealthy and important to retain…this noble pile of buildings their residence.” He also comments that most of the elegant and spacious shops and storefronts are “kept by natives of France.”

Perhaps the last significant sound marker for St. Petersburg was the whistle of the train. As mentioned before, St. Petersburg is a port city, with its various canals serving as modes of transport. For a port city, especially with complicated geography, a railroad may disrupt the nautical soundscape. For a continental city that has no other means of travel or access to the sea, such as Moscow, a train’s whistle may serve more as a nuisance rather than a disruption.

The Nicholas Railway Station, finished in 1847, was not the first railroad station to have been built in St. Petersburg. It was, however, “the only one of the railways radiating from St. Petersburg which leads” into eastern Russia. All other railway stations in the city radiated towards the recently annexed territories in western Europe, and the Baltic states, Poland, and Finland. The line came to represent Russia’s nascent and slow industrialization. Vladimir Korolenko notes in his autobiography that, upon arriving in the Nicholas Railway Station he heard the “musical cries of the haulers, the
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factory signals, and the hurried whistling of the steam engines.”

Conclusion: Closing the “Window to the West”

Western St. Petersburg did not end with a whimper, but with a bang. While Romanov Russia may have ended in 1917, Petersburg’s Western soundscape ended in 1881 with the death of Tsar Alexander II. As Alexander II rode through the Neva embankment, members of the terrorist anarchist group Narodnaya Volya, the People’s Will, threw bombs at the tsar’s carriage. The tsar lost both his legs in the explosion and died of blood-loss in the Winter Palace.

Alexander III was reactionary and conservative, much like his predecessors, but was conservative in the Muscovite sense. He abhorred his father’s, reform policies, such as granting slight representation to the Russian people through local councils as well as fairer judicial reforms. These liberal reforms, Alexander III believed, led to his father’s downfall.

In the visual sense, the end of a European Russia is marked with the Church of the Savior on Spilled Blood. The building resembles traditional Orthodox churches, such as St. Basil’s Cathedral in Moscow, marking it as an inconsistent blight in St. Petersburg’s Italo-Greek cityscape. But in the audial, it is continued through its bells. Recall Izrailov’s rejected tuned bells for the church in Moscow. His tuned bells, in a slight to Orthodox tradition, were mounted in the Church on Spilled Blood. Is the Church on Spilled Blood a blight in the cityscape, or is it a representation of Petersburg’s mixed soundscape?

St. Petersburg’s unique blend of Russian and Western European soundscape, and the hurried whistling of the steam engines.”

evolved as they took on more European characteristics. Yet they all began in the gates of Moscow.
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