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Letter from the Editor

The Madison Historical Review is pleased to present our readers with this latest edition of original historical scholarship. We are proud that the Madison Historical Review is one of the only scholarly journals run by graduate students with a focus geared toward the publication of Master’s level research. The ensuing articles represent a wide variety of graduate student scholarship, from an analysis of the historiography of a seventeenth century war in New England, an exploration of economic populism in post-Soviet Lithuania, a study of cross cultural interaction between the Moghul and Ottoman empires, a study of race and gender in the Reconstruction era, and including a timely article on the measles vaccination. This year we have two book reviews. One reviewing a book on the Queer movement in Brooklyn, New York and the other a book on how food security played a role in the making of modern India.

On behalf of the entire editorial board, I would like to congratulate Kevin March, winner of the 2020 James Madison Award for Excellence in Historical Scholarship. His article, “The Violences of Place and Pen:” Identities and Language in the Twentieth-Century Historiography of King Philip’s War traces the twentieth-century historiography of King Philip’s War, a destructive eleven-month conflict between New Englanders and a loose alliance of Southern Algonquians led by the Wampanoag sachem known as Philip or “King” Philip. Of these historiographic debates concerned the relationship between categories of identity, wartime alliances, and intercultural encounters. The second historiographical debate concerns the most suitable name for the war. March’s work is an excellent example of graduate student research and writing skills.
I would also like to thank our editorial board; without their hard work, the publication of this journal would not be possible. Members of the editorial board review all submitted articles and copy edit the papers chosen for publication. Thank you to Sam Constantine, Ali Kolleda, Nick Strasser, and Laura Butler. Furthermore, the addition of Jamie Bone as Associate Editor provided some much needed respite during the process, and for that I am forever grateful. Additionally, I would like to thank Rebecca Kruse for her technical support and expertise in operating the journal’s Scholarly Commons website. All of us at the Madison Historical Review are especially indebted to our faculty advisor, Dr. Colleen Moore, for her guidance and support in the publication of this issue.

Support for this publication comes from the James Madison University College of Arts and Letters and The Graduate Program in History at James Madison University. A special thanks to Dr. Robert Aguirre, Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, for his continued support for the Madison Historical Review.

Lara Ressler Horst, Executive Editor
In 1997, Colin Calloway observed that King Philip’s War (1675-78) “remains the great watershed” in the historical trajectory of seventeenth-century New England. An influential scholar of Colonial and Native America, Calloway added that, much like “the Civil War in United States history,” the English and Native inhabitants of the colonial northeast found it “difficult to escape the shadow” of King Philip’s War. Its enduring violences and historical legacy still haunt the northeast and influenced the state and federal “Indian policy” in the United States through the Second World War.¹ Calloway’s remarks are more than two


Calloway is currently the John Kimball, Jr. 1943 Professor of History and Professor of Native American Studies at Dartmouth College.

“Colin Calloway,” Dartmouth College profile, accessed November 27,
decades old, but they remain true and, if anything, have become increasingly relevant in both academia and popular historical consciousness. Since 1997, “the shadow” of the war has attracted attention from historians of Early America, indigenous activists, and even popular writers. Although their work has surely contributed in important ways to how scholars and the public understand the war, it seems impossible to adequately understand and assess it without the context of the twentieth-century historiographic tradition. As our nation nears the 350th anniversary of King Philip’s War, it seems particularly opportune to reexamine two notable ways in which twentieth-century historians explored, challenged, and reimagined this “watershed” moment in colonial New England.

Before exploring two significant debates in the historiography of King Philip’s War, a brief historical overview of the conflict will help orient non-specialist readers. Though military alliances often blur the complexity of individual allegiances, the conflict was fought between two major factions. On one side were the United Colonies of New England, an intercolonial alliance between Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth Colony, Rhode Island, and New Haven. The United Colonies were joined by Christian Indian allies, who were mainly Mohegans and Pequots. The other main faction was led by Metacom, also known as

---

2 Promising work outside of strictly “academic” history includes indigenous language reclamation projects. For example, see Jennifer Weston and Barbara Sorenson, “Awakening a Language on Sleeping Cape Cod,” Cultural Survival Quarterly 35, no. 4 (2011): 6-7.
Philip or “King” Philip. Philip was a sachem, or chief, of the Wampanoags, a Southern Algonquian people whose homelands encompass the southern parts of the modern U.S. states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. His allies included the Nipmucks, Podunks, Narragansetts (who were initially neutral but were attacked by the English in December 1675), and Nashaways. After the death of Philip’s father, the Wampanoag sachem Massasoit in 1661, political and economic tensions arose between the English and Wampanoags. These tensions were exacerbated by colonial expansion and their dispossession of Wampanoag lands in the 1670s.

On January 29, 1675, the situation finally ruptured when the Massachusetts Indian John Sassamon was found dead at Assawampsett Pond in Southeastern Massachusetts.

3 Like many Southern Algonquians, the Wampanoag sachem was known by several names, and his people commonly took new ones to signify new identities. While the sachem referred to himself as “Metacom” as a young man, Jill Lepore makes a convincing argument that he called himself “Philip” after 1660. Beginning in the nineteenth century, some scholars and antiquarians started calling him “Metacom” in their romanticized histories of the war that emphasized his “Indianness.” See Jill Lepore, The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), xxv, 21-26. For clarity’s sake, this article will subsequently refer to him as “Philip.”


5 Assawampsett Pond is in the modern towns of Lakeville and Middleboro, Massachusetts. Gladys de Maranville Vigers, History of
Sassamon was a Christian Indian who had been tutored by Puritan minister John Elliot, spoke fluent English, and had served as a translator for New England soldiers in the Pequot War of 1637. He was widely liked and trusted by English settlers in Plymouth Colony. Just weeks before his death, Sassamon warned Plymouth Governor Josiah Winslow that an attack was being planned by King Philip. Winslow and other English leaders initially believed that he had drowned, but they began to suspect foul play after a coroner’s examination revealed that his neck had been violently broken. On June 6, 1675, the Plymouth court brought three Wampanoag men to trial for the alleged murder of

---

Sassamon. Although the evidence was shaky, a jury of twelve Englishmen and six “of the most indifferentest, gravest, and sage Indians” convicted the three Wampanoag men and executed them on June 8, 1675.7

Though Sassamon’s initial warning that King Philip intended to lead an Indian “rebellion” was probably false, the execution of his alleged murders enraged the Wampanoag sachem and his people. After about three weeks of abortive peace negotiations, Wampanoag warriors under King Philip’s direction attacked Swansea, Massachusetts on June 25, 1675. Historical actors on both sides of the conflict were soon forced to consider the extent to which their ethnic and cultural identities determined their military interests. Although Philip secured alliances with numerous Algonquian tribes across New England, many Christian Indians fought for the English. Yet the latter group was consistently distrusted by colonial leaders. By October 1675, the English had become so paranoid about the alleged “duplicity” of their allies and their intent to “rebell” that they confined them on Deer Island in Boston Harbor. Hundreds of Christian Indians died of starvation in their ten months of confinement, a wartime atrocity that only reinforced that complex identities and allegiances are rarely tolerated in war.8

---

7 Quoted from the Plymouth Colony Records, V:168, in Drake, King Philip’s War, 71; 220-35. The identities of the six Indian jurists are unknown.
8 A detailed account of the starvation of the Christian or “Praying” Indians on Deer Island is in David J. Silverman, Faith and Boundaries: Colonists, Christianity, and Community among the Wampanoag Indians of Martha’s Vineyard, 1600-1871 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 78-119.
A few words must suffice to summarize the course of the fighting. Philip’s Indian alliance achieved significant military success into February 1676, razing dozens of English towns, killing many colonists, and taking hundreds of captives. That month, Philip’s men raided sites within ten miles of Boston, and the Massachusetts Council seriously considered erecting a palisade around the city. Yet the colonists were eventually able to blunt these attacks, and a combination of increasing causalities and inadequate supplies caused several tribes to abandon their alliance with King Philip. The Wampanoags continued to fight until August 12, 1676, when Colonel Benjamin Church’s rangers tracked down and killed Philip. The English decided that his corpse should be treated as that of a “rebel,” and therefore the sachem was beheaded then drawn and quartered. Philip’s severed head was displayed for a generation in Plymouth.

In a mere eleven months, King Philip’s War fundamentally reshaped English and Native lives across New England.

In the conflict’s immediate aftermath, Puritan ministers Increase Mather of Boston’s First Church and William Hubbard of Ipswich wrote the first histories of King Philip’s War. In the fall of 1676, Mather published *A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New-England in Boston*. Months later, Hubbard finished *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New England*. In his preface, the

---

9 This account is synthesized from Mandell, *King Philip’s War*, esp. 90-118; and Lepore, *The Name of War*, xxvii.

Ipswich minister decried his ecclesiastic rival describing the conflict as a “war,” which he believed lent too much dignity to the conflict.11 The conflict’s name was therefore contested just months after its conclusion, and this debate continues to manifest in the historiography in ways that will be discussed in the body of this article.12 Though Mather and Hubbard

11 Increase Mather, A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New-England. From June 24. 1675 (when the first Englishman was Murdered by the Indians) to August 12. 1676. when Philip, alias Metacomet, the principal Author and Beginner of the War was slain. Wherein the Grounds, beginning, and Progress of the War, is summarily expressed (Boston, 1676); online edition, the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln, ed. Paul Royster, accessed November 27, 2019; and William Hubbard, A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England, from the first planting thereof in the year 1607. to this present year 1677. But chiefly the late Troubles in the last two years, 1675. and 1676. To which is added a Discourse about the Warre with the Pequods In the year 1637 (Boston, 1677); online ed., Evans Early American Imprint Collection, University of Michigan. For background on Mather and Hubbard, see Lepore, The Name of War, XVI-II; and Naoki Onshi, “Puritan Historians and Historiography,” The Oxford Handbook of Early American Literature, ed. Kevin J. Hayes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 12-20.

detested each other, their accounts became the *de facto* histories of the war for nearly two centuries. Although a number of historians and antiquarians wrote accounts of King Philip’s War in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, their work was essentially derivative of Mather and Hubbard.¹³

In 1716, Benjamin Church, the leader of the rangers who eventually killed Philip, added a third “canonical” history titled *The Entertaining History of King Philip’s War.*¹⁴ As historians Jill Lepore and later Lisa Brooks have shown, Church’s *Entertaining History* is especially problematic because it became a “conventional” history despite the fact that it was comprised of his memoirs edited

---


¹⁴ Benjamin Church, *The Entertaining History of King Philip’s War, which began in the Month of June 1675. As Also of Expeditions More Lately Made Against the Common Enemy, and Indian Rebels, in the Eastern Parts of New-England* (Boston: B. Greene, 1716; Newport, 1772); online ed., *Evans Early American Imprint Collection*, University of Michigan.
and published (and possibly fabricated) by his son forty years after 1676. Lepore convincingly asserted in a New Yorker article that Church’s “as-told-to, after-the-fact memoir is the single most unreliable account” of King Philip’s War. It is also especially boisterous and offers a narrative that minimizes the role of New England’s Native American allies. Lepore, Brooks, and other historians have shown the limitations of the uncritical use of Entertaining History as a historical document. But the full title of Church’s memoir apparently popularized the appellation “King Philip’s War.” This appellation has since seeped into our national historical consciousness and was left unchallenged by academic historians until the mid-twentieth century.15

Douglas E. Leach can justifiably be said to have inaugurated modern academic scholarship on King Philip’s War in 1958, when he published his seminal book Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip’s War.16 Leach did not significantly challenge the historical narratives (or fully abandon the racist perspectives) of Mather, Hubbard, and Church. However, he reinvigorated scholarly interest in the war and, perhaps less directly, initiated two major historiographic debates that are the subject of this article.

16 Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, especially vii-iii.
The first debate was on the relationship between identity (ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic), wartime alliances, and intercultural encounters. While historians in the mid-twentieth century often portrayed the war as a racial conflict between “white” and “red” men, ethnohistorians and those on the New Left complicated this interpretation in important ways beginning around 1976. Epitomized by James D. Drake’s 1999 book *King Philip’s War: Civil War in New England, 1675-1676*, this historiographic current was complete by the new millennium and remains contested. The second debate was over whether there was a better name for the conflict than “King Philip’s War.” As detailed in the second section of this article, the “names of war” debate started in 1976 and perhaps peaked with Jill Lepore’s 1998 masterpiece *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity*. Lepore explored how literacy empowered English historical actors to inscribe the significance of the conflict and “kill their enemies twice” in the process. Her book was influenced by the “cultural turn” in the humanities and especially by the work of postcolonial historians like Michel Foucault and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. The historiographical debates identified in this article chronologically overlap, often intertwine, and are occasionally inseparable. Yet exploring them separately offers two significant and somewhat discrete historical perspectives on King Philip’s War.

---

I. Blurring The Line Between “Civilized” and “Savage”

If *Flintlock and Tomahawk* is the origin of the modern historiography of King Philip’s War, Leach also initiated the first historiographical debate on the role of ethnic, cultural, and religious identities in shaping wartime alliances and cultural encounters. Raised in Providence, Rhode Island, Douglas Edward Leach (1920-2003) served in the U.S. Navy in World War II and earned his PhD in history from Harvard University in 1952. Advised by the influential historian Samuel Eliot Morrison, an unshakeable Rankean scholar and committed anti-relativist, Leach became interested in cultural “relations and military interactions among colonials, Native Americans, and Britons.”

His PhD dissertation was the basis for *Flintlock and Tomahawk*. After beginning his career with a six-year stint at Bates College, Leach taught for three decades at Vanderbilt University before his death in 2003. Leach generally interpreted the war as one between two factions that fit neatly into the racial and cultural categories of “red” and “white.” While he did sometimes note intertribal and intercolonial factionalism, Leach usually ignored the complexities of these colonial and indigenous identities and

---


did not consider how they were often mutually constituted. After discussing Leach’s most significant contributions to this first historiographic debate, this section will survey how it has been taken up by historians Alden T. Vaughan, Francis Jennings, James Axtell, Philip Ranlet, Richard White, Jill Lepore, and James D. Drake. While this historiographical survey is hardly exhaustive, it does include most of the influential twentieth-century histories of King Philip’s War.

In the opening pages of *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, Leach identifies the contemporary and historical exigencies of his work. He claims that “[l]ittle] has been written about King Philip's War in more than half a century. The subject was one which fascinated earlier generations, but most of the available accounts tend to be uncritical and otherwise limited in scope. None presents a...whole society in travail—the true picture of New England in 1675-1676.” This assessment is likely true, given that most older histories were antiquarian reprints of the three “canonical” narratives written by Mather, Hubbard, and Church. Writing in the 1950s, Leach probably also believed that postwar liberation movements lent new relevance to King Philip’s War, though not in a progressive sense. His book’s preface, which Morrison wrote, claims that given “our recent experiences of warfare, and of the many instances today of backward peoples getting enlarged notions of nationalism and turning ferociously on Europeans who have attempted to civilize them, this early conflict of the same nature cannot help but be of interest.”

---

21 See Note #9.
22 Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, ix.
For Leach and his old advisor, King Philip’s War was essentially a violent, but short, interruption in the progressive march from Indian “savagery” to white “civilization.”

Leach made impressive use of the archive to detail intercolonial factionalism and especially the dynamic English-Native military alliances. However, he was fundamentally unable to escape the ethnocentric argument that conflict between “civilized” and “savage” societies was inevitable. Leach claimed that “when the first English settlers landed on New England shores and built permanent homes there, King Philip’s War became virtually inevitable...[Two] incompatible ways of life confronted each other, and one of the two would have to prevail.” His interpretation echoed Morrison, who claimed that “behind King Philip’s War was the clash of a relatively advanced race with savages, an occurrence not uncommon in history.”

This assumption had implications for his treatments of intercultural encounters, including English-Native alliances and the universal practice of captive-taking. Tellingly, Leach titled his chapter that contained his most comprehensive discussion of alliances “The Problem of the ‘Friendly Indians.’”

Failing to separate his perspective from those of the colonial leaders, he sought to answer slanted questions like “How far could these outwardly loyal natives be trusted?” and “Was their Christianity stronger than their savage instincts and kinship with the enemy?” His treatment of wartime captives followed similar lines, and he wrote in

23 Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, ix.
glowing terms about the missionaries and the allegedly innate “savagery” of allied Christian or “Praying” Indians.\textsuperscript{25}

Alden T. Vaughan (1929—) made the next major contribution to the historiography of intercultural relations during King Philip’s War. After earning his PhD in history at Columbia University in 1964, Vaughan taught for three decades at the same institution before concluding his career at Clark University in 2004.\textsuperscript{26} His dissertation informed his first influential first book, which was titled \textit{The New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians 1620-1675} and was published in 1965.\textsuperscript{27} In \textit{The New England Frontier}, Vaughan focused extensively on the factors that caused King Philip’s War, including the deterioration of intercultural relations in New England. His arguments both contested and reinforced Leach’s conclusions. Vaughan’s entire argument rested on his unshakable conviction that the “Puritans followed a remarkably humane, considerate, and just policy in their dealings with the Indians…who were less powerful, less civilized, less sophisticated, and—in the eyes of the New England colonists—less godly.”\textsuperscript{28} Where Leach held English colonists somewhat culpable for atrocities like Deer Island, the Puritans did virtually no wrong from the perspective of Vaughan. This divergence also had implications for their

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{25} Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 242-44.
\textsuperscript{26} Alden T. Vaughan, “New England Puritans and the American Indian, 1620-1675” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1964); and “Alden T. Vaughan, PhD,” History Department Website, Clark University accessed online Nov. 30, 2019: http://www2.clarku.edu/faculty/facultybio.cfm?id=512
\textsuperscript{28} Vaughan, \textit{New England Frontier}, vii.
\end{flushleft}
assessments of who started King Philip’s War. Leach argued that the Wampanoag’s alleged inability to conceive of private land ownership had sparked conflict, but Vaughan directly blamed the violence on Philip’s aggression and the fact that he was not a Praying Indian.29

Yet Vaughan’s conclusions also echoed Leach’s in important ways. Like his predecessor, he drew a fundamental dichotomy between “civilized” and “savage” actors in King Philip’s War. Vaughan contended that “the challenge of the Puritan…was not to exterminate, enslave, or ignore the native, but to convert, civilize, and educate him…”30 From a modern perspective, this claim is dated and seems to have little historical value. It also represents an important contribution to the historiographic debate in that it begins to untether cultural notions of “civilized” and “savage” from the racial categories of “white” and “red.” Vaughan claimed that “New England natives based their loyalties on criteria other than racial affinity.” He likewise insisted that it “was the historian, not the Puritan or the aborigine, who insisted on making racial division the focal point of Puritan-Indian relations in New England,” which contradicts Leach and especially Elliot.31 In Vaughan’s treatment of the Praying Indians, he makes it clear that they could become “civilized” through Christianization. Diverging markedly from both three “canonical” narratives and Leach’s Flintlock and Tomahawk, Vaughan contended that cultural and religious identities were somewhat mutable and distinct from race in King Philip’s War.

29 Vaughan, New England Frontier, 310.
30 Vaughan, New England Frontier, viii.
31 Vaughan, New England Frontier, 63.
From 1976 to 1991, at least three historians directly challenged the whiggish mid-century histories of King Philip’s War. While Francis Jennings (1918–2000), James Axtell (1941–), and Richard White (1947–) never wrote full accounts of the war, their work left an indelible mark on the fields of Colonial America and Native American Studies and undoubtedly influenced the historiography of the war. Raised in rural Pennsylvania, Jennings was a secondary school history teacher before earning his PhD at the University of Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{32} In 1976, his book \textit{The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest} shifted the terms of historiographical debate in its attempt to depict how seventeenth-century colonialism was experienced by Indians in northeastern America. Jennings asserted that, from an indigenous perspective, the “colonial period of United States history…is the period of invasion of Indian society by Europeans.”\textsuperscript{33} \textit{The Invasion of America} traced the evolution of English (and especially Puritan) ideologies, which justified their colonialization and conquest of Native Americans. Summarizing the historiographical impact of Jennings’s book, one reviewer described it as “a powerful assault on the racist mythology that has so long obscured an honest view of Indian-European relations in early America.”\textsuperscript{34} In attempting to uncover indigenous perspectives on the war, Jennings distinguished himself from

\textsuperscript{33} Jennings, \textit{The Invasion of America}, x.
Leach and Vaughan, who both claimed (with some remorse) that the absence of written records made this task impossible.35

Axtell and White made pivotal contributions to the historiography that blurred cultural and racial identities in Colonial America. While Jennings was the first major scholar to be categorically critical of the Puritans, *The Invasion of America* did not subvert the historiographic dichotomy that theorized fundamentally distinct “European” and “Indian” cultural identities in the way that Axtell would almost a decade later.36 A native of Upstate New York, Axtell earned his history PhD from Cambridge University in 1967. He spent the majority of his career at William & Mary, where his 1985 book *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* established him as one the leading Early Americanists.37 Although King Philip’s War was not the focus of Axtell’s book, he influenced the historiographical debate on identity, allegiance, and encounter by further unsettling the rigid ethnic, cultural, and especially religious identity categories codified by Leach, Vaughan, and, somewhat ironically, Jennings. Axtell was fascinated by so-called “White Indians,” English and French colonists who were taken captive and chose to “go native.” His book also offered a far more critical view of colonial

36 To his credit, Jennings also made this shift in his later work.
missionaries, whom he saw as colonial agents who intended to oversee a total cultural and spiritual transformation of “savage” Native Americans into “civilized” peoples whose identities mirrored those of English and French colonists. Axtell termed this wholesale missionary transformation project “an invasion within,” which became his title.\(^{38}\) He also made full use of ethnohistorical methods and incorporated New France (the modern Canadian province of Québec) as a “third society” in the historical narrative of Colonial America.

In 1991, White’s book *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* created a third seismic shift that would influence future histories of King Philip’s War. After completing his undergraduate education at the University of California, Santa Cruz, White (1947—) earned his history PhD from the University of Washington in 1975.\(^{39}\) White’s book begins with a significant historiographical observation:

> The history of Indian-white relations has not usually produced complex stories. Indians are the rock, European peoples are the sea, and history seems a constant storm. There have been but two outcomes: The sea wears down and dissolves the rock; or the sea erodes the rock but cannot finally absorb its battered remnant, which endures. The first outcome produces

---


stories of conquest and assimilation; the second produces stories of cultural persistence. The tellers of such stories do not lie. Some Indian groups did disappear; others did persist. But the tellers of such stories miss a larger process and a larger truth. The meeting of sea and continent, like the meeting of whites and Indians, creates as well as destroys. Contact was not a battle of primal forces in which only one could survive. Something new could appear.\(^{40}\)

To address this historiographic shortfall, White posited the existence of a “middle ground” which was “the place in between: in between cultures, peoples, and in between empires and the nonstate world of villages. It is a place where many of the North American subjects and allies of empires lived. It is the area between the historical foreground of European invasion and occupation and the background of Indian defeat and retreat.”\(^{41}\) The “middle ground” was sustained when Natives and colonists tried to establish intercultural relationships through appeals “to what they perceive[d] to be the values and practices of…[the] others.” Colonists and Indians frequently misinterpreted each other’s cultural values, and their “creative misunderstandings” birthed “new meanings and through them new practices—the shared meanings and practices of the middle ground.”\(^{42}\) Despite White’s explicit claim that the “middle ground” was

---


\(^{41}\) White, *The Middle Ground*, xxvi.

\(^{42}\) White, *The Middle Ground*, xxvi.
a phenomenon limited to the eighteenth-century Great Lakes Region, the idea was widely (and sometimes fallaciously) used to characterize Euro-Native intercultural relations in numerous contexts, including King Philip’s War. It would foreground the future contributions to the historiographical debate on the complex relationships between identities and alliances.

In 1990, Russell Bourne (1929-2019) wrote his impactful book *The Red King’s Rebellion: Racial Politics in New England, 1675-1678*. Although Bourne was not an academic historian, he was a writer and editor for *TIME* Magazine, ran several publishing departments, and eventually wrote three history books and a poetry collection. However, under the informal tutelage of Neal Salisbury, an accomplished scholar of Colonial and Native New England, he was able to write a book that influenced the historiographical debate on the connections between categories of identity and wartime alliances in King Philip’s War. Perhaps Bourne’s most important claim was that there were numerous commonalities between the two sides before and during the war, “most obvious of all…[was] that across all New England the settler and native societies were blundering through a political experience [where]…the great diplomats of the first two generations of red-white contact

---


were succeeded by a new generation of less accommodating, more bitter personages.”  45 To Bourne the “bitter” generation included King Philip and Josiah Winslow, the Plymouth Governor who had presided over the court that had convicted and executed three Wampanoags for the alleged murder of John Sassamon in June 1675. As discussed in Section II, Bourne’s argument can be seen as an attempt to chart a “middle course” between progressive and conservative accounts of the conflict, but it seems to contradict the historical record in significant ways.

In the late 1990s, Jill Lepore (1966—) and James D. Drake (Unknown—) added new dimensions to the historiographical debates on cultural identity and cultural encounter in King Philip’s War. A native of Central Massachusetts, Lepore earned her PhD from Yale University in 1995. Now at Harvard University, she has since risen to the highest ranks of American historians and is one of few scholars with a “public persona.”  46 While Lepore’s 1998 book *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* is featured more significantly in the second historiographical debate about the names of war, she also comments about the relationship between wartime identities, alliances, and intercultural encounters. Writing at the height of the “cultural turn,” Lepore emphasizes how language fundamentally constructed both colonial and indigenous ethnic, cultural, and religious identities. She starts with an observation from the historian Stephen

---

Greenblatt, who claimed that language is “one of the crucial ways of distinguishing between men and beasts.”\textsuperscript{47} Building on this assertion, Lepore contends that through describing Indian as others, “the language of cruelty and savagery was the vocabulary Puritans adapted...[as they] attempted to carve out for themselves a narrow path of virtue, piety, and mercy.”\textsuperscript{48} This observation invites her readers to critically interrogate the “English” and “Indian” identities that had been presupposed by earlier scholars, particularly Morrison, Leach, and Vaughan.

Drake took a less linguistic approach to the war. Raised in Colorado, he received his PhD from UCLA and has since taught at the Metropolitan University of Denver.\textsuperscript{49} Rather than assuming that the cultural dichotomy had caused the war, Drake argued in his book \textit{King Philip’s War: Civil War in New England} that starker differences were created through the conflict. Before June 1675, he contended “that the natives and the colonists of New England had enough in common to form their own unique society. Fought among various groups of these Indians and the English, King Philip’s War was a civil war that destroyed that incarnation

\begin{flushright}
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of New England.”50 This observation almost completely blurs the identity categories of “English” and “Indian.” Drake adds further that “Both Native American and English groups found enough commonality between their cultures to allow for…political linkages, [which,] combined with a shared economy, legal system, and social space, constituted the metaphorical electrons in the covalent society formed by bonds [between]… groups of Indians and the various English colonies in New England.”51 Adopting the ethnographic perspectives of Axtell and White, Drake claimed that King Philip’s War “is ultimately interested in the intersections among these groups: the sites where they encounter and challenge each other, responding dialectically to each other’s heritage practices.”52

Over the course of about forty years, the historiographic debate on the relationship between identity (broadly construed) and wartime alliances has become increasingly nuanced. It started in 1958 with the static identity categories and neatly constituted “white” and “red” sides in Douglas Leach’s *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, which echoed the staunchly anti-relativist views of his doctoral advisor, Samuel Eliot Morrison. Alden Vaughan made minor inroads in complicating Leach’s neat dichotomies, but his love for the Puritans as “civilizers” probably made significant reassessments difficult for him. Yet over the next twenty-five years, increasingly ethnographic and anti-colonial sentiments within the profession created opportunities for significant reassessments of identity and

50 Drake, *King Philip’s War*, 2.
allegiance in the war. Francis Jennings, James Axtell, and Richard White all advanced frameworks that would allow future historians to complicate the relationship between identities and allegiances, and eventually do poststructuralist analyses that interrogated them as categories. James D. Drake’s *King Philip’s War* epitomized the first approach, while Jill Lepore’s *The Name of War* exemplified the latter treatment. Having traced the historiographical debate on wartime identities and alliances, the next section turns to the second debate, which is over the most suitable appellation for King Philip’s War.

II. The Names of King Philip’s War

The second major historiographical debate concerns the most appropriate name for King Philip’s War. As mentioned in the introduction, Benjamin Church was probably the first to label the eleven-month conflict “King Philip’s War” in his fraught 1716 narrative *The Entertaining History of King Philip’s War*. Since most arguments for retaining this appellation are compelling, this article will continue to refer to the conflict as King Philip’s War. The first section of this article describes how Douglas E. Leach’s 1958 book *Flintlock and Tomahawk* reignedited academic interest in the war and initiated a historiographical debate over identity categories and intercultural encounters in seventeenth-century New England.

But while Leach can be justifiably called the “father” of modern historiography of King Philip’s War, in *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, he never critically considers whether the conflict was appropriately named. Similarly, Alden T. Vaughan’s 1965 book *New England Frontier* does not reflect
on the suitability of the war’s name. Given that both books were written in an era when conservativism dominated the field of American history, their silence on this matter is unsurprising. The historiographical debate on the best name for the war began in the turbulent 1970s.

In 1976, Francis Jennings proposed the first new name for the war in his book, *The Invasion of America*. Presenting the conflict as a case study in which the Puritans manifested their colonialist ideologies, he claimed that the conflict “has been misnamed King Philip’s War; it was, in fact, the Second Puritan Conquest.” Significantly, Jennings both rejected the argument that racial tensions played a central role in instigating conflict and, to a lesser extent, recognized the power of language in constituting meaning. He contended:

> that the standard way to characterize this event has been to call it a racial showdown. This…is wrong. Far from having any unity of contestants…[the war] became a congeries of conflicts of which the resistance led by Wampanoag sachem Philip was only one. Different Europeans pursued different interests and fought different conflicts, and so did different Indians. The contestants themselves showed scant evidence of racial objectives as such. Such views were imposed on the phenomena later.”

James Axtell and Richard White would drive academic cognizance of more nuanced identities and motives for
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53 Jennings, *The Invasion of America*, 298.
54 Jennings, *The Invasion of America*, 298.
Native Americans, which further contributed to identity categories in King Philip’s War.\textsuperscript{55} After complicating the assumption that racial identities dictated wartime interests and allegiances, Jennings elaborated on the question of language that would intrigue historians in the 1990s.

Jennings directly challenged Leach’s conclusion that a “few, intelligent men who lived through King Philip’s War, and who later pondered its causes, its development, its outcome, and its effects, sensed a historical significance of that great conflict. They realized that the two races had fought a war of extermination.”\textsuperscript{56} On the contrary, he observes that Massachusetts Puritans had frequent squabbles with colonists from Martha’s Vineyard, Connecticut, and New York. Jennings defined a new historical legacy for Puritan leaders, claiming that the “the few intelligent racists’ problem was to put a good face on a war of intended conquest by the Puritans that was met with desperate resistance by the Indians…Puritans had long known the power of propaganda presented as history. In their scheme of predestination, invention was the mother of necessity.”\textsuperscript{57} As suggested here, Jennings contends that Puritan histories were colored in deliberate ways by their colonialist ideologies, since through the written record, colonial leaders sought to solidify racial distinctions and present the conflict

\textsuperscript{55} For example, see Axtell, The Invasion Within, xi; and White, The Middle Ground, 1-49.
\textsuperscript{56} Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 94, 123, 137-138, 169, 184-187; and Jennings, The Invasion of America, 298. In a historiographic footnote, Jennings comments “It will become evident that I owe a debt to Leach’s scholarship, though I differ sharply from him in interpretation.” See The Invasion of America, 298 n.1.
\textsuperscript{57} Jennings, The Invasion of America, 298.
as a defensive and unavoidable war against the “savages.” While his work would draw conservative backlash, he made the first substantial contribution to the historiographic debate on the best name for King Philip’s War.

In 1988, Philip Ranlet (1953—) challenged Jennings’s choice to rename the war “The Second Puritan Conquest.” A historian interested in Loyalists in the American Revolution, Ranlet earned his history PhD from Columbia University in 1983.58 His 1988 article “Another Look at the Causes of King Philip’s War” directly criticizes Jennings as one of the “historians of the New Left who arose to champion Indians” in the late 1960s, and “have since been sympathizing so totally with the natives that they have failed to appreciate the settlers’ experience.”59 He also describes Leach’s Flintlock and Tomahawk as a “a more balanced view” of the war and claims that some of “Vaughan’s conclusions go too far, but his book should nonetheless be the starting point for those pursuing the subject.”60 Returning to his critique of Jennings, Ranlet problematized how historians had tried to rename the conflict. Gary B. Nash called the conflict “Metacom’s War” in Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America, but Ranlet rejects this revisionist name and cites primary evidence that name the Wampanoag sachem as King Philip.61 Ranlet cites the

60 Ranlet, “Another Look,” 79 n.1.
historian Richard Slotkin, who claims that he was given this name before intercultural hostilities began in the 1670s. These observations led the conservative historian to conclude that “Renaming King Philip’s War, then, seems to be of dubious value...[t]here is no reason not to use the [conventional] name.”

Bourne also weighed in on the name debate in his 1990 book *The Red King’s Rebellion*. As indicated in his title, Bourne posited that the war was best characterized as a “rebellion” led by King Philip. This name was apparently not intended to avow the pretensions of colonial officials, who liked to claim that Philip, the Wampanoags, and their Southern Algonquian allies were all English subjects. However, we can determine some of its significance from how he positions himself in the historiography. Bourne criticized conservative historians’ claims that the settlers justly purchased property from their indigenous neighbors. Yet he lashed out at “revisionist” historians like Francis Jennings, whom he described as an agenda-driven, “blame-throwing breed of analysts.” It seems plausible that Bourne chose “Metacom’s Rebellion” because he saw it as a “middle ground” in the historiographic debate in that it both

---


63 Ranlet, “Another Look,” 80 n.3.

64 Curiously, Bourne never explicitly comments on his title. My interpretation here is borrows from that of Jill Lepore. See Lepore, *The Name of War*, xv, 251 n.25.

65 Quoted in Bourne, *The Red King’s Rebellion*, 8. For other critiques of revisionist history, see 6-7, 46, 99 and 111. For pushback against conservative interpretations, see xii-xiv.
underscored indigenous agency while also assigning a degree of blame to King Philip, whose alleged insolence helped destroy the prewar “biracial society [that is] not generally reported in the history books.” Yet in staking a historiographic “middle ground” by calling the conflict a “rebellion,” Bourne makes an implicit historical claim that is not supported by the primary record. There is insubstantial evidence to suggest that Metacom intended to rebel against New England in July 1675.

Jill Lepore’s 1998 book *The Name of War* revitalized the historiographical debate about the most suitable name for the war by emphasizing how language can constitute meaning. Writing at the height of the “cultural turn” in the late 1990s, Lepore described her book in these terms:

“This is a study of war, and of how people write about it. Writing about war can be almost as difficult as waging it and, often enough, is essential to winning it. The words used to describe war have a great deal of work to do: they must communicate war’s intensity, its traumas, fears, and glories; they must make clear who is right and who is wrong, rally support, and recruit allies; and they must document the pain of war, and in so doing, help to alleviate it.”

Perhaps influenced by poststructuralists like Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, Lepore argues in *The Name of War*
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of War that written language had a central role in assigning cultural significance to the conflict, which became the hegemonic historical narratives that were consolidated and amplified in the more than three centuries since 1676. Lepore considered war to be both a “a violent contest for territory, resources, and political allegiances” and “a contest for meaning.”⁶⁹ Although the physical violence is initially overwhelming, war survivors “do not remain at a loss for words for long. Out of the chaos we soon make new meanings of our world, finding words to make reality real again.” In this fundamental way, war “twice cultivates language: it requires justification, it demands description.”⁷⁰ Lepore tried to distance herself from the notion that language constituted the entire human experience, reminding her audience that to “say that war cultivates language is not to ignore what else war does: war kills.”⁷¹ Yet she follows this essential qualifier with a contention that seemingly “doubles down” on her belief that language is constitutive in several essential ways: “the central claim of this book that wounds and words—the injuries and their interpretation—cannot be separated, that acts of war generate acts of narration...[that] are often joined in a common purpose: defining the geographical, political, cultural, and sometimes racial and national boundaries...”⁷² In a summary of her position on language and conflict, Lepore concludes that “[w]aging, writing, and remembering

⁶⁹ Lepore, *The Name of War*, x.
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a war all shape its legacy, all draw boundaries.”

The Name of War had significant ramifications for the historiographical debate on the most suitable name for King Philip’s War. If language had constituted the significant cultural, racial, and national boundaries in the seventeenth century, it can also be said to have insulated them from serious scrutiny by concurrently inscribing the dominant historical memory of the conflict. As the title of her book implies, Lepore justifiably believed that the war’s name was an important site where language played a fundamental role in the construction and preservation of the dominant historical memory of King Philip’s War.

Given that the constitutive power of language was essential to her analysis, Lepore surely felt obligated to offer her own perspective on the historiographical debate about the “correct” name for King Philip’s War. Surveying previous answers to the question of can “what happened in New England in 1675 and 1676 rightly be called King Philip’s War?” Lepore considers the alternatives posited by three historians who have answered in the negative. As discussed above, Jennings renamed it “The Second Puritan Conquest,” Bourne termed it “Metacom’s Rebellion,” and Drake went with “Indian Civil War.”

While each of these names has some merits, Lepore ultimately advocates for the name King Philip’s War. She argues that “The Second

73 Lepore, The Name of War, xi.
74 Lepore, The Name of War, xv, 251 n.25. Though Drake did not publish his book on the war until 1999, he evidently made similar arguments that the conflict is best understood as an “Indian civil war” in his thesis. See James Drake, “Severing the Ties That Bind Them: A Reconceptualization of King Philip’s War” (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1995), 3-11.
Puritan Conquest” implies that the outcome of the war was foreordained, which was fallacious and teleological. Although it was intended to celebrate the historical agency and tribal sovereignty of Native Americans, “Metacom’s Rebellion” implied that the Indians allied with King Philip were rebellious subjects of the British Empire, a pretense that was often adopted by colonial officials. Finally, although it made a well-intentioned attempt to center how indigenous peoples experienced the war, the name “Indian Civil War” is at odds with the primary record, which suggests that most of Philip’s allies understood themselves to be at war against the colonists of New England.\footnote{Lepore, The Name of War, xv, 251 n.25.}

Lepore continues this discussion by assessing the name “King Philip’s War.” Her analysis discussion is worth quoting at length:

“King Philip's War” is not unbiased, but its biases are telling. (And some of its biases are less biased than historians have assumed.) Perhaps it will be best to consider each of the contested terms in “King Philip’s War” in turn. To begin with, calling an Indian leader a “king,” though it eventually became mocking, began as a simple (though inaccurate) translation of sachem. The English called many prominent Indian leaders “kings,” partly in recognition of the sachems’ very real political authority and partly as a result of the colonists’ overestimation of that authority. Most sachemships were hereditary, and English colonists saw them as roughly analogous to European monarchies, however much smaller in scale; “king”
might have seemed a fitting, if not entirely satisfactory, translation of “sachem.” “Philip,” too, was an English creation; it was the name given to Metacom when he and his brother Wamsutta appeared before the Plymouth Court in 1660 as a gesture of friendship and fidelity…

“War” is, of course, the slipperiest, most disputed word in “King Philip’s War,” but the recently proposed alternatives are poor substitutes. “Conquest” implies that the outcome of the hostilities was predetermined, while “rebellion” suggests that Philip was a treasonous subject of King Charles. Neither is quite true (much as the colonists would have liked to believe both). “Indian Civil War” rings false too, although the colonists were quick to call upon Indian allies, the majority on both sides perceived the war as an English-on-Indian conflict. In the end, “war” may be the word that takes the conflict most seriously…

This analysis is the most substantial justification for the name “King Philip’s War.” Lepore observes that while linguistic meanings are almost always contested and unable to encompass the totality of the human experience, some names are more suitable than others. Importantly, she also makes the observation that historians sometimes overanalyze and take umbrage with the conventional names of war, finding presentist significances that betray their own ideological perspectives. In numerous respects, Lepore’s *The Name of War* remains the book on the conflict that has
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become a touchstone for almost all twenty-first century histories of King Philip’s War.

The second historiographical debate over the most suitable name for the violences of 1675-1678 garnered scholarly attention in the twentieth century. As discussed in Section I, Douglas E. Leach reignited academic interest in the war in his 1958 *Flintlock and Tomahawk*. However, he and Alden T. Vaughan tacitly accepted “King Philip’s War,” an appellation first coined in Benjamin Church’s problematic account titled *Entertaining History of King Philip’s War*. In 1975, Francis Jennings inaugurated the historiographical debate in earnest when he described the conflict as “The Second Puritan Conquest,” which was decried as inappropriately biased by conservative historian Philip Ranlet. Russell Bourne tried to chart a “middle ground” between the traditionalists and alleged “revisionists” on the New Left. However, he came to an anachronistic name expressed in the title of his book *The Red King’s Rebellion*. In 1998, Jill Lepore masterfully defended the old name “King Philip’s War,” which reaffirmed its status as the historical discipline’s “conventional” name for the war. Lepore’s nuanced justification for “King Philip’s War” remained the status quo until 2018, when two promising young historians reignited the debate and offered sweeping new interpretations of the war.

*****

Although King Philip’s War has been studied by several talented historians in the current century, in 2018 Lisa Brooks (1971—) and Christine DeLucia (1984—) made seminal contributions to its historiography. While it is too
soon to fully assess how their books will influence future work on the conflict, they have recovered indigenous perspectives on the war in powerful ways. A member of the Missisquoi Abenaki Nation, Brooks earned her history PhD from Cornell University in 2004 and is currently at Amherst College.77 As alluded to in the title of her book *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip’s War*, Brooks retraces the complex lives and identities of two little-known Native Americans—Weetamo, a female Wampanoag leader and James Printer, a Nipmuc scholar at Harvard University.78 Brooks is especially interested in material culture, and she has also visually displayed her research using an interactive website created with Geographic Information System (GIS) Mapping Software.79 She claims that these methodologies allow her to break free from colonial narrative structures that have constrained “authors and historians…within an orderly “chain-of-events” or thesis argument.” Brooks asserts that a “decolonial process might reverse that trend by resisting containment and opening possibilities for Native presence.”80 As historians write new accounts of King Philip’s War, it seems likely that many will at least attempt to use Brook’s decolonial approach.

DeLucia earned her PhD in American Studies from Yale University in 2012. She currently teaches at Williams College in Western Massachusetts. In 2018, DeLucia published *Memory Lands: King Philip’s War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast.* Where Brooks focused on material culture as a means to decolonize histories of the war, DeLucia uncovers Native American voices through methods associated with memory studies. This methodology lets her integrate later sources written by indigenous actors, oral testimonies, and print media into an analysis of the war’s place in our national historical consciousness. With the partial exceptions of James Axtell and Richard White, the twentieth-century historians surveyed in this article relied almost entirely on colonial records and ignored non-written indigenous sources. While the intellectual foundation for decolonial histories was partially created by progressive historians like Francis Jennings and Native American activists like Vine Deloria Jr. in the 1970s, most scholars believed that it was impossible to fully write about the conflict from an indigenous perspective. Brooks and DeLucia discredit this old notion and have likely charted new paths in the historiography of King Philip’s War.

What historiographic debates and methodological approaches will frame future histories of King Philip’s War? While it is impossible to say with certainty, a few debates and approaches look to be increasingly influential. First, it
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seems that the historiographic debate on how ethnic, cultural, and religious identities influenced wartime alliances and intercultural encounters will now be taken up and reconsidered from the perspective of everyday Native Americans, rather than well-known colonial officials or even Native leaders like King Philip. For example, Brook’s two main historical “characters” are the female Wampanoag leader Weetamo and the Nipmuc scholar James Printer. \(^{84}\) Secondly, it seems that language will continue to factor into future work on the war, but not in the fully constitutive sense expressed by Foucault, Spivak, and other postcolonial scholars of the “cultural turn.” Instead, Brooks and DeLucia have urged the study of indigenous languages, the use of oral testimonies as historical evidence, and the use of Native place names in their work to help decolonize their histories. Finally, it seems that both older theoretical frameworks, such as memory studies, and new technologies GIS will be used more widely. Although it ended almost 350 years ago, rarely has there been a more opportune moment for fresh histories of King Philip’s War.
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Economic Populism in Post-Soviet Lithuania

Scott Cichowlas
Wayne State University

The terminus of the Cold War in Eastern Europe is often characterized by the fall of Communism and the rise of capitalist governments. This narrative is only half true when applied to Lithuania. Popular elections did occur peacefully with the transition to multiparty power. Democracy was successfully reintroduced, resulting in a new constitution. With democracy asserting itself, it may seem logical that economic reforms would as well. Despite being nicknamed a Baltic Tiger, due to rapid economic growth, it would not be accurate to describe Lithuania’s post-Soviet government as a capitalist democracy until the 21st century.85 Instead of supporting a privatized government, Lithuania’s first presidential election was used to elect the former Communist Party leader, Algirdas Brazauskas. Anatol Lieven, a journalist in Vilnius during the revolution, wrote about his experience in The Baltic Revolution: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Path to Independence. Lieven argues that Lithuanian independence ended with “disintegration of the Soviet Union – as opposed to the end of Communism.”86

Within two years of declaring independence, the old regime was back in control of parliament and had implemented measures to curb free market policies. The ex-Communists governed Lithuania as the Democratic Labor Party of Lithuania (LDDP) and remain politically influential in 2020. Five of the seven total parliamentary elections in Lithuania resulted in the LDDP coalition obtaining a ruling majority. Lithuania’s political spectrum has continuously swung between the free market-oriented Homeland Union (TS) and the LDDP which supported a interventionist approach to economics. Initially, in 1990, these two factions were united in advocating a full economic and political break from Russia and shift towards a free-market system. The first leader of Lithuania’s multiparty Parliament (Seimas), was Vytautas Landsbergis. Landsbergis was the head of a coalition comprised of ex-Communists, economic conservatives, and religious fundamentalists. Elections in 1992 resulted in an overwhelming loss for Landsbergis’s coalition party, named The Movement (Sąjūdis).

Why did Lithuania reject Sąjūdis in favor of the former Communist Party? Why has Lithuania supported different political ideologies instead of favoring one consistently? To answer these questions, another must first be addressed: what determines Lithuanian political activism? This paper will argue that Lithuanian political activism is the conjunction of three main factors: economic pragmatism, populist candidates, and a lack of strong ideological affiliation. These motivations were significant contributors to independence and continue to determine political and economic outcomes in Lithuania.
Moving Toward Democratic Elections

After losing independence in 1940, the former Republic of Lithuania was governed by a single political party. This was the Communist Party of Lithuania (LKP), a puppet party of the Soviet Union. Because the party had such strong ties to Moscow, Lithuanian concerns came second to those of the Soviets. As long as the Soviet state remained strong, so did the LKP’s authority in Lithuania. Despite Moscow’s efforts to maintain stability and order, the Soviet state did not remain strong. Growing dissatisfaction with economic and political realities led to a rejection of the one-party system by 1988. As a result, Soviet leaders were not seen as truly representative of the people they governed. The LKP responded to unrest by assigning the position of First Secretary to Algirdas Brazauskas, who advocated for reform. Despite this, political ambivalence and repression of the local will culminated in one of the largest demonstrations in human history, known as the Baltic Way. The protest was largely inspired by the 50-year anniversary of and opposition to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which illegally placed the Baltics under Soviet control in 1940. Shortly before the protests, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was revealed to be an illegitimate partition of territory, contributing to erosion of support for the Communist regime.
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88 The Baltic Way, also referred to as ‘Arms Across the Baltic’ or the ‘Singing Revolution,’ was a mass demonstration that took place in 1989 across Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia simultaneously. Over two million Balts participated in this peaceful protest, with the greatest number of participants in Lithuania.
Rejection of the LKP in 1989 increased populist sentiment in Lithuania against the Soviet Union. Responding to public discontent, The Academy of Sciences in Lithuania formed a commission to propose changes to the constitution. This led to a public meeting on June 3, 1988, at the Academy in Vilnius. At this public meeting, the institution’s proposals were drowned out by dozens of independently-minded faculty. Instead of reforming the current system, political autonomy was demanded. These activists at the Academy in Vilnius called themselves the Initiative Group, later known as the Movement (Sąjūdis). Many future politicians were present, politically united under Lithuania’s fist coalition party. Sąjūdis contained staunch Communists and free market conservatives and tended towards populism rather than anti-Communism.

Vytautas Landsbergis was among the professors who raised the initial call for non-Communist parties. His knowledge and use of ethnic poetry and literature inspired nationalist sentiments. Landsbergis was a cultural expert who used religious overtones to make profound and impactful speeches. As a musicologist, Landsbergis was perceived as detached from the Soviet bureaucracy, granting him credibility when speaking about Lithuanian autonomy. Having social ties in Kaunas and Vilnius, the largest centers of population, helped Landsbergis assume a prominent position within the Sąjūdis. Economic ruin may have brought crowds together, but leaders such as Landsbergis were capable of transforming them into an institutional force.

Sąjūdis organized a large rally to discuss proposing a mandate on June 24, 1988. Speakers at the event included the leadership of the future conservative party and socialist parties. Public activism for these events is reported on the Global Nonviolent Action Database page about the Lithuanians Campaign for National Independence 1988-1991 and states that “20,000 people attended the second demonstration where they heard speeches by Vytautas Landsbergis (who would later become the leader of Sąjūdis) and Algirdas Brazauskas (a Communist Party leader).”

Brazauskas, speaking on behalf of Sąjūdis was a red herring, he would later run against the party and its free market agenda. In the initial stages of the revolution, conservatives and ex-Communists showed more willingness to forge a mutually beneficial path of compromise. The willingness to work together as a revolutionary coalition quickly became strained. Revolutionaries would later become rivals, splintering the country’s political spectrum.

Sąjūdis in 1988 was more moderate and populist than it would be during the post-Soviet era. The ideological broadness of Sąjūdis constricted with the influx of nationalist members. Kaunas, the second largest city in Lithuania, quickly joined the nationalist discussion. The Kaunas faction brought more adamant calls against Communism and the existing bureaucracy to the Sąjūdis. Membership in Sąjūdis from outside the capital, as Lieven states, led directly to the “gradual takeover and radicalization by representatives from Kaunas.”
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maintain the coalition for independence, Landsbergis, himself originally from Kaunas, rose to represent both factions by 1990. In order to contain the Kaunas nationalists within Sąjūdis, Landsbergis became more extreme in his rhetoric, demanding a complete separation from the Soviet Union. This trend resulted in alienating many of those in Sąjūdis who desired moderation.

The Baltic Way represented the crest of a tidal wave of populist expression. Sąjūdis was highly active in organizing the Baltic Way, collecting signatures and spreading information to the population. Organizing efforts were met with enthusiasm, and as time went on participation in demonstrations increased. The Lithuanian people clearly desired freedom from one-party Soviet rule. Populism was the defining political catalyst for change in 1989, and continues to define Lithuanian politics today. Populism in Lithuania defines populism as a style, not an ideology, meaning populism brought together individuals with differing political principles. The roughly two million participants in the Baltic Way were responding to nationalist sentiment that appealed to capitalists and Communists alike. The Baltic Way demonstration should be historically viewed as an expression against the Soviet concentration of power, not as an anti-socialism movement. Independence was the main political concern of the people, as is evident in this 1991 survey asking: “Do you agree that the Lithuanian state should be an independent, democratic republic?” About 85 percent of eligible voters participated and 90 percent said

---

yes.”93 The level of activism the population showed toward political elections was significantly less. The role of Sąjūdis in the mass demonstrations of 1989 is uncontested, but the transition from protest movement to political party is more muddied. Popular voting for the newly independent parliament barely exceeded 50 percent participation, the minimum by law to count as an election. According to European Parties Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN), after the adoption of the 1992 Constitution came “a general decline in political activity by Lithuanian citizens.”94 Lithuanians were less interested in supporting political parties than gaining autonomy from the Soviet Union.

Nationalist Direction

After losing to Landsbergis for head of state in 1990, Brazauskas changed his stance on Lithuanian independence. According to an article put out by The Telegraph, Brazauskas initially “believed that the old USSR might be reconstituted as a looser federation of independent but still Communist states.”95 Reading into the popular sentiments of the people, Brazauskas continually changed his ideological position to stay politically viable. As the political atmosphere grew more factional, the centrist parties refused the idea of forming a coalition while Brazauskas expressed

a desire for compromise. Reform to introduce independent political parties was something the LKP had recommended under Brazauskas’ leadership. Calls for full independence however, placed Sąjūdis and its leader Landsbergis, in ideological opposition to Brazauskas. By February 1990, the radical wing of Sąjūdis was intensely nationalist, demanded complete independence, and won on it. As Brazauskas took steps toward becoming a populist through promoting minor reform, Landsbergis’ persona became more ideologically hardline. Taking a hard stance brought victory in 1990, but would alienate Sąjūdis from the electorate in the long run.

Urged on by extremists in Sąjūdis, such as the Kaunas faction, Landsbergis’ insistence on immediate independence was less appealing to moderates in his party and Lithuania in general. Natalia Vekteriene resided in Lithuania during the political movement toward independence and she recalls hearing the news about Sąjūdis coming to power: “They would say ‘the new government is coming’ and that’s it, you just accept it. You see, we are not very political people. We, as citizens, just accept a new government. We did not know it was going to bring a new order.” Uncertainty about the new system by people like Vekteriene was shared by members within the Seimas.
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99 Five interviews were conducted by phone with Lithuanians who experienced the post-Soviet transition or grew up in its aftermath. Subjects were selected to allow for a diversity of perspective. Participants vary in age, gender, and socio-economic background. In 2018, Greta Baltrusaityte was a 22-year-old student from Vilnius. She
Within three months of the declaration, Landsbergis was under pressure from his own party to place a moratorium on independence to improve strained Soviet relations. The reluctance to put the good of the economy over nationalist ideology further marginalized Sąjūdis from mainstream sentiments. Momentarily betraying his ideology, Landsbergis did capitulate to popular demands to improve Lithuania’s economic and international standing with the Soviet Union. A June 14, 1990 issue of *The Chicago Tribune* demonstrates the ideological shift by the head of state; “Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis has maintained that everything may be laid on the bargaining table except the declaration of independence. But on Wednesday - Landsbergis told parliament that ‘our side should think it over: how to do some maneuvering without inflicting damage on Lithuania and on the political path chosen by it.’”¹⁰⁰ As negotiations with Russia failed to alleviate
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economic and military threats, Landsbergis abandoned his cautious rhetoric and pivoted toward full independence in December 1990. Sąjūdis, under the leadership of Landsbergis, was ideologically opposed to compromise with the old regime. The rejection of moderate policies led to the party’s victory in 1990 and its loss of public support by 1992.

**Blockade and Occupation**

Military operations by Soviet forces commenced in the capital directly following the reinstatement of independence. Soviet tanks and troops occupied strategic points in the city, killing and wounding civilians. Popular outrage over Soviet atrocities turned into support for the new government. Tomas Vekteris was a student at Vilnius University during the military occupation of the city. He remembers that “at my University there was nobody campaigning, nobody was talking about it. Only after January 13th and 14th everybody started talking that people died and then everybody started expressing their feelings that something is happening and that we have to do something.”101 Another student at the time was Jolanta Baltrusaitiene. Baltrusaitiene joined the demonstrations to preserve the parliament building and recalls that “we were keeping guard by parliament, but only driven by solidarity to indicate that we really support our government and its leaders on their aspirations to resist and dissociate from Russia.”102 Popular support for the reborn republic was out
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of protest to Russian aggression, not ideological agreement with Landsbergis.

The Soviet Union’s blockade of Lithuania’s ports embargoed essential supplies into the country. This blockade was crippling to the burgeoning republic. *Transforming the Lithuanian Economy*, by Valdas Samonis, explains the dependent relationship between the Baltic economy and Soviet imports. Samonis notes that “Lithuanian agriculture was made heavily dependent on cheap mixed fodder, oil, and other inputs imported from Russia and other Soviet republics. The use of local inputs, except heavily underpriced labor, was limited to a minimum”.  

A *New York Times* article from 1990, *Soviets Say Blockade of Lithuania Is Lifted*, gives some sense of the social impact, describing how “hundreds of factories were closed, putting almost 50,000 people out of work.” Economic hardship in the transition towards independence was not only prevalent in the industrial sectors, but in rural areas as well. Jolanta Baltrusaitiene comments on her parents’ predicament outside of the city: “Those who lived in cities – had bigger food or fuel shortage, but since my parents are from the village – deprivation was more related to non-food products and money shortages.” Not only was employment and supply affected by sour relations with Russia, but commodity prices shot up forcing the Lithuanian Supreme
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103 Valdas Samonis, *Transforming the Lithuanian Economy: from Moscow to Vilnius and from Plan to Market* (CASE, 1995).
105 Baltrusaitiene, “Lithuanian Blockade.”
Council to introduce rationing.  These extreme circumstances hindered the ability for the Sąjūdis government to implement privatization of the Lithuanian economy.

**Economic Dreams and Realities**

Popular support for independence was coupled with demands for economic autonomy. Inspiration for free market reforms came from prominent Lithuanian economists who joined Sąjūdis.  By September 1988, Sąjūdis was promoting guidelines for dismantling the Communist system. These capitalist reforms were known as “The Blueprint for Lithuania’s Economic Independence,” or simply the “Blueprint.” The main directive of the Blueprint was to increase living standards by making the economy more efficient. The Blueprint rejected the old regime’s economic model of resource allocation in favor of cost-benefit analysis. To create a decentralized market economy, the Blueprint called for the creation of a National Bank, along with a separate Lithuanian currency. Along with currency reform, state planning and price committees were to be abolished. The Blueprint called for radical and immediate implementation. Valdas Samonis states in *Transforming the Lithuanian Economy*, that “gradual economic reform is inadmissible, one cannot go step-by-step.” Above all, the Blueprint sought to dissociate the
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Lithuanian market from that of the Soviet Union. Samonis claims that before the Blueprint was implemented, “90-95% of the Lithuanian economy was firmly controlled from Moscow.”

Sąjūdis advocated for not only political separation from the Soviets, but economic separation as well. The pace and comprehensiveness of Sąjūdis’ economic reforms matched their extreme stance on independence. Just as the population initially supported Landsbergis’s nationalist extremism, they likewise upheld his economic plans out of protest to Soviet hegemony.

Three months before the Baltic Way demonstrations, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet passed an adulterated version of Sąjūdis’ economic plan. The Communist regime under Brazauskas responded to demands for radical reform, showing a preference for populism over Communist ideology. Despite incorporating reforms from the Blueprint, Brazauskas desired slow and minor economic change. The final version of the law was heavily watered down, avoiding issues like the National Bank and currency. The version of the Blueprint that Brazauskas supported still gave preferential status to Moscow, failing to create a separate Lithuanian market. Lithuania’s natural resources were earmarked for Soviet purposes over national ones. Most significantly, Brazauskas’s path of minor reform helped to preserve the relationship between central economic planning and enterprises.

Far from economic independence or free markets, the Communist form of the Blueprint did not go far enough to win over the populist surge of activism occurring across the country.
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Dissatisfaction with the pace of economic change was a leading factor for Brazauskas’s electoral defeat in 1990.

The promises of higher living standards through privatization won populist support for economic reforms. Once Sąjūdis was put into power, however, the ideology of privatization lacked the mass support it had held in 1990. Jolanta Baltrusaitiene remembers when privatization was introduced: “We were hurt pretty bad economically. I can say that the majority of provincial people who were less economically educated lost their jobs after the privatization. After the collective farms were torn up, they were not satisfied with free Lithuania.”112 Gediminas Cerniauskas published Emerging Market Economy in Lithuania, which tracks Lithuanian economic reformation from controlled economy to a free market. Cerniauskas defines the years 1990-1994 as the “initial transition period for Lithuanian, which – witnessed a 43.86 percent fall in real [Gross Domestic Product] GDP and 318 percent annual inflation.”113 With such an extensive recession, Baltrusaitiene’s testimony is hardly unique to the provincial region. Natalia Vekteriene experienced the initial transition period from the capital: “It was complete turmoil, factories shut down, no one was producing anything because a lot of the factories were making things for the army.”114 This statement is supported by Cerniauskas’s analysis that the free government of Lithuania made the decision to drastically

112 Baltrusaitiene, “Lithuanian Blockade.”
114 Vekteriene, “Lithuanian Revolution.”
reduce production of military goods, negatively impacting GDP. By September 1991, Russia had recognized Lithuania’s independence, but economic conditions were slow to improve in the Baltic state. Instead of ushering in a free market economy, which was an ideological priority for Sąjūdis, the conservative government had initiated price controls and vouchers. Natalia Vekteriene recalls that, “the stores were as empty as before, but now you also have vouchers. Queues and queues of people, everybody would stand in lines, just like before.” Between 1990 and 1992, Lithuania’s real GDP had plummeted nearly 50 percent. Despite Sąjūdis’ long-term policies of privatization and competitive markets for Lithuania, full implementation of a free market was not achieved. Due to the abrupt reforms, coupled with a Russian embargo, Lithuania experienced an economic crisis. On the eve of the 1992 election, public demands to halt reforms intensified. Sąjūdis was unable to achieve its economic goals and was subsequently voted out of power. According to The National Archive for Parliament Election Results for Lithuania, the 1992 elections should be read as the result of “popular anger about the economic crisis, in particular the fuel shortage since Russia, the main supplier, had cut off imports.” The rise of Lithuania’s free market was incomplete after independence, despite the reform party controlling the government from 1990-1992. After taking initial steps to privatize the market, Lithuanians

116 Vekteriene, “Lithuanian Revolution.”
117 Černiauskas and Dobravolskas, “Emerging of Market.”
rejected the conservatives in favor of a more populist economic path.

**Return to the Old Regime**

A moderate stance on breaking from Russia had initially lost Brazauskas his chairmanship of the Seimas, but when parliamentary elections were held in 1992, his party of ex-Communists easily won the first round of voting. Had Lithuania resolutely voted freely and fairly for the old regime? There were many similarities between the Democratic Labor Party of Lithuania (LDDP) and the Communist Party of Lithuania (LKP), suggesting a vote for the LDDP was a vindication of the LKP. Brazauskas was the head of the LKP just prior to its dissolution and resurrection in the form of the LDDP. Both the LKP and LDDP urged maintenance of close international ties with Russia. A policy of gradual independence had been favored by the LKP and LDDP. The LDDP promoted far left socialism, resembling traditional Communist governance instead of free markets and privatization. As president, Brazauskas chose his staff exclusively from the LDDP. Ausra Park wrote *Post-Communist Leadership: A Case Study of Lithuania’s ‘White House’ 1993-2014*, detailing the policies of various post-Soviet administrations. Park remarks that “such an attitude indicated a tendency to avoid openness and keep many matters secret – suggesting that the presidential office under Brazauskas was built on a model reminiscent of the Soviet Politburo.”\(^{119}\) Despite ideological ties to the old regime, the
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LDDP coming to power was less a vindication of Soviet rule and more of a populist backlash to poor economic conditions and Landsbergis’s decreased popularity.

Evidence that Lithuanians were not enthusiastic about a ‘new man’ in government is the election of July 1992, when the first popular vote was definitively in support for the former Communists, and against Landsbergis. Adherence to nationalist rhetoric cost Landsbergis, and his party, the presidency, and parliament. Tomas Vekteris comments that “probably more people voted against Landsbergis than for Brazauskas.” Landsbergis, as Lieven explains in *The Baltic Revolution*, “misjudged the temper of his own people. He failed altogether to appreciate their dour underlying pragmatism.” Insight into the temperament of Lithuanians toward Landsbergis can be found in Tomas Vekteris’s interview; Landsbergis’s message was “to cut off all the ties with Russia, start from zero, destroy everything. No compromise, he wants to limit people’s choices. Even now a simple citizen understands the political life a bit differently, they see it through their own economic status. If it is profitable for you to have business relations with Russia, then they would much rather keep the business going and live well.” Instead of trying to rule with the ex-Communists within a coalition government, Lieven claims that Landsbergis “left the nation more divided than when he
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became its leader.”  

Landsbergis failed to tap into populist sentiments after Lithuanian independence, causing the LDDP to be the more appealing choice in 1992. One factor for the lack of support Landsbergis received, was due to religiously-based nationalism. Notions of divine justice were touted at the expense of economic pragmatism. According to a *Chicago Tribune* issue from September 4th 1990, “eighty percent of Lithuania’s 3.6 million people call themselves Catholics.” Politically, it would seem wise to appeal to religious ideology in such a monotheist nation. Unfortunately for Landsbergis, religion in Lithuania was more divisive than uniting. The decades of anti-religious Communist rule had created suspicion throughout the population with regards to religious expression. Natalia recalls her family’s sentiments toward Catholicism under Soviet governance: “There was no official religion, but my grandma was still going to church. My mom was so embarrassed that her mother was religious, it was embarrassing to face the neighbors but you were also scared to get caught - you were not allowed to talk about it or tell people.” Although most Lithuanians did have some connection to the Catholic faith, it did not translate into political allegiance. Identifying as Catholic should be read in Lithuania’s case, as identifying with tradition as opposed to religious ideology. Landsbergis was more concerned with ideology than political pragmatism, serving to alienate moderates within the population.
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Brazauskas took steps to move Lithuania away from a competitive market economy. Lieven points out that with the ex-Communists in control, Brazauskas reinforced “the growth of unhealthily-close links between ex-Communist business and ex-Communist bureaucracy and government, or ‘crony capitalism.’”¹²⁷ Samonis backs up Lieven’s claim that the Soviet system returned under Brazauskas. He writes that “the new post-Communist government quickly resorted to old bad habits of inflationary wage increases, reversing some of the effects of the earlier income policies.”¹²⁸ The LDDP politicized the economic market. Detrimental to the Sąjūdis’ Blueprint, the LDDP subsidized businesses, enacted protectionist policies on imports, and created a currency board to undermine the National Bank. Samonis points out that these policies served to “unnecessarily politicize the whole process of economic transformation.”¹²⁹ The fiscal interventionism that the ex-Communists enacted should be seen as adhering to populist pressures for economic relief as well as an ideological adherence to a command economy. From 1992, deficit spending increased thanks to the LDDP’s economic policy. As Samonis puts it, depleting the county’s currency reserves was “aimed at propping up consumption levels in the known populist tradition.”¹³⁰ In contrast to the goals of the Blueprint, Lithuania moved toward a corporatist system under Brazauskas.

¹²⁷ Lieven, The Baltic Revolution, 271.
¹²⁸ Samonis, Transforming the Lithuanian Economy, 19.
¹²⁹ Samonis, Transforming the Lithuanian Economy, 19.
¹³⁰ Samonis, Transforming the Lithuanian Economy, 22.
Free Market Government Returns to Power

Public support for Brazauskas and the LDDP waned as the economy continued to falter. LDDP policies negatively impacted Lithuania’s workforce, increasing unemployment rates. By interfering with the National Bank, Brazauskas helped to create a recession by the mid-1990s. As voters were scheduled to return to the poll booths in 1996, Brazauskas’s approval rate sharply declined. According to the Historical Archive of Parliamentary Election Results for Lithuania, in the 1996 Seimas elections: “The economy was at the forefront of campaign debate, as four years earlier when LDDP had won out on the same basis.”131 Sąjūdis had broken apart into differing conservative parties, with the most prominent being the Homeland Union. Landsbergis had formed this second coalition party out of the ashes of his political defeat in 1992. Popular opinion had swung back toward the conservative free marketers as ex-Communists gained a reputation for inhibiting growth. As the Historical Archive notes, the LDDP “was criticized for the country's economic stagnation and had been plagued by financial scandals.”132 Lithuanians were not willing to adhere to the ideology of command economy through thick and thin, and they shifted support to the Homeland Union in 1996. This politically polar switch was due to economic pragmatism. Landsbergis promised Lithuanians prosperity through European Union (EU) membership and increasing ties to the West. Economic pragmatism has been the driving force concerning the transfer of power since independence.
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Ideological attachment to the party was insignificant compared to the promise of prosperity.

The shift from a Soviet model of bureaucracy was accelerated with the ascension of Lithuania’s second president, Valdas Adamkus. During the Brazauskas presidency, reinforcement of the Soviet model of state resulted in a dichotomy between the presidency and the Seimas. Not until the presidential election of 1998, did the Soviet model completely lose out to free market governance. Valdas Adamkus ran as an independent, allowing him to obtain votes from moderates within the socialist LDDP and conservative Homeland Union. Park notes that “the electorate was looking for a high-impact, change-oriented leader.”

By running unaligned, Adamkus was successful in projecting himself as a populist rather than an ideological candidate. Despite running as an independent, Adamkus had strong notions that economic growth would be obtained through membership into the EU. By focusing on economic reforms that conformed with EU guidelines for membership, not only did Adamkus spread a populist message of making things better for everyone, he implemented substantial free market changes to the system. The article *Post-Soviet Transformation of Bureaucracy in Lithuania*, by Saulius Pivoras, discusses the dismantling of the Communist bureaucratic structure. Pivoras comments on the structural change of government after Brazauskas: “The model selected was Weberian, which presupposes a strict division between the spheres of politics and administration. The major motive for selecting this model was the effort to
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abolish the practice of Soviet administration.” The presidential election of 1998 was a rejection of the Soviet system for its poor economic performance. Populist sentiments in Lithuania shifted away from the east-looking LDDP and towards westward-looking Adamkus. Park writes: “Many voters took a favorable view of him and hoped that with his half-century in America, he would bring a fresh, totally non-Soviet approach to government.” Valdas Adamkus had lived in the United States since 1949, easily winning the expatriate vote. His populist message for closer ties to the West convinced domestic Lithuanians that he was truly a vote for change. Populist messaging coupled with economic dissatisfaction once again aroused political activism to reject whatever ideology belonged to the status quo.

**Continuity of Populist Activism and Economic Protest**

Political activism in post-Soviet Lithuania is routinely unleashed by weak economic performance. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union had financially mismanaged its satellites. By the 1970s, Lithuanians were becoming politically active, as shown in the article, *Self-Immolations and National Protest in Lithuania*. Political demonstrations erupted in the late 1980s, but had occurred previously in 1972 when riots in Kaunas broke out. Tomas Remeikis is a researcher whose focus is Lithuanian resistance to Soviet rule. Remeikis claims that “the attack on
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135 Park, “Post-Communist Leadership,” 163.
economic policy indicates that perhaps we are witnessing what has been called ‘a revolution of rising expectations.'” Economic dissatisfaction progressed into political activism by the 1980s. Samonis reiterates this point, claiming “economic sovereignty meant something less than independence in the beginning – during 1988 however, these terms converged.” In the post-Soviet era, economic demonstrations have continued to occur. This tendency to take to the streets over economic dissatisfaction supports the claim that economic performance motivates political activism. In 2009, economic demonstrations in Vilnius turned violent. The New York Times described the scene in the capital; “A group of 7,000 gathered to protest planned economic austerity measures. A small group began throwing eggs and stones through the windows of government buildings until the police moved in, using tear gas and rubber bullets.” Lithuania’s 2009 election appointed an independent economist by popular vote. Again, candidates promising prosperity trumped party allegiances.

Economic conditions in Lithuania have continued to be a point of political contention past the 2009 global recession. In 2018, Lithuania experienced a protest movement focused on economic issues. The ‘I Want To Work Here’ movement was a reaction to the exodus of job-seeking Lithuanians. Poor job opportunities in the country
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inspired protests just a year after the 2017 parliamentary election, showing discontent for the new government’s economic policies. Auguste Cichowlas is a Lithuanian expatriate living in the United States. The recent socialist victory in the Seimas has come as an upset to Cichowlas: “The political perspective that the peasant party holds is not capitalist enough, they focus on agricultural growth and that is not what Lithuania needs at the moment.” Many Lithuanians feel their country needs to take a new political direction based largely on improving the domestic economy. Greta Baltrusaityte resides in Vilnius, and although she did not take part in the recent economic demonstrations she is upset with the country’s ruling socialist party. Greta claims the Peasant and Greens Union “…is a total disaster, they keep doing reforms and they are terribly corrupt.” Dissatisfaction with economic reform and performance remains a poignant factor for supporting the status quo. Economic mismanagement recurrently motivates political activism in Lithuania’s past and present.

Conclusion

The Lithuanian government is not a product of people’s ideological convictions but a result of economic populism. When the economy fails to benefit the lay person, Lithuanians take to the streets and the ballot box. Because of the strong desire for economic pragmatism over ideology, political parties with diverse ideologies have alternated after

139 Auguste Cichowlas, “I Want To Work Here Protests,” interview by Scott Cichowlas, April 5, 2018.
independence. The popular shifts in party support demonstrates a weak affiliation between the people and ideological political platforms. The 1992 backing of the ex-Communist LDDP was a vote for change, not for business as usual. Business as usual is what Lithuania got however, under the Brazauskas presidency. When the LDDP failed to bring economic prosperity, Lithuanians once again supported Landsbergis for his message of change. In 1998, Lithuanians threw their support behind the Western-oriented Valdas Adamkus. Running unaligned, Adamkus benefited from the weak ideological ties Lithuanians have with political parties. Lithuania was admitted into the EU shortly after the turn of the century. Admittance marks the point where Lithuanian government and markets had obtained a level of separation worthy of being called a free market. The traditional narrative of Lithuania as a capitalist Baltic Tiger should be applied to the 21st century as opposed to the years immediately following independence. Populist demands for economic pragmatism over ideology led the country toward a competitive market. Candidates promising superior economic results routinely garner populist support at the ballot. Populism, economic pragmatism, and weak ideological affiliation continues to drive Lithuanian activism. This activism can and has been used to support ex-Communists as well as free market conservatives. As the LDDP and other socialist parties periodically resurge in the ranks of parliament, it would be wise to read such trends as dissatisfaction with the status quo and not be misread as the desire for a return to the former Soviet system.
Books as Objects of Exchange: 
A Study of Cross-Cultural Interaction and Connected Systems between the Mughals and Ottomans
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The study of diplomatic relations between the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals has always been the mainstay of historical research in this region, blanketing the existence of local channels of cross-cultural interactions and acculturation. Scholars like Naimur Rahman Farooqui, Stephen Dale, and Ashraf Razi have underscored the diplomatic connections between the Islamic empires of South Asia and the Middle East and used this to gloss over the cultural dimensions in their interactions.\textsuperscript{141} These empires stretched from the Balkans and North Africa in the West, to the Bay of Bengal in the East. They created an imperial cultural zone with

\textsuperscript{141} ‘The time for the diplomatic ties between the Mughals and the Ottomans ranges from 1556-1748. The year 1556 marks the time when the first official letter was written by the Mughal ruler Humayun to the Ottoman Sultan and the year 1748 is the year when the last Ottoman embassy to the Mughal court left Shahjahanabad.’ Naimur Rahman Farooqi, \textit{A Study of Political and Diplomatic Relations between Mughal India and the Ottoman Empire}, 1556-1748 (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyyat-i Delli, 1989) 1:12-13. Ashraf Razi, ‘Turkey-Pakistan Political Relations,’ \textit{The Eurasia Studies Society Journal} (2013). Stephen Frederic Dale, \textit{The Muslim Empires of the Ottomans, Safavids and Mughals} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
commonalities within the diverse traditions of the broader Islamic world.

The Mughal empire was founded by Zahir-ud-din Muhammad Babur in 1526. Babur was a ruler of the Turkicized Chagatai Khanate (1225-1680) from Central Asia who defeated Ibrahim Lodi, the Sultan of Delhi, in the First Battle of Panipat to establish the Mughal empire. The Safavid dynasty controlled the territory that comprises present-day Iran. It was founded in 1501 and lasted until 1736. The son and successor of Babur, Humayun (r. 1530-1540; 1555-1556) sought refuge in the Safavid court of Shah Tahmasp (r. 1524-1576). The history of the Ottoman principality dates to circa 1300, two hundred years before the Safavid and Mughal empires developed. The Ottoman principality came into existence during the disintegration of the Byzantine or the eastern Roman empire, and scholars often describe the Ottomans as the ‘Romans of the Muslim world.’ The Ottomans outlasted their Safavid and Mughal counterparts and survived beyond the third decade of the eighteenth century essentially intact because they reorganized their military and tax system at the provincial level.

These empires sought legitimacy from pre-Islamic Iranian, Roman, and Turko-Mongolian traditions of kingship and were more concerned with security, longevity, and prosperity than pleasing the religious classes. This at times brought them into conflict with

\[142\] All dates used in this article are Common Era (CE) unless otherwise indicated.

clerics who believed in strict adherence to Islamic law (Shariat) for governance.¹⁴⁴ In Islamic Gunpowder Empires: Ottomans, Mughals and Safavids, Douglas Streusand argues that the ‘empires of the gunpowder era’ shared political, military, and administrative backgrounds. The monarchs of the three empires were successful in establishing more centralized, secure, and enduring polities than their predecessors due to their pragmatic decision making.

The state structures of these empires have been described as ‘gunpowder empires,’ ‘patrimonial-bureaucratic,’ and ‘early modern.’¹⁴⁵ One of the reasons

¹⁴⁵ Stephen P. Blake, ‘The Patrimonial-Bureaucratic Empire of the Mughals,’ The Journal of Asian Studies 39, no.1 (Nov., 1979): 77-80. ‘The concept of the patrimonial-bureaucratic state was given by Stephen Blake for understanding the state structure of the early medieval empire. Blake’s patrimonial-bureaucratic structure is based on Max Weber’s model of the patrimonial state. In this structure, the lords and the princes extend their authority beyond their household to extra household subjects. Thus, the authority is extended from personal affairs to professional affairs.’ Marshall G.S Hodgson, The Venture of Islam, The Gunpowder Empire and Modern Times. Vol. 3 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974). The term ‘gunpowder empires’ was coined by Marshall Hodgson and his University of Chicago colleague William H. McNeill. The concept of gunpowder empire implies a fundamental similarity among the three polities of the Mughal, Ottoman, and Safavids. McNeill argues that such states were able to monopolize firearms and weapons to unite and assert control over larger territories. Gunpowder empire is a convenient classification that facilitates comparison and contrast between these empires, but over a period of time it has been criticized by scholars like Douglas E.
for the dominance of the Ottomans over others in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was the use of firearms, including: artillery for sieges, muskets in the field, and the adoption of tabor jangi (tanks). Babur used Ottoman warfare tactics to defeat Ibrahim Lodhi in the Battle of Panipat in 1526.\(^{146}\) Interestingly, some of his reputed gunners and musketeers, like Mustafa Rumi, were Ottoman Turks.\(^{147}\)

In his text, Streusand vividly explains how military organization, weapons tactics, and prevailing political ideology played a significant role in unifying an empire. Even though these empires shared a common religion and history that traces back to Central Asia, they developed unique solutions to their local spatial concerns. The French physician and traveler Francois Bernier (who came to India to the court of the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb) notices the similarity in the Mughal Jagir and the Ottoman Timar systems. The Timar and Jagir were both forms of salary through land-revenue assignments.\(^{148}\) Secondly, the role of an Ottoman private soldier (sipahi) is comparable to the position of a Mughal military commander (mansabdar).\(^{149}\)

Analysis of the political, economic, and cultural backdrop of the pre-Mongol Islamic world explains the subsequent emergence of the Ottomans, Mughals, and
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Safavids. The founding monarchs of these empires, Osman in Anatolia, Isma’il in early sixteenth-century Iran, and Babur in India, were of Turkish background. Stephen Dale traced the common heritage of these rulers in *The Muslim Empires of the Ottoman, Safavids, and Mughals*, and argues that these monarchs spoke some form of Central Asian Turkish as their native language. Other commonalities included the influence of Sufi saints, particularly the idea of Ibn al Arabi’s *Wahadat-ul-Wujud*, literally meaning the ‘unity of existence’ or ‘unity of being’. Rulers from all three empires patronized not only *madrasas* and *masjids*, but also Sufi shrines. Other commonalities include knowledge of the Persian language and self-portrayal as *Ghazis* (warriors of faith). Nevertheless, the geographical and cultural settings of the empires differed.

In the case of the Indian subcontinent, its isolation from the rest of the world was removed after the establishment of the Sultanate of Delhi in early twelfth century (1206-1526). The sultans of Delhi not only maintained relations with the Caliphal authority in Baghdad and Cairo, but also had linkages Qarachil and Khorasan, located in present day Iran and Afghanistan respectively. The Ottoman influence had preceded the Mughals in India, particularly on the western coast of the subcontinent (Gujarati Sultanate) and the Deccan region (Bahmani Sultanate). Sultan Muhammad Shah Bahman (r. 1463-1482) was the first ruler of the subcontinent to exchange diplomatic missions with the Ottomans, followed by the Muzaffarids of Gujarat. These rulers recognized the Ottoman sultan as ‘Khalifa on the Earth’ (Commander of the Faithful). After the Portuguese
occupation on the west coast of India, the Muzaffarids of Gujarat formed an anti-Portuguese alliance with the help of the Ottoman sultan. The port in Gujarat was not only significant for conducting trade with the west, but was the only port for the pilgrimage to Mecca from the Indian subcontinent. The Portuguese politico-militaristic approach in the Arabian Sea waters disrupted hajj traffic, thereby making the alliance necessary. The partnership between the rulers of Gujarat and Ottoman Turkey was supposed to oust the Portuguese and enhance the diplomatic and cultural relations between the empires.

During the reign of Mughal emperor Humayun, Ottoman Sultan Suleyman ‘The Magnificent’ ordered several naval expeditions to Gujarat to check the Portuguese advancements in the Arabian Sea and on the west coast of India. Admiral Sidi Ali Reis and his army were re-routed and later escaped to Turkey overland. Sidi Ali Reis thereby became the first unofficial Turkish Ambassador to visit the Mughal Empire. In addition to being an admiral, he was also a poet who wrote the treatise Mir’ātū’l-Memālik (Mirror of Kingdoms) and composed Ghazals in the style of Amir Khusrau
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150 Farooqi, A Study of Political and Diplomatic Relations, 144-173.
151 ‘Ghazals are short poems consisting of rhyming couplets called Sher or Bayt. The couplets end with the same rhyming pattern and are expected to have same meter. A ghazals rhyming pattern is described as AA, BA, CA, DA.’ Further references to Persian meter system can be found in Wheeler M. Thackston, A Millennium of Classical Persian Poetry (Bethesda, 1994) and Heinrich Ferdinand Blochmann, Prosody of the Persians according to Saifī, Jami, and Other Writers (Calcutta, 1872).
Dehalvi. He boasted that he never stopped hoping to see Gujarat andOrmuz join the Ottoman realm. His book provides evidence that 200 Ottoman gunners joined Sultan Ahmed of Gujarat to crush the rebellion of Nasir-ul-Mulk. However, after Emperor Akbar’s conquest of Gujarat in 1572, no further negotiations were carried out. On the contrary, Emperor Akbar tacitly accepted the Portuguese presence on the Indian Coast, which in turn highlighted the lack of political pragmatism and diplomatic acumen on the side of the monarch.

The Ottomans were also reputed to be expert gunners and musketeers, employed in the Sultanate of Gujarat. Some famous names include Rumi Khan, Safar Khudawand, and Rajab Khudawand Khan, who held dominant positions and wielded considerable influence in

---

152 Muhammad Wahid Mirza, *The Life and Works of Amir Khusrau* (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press), 1-5; Sunil Sharma, *Amir Khusrau - The Poet of Sultans and Sufis* (Oxford: One World Publication, 2009), 38-39. Amir Khusrau became one of the significant names in the new literary current that came to the forefront during the Delhi Sultanate period (1206-1526). He was a poet, writer, linguist and a devotee of Nizam-ud-din Awliya, who wrote under the patronage of several rulers and nobles. His persona represented a fine mixture of medieval culture. Since Khusrau’s origin was both Turkish and Indian, he bridged the gap between the two cultures and this would be reflected in his writings.


154 Vambery, *The Travels and Adventures of Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali*, 120.

Gujarat. According to the historian Ferishte, Rajab Khan built the castle of Surat, fortifying it in the Turkish architectural fashion. The Mughals did not follow a consistent policy towards the Ottomans and the nature of Mughal-Ottoman interaction varied with each successive monarch. Nonetheless, the interaction between the Mughals and Ottomans was higher during the sixteenth century as compared to later periods. While Humayun was in Tabriz in the first half of the sixteenth century, Jauhar Aftabchi (Humayun’s personal valet) mentions that he sent compliments to the sultan via two Ottoman Turks and used this opportunity to negotiate ties with the Ottomans. The Turkish Archives contains evidence that Mughal emperor Aurangzeb (r. 1658-1707) wrote letters to the Ottoman rulers and inventories indicate that Muhammad Shah (r. 1719-1748) sent gifts.

In addition, Francis Robinson opines in his article ‘Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems’ that connective knowledge systems, as evident in the madrasa curriculum of three empires and production of the manuscripts in religious centers, further explains that traveling religious scholars also played a significant role in the exchange of ideas and texts. The

156 Vambery, The Travels and Adventures of Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali, 125.
need to find a suitable patron and safety from oppression motivated the scholars’ journey. The madrasas in the three empires adopted the same text and sometimes used similar commentaries and annotations. Analyzing the channels these scholars took not only validates study of textual circulation and material exchange, but also provide reasons for the shared spiritual ideas between the empires. Robinson concludes that one of the inferences that emerges by comparing madrasa curriculums from the three empires is the similar element of inspiration drawn from thirteenth and fourteenth century scholarship in Iran and Central Asia. The Sunni Mughal and Ottoman empires drew from similar sources for textual commentary and madrasa curriculum—both were influenced by two great rivals from the court of Timur: Sa’d al-Din Taftāzānī (d. 1389) and Sayyid Sharīf Jurjānī (d. 1413).\textsuperscript{159} By the end of the nineteenth century their influence can be seen in works published in Istanbul, Tehran, Delhi, and Lucknow.\textsuperscript{160} Trade networks from the west coast may have also played a significant role in this process. This suggests that the interaction between the Ottomans and the Mughals was much more than mere diplomatic ties. By far, the Topkapi and Istanbul Museums and archives remain an unexploited source for understanding such cultural encounters.

The availability of Persian manuscripts produced in the Indian subcontinent at the Topkapi Saray Museum, indicate that books made their way into Ottoman Turkey

---

\textsuperscript{159} Robinson, ‘Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals,’ 155; Fleischer, \textit{Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire}, 260.
\textsuperscript{160} Robinson, ‘Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals,’ 155.
through various channels. It is interesting to note that these manuscripts were acquired from the Safavids as war booty and gifts and were not commissioned by the Ottoman Sultan. The presence of Khusrau’s works in the Ottoman realm in large numbers indicates that they were preferred texts deliberately acquired from the Safavids. Because of the geographical location of the Safavid Empire, it formed a vital link in interactions between the Mughals and Ottomans. Any discussion of Mughal-Ottoman cultural connections must include exploration of the role of the Safavids.

**Manuscript Circulation and Reception**

Due to the difficulty in tracing the distribution of manuscripts, the circulation and readership of text has not been adequately explored. The colophon, which is the writer’s imprint and is located at the beginning or end of a text, provides information about the patron, the copyist, and to whom the text was gifted, as well as the region where it was commissioned. As Filiz Çagman points out in his work, tracing the histories of books can be done by examining the impressions from the seals and records of ownership found in the inner lining of texts.\(^{161}\) This section brings to forefront manuscripts produced in the Safavid and Mughal realms that eventually made their way to Ottoman Turkey in the sixteenth century. Collections of manuscripts from the Ottoman Empire and its various imperial libraries survive in three institutions in present-day Istanbul, namely the

Topkapi Palace Museum Library, Istanbul University Library, and Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum. The Persian catalogue of these museums brings to light the works of Amir Khusrau Dehlavi. Khusrau’s work from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries remains one of the best-preserved Persian classics in the imperial Ottoman collection.162 This indicates that among the various Persian texts read and circulated in the literary circles of the Ottomans and Safavids, Khusrau gained a popular place. Scholars have also attested to the popularity of Khusrau in the Timurid and Uzbek realm. In one such instance, Babur notes in his memoirs that the Timurid Prince Hilali (d. 1529-1530) had memorized couplets of both Khusrau and Nizami.163 These books were acquired during several raiding expeditions carried out in the Safavid realm, as well as through trading networks, diplomatic gifts, and war booty. The portability and mobility of books meant that they circulated not only within the spaces of the imperial palace, but also beyond. For example, sultans often brought their favorite books on royal outings to suburban palaces and on military campaigns.164

In many cases, the ruler himself is responsible for the wide circulation of a text. For instance, the Mughal Emperor Jahangir (r. 1605-1627) recorded the events of his twelve regnal years and ordered the folios of the prospective *Jahangirnama* to be bound into a book and circulated.\(^{165}\) In a similar instance during the reign of the third Mughal ruler Akbar (r. 1556-1605), a secret diary criticizing Akbar called the *Muntakhab ut Tawarikh* and written by Abdul Qadir Badayuni, was widely circulated. Between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, rulers of Iran, Turkey, and Mughal India employed many calligraphers, painters, illuminators, and binders to produce sumptuous volumes for their libraries. The commissioning of books that bore royal seals and titles was a sign of status and power. This further encouraged book collection in which the rulers appropriated texts from each other’s library. In fact, maintaining a private library was a favorite avocation of the Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal rulers. The collection of texts in the Topkapi Museum library is attributed to Ottoman-Safavid political relations and the increasing war between the two empires.\(^{166}\)

In the case of the Mughal Empire, all books were manuscripts embellished and decorated by hand and as a result there was a large market for writing and copying texts, a fact observed by a seventeenth century Englishman in Gujarat.\(^{167}\) It is significant that the patronage for a book’s production, including its illustrations, was not just limited to the ruling elites, as the nobility was also involved in the


\(^{166}\) Çağman and Tanindi, ‘Remarks on Some Manuscripts,’ 133.

\(^{167}\) Çağman and Tanindi, ‘Remarks on Some Manuscripts,’ 48.
process. In its early years, the Ottoman court avidly collected Timurid literary works in Chagatai Turkish, as well as in Persian.\footnote{For reference to the Timurids see Stephen Frederic Dale, \textit{Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland}. Vol. 8, \textit{The Legacy of the Timurids} (1998).} In \textit{Translators and Translation}, Gottfried Hagen argues that Timurid literature was translated as quickly as two years after its composition.

In Ottoman Turkey, as in Safavid Iran and Mughal India, the patronage for book production lay with those who were wealthy enough to support the scribes, painters, and calligraphers, such as the sultan and the nobles.\footnote{Norah M. Titley, \textit{Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of India and Turkey} (University of Texas Press, 1984), 133.} The Ottoman Imperial Library has a rich collection of Khusrau’s work, which includes fourteen of the poet’s \textit{Khamsa} (Quintet); eleven of which are full works with the twelfth one bound alongside the \textit{Khamsa} of Nizami.\footnote{Uluc, ‘Comments on the Amir Khusrau Dehlavi’s Work’s,’ 29.} The Topkapi Saray includes illustrated copies of three of Khusrau’s works: \textit{Duwal Rani Khizr Khan}, \textit{Qiran-us Sadayn}, and \textit{Nuh Siphir}.\footnote{Uluc, ‘Comments on the Amir Khusrau Dehlavi’s Work’s,’ 30.} The availability of the works of Khusrau over other authors undoubtedly stresses that it was a deliberate choice.

\textbf{Duwal Rani Khizr Khan}

The following section focuses on the manuscript copies of \textit{Duwal Rani Khizr Khan} from the sixteenth century. The text \textit{Duwal Rani Khizr Khan} is a historical romantic \textit{masnavi} which is based on the love story of Khizr Khan (the heir apparent of Alauddin Khilji) and Duwal Rani.
Various other names have also been assigned to this masnawi including: Ashiqā, Ishqiyah, Manshur-i Shahi, Khazir Khani - Duwal Devi, and Qisa-i-Khazir Khani. In the poem, the son of Alauddin Khilji and heir apparent of the Khilji dynasty falls in love with a Gujarati Princess Duwal Rani (daughter of Rai Karan Vaghela of Gujarat). They marry, but are separated when Khizr Khan falls from favor. Later in the poem, Khizr Khan is incarcerated in the fort of Gwalior and then murdered by his brother along with Duwal Rani. As a historical masnawi, Duwal Rani Khizr Khan provides insight into the life of medieval royalty, court politics, the war of succession, and marriage ceremonies; thereby highlighting different shades of the courtly life of the Sultans of Delhi.

The sudden production and circulation of the text Duwal Rani Khizr Khan in the late fifteenth and early

172 Sharma, Amir Khusraw, 59-60; Michael Boris Bednar, ‘The Content and the form in Amir Khusraw’s Duval Rani Va Khizr Khan,’ Journal of Royal Asiatic Society (September 2013): 27. Masnawi is a narrative poetry which developed in Persia. This style was adopted in Persia in place of panegyric ode or qasidah and it usually dealt with epic and romantic legends from past history, taken up to address issues of concern specifically from authors’ own time. However, Khusrau’s Duwal Rani Khizr Khan is based on events and characters contemporary to his time. The masnawi follows the rhyme scheme of AA/BB/CC/DD.


sixteenth century underlines the popularity of this work at the same time in three empires. The earliest available manuscript, dated 1497, belongs to the library of Hakim-Oghlu Ali Pasha, who was grand vizier under the Ottoman Sultans Mahmud I and Othman III in the early eighteenth century. Other manuscripts include the Aya Sufiyah Library and Punjab University Library manuscripts, transcribed in 1511. According to their colophon, these manuscripts were commissioned in the Indian subcontinent and made their way to the Ottoman realm. The British Museum collection, entitled *Kulliyat-i Khusrau*, is dated 1517 and includes three whole-page miniatures produced in the Safavid realm.\(^{175}\) The Salar Jung manuscript bears the date 1523, and the copy in the National Museum (New Delhi) is dated 1568. The National Museum (India) manuscript is of historical importance because decades after Akbar commissioned this manuscript, the Safavids commissioned the same text in 1584.\(^{176}\) This manuscript bears two whole-page miniatures that are discussed at length in the next section.

As mentioned in the *Indian Collection: Descriptive Catalogue*, the colophon of this manuscript indicates the name of the scribe and the date of commissioning: “The miserable wretch, the sinner, Sultan Bayazid, son of Mir Nizam known as Dawri, dated Muharram 976 (=1568).”\(^{177}\) According to the seals on the book, it was present in the library during the reign of two Moghul emperors, Shah
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176 *Manuscript of Indian Collection Descriptive Catalogue* (New Delhi, 1964), 96.
177 *Manuscript of Indian Collection Descriptive Catalogue*, 96.
Jahan and Aurangzeb. Earlier, it belonged to a prestigious lady of the imperial family, Salima Sultan Begum, who was the granddaughter of Emperor Babur and the wife of Emperor Akbar. Akbar commissioned this text in the early decades of his reign.

The Topkapi Saray manuscript of Duwal Rani Khizr Khan, which includes six illustrations, is dated 1584 and also discussed in the following section. It is same manuscript that was commissioned by the Safavids and was probably gifted to the Ottoman Sultan. Another manuscript dated 1586 and preserved in the Bankipore Collection (Patna, India) is significant because the colophon describes its writing as coming at the insistence of Shihab-ud Din Ahmad Khan (who was the governor of Gujarat during the reign of Akbar) at Ahmadabad. The writer of the manuscript was Husayn bin Alf-al-Husayni. This manuscript was corrected and completed under the supervision of the poet Waqui. Muhammad Sharif Waqui was originally from Nishapur in the Safavid Empire and came to India during the reign of Emperor Akbar. He was in the service of Shihab-ud din Ahmad Khan. This indicates that the Safavid Empire and

178 Stuart Cary Welch, India Art And Culture, 1300-1900 (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985), 141.
179 Maulavi Abdul Muqtadir, Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscript in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore (The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, 1908).
180 M. Athar Ali, The Apparatus of Empire, Awards of Ranks, Offices and Titles to the Mughal Nobility, 1574-1568 (CAS, Aligarh Muslim University, 1985).
181 Athar Ali, The Apparatus of Empire, 114. Although, ‘Shihab-ud Din Ahmad Khan was governor of Allahabad, not Ahmadabad’ this supports the claim that the governors of provinces were patronizing
the Mughal Empire had well established cultural linkages and they both commissioned texts by Khusrau within two years of each other.

Another instance from the Mughal Empire indicates the gifting of texts to slaves. For instance, a rare work on history of Bengal *Bahrstani-Ghai*, which is preserved in a single manuscript in the national library of France, was given by the owner to his manumitted slaves as a parting gift, as evident from its colophon. Analysis highlights that cross-cultural encounters were not limited to actors at the state level. In fact, nobility at the provincial level, religious scholars, and slaves also played an important role in textual circulation and production.

Hatice Aynur points out that in the 1700s and 1800s there were three major literary currents in the Ottoman world: the so-called Indian style (*sebk-i hindî*); that of the poets associated with Nabi; and finally the type of writing favored by authors wishing to bring literary expression closer to contemporary speech. Representatives of the first current include Fehîm-i Kadîm (1627–1648) and Nesâtî; Nabi himself and Rami Mehmed Pasa represent the second current; as to the third current, the most brilliant name is surely Nedîm. The popularity of *sebk-i hindî* (a genre of Persian poetry writing associated with Khusrau) as one of the literary currents in the seventeenth century Ottoman

(manuscript production.

184 Aynur, ‘Ottoman Literature,’ 492.
realm indicate that works of Khusrau were not just collected, but also read. This is further evidenced by the availability of ten manuscripts of the same text being produced in sixteenth century. Similarly, a novelty of the eighteenth century Ottoman literary world was the emergence of biographical collections on dervishes and sheikhs—sometimes discussing them individually and sometimes as part of larger biographical dictionaries also encompassing scholars.\footnote{Aynur, ‘Ottoman Literature,’ 485.} This trend is very similar to the development of a genre of biographical Sufi literature called Tazkirah from the Awadh region in the eighteenth century.

Khusrau initially wrote the text in the reign of Alauddin Khilji sometime around 1315 for his son and heir apparent Khizr Khan. During the reign of Sultan Mubarak Khilji (r. 1316-1320, Successor of Alauddin Khilji) 319 more verses were added.\footnote{Rashid Ahmad Salim (ed.) and intro. by K.A. Nizami, Duwal Rani-Yi Khizr Khan (1988), 36-42.} However, it is intriguing to note that most of the manuscript copies of this masnawi belonged to the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Even though the text was written in the early fourteenth century, it did not initially circulate widely, which is evident from its absence in any of the contemporary or near contemporary writers’ accounts. For instance, early medieval writers of the Delhi Sultanate like Zia-ud-din Barani, Shams-i Siraj Afif, Isami, and Ibn Batuta do not mention the text Duwal Rani Khizr Khan or the events in the text. It was not until the sixteenth century that it became popular and was widely commissioned and circulated in the three empires.
Patronage for book production, calligraphy, illuminations, and illustrations increased during the reign of Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent. His regnal era was considered a golden age of Ottoman culture. The sultan spoke Chagatai Turkish, Arabic, and Persian, and was an accomplished poet. Perhaps, for this reason, poetry was a popular court art that the sultan encouraged and patronized. This further explains the reason for the popularity of Khusrau, even though there is no record of how Khusrau was received by the Ottoman court. Nonetheless, historian Mustafa Ali, who wrote his text *Epic Deeds of Artists* in Baghdad, records the names of artists who migrated from the peripheral areas of the Indian subcontinent to the Turkoman and Safavid realms. Some of the artists recorded in this text include Muhammad Husayn of Kashmir, a scribe by profession under Mir Ali of Herat; Dervish Muhammad of Kashmir, a calligrapher; and Muhammad Qasim Mawlana Munshi, a scribe.\(^{187}\) It seems plausible that some of these artists from the peripheral areas of Hindustan might have made their way to Ottoman Turkey. In fact, as stated in a Turkish manuscript catalogue, one of the artists, Fahr-ad Din Sirazli, immigrated to India and joined Akbar Shah’s palace.\(^{188}\) The Rieu Catalogue states the artist died in


The Turkish manuscript catalogues also bring to light manuscript copies of *Tarikh-i-Akbari* preserved in the Ottoman libraries. The types of materials used for calligraphy and illumination can be seen as examples of cultural connectivity, as with those made of Indian silk paper. This establishes that materials of cultural production were also procured from the Indian subcontinent.

Further research into the realm of material culture will open a whole new world for historical analysis. Research on codicology, materiality, marginalia, and colophons will not only shed light on production, circulation, and reception but highlight the readership, librarianship, and collecting practices in the medieval Islamic empires. The inventory at Topkapi Saray carries the potentiality to make wider contributions in the field of manuscript and catalogue history. In addition, there is potential to explore in greater depth similarities in illustrative traditions. Unlike the Timurid and Turkoman institution of *Kitābkhāna* which was believed to have a combined treasury and library for storing books and a book workshop for copying and producing texts, the Ottoman royal library in the inner treasury was spatially separate from, yet institutionally connected to, the court scriptorium (*nakkāshāne*). The cultural horizon of the Ottoman palace
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1621. The Turkish manuscript catalogues also bring to light manuscript copies of *Tarikh-i-Akbari* preserved in the Ottoman libraries. The types of materials used for calligraphy and illumination can be seen as examples of cultural connectivity, as with those made of Indian silk paper. This establishes that materials of cultural production were also procured from the Indian subcontinent.

Further research into the realm of material culture will open a whole new world for historical analysis. Research on codicology, materiality, marginalia, and colophons will not only shed light on production, circulation, and reception but highlight the readership, librarianship, and collecting practices in the medieval Islamic empires. The inventory at Topkapi Saray carries the potentiality to make wider contributions in the field of manuscript and catalogue history. In addition, there is potential to explore in greater depth similarities in illustrative traditions. Unlike the Timurid and Turkoman institution of *Kitābkhāna* which was believed to have a combined treasury and library for storing books and a book workshop for copying and producing texts, the Ottoman royal library in the inner treasury was spatially separate from, yet institutionally connected to, the court scriptorium (*nakkāshāne*). The cultural horizon of the Ottoman palace
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191 Necipoğlu, *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of Ottoman Palace Library.*
library expanded with textual circulation, movement of scholars, artists, poets, calligraphers and binders from Timurid, Turkoman, and Mamluk realms.

**Description of the Illustrated Manuscripts of *Duwal Rani Khizr Khan* Commissioned Under the Mughals and Safavids**

Safavid Iran saw a strong tradition of painting and book production, which left an imprint on the contemporary empires of the Timurids and Ottomans. Besides the system of patronage and diplomatic exchange, maintaining intellectuals at the court who produced texts and illustrations remained a common feature of the Mughal, Ottoman, and Safavid empires. Safavid Iran set the standard for excellence against which all the works were judged. For instance, Mughal scholars mention works of Safavid artists such as the paintings of Bihzad and the calligraphy of Sultan Ali Mashhadi.¹⁹² Safavid Iran also borrowed illustrations of Mughal and Ottoman dynastic histories.

Following is a list of eight illustrations found in two *Duwal Rani Khizr Khan* manuscripts. The first two illustrations are found in a manuscript commissioned by Mughal Emperor Akbar in 1567.¹⁹³ The last six are from a manuscript commissioned by the Safavid ruler in 1584.¹⁹⁴

---

¹⁹³ Copies are available in the National Museum (L.53.217), New Delhi.
¹⁹⁴ MS, *Topkapi Saray* (TSMK H. 684), Istanbul.
• Fiery Horse Being Brought in Front of Khizr Khan - Court Scene
• Khizr Khan and Duwal Di Enthroned and Honored by Angelic Visitors
• Mi’raj of the Prophet - fol.7v
• The Battle between the Armies of Khizr Khan and Qutlugh Khwaja - fol. 27v
• The Capture of the Castle During the Conquest of India - fol.32r
• Khizr Khan at a Banquet After the Conquest of India - fol.35r
• Khizr Khan and Duwal Rani Make Love - fol.88r
• Khizr Khan Being Entertained - fol.114r

The first two miniature paintings commissioned by Akbar show similarities with the expansive style of Akbar’s Hamza-Namah series. The Hamza-Namah centers on the story of Amir Hamza, an uncle of prophet Muhammad who wanted to convert the world to Islam. The manuscript consisted of fourteen volumes, each with one hundred illustrations of relatively large size (about 27 inches high and 20 inches wide). The Hamza-Namah series does not contain a contemporary colophon or date. The earliest manuscript with such an inscription is the Duwal Rani Khizr Khan manuscript produced in 1568.

Stuart Cary Welch in India Art And Culture, 1300-1900 argues that in both illustrations from the Mughal text, the hero, Khizr Khan, is depicted in Mughal settings,
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195 Milo Cleveland Beach, Themes in Indian History: The New Cambridge History of India: Mughal and Rajput Paintings (Cambridge University Press, March, 2008), 27.
196 Beach, Themes in Indian History, 28.
characterizations are portraitlike, and often verge on caricature.\(^{197}\) The portraits are very similar to those found in *Hamza-Namah*. Both Welch and Bonnie C. Wade include the image ‘Khizr Khan and Duwal Di Enthroned and Honored by Angelic Visitors’ in their books (See Figure 1). Wade describes the illustration as the wedding scene of Duwal Rani and Khizr Khan in her work *Imaging Sound: An Ethnomusicological Study of Music, Art and Culture in Mughal India*.\(^{198}\) This painting shows the couple together and Duwal Rani and other female dancers wearing angel wings. The male musicians in the illustration are playing the *harp* (stringed instrument), *daf* (Persian and Arabic frame drum), and *na’i* (Pan flute).\(^{199}\) The artist’s fairy world is similar to depictions in paintings at the Safavid court. In addition, the illustration draws on symbolism relating to divinity by giving Duwal Rani the wings of an angel. The imagery relating to divinity was a pronounced element in both Mughal and Ottoman paintings. Images were understood to have multi-layered meanings giving the illustrations a power to render tangible vision and create a space for depicting utopia. Symbolism in paintings provided sustenance to the concept of a future utopia that the monarch wished to project.

\(^{197}\) Beach, *Themes in Indian History*, 154.

\(^{198}\) For references to the paintings of Duwal Rani Khizr Khan see Fig. 56, plate xx in Jeremiah Losty, *The Art of the Book in India* (London: The British Library Publishing Division, 1982) and Fig. 92, in Welch, *India Art and Culture, 1300-1900*.

The figures and architectural forms of the two illustrations from the manuscript commissioned by Akbar have Mughal characteristics. The pavilion shows combined Rajasthani and Islamic influence, which was in vogue during the time of Akbar. Both the paintings are in the Bokhara tradition, and the illuminations and margins closely resemble the near-contemporary manuscript *Gulistan*.\(^{200}\) *Gulistan* has a double margin painted exclusively within the separate panel. Usually, there are paintings within the margins as well. The illustrations commissioned by Akbar also bear an ‘unwan,’ which is an illumination that surrounds the text panel in blue or beige with a gold marginal design. These illustrations are significant because while they thematically draw on Safavid influence, the style is Mughal in character, especially the landscape, coloring details, human figures and architecture. For example, in Figure 2, ‘Fiery Horse Being Brought in Front of Khizr Khan - Court Scene,’ the arabesque with one leg extended backwards at a right angle, the torso bent forward, and the arms outstretched with one forward and the other backwards, is associated with the Mughal style. Milo Beach in *Early Mughal Paintings*, mentions that the new Mughal interest in action is apparent in details such as a rearing horse and flowing garments. However, the depictions are less dramatic than those of the *Hamza-Namah*.\(^{201}\) Since these paintings were commissioned in the early years of Akbar’s reign, they appear less intense than others in the *Hamza-Namah* collection.

\(^{200}\) Losty, *The Art of the Book in India*, 86.
\(^{201}\) Beach, *Early Mughal Paintings*, 67-68.
Figure 1: Khizr Khan and Duwal Di Enthroned and Honored by Angelic Visitors. Published in Jeremiah P. Losty, *The Art of the Book in India* (London: The British Library Publishing Division, 1982), Plate XX 56 ff.28b and Stuart Cary Welch, *India Art and Culture (1300-1600)*, 153-154. Manuscript copy in National Museum, New Delhi, India (L 53.217)

Figure 2: Court Scene: Fiery Horse being brought in front of Khizr Khan Published in Milo Cleveland Beach, *Themes in Indian History: The New Cambridge History of India: Mughal and Rajput Paintings*, Cambridge University Press (March, 2008), 32.

The remaining six illustrations are found in a manuscript commissioned by the Safavids and copied by Muhammad Sharif al-Husaini al-Ishfahani in 1584. This manuscript displays an illuminated heading at the beginning of the text with high-quality binding, lacquer-painted covers, and leather doubles. The lacquer-painted cover indicates a new direction in the decoration of Safavid-lacquered bindings. The Safavid manuscript of *Duwal Rani Khizr Khan* shares a close resemblance in its binding quality and outer cover to an earlier Safavid court copy of *Yusuf and*
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202 Chander Shekhar (ed.), *Historiography in Indo-Persian Literature* (Department of Persian, Delhi University, 2009), 60.
Zulaikha written by Jami, dated 1525. The wars that took place between the Safavids and Ottoman empires did not lead to destruction of royal or commercial workshops and the best manuscripts were at taken to the conqueror’s library or kept in the treasury. As Zeren Tanindi notes in her work, unbound manuscripts were bound according to the taste of the patron.

The illustration ‘The Mi’raj of the prophet’ is included in a section of the manuscript that runs over 92 couplets, in which Khusrau describes the voyage of the prophet from the earth to heaven on the night of power, i.e., Shab-e-Qadr. ‘The Battle between the Armies of Khizr Khan and Qutlugh Khwaja’ is an illustration depicting a battle scene. Apart from these two illustrations, romance is the central theme of the other four images in the Safavid manuscript and include picturesque presentations of erotic activities.

203 Uluc, ‘Comments on the Amir Khusrau Dehlavi’s Work’s,’ 29. ‘Jami was a Persian poet who belonged to the Naqshabandi order of Sufism and was known for his achievements as a scholar and a writer of Sufi literature.’
204 Zeren Tanindi, ‘Additions to Illustrated Manuscript in Ottoman Workshops,’ *Mugarnas* 17 (2000): 147.
206 Though Khusrau and other contemporary writers of the Delhi Sultanate like Zia-ud din Barani have mentioned the battle in their text, it is impossible that the armies of Khizr Khan led the battle. Khizr Khan never became the ruling monarch and, as such, the armies belonged to Sultan Alauddin Khilji. Additionally, while discussing the battle, Khusrau does not mention Khizr Khan’s name, so this seems to be mislabelled depiction. For reference see, Ishtiaq Ahmed zilli (trans.), *Tarikh-I Firoz Shahi* (Primus, 2015).
Another manuscript of *Duwal Rani Khizr Khan* which is preserved in the British Museum, dated 1574, is written in gold *nastaliq* (calligraphic hand used in Persian writing which was popular in India, Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan). This version has gold-rulled margins and headings, and contains three whole pages of miniatures. It is unknown if any of Khusrau’s texts were transcribed in the Ottoman realm, but there are instances where illustrations were added to unfinished manuscripts in the Ottoman *nakkaskhane* (royal painting workshop).

**Conclusion**

The Mughal Empire was land-based with the port of Gujarat being used only for the Hajj traffic, fostering a commonly held belief that Mughals maintained few overseas ties. In addition, the diplomatic policies of the Mughals towards the other contemporary Islamic empires seem rather precarious. While there is evidence of regular diplomatic and cultural exchange with the Safavid Empire, attempts at forging alliances with the Ottoman rulers only took place in times of political need. Both the Ottomans and Mughals were Sunni Muslims, and while they attempted to maintain diplomatic ties, they were also competing for the claims of Caliphal authority. Although Mughals were never assertive about their claim on the Caliphate, they also barely acknowledged the Ottoman Sultan as *Khalifâ* (Commander of the Faithful). Insight into the illustrative traditions of the Mughal *Akbarnamah* and Ottoman *Suleymanamah* establishes similarities in depictions of the monarch. In both
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207 Tanindi, ‘Additions to Illustrated Manuscript in Ottoman Workshops.’
illustrative traditions, attempts were made to re-affirm the image of the monarch as a world sovereign by portraying them as the Persian hero from the *Shahnamah* (Book of Kings), leading armies into battles, hunting, and holding an audience. However, despite cultural similarities and connectivity in the sixteenth century, attempts were made at developing independent identities to legitimize their position against the other. In the case of the Ottomans, there was an increasing anxiousness to proclaim their Turkish tribal lineage and distinctiveness from other powers in the region. However, there remains much to be explored in terms of their connectedness by analyzing visual and material culture.

There are several reasons why scholars fail to notice cultural connections between the Ottomans and the Mughals. The earlier historiography on visual and material culture was written in the language of traditional art, which was designed to understand traditions rather than connective systems. A study of the court consumption patterns of the Islamic empires, circulation of manuscripts, and development of imperial libraries provides an insight into the passions for collecting an increasing number of books. An examination of variegated networks broadens the possibility of interaction from other channels. For instance, royal ladies of Akbar’s harem, like Gulbadan Begum and Salima Sultan Begum, expressed their desire to go on the pilgrimage to Mecca. They left Fatehpur Sikri for Mecca in 1575 and returned from the Hajj in 1581. Their presence in Hijaz would have facilitated cultural interactions between both the empires. In addition, the ladies were writers and they

---

maintained private libraries. As a result, there is a possibility that books of Indian origin found their way to the Ottoman Empire during their travels. Given the popularity of Khusrau in the Ottoman realm, it seems reasonable to conclude that some exchange of literature and art may have taken place.
Carolina Sunset, Cuban Sunrise:
A Comparative Study of Race, Class, and Gender in the
Reconstructed South and Colonial Cuba, 1867 – 1869
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Editor’s Note: The Language of Reconstruction

Readers should be aware that the primary sources analyzed in this article contain racial slurs and direct references to racial stereotypes that are offensive. The language of Reconstruction was violent and racialized, and slurs and stereotypes figured prominently in the discourse of elite whites in the Reconstruction-era South. Language was a powerful tool used to reinforce the social, cultural, and political order of segregation and this article explores some of the ways that language reflected the racial antipathy that white elites felt towards formerly enslaved people.

Maintaining the integrity of historical vernacular language in order to understand both the world of Reconstruction and roots of racism in American society rests in tension with the political and deeply offensive ways in which racial slurs, in particular “n—” continue to be used in the present day to reinforce systems of oppression against Americans of African heritage. The Madison Historical Review in no way condones the use of such language.

As such, the editorial staff made the decision to remove this word entirely from the article and replace it with “[racial slur].” Other references to racial stereotypes cited
in the primary source literature have been retained as a way of conveying accurately the class, gender, and racial dynamics of the time period.

The loss of the American Civil War and the consequence of Reconstruction literally turned the South on its head, profoundly altering the dynamics of race, class, and gender that previously shaped and defined antebellum Southern society. The letters of Harriet Rutledge Elliott Gonzales reveal one formerly elite South Carolina family’s struggle as they faced a radically altered social landscape. New challenges abounded, particularly surrounding emancipation and the drastic reversal of social norms characteristic of Southern society that development entailed. The adversity, poverty, and social upheaval Harriet experienced in the aftermath of the war called into question her sense of identity and place within the Southern social hierarchy. Despite these challenges, Harriet never abandoned a sense of her aristocratic origins and her “good blood.”

Her perceptions of her new situation reflected the norms that previously reigned in antebellum society and reveal the way that elite Southerners, particularly elite Southern women, viewed and interpreted the myriad changes brought about by Reconstruction. Hers is a story of the way one woman and her family dealt with and responded to these changes, which ultimately led them to abandon the South and the United States completely as they sought to
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209 Harriet Rutledge Elliott Gonzales (HREG) to Ann Hutchinson Smith Elliott (AHSE), 11 November 1867, Box 5 Folder 88, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009. Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
reaffirm their status and identity in a place that seemed to still conform to their preconceived notions of the natural order of things – Cuba.

The war drained the Elliott and Gonzales families’ fortunes and status. With much of their property destroyed and stripped of the slave labor that previously provided the basis for their material support, Harriet found herself face to face with physical and material woes that she likely never imagined suffering. Harriet’s husband was Ambrosio Jose Gonzales, a former Cuban independence fighter and member of Narciso Lopez’s ill-fated filibustering expeditions to the island. After the failure of his filibustering efforts and subsequent banishment from Cuba, Ambrosio ingratiated himself into antebellum South Carolina society. This included Hattie’s influential father William Elliott, whom Ambrosio met through mutual acquaintances. Ambrosio later became a colonel in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. Harriet and her husband were accustomed to a life of relative leisure, comfort, and status. Colonel Gonzales (or as he was known to his friends and family, “General” Gonzales) struggled to put his wife and children on a solid footing during Reconstruction. He faced the constant trials of a ravaged economy and social upheavals that made

210 Ambrosio and Hattie married in 1856. They met when Ambrosio visited his friend William Elliott at the Elliott family’s summer home in Flat Rock, N.C. The couple had six children together: Ambrosio (Brosio) Jose, Jr. (1857-1926), Narciso Gener (1858-1903), Alfonso Beauregard (1861-1908), Gertrude Ruffini (1864-1900), Benigno (1866-1937), and Ana Rosa (Anita, born 1869).

211 For a full biography of Ambrosio, see Antonio Rafael de la Cova, Cuban Confederate Colonel: The Life of Ambrosio Jose Gonzales (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).


inconsistency the only consistent factor in his family’s life. Often away attempting to secure new business deals, Ambrosio left Harriet (or “Hattie,” as her friends and family called her) to secure and manage the family’s small homestead and struggling sawmill enterprise with only the help of her young sons and whatever servants and laborers, often the very people her family formerly held in bondage, she could manage to hire and maintain with the limited resources available to her.

Harriet and Ambrosio found little success in their efforts. After several years of struggling to rebuild a life in a South Carolina that was anything but the place Harriet remembered from her youth, the Gonzales family set out for Ambrosio’s homeland, Cuba. There, in a society alien yet strangely familiar, Hattie found renewed hope. In Cuba, Hattie found a place that felt to her more like home than her actual homeland had become. Still a slaveholding society at the time, the social, racial, and gendered norms of Cuba were akin to that of the antebellum South. For Hattie, the island represented a return to a social hierarchy she understood, with all its corresponding dynamics of gender, race, and class. Yet, as much as Cuba represented for Hattie a return to and reaffirmation of a social hierarchy that conformed to her own assumptions and conceptions, it too was undergoing profound changes that had the potential to once again leave Hattie and her family disconcerted and disconnected from their preconceived assumptions about what they believed to be the correct order of things.
Gender dynamics, relationships of power, and normative conceptions are unquestionably essential tools of historical analysis.212 Historians since the 1970s have made great strides in creating a space for gendered historical perspectives to be heard and taken seriously. However, as at least one historian that has studied the social dynamics of the pre and post-Civil War plantation households points out, “gender wielded as a primary category of historical analysis often obscures as much as it reveals…”213 Gender, race, and class are social concepts that are so intimately intertwined that to separate them, isolate them, and study them independently is akin to putting on scholarly blinders. Only by examining the ways these three concepts merge, morph, and mingle together can a greater understanding of social relations and their influence on the course of historical events be achieved. Arguably, no other period in American history showcases the miasma of gender, race, and class more acutely than the Reconstruction era in the South.

To understand the extreme social upheaval of Reconstruction, its effect on the Southern psyche, and the Southern society that emerged from it, it is imperative to understand the social norms of the antebellum South. Southern men took it as a given that they had the “right to run their households and rule their women without

interference from the government.”\textsuperscript{214} Women were expected to submit to patriarchal authority in exchange for physical, economic, and social protection. Yet, while men overwhelmingly dominated women in the public sphere of the wider community and world beyond, “male dominance was not a controlling force in a plantation household.”\textsuperscript{215} The Southern gender ideals of women’s passivity, delicacy, pursuit of leisure, and submission to male dominance clashed with the reality of female dominance in the individual household.\textsuperscript{216} As mistresses of the plantation household, elite Southern women’s very identity was intertwined with the perceived importance of owning slaves and running the household.\textsuperscript{217} According to historian Drew Gilpin Faust, this “…fundamental sense of identity depended on having others to perform life’s menial tasks.”\textsuperscript{218} 

The antebellum Southern household was in its own way a “public space” with a woman at the head of everyday activities, managing their children and the work of household slaves.\textsuperscript{219} The “plantation…served as the primary site of social and political organization” and “embodied the hierarchical structure of Southern paternalism”.\textsuperscript{220}
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planted the roles appropriate to their age, gender, and race” within the social order of the plantation. The very meaning of elite Southern civilization required the order, management, and discipline of the plantation household that Southern ladies provided.  

The plantation household was the locus for the “construction of white womanhood.” The concept of race itself was integral to this process, signaling the intersections of race, class, and gender that buttressed perceptions of identity amongst Southern elites. “The omnipresent issue of race,” writes Faust, “tied white men and women together and undermined white southern females’ willingness to challenge patriarchy.” The one place where elite women could express agency was within this uniquely social atmosphere of the plantation household. This agency existed within the dynamic between women’s submission to patriarchy and household slaves’ submission to the authority of the mistress. Historian Thavolia Glymph states, “…slaveholding women stood before slaves as the bedrock upon which slavery rested.” The Southern white elite in general, and elite women in particular, evaluated their own elite status relative to “the distance that separated them from enslaved and free black people.”
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The void between elite Southern women and their lower-class counterparts was almost as wide as the void between whites and African Americans. After the Civil War, with much of the economic backbone of the South destroyed, both physically with the burning and looting of lands by the armies of both the Union and the Confederacy, and ideologically with the crumbling of their slave-based society, many elite Southern ladies found themselves in a position not too far removed from that of the lower class soldiers’ wives. Both lower-class women and elite ladies faced a fear of “becoming as poor and disrespected as slaves.”  

Even then, many elite Southern women expressed “revulsion” at poor whites even as their own situations began more and more to mirror that of those they despised. Poor white women, in return, often felt extreme resentment for the elite. These profound challenges to class and race-based assumptions and distinctions shaped the dynamic of many women’s lives during the Reconstruction era.

The Civil War, emancipation of the slaves, and Reconstruction destroyed the “fundamental unit” of Southern society—the plantation household and lifestyle—and shattered the norms of Southern civilization. The social dislocation of the war stripped many elite women from the “accoutrements of superior status” and “the substance and trappings of gentility.” The story of Harriet “Hattie” Rutledge Elliott Gonzales exemplifies this
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dislocation. Hattie’s husband, Ambrosio Jose Gonzales, volunteered for the Confederate Army the moment he heard the guns firing on Ft. Sumter in early 1861.\(^{232}\) Faced with insubordinate slaves and the threat of Union invasion later that same year, Hattie’s father William Elliott abandoned the family’s multiple plantations in South Carolina’s Low Country and moved further inland.\(^{233}\) He died at the family’s summer home in Flat Rock, NC in February of 1863.\(^{234}\) This left Hattie, her mother, sisters, and growing brood of children without a male head of household even before the end of the war. The Elliott women found themselves far removed from the society they once knew and faced an uncertain future.

At the end of the war, the family tried to pick up the pieces of their lives as best they could. Sherman’s army left two of the Elliotts’ plantations, Oak Lawn and Social Hall, utterly destroyed on their way through the Carolinas. The family lost nearly everything, and economic hardships soon clashed with their tenuous claims to elite status. In 1866, Ambrosio Gonzales managed to put enough money together to purchase Social Hall from William Elliott’s eldest son, Ralph Elliott.\(^{235}\) Seeing some potential in the vast pine

\(^{232}\) Antonio Rafael De la Cova, “Ambrosio Jose Gonzales: A Cuban Confederate Colonel,” (PhD diss., West Virginia University, 1994), 142.
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\(^{235}\) Ambrosio J. Gonzales to William Elliott, undated, Box 3 Folder 52, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel
forests on the property, he moved his family there in early 1867 and attempted to set up a sawmill business. The Gonzaleses struggled over the next two years, facing numerous setbacks, false starts, and dashed hopes as they attempted to eke a living while also maintaining some sense of dignity and semblance of their former lives. Hattie’s letters during these years shed much light on the dramatic transformations of many elite households during Reconstruction and the ways that white women tended to respond to them.

The most fundamental challenge to Southern white women’s understanding of the world, relationship to society, and relationship with their household, was emancipation. The disappearance of the institution of slavery from Southern plantations and elite households represented a profound upheaval of the social and domestic sphere. According to Glymph, many Southern white women found the experience “paralyzing.” Hattie’s correspondence with her mother and sisters from 1867-1868 is filled with examples of the transformative nature of African American freedom on the elite Southern household. Most elite Southern white women lacked knowledge of basic domestic skills. The loss of household slaves forced many to learn on the fly in order to maintain their homes. Used to simply managing the household and relying on slaves to do the actual work, elite Southern ladies for the first time had to learn what it meant to be a housewife. Hattie’s

Hill.
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correspondence often speaks of these troubles. Hattie wrote to her mother in one letter that having “no one to work is a trial,” and implores her mother to “pity the sorrows of a housekeeper for the first time.”\textsuperscript{239} She laments her loss of free time and inability to visit her relatives. “I had hope to be with my dear Mama and sisters ere this,” she writes in October of 1867, “but you see how impossible it is for poor little housekeepers to form plans.”\textsuperscript{240} Women often found their only help was from their male children, obligating young boys to assist them in their domestic duties.\textsuperscript{241} Hattie found this challenging as well. In December of 1867 she writes, “Boys are ‘no good’ as the Irish say!” She felt physically overwhelmed at times by her new responsibilities, adding “… I cannot work myself without getting so fatigued as make me useless for some time after.”\textsuperscript{242} Yet, Hattie found ways to cope, adjust, and even found some pride in her new role. Writing of a recent delivery of a gift of venison for her family she beams, “…all the housekeeper was aroused in me. It was so delightful not to have to think up a dinner for five or six days.”\textsuperscript{243}

The loss of their slaves did not mean that elite white women abandoned the idea that they and their families were entitled to the services of African American labor. The

\textsuperscript{239} HREG to AHSE, 16 December 1867, Box 5 Folder 89, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
\textsuperscript{240} HREG to AHSE, 6 December 1867, Box 5 Folder 89, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
\textsuperscript{241} Faust, Mothers of Invention, 130.
\textsuperscript{242} HREG to AHSE, 6 December 1867, Box 5 Folder 89, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
\textsuperscript{243} HREG to AHSE, 13 May 1867, Box 5 Folder 86, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
occupational transformation from plantation mistress to housekeeper only made their sense of need and entitlement to household assistance more acute. White women resolved to cling to African American labor, even if that meant they had to pay for it.244 This created what Drew Gilpin Faust describes as the “servant problem.” “From being queens in social life,” elite white women became “mere domestic drudges.”245 To maintain their sense of status and racial separation under these conditions, control over the labor of the formerly enslaved was essential. “To do without a black servant, in the South,’ argues Glymph, “was not an option.”246 For the first time, “former mistresses had to learn how to be employers,” which most elite white women found “demeaning” and “appalling” as it was so counter to their sense of the proper racial roles in society.247 To be forced to rely on the formerly enslaved was “provoking” to their very sensibilities.248

Hattie’s newfound domestic role and her relations with servants co-existed with her new, more public role, of assisting her husband to run the family’s farming endeavors and sawmill business. This represents the unique ways that the Civil War and Reconstruction often altered “deeply held assumptions about women’s nature and proper roles” in the South.249 Often away from Social Hall, Ambrosio left Hattie in charge of overseeing the day-to-day affairs. “You don’t
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know what a business woman I have become,” she writes to her sister, Emmie, in September of 1867. “I keep a book and an account of all that is sold and supplied the hands white and black all sick days and loss of work.”

Hattie describes her new role to her mother in May of 1867, “But then we are very busy late every evening with the hands coming in for rations and buying provisions. All the workmen at the farm but one are paid in provisions or cloth. I determine the prices of the last.” She often complains of the difficulties in obtaining necessary provisions with which to pay employees and the potential repercussions of the failure to do so. “The buying of corn for horse, hands, and ourselves is a fearful business....it is a cash article, too,” she tells her sister Emmie in June of 1867. “The negroes…will only work for corn which we must give or have what we have planted ruined.” This concurs with Glymph’s assertion that “mobilizing and managing a free labor force appeared unintelligible, inconvenient, and even sinister.”

Also part of the new role was the act of negotiating wages, a previously unheard of proposition for a woman of her antebellum status. In December of 1867, she writes to her mother to make an offer to one of the Elliott family’s more reliable hands, offering a wage of “$30 per month and mill hands rations.” Many times, the very people she was
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negotiating with were men and women the family previously held in bondage. In the same December letter, Hattie communicates to her mother that “George Sanders, your former slave” came to her to offer to work one of the Elliott plantations that fell into disuse after the war. The frequent demands for high wages from free African American laborers were a concern not just because of the expense, but also because it upset the social hierarchy. In November of 1867, she wrote to her sister, “Carpenters in this neighborhood, [racial slur], are full of air and ask 45 per month.” Due to the nature of the new circumstances, with African Americans now free to move from employer to employer seeking better opportunities, they generally had at least some advantage in wage negotiations.

Even as the Elliott and Gonzales families came to rely more and more on free African American labor, their inherent racism and distrust of African Americans, coupled with their sense of consternation over the disruption of the normal racial order and hierarchy, can be seen again and again in Hattie’s correspondence. Many of her letters express her distrust and condescension towards the African American work ethic. Writing of her role in determining prices for the provisions the family used to pay many of their hands, Hattie contends that her husband “thinks I am too exorbitant, but I tell him I am sure the [racial slur] do not do

---
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full work.” She seems to revel in her ability to exact some revenge on the workers for not working hard enough. “A piece of nice blue cloth, which costs 22 cts by the piece, your Jewess of a daughter gets 60 cts for and the freedman gets 12 yds at a time.” Yet, even her small revenge is bittersweet, “as store articles are paid for in work of course my satisfaction at getting high prices is greatly diminished.”

Her doubts extended beyond the perceived laziness of African American laborers, and she questioned the inherent viability and profitability of labor using freed slaves. In June of 1867 she writes to her sister Emmie, “I am sorry to hear that you think it impossible to make money with free labor, but I agree with you. It distresses me to see what the negroes get for one day’s work which I know to be badly done.”

The Gonzaleses’ frustration with their free African American laborers rears its head on several occasions in Hattie’s letters. In July of 1867, the family hired back one of their hands, known as Gen’l Prince Wright who had previously stolen from them. Hattie notes that he “had taken in different articles a month and a half pay in advance and as soon as we began to make him useful carpentering, he skedaddled.” However, she hired him back, noting that “he is one of the untried rascals you think preferable to the discovered ones.”

In December of 1867, she complained in a letter to her mother of an African American employee.
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named Louis that lost one of the family’s mules. She writes, “We have suffered too much from not having one negro who felt interested sufficiently to care what became of us. In this respect we are worse off than very body else for all who live on a plantation have some of their former domestics about them but we are left to the tender mercies of the turned off scamps in the neighborhood…”261 Hattie seems to have a difficult time understanding why the same people that she previously relied on for almost every need were unconcerned for her family’s well-being after emancipation. She could not comprehend that without the coercion and threat of violence implicit in the condition of slavery, former slaves found it easy to drop any pretense of affection for their former masters.

Even as dependent as elite Southern white women were on slave labor during the antebellum period, emancipation did not change their belief that African Americans could not function without their protection and guidance.262 In an undated letter from 1868, Hattie expresses shock at the thought “that the negroes in the neighborhood, about two hundred, intend on hiring out or buying Aleck Chisolm’s place… for themselves!” The instigator of this endeavor was none other than Gen’l Prince Wright, the former employee that had caused such trouble for them earlier that year. The sarcasm almost drips from her pen, “Should Chisolm consent, it will make this neighborhood a

261 HREG to AHSE, 16 December 1867, Box 5 Folder 89, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
charming location.” To elite Southerners, African American men and women’s “…survival was impossible… outside of the framework of the white household and the authority of the white master.” Yet, Hattie was not without her sympathies, especially when those sympathies reinforced African Americans’ perceived helplessness without their former masters and mistresses. She writes to Emmie sometime in either 1867 or 1868, “The negroes are ragged and look so hungry that I can’t help feeding them. Encouraged, they beg extensively…”

However, this idea of African American dependency, and the concepts of class and race as elite whites understood them, were frequently challenged. The Gonzaleses often found themselves dependent on the willingness of freedmen and women to oblige their needs. Circumstance sometimes left the family face to face with the reality of trading with their African American neighbors, with often frustrating results. “The miserable negroes refuse to sell their corn, but tis wise of them,” she tells her mother on October of 1867. In December she complains, “The negroes won’t sell corn at 8 ¼ . Whiskey is the only thing that will open their corn bins.” Hattie’s sense of class, as well as racial norms, are also evident in these interactions. She tells her mother in
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November of 1867, “…bacon, molasses, and whiskey is what the freed people care for. They have passed the stage for fancy hats and jewelry, at least in these regions.” These interactions also sometimes challenged gender roles as Hattie and her sons occasionally had to step in to help her husband. “Tis very amusing to see Gonzie trading with them. Several times he was about to cheat himself badly when Brosio and self came to the rescue.”

Perhaps nothing contested the concept of African American dependency on whites, and the racial hierarchy of Southern society itself, more than African American suffrage. The Fifteenth Amendment gave African American men the right to vote and 1867 was the first year they could exercise this right. This event caused much disruption in the Gonzaleses’ lives and the operation of their business. In November of 1867, Hattie complains to her mother:

The darkeys are all going to vote tomorrow and have taken their departure for Walterboro…They came to sell their produce in order to get money for their journey which they seem to think will be expensive. Perhaps the Yanks make them pay for the privilege of voting, who knows? The mill hands all went off yesterday. “Nothing in the world could induce them to miss the election” they said so the mill lies idle until Wednesday when the noble patriots expect to return.
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A week later, Hattie wrote to her sister, “The mill hands have returned after an absence of one week. The delight of voting for the first time seems to have intoxicated their wooly heads.” Hattie seems to have resented the obvious relish the freedmen displayed as they exercised their newfound rights. Yet, she could not imagine that it was more than a temporary development and the world would somehow right itself in time; “I trust they will be in their right places this time next year,” she concludes.271

Beliefs of African American dependency intermingled, often paradoxically, with ideas of protection, both physical and material, in the Southern mind during Reconstruction. Concern for protection is a theme that recurs regularly in Hattie’s correspondence and is deeply connected to conceptions of gender, class, and race that stretched back into the antebellum days and did not die with the Confederacy and its promises.272 With Ambrosio often away on business, not only did Hattie have to help manage the family business, she had to find a way to ensure their domestic and economic protection as well. Her letters often reveal her concerns about free African Americans pillaging her lands and resources—whether real or perceived. “I have a dislike to the land of Florida since the [racial slur] are being sent there” she explains to her mother in October of 1867. “…I don’t think there can be an advantage to having a large body of undisciplined blacks near us. They would steal
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everything we made. Do you know they steal all of our corn!” She goes on to implore her mother to do something about the situation at the Bluff plantation, for “Tis nothing but a harbor for vagrants who steal where they can.”273 In June of 1867 she tells her sister, Annie, of her worries that their potato patch was being “grazed upon” by local African Americans and notes it only happened since her husband left.274 The next month she tells Emmie, “We will put a mill hand to take care of the corn and pease that the [racial slur] and raccoons have left….”275 Their hired hands were no better than the vagrants in her eyes, “A freedman with a gun and dog guards the garden. He has his family with him. Fortunately a small one to steal for.” Only the presence of a “white man” in the vicinity who could respond in the event of an emergency eased Hattie’s apprehensions.276

The shift from a slave-based to waged-based economy created opportunities for new social and economic relationships based on class as well as race. The new social and economic paradigm brought upper and lower-class whites into interactions and relationships that were far from the norm in the antebellum South. One of the first places this manifested was within the elite household between elite women and their poor white counterparts. Difficulties in managing free African American female servants led many
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elite Southern households to attempt to find white servants to fill their roles. In September of 1867, Hattie wrote to Emmie that the formerly enslaved were “…very provoking now and people seem very desirous to get rid of them as house servants.” She tells Emmie that her neighbors, the Rhetts, were “anxious to get a white cook” and that they were “often without a servant of any kind and can’t stand such discomfort longer!”277 The importance of servants, and of being served, as a necessary element of the elite Southern way of life is clearly implied by such language.

In the household, female servants were indispensable. Hattie expresses shock to Emmie in July of 1867 when she learns that she was “without a female servant.”278 As much as they desired to hold onto and control free African American domestic labor, elite Southern women were able to pragmatically, in their perspective, adapt their concepts of what constituted a proper servant. This adaptation was not taken without some chagrin, however. Hattie asked her mother in November of 1867, “Is Mamie’s new servant (I call things by their proper names) white or black? ‘Help’ is a northern word which has, helped, to bring about the present state of affairs.”279

This adaptation quickly collided with class perceptions. Hattie, like many others of her ilk, found that white servants were not an improvement over their African
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American counterparts. Sometime in the spring or early summer of 1867, Hattie secured the services of two Irish servants. Hattie’s constant reminder in her correspondence of the Irish origins of her white servants unconsciously signals the interweaving of race and class so present at the time. Not only were they poor whites, they were Irish, which many still viewed with only slightly less contempt as African Americans. In fact, in some ways Hattie saw her Irish girls as even more backward than the slaves she once knew. She comments to Emmie in June of 1867, “They are excellent servants but they lack the refinement so striking in our former slaves.” At first the arrangement proved beneficial; “Our servants are not paid by the month, don’t desire it. And if their wages are higher than the blacks they work harder and save much by their honesty.” The hope of a more ordered household was soon dashed, however, and Hattie found her patience constantly tested. “Managing a household of obstreperous boys and Irish maids had been more trying than very hard work,” Hattie tells Emmie in November of 1867.

Issues with white workers were not exclusive to the Gonzales family’s household servants. The white men they hired as workers and managers were consistently inconsistent. In May of 1867, Hattie writes to her mother about “Old Simmons” who “…did not like to get up early to

---
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feed the horses. Said the sun rose at 7 o’clock. He could work himself but could not direct others and was so afraid of negroes that he would not stay by his garden to guard it at night. His wages were much too high and we were glad to see him go of his own accord.”  

In July of 1867, a “Mr. Duc” was added to her “list of white scamps” after being hired as a carpenter at the sawmill only to abscond from his duties within days. “Honesty don’t do in this country now,” Hattie lamented.

It was this lack of “honesty” from these white men that so struck Hattie and called into question her perceptions of her own race. In November of 1867, she regales her sister, Emmie, with a tale of another “white scamp.” This one even more disappointing because he was apparently a Confederate veteran. After detailing the extra care, including food and medicine, they provided the man and his family due to his veteran status, Hattie fumes that the man owed “us ever so much but won’t finish the miserable day affair he has been about for weeks and quick goes away and leaves us in the most open condition.” Hattie concluded her tirade with the pointed, “Our poor whites are just as mean as [racial slur],” bringing full circle the sometimes amorphous nature of race and class that so colored the South during Reconstruction.
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Concepts and ideologies of gender, race, and class also collide in Hattie’s perceptions of herself and her family’s situation. The destruction of the family’s plantations during the war destroyed the base of their economic well-being, significantly lowering their status. Forced to attempt to rebuild their standing in a ravaged landscape, alien social atmosphere, and shattered economy, Hattie’s family struggled to re-orient their sense of self throughout the late 1860s. Hattie was acutely aware of the challenge to her status, its implications for previously established racial norms, and her sense of self-worth that the circumstances entailed. “I am more aristocratic now than I ever was,” she confides in her mother in November of 1867, “and the poorer I am the more I am proud of my good blood. Perhaps in heaven two classes might live together on the same footing, religion making ladies and gentlemen of us all, but on earth certainly not.”288 Her sense of pride gave her the strength to face economic hardship and bristle at the thought of incurring debt. “My dear, if the world was to come to an end tomorrow,” she wrote Emmie in June of 1867, “our chief regret would be that we left it owing.”289 Whatever the fates threw her way, Hattie’s letters express a consistent determination to persevere and maintain the heritage she felt entitled to, no matter the material and social condition in which she found herself.

Hattie’s perseverance was tempered with shame at her lowered standards. Forced to live in a one-room log
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cabin—a former slave quarters—struck a blow to Hattie's aristocratic ego. In November of 1867, Hattie wrote her mother:

There will be families in their neighborhood but I don’t care for neighbors, living in such a cabin as I do so low to the ground and so impossible to keep clean. The poultry pig and even the pony “roam at their rise” and come into the shanty whenever they please. I don’t object to clean poverty but I to rebel against dirt and dirty we must be as long as we are in such a low building.²⁹⁰

Dress was a particularly Southern way to express status, especially for elite Southern women. It many ways, refined dress was firmly wrapped up in elite Southern women’s conceptions of identity and their place in society. Faust describes clothing as the “language Southerners used to explore and communicate their relationship to personal, cultural, and social transformations of war” and shortages of cloth and clothing were one way Southerners marked their loss of wealth and status.²⁹¹ Hattie’s correspondence is full of conversations about clothing, and her sisters often played seamstress to her children as the Gonzaleses struggled to provide their children necessities, much less the finer things. Hattie’s response when her sister, Emmie, sent her a dress is particularly telling of the dislocation from her former life as an elite Southern lady. She writes, “The flannels are beautiful and thank E very much for the trouble she took
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about the dress. Is it to be worn without a hoop and on which side fastened? She must excuse my stupidity but I have been out of the fashion so long I find it difficult to accommodate myself to the present style.”

Her embarrassment over her clothing also extended to her children, as their condition reflected the family’s condition. Her fears of what others, even her own relations, might think of her children’s country bumpkin appearance frequently prevented the family from visiting her relatives. She excused the children’s inability to visit their grandmother in October of 1867 because “…they were minus capes and proper shoes and their warm clothes were not finished yet.” It may be easy to interpret this as merely displaying Hattie’s concern over her children having warm clothes with which to travel during the cold winter months, but another letter to her mother in January of 1868 reveals the truth behind Hattie’s hesitations and excuses. She again acknowledges the invitation for the boys to see their grandmother “… but Brosio is using his father’s shoes and Nigno is still without his. None of them “have hats or capes and pride keeps me from letting them be seen on the cars until furnished with these indispensable articles.” It was not so much that the children might need these articles to brave the cold winter months, it was the way they would appear on the train, in public, that was Hattie’s greatest concern. Her sense of pride, so intimately engaged with her notions of race, class, and gender, made her wary of the
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potential for socially ruinous rumor. She begs her sister, Annie, in June of 1867 after extolling a list of her troubles to not “…tell them to strangers or people who would like to hear them.”\textsuperscript{294}

The litany of financial struggles and difficulties in adjusting to the new paradigm of a Reconstructed South led the Gonzales family to make the decision to move to Cuba. This was not a decision that came suddenly or lightly. Almost immediately after the Civil War the Gonzaleses considered moving to Cuba to escape the degradations and loss of status but were talked out of the notion by the Elliotts.\textsuperscript{295} Less than a year after the Gonzales family moved to Social Hall, Hattie confided in her mother, “I am anxious to leave this country forever. The only attraction here is yourselves.”\textsuperscript{296} By January of 1868, besieged by debt and the failing sawmill operation, Ambrosio resolved to abandon the venture at Social Hall and seek new opportunities in Cuba where he still had family and numerous personal and business connections. Perhaps Hattie’s own physical condition, described as “emaciated” by Ambrosio’s biographer Antonio Rafael de la Cova, influenced his decision.\textsuperscript{297}

In March of 1868, the Gonzaleses paid a visit to Cuba to begin preparations for their move. While there, former Confederate President Jefferson Davis, also in Cuba at the
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time, visited with his former Colonel and his family. Ambrosio helped to arrange an introduction for Davis into the Matanzas Lyceum, a local social and cultural fraternal organization, as an honorary member. The family spent their time in Cuba as “guests of wealthy relatives and friends” and the trip invigorated the ailing health of Hattie and the children. Unfortunately, there is little correspondence in the archive between Hattie and her relatives during this period, but it can easily be ascertained that the visit likely cemented the appeal of the planned relocation, as she was exposed to a society that still aligned to her antebellum ideals of gender, race, and class. Former Confederates were welcomed in Cuba with open arms. Men like Jefferson Davis and her husband could still roam the halls of high society and were granted dignity and respect. In June the Gonzaleses returned to South Carolina to settle their affairs, which included legal disputes over debts they incurred from the failed saw mill operation at Social Hall, ultimately leading the family to file for bankruptcy in December of 1868. This was the final nail in the coffin for the Gonzaleses’ life in South Carolina. The family looked to Cuba as a land of opportunity that could restore their fortunes, their sense of place within an ordered society they understood, and ultimately their sense of self.

Immediately upon entering Havana Harbor in January of 1869, Hattie was enthralled with the splendor of Cuba’s ancient capital city. “The view of the Havana harbor,” she wrote her mother late that month, “is worth alone a trip to the island! Tis grand and lovely, both the sky
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and water. The view of the town, the Morro Castle, the splendid ships, some of them with bands of music on board. The numberless boats with colored awnings. The vendors of delicious fruit who crowd around the vessel, all combine to give a most delightful sensation.” The “wealth and magnificence of the city” was “great” and she imagined it “more beautiful than Paris even.”\textsuperscript{300} She marveled at the local markets, “Every vegetable that is seen at the North and South at all season.” The “fruit and the fish, too pretty to be eaten,” and “potatoes (Irish) brought from Spain weighing about two pounds a piece…” She rubbed elbows with families “of the old nobility” that lived in a “palace (to me)” with “such spacious halls, marble floors, beautiful vases, and adornments from Italy” and “fountains and gardens, quite a novelty to me.” She went on to note, “Tis very nice to be rich in this country!” Sabbath day in Havana most impressed Hattie, “…the streets filled with people, most of them ladies, in splendid costumes all going to visit the churches which are brilliantly illuminated and adorned.”\textsuperscript{301} The affluence she witnessed in Havana was above and beyond even her own privileged upbringing. Her immersion in surroundings filled with such opulence—wealth, riches, and finely dressed “ladies”—helped to invigorate Hattie and provided her comfort despite the differences in language and culture.

In April of 1869, the family still resided in Havana as Ambrosio attempted to secure permanent employment. She continued to be awestruck by life in Havana, soaking up the
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“sea breezes as we have a night and such moonlights! I never imagined anything more beautiful.” The family’s health improved and they feasted on fried bananas, fresh oranges, and raw sugar cane. Hattie delighted at the “reasonable” cost of dresses for her and her youngest daughter, an especially pleasant development for Hattie, as concerned as she was with appearance and presentation. The family thrilled at the “great festivals” of the city, with “beautifully decorated streets” and “nights brilliantly illuminated” with “oil lights, Chinese lamps, flowers, music, and fireworks.”

Hattie’s son Alfonso quickly adapted to “Cuban ways and cooking.” He obviously adjusted well, with “…lots of friends among the little boys and being separated from his brothers is obliged to speak Spanish.” The children did experience some sickness in Havana in the spring of 1869 and Ambrosio still struggled to find employment, leaving Hattie to remark to her mother in mid-April of “poverty and sickness” that was sometimes “hard to bear.” Despite this, the tone of Hattie’s letters of this period are full of wonder at her new locale and hope for a brighter future.

That brighter future seemed to be just over the horizon in May of 1869 when Ambrosio secured a teaching position at a college and moved the family to his hometown.

---

302 HREG to AHSE, 29 April 1869, Box 5 Folder 95, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
303 HREG to AHSE, March 1869, Box 5 Folder 94, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
304 HREG to AHSE, 9 July 1869, Box 5 Folder 96, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
305 HREG to AHSE, 14 April 1869, Box 5 Folder 95, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
of Matanzas. On May 21, the Gonzaleses welcomed another edition to their clan with the birth of Ana Rosa Gonzales. Hattie managed to hire “an excellent nurse, black, a slave and one who speaks English perfectly” to help her with the infant. This reference to the slave nurse was the first mention of someone of African descent or slaves in any of Hattie’s correspondence with her family back in South Carolina since arriving in Cuba. This silence speaks volumes about the society in which Hattie now found herself, with its familiar racial hierarchy and etiquette. It was simply normal to her and therefore required little comment. When her “famous black nurse” became ill and could not support Hattie during the birth of Ana Rosa she found a replacement, a slave girl originally from South Carolina whose “missus” sounded “natural and very pleasant.” The slave girl’s presence reminded Hattie of home and provided her great comfort. The “good lady” Mrs. Ximeno, wife of Ambrosio’s high school friend Jose Manuel Ximeno, a “distinguished socialite” in Cuban aristocratic circles, provided Hattie with “...linen… and embroidery, beautiful shoes, lace caps, bibs, and embroidered diapers” for the young Ana Rosa. Hattie greatly admired Mrs. Ximeno,
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describing her as “a clever, handsome woman, quite independent for a Cuban. She drives her children out herself and digs about her plants and waters them with her own hands” despite being “tremendously rich.” This independence seemed to inspire Hattie and provided her an example of how a woman could maintain her aristocratic charm while also stepping outside of traditional gender roles. Willing to adapt to her new country, Hattie even contemplated adding the name Hutchinson (her mother’s maiden name) to Ana Rosa’s name as per typical Spanish custom.

Hattie and her family quickly settled into their life in Matanzas. “So far I am delighted with the climate,” she wrote to her mother in July. “The nights are charming… In the afternoon we often stroll to the seaside, a delightful walk. Beautiful villas surrounded by gardens of lovely flowers… some of which have clusters of gorgeous blossoms.”

Hattie and the children’s health continued to improve, prompting Hattie to write in August, “I have not seen the children look so well for two years and I am fat and feel strong and well.” This was a far cry from the emaciated state in which the family had seen her in Charleston in late 1868. She regaled her mother with descriptions of her
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family’s abode and its furnishings in Matanzas. “We are living luxuriously,” she remarked to her mother, “at least it would be considered so at the South.” This comparison reveals the juxtaposition of her new life in Cuba with what she left in her native land, as luxury there became foreign to her in the years after the war. She reveled in the availability of provisions and new taste sensations like avocado, pineapples, mangoes, coconuts, and guava and the accessibility of local cafes and the “cool drinks” that could “be had at all hours.” She could not help but quip to her mother, “No wonder the Yankees love to live here!” Hattie enjoyed leisurely pursuits like she seldom experienced since before the Civil War, remarking to her mother in July about driving into town and walking in the evenings among “crowds of well behaved, well dressed people, took in an ice cream at Lola’s Café, heard good music, paid a visit to some friends and drove home.” Clearly, this was a place that felt comfortable and familiar in its own alien way.

All was not quite as rosy as Hattie often made it seem. The Gonzales family happened to move to Cuba at the precise moment when the island colony initiated one of the most significant social and political events in Cuban history—The Ten Years’ War. This conflict was the first full-scale war for Cuban independence from Spain. As a former Cuban filibuster and Confederate soldier, Ambrosio Jose
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Gonzales’ experience reveals how the fates of Cuba and the United States were long intertwined. The vast majority of Cuban sugar, the island’s primary cash crop, was sold in the United States, intimately tying the economies of the two countries together.\(^{319}\) Cuba’s status as a slaveholding society made it particularly attractive to Southerners, and many Confederate property owners took advantage of this during the war to smuggle their slaves out of the South and resettle them in Cuba.\(^{320}\) As the example of the Gonzales family shows, some former Confederates found succor on the island after the Civil War, with many “fleeing rebels” finding safe harbor on the island, including “high ranking generals.”\(^{321}\)

Yet, this war was different from the filibuster movements that Ambrosio had taken a part in decades earlier with Narciso Lopez. The filibuster movements were directed by Cuban creoles that sought to preserve Cuba’s slave society and integrate it into the United States as a slave state, however the American Civil War completely changed that dynamic. The wave of abolitionist sentiment pouring from the United States and Britain in the 1860s and the experience of the American Civil War, inspired some Cuban Creoles to take a different approach in this new bid for independence.\(^{322}\) In October of 1868, Cuban planter Carlos Manuel Cespedes issued a call for independence and abolition and set an example by freeing his own slaves.\(^{323}\) The resulting conflict
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pitted two conflicting ideologies and sometimes three different sets of combatants against each other: those that wanted independence but to retain slavery, those that desired both independence and abolition, and the Spanish government that wanted to maintain the status quo. With Ambrosio’s less than spotless record with the Spanish authorities on the island, the Gonzales family found themselves under scrutiny from the very start. The government would not even allow them to disembark from their ship in Havana Harbor until Ambrosio personally met with the island’s Captain General Dulce and gave his assurances he planned no ill will towards the Spanish government.\(^{324}\) Even with those assurances, the Havana authorities kept the family under “constant surveillance,” a fact of which Hattie was keenly aware.\(^{325}\) Likely due to this knowledge, Hattie’s correspondence does not make clear the extent of her husband’s knowledge or involvement in the continuing plots on the island. Many of their friends and acquaintances, however, were connected with the revolt in one form or another, which often caused Hattie great concern. She remarked to her mother in February that “numbers were leaving the island” due to the conflict.\(^{326}\) In March, she reports that the son of their family friend, Benigno Gener, was in prison after being “taken in a schooner bringing arms from Nassau.” In July she told her
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mother about friends that were forced to leave the country and about the son of a close friend, Antonio Guiterras, who was “banished and condemned to two years hard labor.”

The schools in Matanzas that employed Ambrosio were operated and attended by some that did assume leadership roles in the conflict. Hattie also elusively hinted at her husband’s ties with General Thomas Jordan, former Confederate commander who was an associate of Ambrosio’s in the Confederacy, and briefly took part in the war in Cuba.

Regardless of her husband’s involvement, the war in Cuba certainly affected Hattie’s view of their prospects on the island and tempered her hope with bitter memories of upheaval and dislocation during her own country’s civil war. The war in Cuba prevented her from completely settling into her new environment. “Were it not for this revolution, we should have long ere been comfortably settled,” she wrote to her mother in April. In August she complained, “If it had not been for the Civil War, teaching would be a most profitable employment.” Somewhat paradoxically, and perhaps because she knew her correspondence was being read by Spanish officials before leaving the island, she never mentions slavery or abolition and seemed unconcerned.

---
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about that particular potential outcome of the war. She seemed to actually side with the Spanish to a degree, remarking in April, “The country has been in a terrible condition, but things are much better since Gen’l Dulce and the volunteers came to an understanding.”

She expressed trepidation that the war might force the family to uproot itself once again before they could completely settle into their new, more prosperous and hopeful life in Cuba. In June she wrote her mother, “Since our last revolution everything has been quiet, but no one knows when it may be necessary to quit the country. We can make a living here. Gonzie… is so much considered and teaching here is considered so highly that it is pleasant although hard work. I hope we will be able to remain here. To begin life elsewhere would be too trying.”

Hattie’s language here is indicative of both her and her husband’s prime motivations for moving to Cuba—to reclaim the respect and standing they felt they rightfully deserved based on their race and class, and that they had felt slip away in the years since the American Civil War. In July Hattie told her mother, “I am quite comfortable where I am, with fine rooms and a bath always at command and do not care to move…”

Even though she remarked in April, mere months after first arriving on the island, that, “I have seen more of civil war here than in four years at the South,” she was determined to

332 HREG to AHSE, 14 April 1869, Box 5 Folder 95, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
333 HREG to AHSE, 8 June 1869, Box 5 Folder 96, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
334 HREG to AHSE, 9 July 1869, Box 5 Folder 96, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers #1009.
make a life in Cuba and felt that despite the challenges of the war, their prospects there were more promising than in the United States. There is no evidence that she was considering the potential societal changes, such as emancipation, that could result from the war. It appears Hattie hoped the situation would soon pass and Cuba would return to the pre-war status quo.

The situation would not soon pass. In fact, 1869 was merely the first full year in what became a decades long struggle over Cuban independence and the fate of millions of enslaved residents of the island. But Hattie would not be around to be faced with such developments. A letter dated 3 September is the final letter she sent her mother from Cuba. On 17 September, Hattie passed away from yellow fever.335

Ambrosio was devastated by Hattie’s death. Soon after, he gathered up four of his six children and returned to South Carolina, abandoning hope for a new life in his native country forever. The remaining two children, Narciso and Alfonso, followed their siblings back to South Carolina within the year. Hattie’s eldest sister Emily (Emmie), who had always harbored feelings for the dapper and distinguished Cuban, assumed that Ambrosio would marry her. It was a typical practice at the time for a man to marry his sister-in-law after his wife passed. Ambrosio, however, never returned her affections and this caused a deep rift in the family. Emily could not get over being spurned and spent the next several decades spitefully undermining Ambrosio’s relationship with his children.336 Ambrosio never got over Hattie’s death and never remarried. In the 1880s, he ventured
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into the nascent world of late nineteenth century spiritualism in attempts to reconnect with his dearly departed wife. He attended numerous seances over the years and even wrote a book, *Heaven Revealed: A Series of Authentic Spirit Messages, from a Wife to her Husband, Proving the Sublime Nature of True Spiritualism.* The memory of his Southern belle haunted him for the rest of his life.

The experiences of Harriet Rutledge Elliott Gonzales vividly illustrate the dynamic intersections of gender, race, and class that so thoroughly dominated the social and political atmosphere of the Reconstruction-era South. The Gonzaleses’ struggles to reclaim and maintain a sense of identity and purpose in a world so changed exemplify similar struggles of many formerly elite Southern families at the time. Their choice to ultimately abandon the South and attempt to start again in another land signifies not just the Gonzaleses’ financial troubles, but also their inability to fully come to terms with the changed social landscape and its repercussions. Emancipation was the most profound and abrupt change that affected elite Southerners, as it required a complete and total reorientation of both the economic and social paradigms that previously held sway in both public and private consciousness.

On the surface, the Gonzales family’s move to Cuba made sense because it was Ambrosio’s homeland, but it also reflected the family’s desire to return to a social paradigm that fit with their antebellum sensibilities. As much as issues of race played a large role in Hattie’s correspondence while in South Carolina, her letters from Cuba are all but silent on the topic. This can be interpreted to mean that the comfort of

---
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returning to a society still very much based on slavery and a strict racial and social hierarchy made the issue a moot point in Hattie’s consciousness. The Cuban racial hierarchy of the time, and its implications for both gender and class, was a return to a more normative experience for Hattie, one that provided a sense of hope and stability despite the still clouded uncertainties of the future. Unfortunately, we will never know in what way the changes Cuba that was undergoing—the Ten Years War and the rising abolition movement—would have affected this dynamic as Hattie did not survive long enough to experience them. One can only imagine that had she survived, Hattie’s Cuban experience could have turned into a case of déjà vu. Hattie would have been forced to deal with many of the same issues and problems that had already turned the world she knew upside down. The way she would have dealt with that can only be a matter of conjecture.
Measles, Movements and Medical Exemptions: How California Learned to Lead the Way

Joseph Bishop
New York University

A Disney Disease

In mid-December of 2014, tourists from all over the world buzzed around Anaheim’s Disneyland. While they waited in line for the Matterhorn or spun around in oversized teacups, parents and children were unaware of the spreading disease—a strain of measles found earlier that year in the Philippines. Researchers estimated the vaccination rate of Disneyland’s guests during the outbreak to be as low as fifty percent and no higher than eight-seven percent. With such dismal rates, Disneyland became a resort for infectious disease. The higher estimate still placed the population well under a rate offering herd immunity—an immunity level to a disease within a population that makes disease-spreading difficult or impossible. After running models using data from California’s Department of Health and media-reported sources, epidemiologists tracked the spread to states beyond California, and into Canada and Mexico. By mid-January, there were already fifty-one confirmed cases in California.

alone. Health officials hoped to contain the outbreak to theme park visitors, but patients who had not visited the park began to appear in Orange County hospitals. Ultimately, at least 147 measles cases originated from the Disneyland outbreak.

A contagious disease spreading through a crowded theme park is not particularly uncommon. But this theme park was located in the United States, where health officials declared the elimination of measles in 2000. Even so, from the Northwest to New York, epidemics are now sprouting all over the country. The Disneyland epidemic is a cautionary tale of how little is required for measles to spread. This paper shows how vaccination hesitancy and dissemination of misinformation about measles contributes to preventable loss of life and health, and that addressing school-entry vaccination policies effectively increases vaccination rates. In particular, states now struggling with measles can learn from California’s Senate Bill 277—written in the wake of the Disneyland outbreak—and recreate California’s success. These measures are demonstrated to be successful and can prevent official states of emergency like those in Brooklyn and Rockland County, New York, during the recent measles epidemic in 2019.

---

When the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) announced the elimination of measles within the United States, the institution defined elimination as an absence of disease transmission for greater than twelve months. Effective vaccination programs throughout the country deserve credit for this success. Before the vaccine became available in 1963, nearly all children contracted measles. Every year around three to four million Americans were infected, and of those, an estimated 48,000 were hospitalized and 400 to 500 died.343

In 1978, the CDC set a goal to eliminate measles by 1982. This goal was not met, but widespread vaccinations dramatically reduced infection. The CDC reports that a measles outbreak among vaccinated children in 1989 spurred the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Academy of Family Physicians to recommend a second dose of the measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccine for all children. This second dose, along with an improved first dose, further dropped the rate of infection.344

Measles is not uncommon in many countries and regularly transmits to the United States. Since the vast majority of Americans are vaccinated, the general population benefits from herd immunity, which includes the small percentage of the population that is medically unable
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to be vaccinated or is still too young to be vaccinated. To protect a community from a highly contagious disease like measles, epidemiologists generally consider a vaccination rate of around ninety-three percent to effectively achieve herd immunity.\textsuperscript{345}

As the Disneyland epidemic continued to spread, San Diego reported ten more cases. According to the Health and Human Services Agency, nine out of these ten had never received vaccinations.\textsuperscript{346} A study in the \textit{Journal of the American Medical Association} suggests the Disneyland outbreak was likely a consequence of low vaccination rates encouraged by the anti-vaccination movement in America.\textsuperscript{347}

A few influential groups oppose vaccinations, and though small, concentrations of unvaccinated people incubate epidemics. The anti-vaccination movement is not a recent phenomenon, nor is it unique to the United States, but dates back to when the English physician Edward Jenner first discovered a smallpox vaccine in 1796.

\textbf{The Rise of Vaccinations and Movements Against Them}

Since antiquity, smallpox posed a serious threat to human health, and it was not until the late eighteenth century


that Edward Jenner discovered a vaccine derived from cowpox. Jenner wondered why milkmaids had a reputation for lovely complexions—they rarely had smallpox scars. By contracting the less severe cowpox, Jenner hypothesized that milkmaids developed protection from smallpox. During this time, the sciences of virology and immunology were nonexistent. Instead, Jenner sought to fight smallpox by imitating the immunity he found in milkmaids. After twelve years of research, he experimented on a boy named James Phipps. Jenner inoculated Phipps with cowpox, and within days, Phipps developed cowpox sores around the administered location. Jenner then exposed Phipps to smallpox and the boy remained healthy. Even while lacking the underlying modern scientific explanations, Jenner discovered the basic concept of vaccination by carefully observing the workings of nature.348

Following Jenner’s publication of the cowpox experiment, use of vaccinations spread throughout England. The general enthusiasm for mass vaccination also met with opposition. After the first Vaccination Act in 1840, which provided free vaccinations to the poor, England established compulsory vaccination with the Vaccination Act of 1853. Anti-vaccination sentiments soared after the introduction of compulsory vaccination. Organizations began to spring up: the Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League in 1867, the National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League in 1874, and William Tebb’s London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination in 1879. In 1896, Tebb

consolidated resistance groups into the National Anti-Vaccination League.349

The anti-vaccination camp launched a range of criticism. Not only did they challenge Jenner’s idea of vaccination, they also disagreed with how the disease spread. Some criticism derived from religion, when clergy deemed vaccinations unchristian because they came from animals.350 Some criticism revolved around a disagreement about the origin of disease; for example, maintaining that vaccinations provided no protection because disease arose from decaying organic matter.351 Other criticism emphasized political concerns about government-mandated vaccinations, stoking a controversy between individual liberty and public safety.352

In the United States, however, influential supporters such as Thomas Jefferson saw the public health potential. Jenner’s vaccine arrived in the United States in 1800. Starting in 1809, Massachusetts enacted the first mandatory vaccination laws, later followed by Minnesota, West

Virginia, and California.\textsuperscript{353} Still, Americans were generally suspicious of the medical field. The previous century saw the golden age of medical quackery and in the early nineteenth century the practice of bloodletting was still common.\textsuperscript{354}

In 1902, a smallpox epidemic broke out in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The state entrusted cities with the power to legislate vaccinations, so Cambridge established a mandatory vaccination policy. Cambridge ran into difficulties executing the new law and one resident, Pastor Henning Jacobson, refused compulsory vaccination. As a child in Sweden, inoculation caused him intense sickness and one of his sons also became ill after being inoculated.\textsuperscript{355} The city filed criminal charges against him and he went to court. The case went up to the United States Supreme Court and, in 1905, the court decided to permit states’ municipalities to enforce laws that protect the public against communicable diseases—a decision that is among the most important Supreme Court decisions in the field of public health.\textsuperscript{356} The United States did not see another major advancement in measles treatment for half a century.

In November 1961, President John Kennedy delivered the opening speech for the first International Conference on Measles Immunization. The National
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Institutes of Health hosted the conference in Bethesda, Maryland, and the event was partly a tribute to the recent advances by John Enders, a Nobel laureate who developed an exceptional strain of measles for use in vaccines.\textsuperscript{357} Enders discovered the strain in an eleven-year-old boy, Dave Edmonston, that provided an infection strong enough to build immunity to the disease, but with mild enough symptoms not to sicken the child. The virus was named the Edmonston strain. Enders delivered a lecture after winning the Nobel Prize in 1954, which sparked new tissue culture studies in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{358} Enders never patented the strain because he believed, as his colleague Samuel Katz recalled Enders saying, “The more people working on the problem the sooner you’d get an answer.”\textsuperscript{359}

By 1961, increasing political tension between the Soviet Union and the United States spilled into public health issues. The Soviets had already begun using Albert Sabin’s oral polio vaccine on a mass scale. “The Soviet Union would be in a position to exploit the new oral poliomyelitis vaccine as a ‘Cold War’ weapon if the U.S. did not accelerate mass production of the vaccine,” was the lead of a \textit{New York Times} article that year.\textsuperscript{360} Under this pressure, President Kennedy made vaccinations a critical aspect of his administration. He proposed the Vaccine Approbations Act, which subsidized
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polio and measles vaccine purchases by the state, and funded vaccines for the next four decades.\textsuperscript{361}

During the hearing for the Vaccine Approbations Act in 1962, congressmen from the southern and western regions of the country showed concern about its implicit coercion. The critics recognized that an increase in federal funds also increased pressure to vaccinate. They carefully ensured that state-mandated religious and philosophical exemptions were not overridden by the federal government.\textsuperscript{362}

Vaccination was so successful throughout the 1960s that general concern for infectious diseases fell, and by 1970, President Nixon shifted focus to cancer.\textsuperscript{363} During this period, however, policy makers weakly applied vaccine laws. By 1969, twenty-four states still had no vaccination requirements and of the states that had requirements, only eight had penalties for not vaccinating. The ineffectual execution of mass vaccinations halted in 1977, when the Carter administration arrived in Washington. They requested that the CDC set a goal to have ninety percent of children immunized by school entry. During this time, federal spending on vaccinations more than quadrupled from $4.9 million in 1976 to $23 million two years later.\textsuperscript{364}

In 1998, a revival of the anti-vaccination movement occurred when an article authored by Andrew Wakefield and published in the prestigious British medical journal, \textit{The
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Lancet, claimed a connection between autism and bowel disease and the MMR vaccine. Wakefield’s article feigned scientific evidence linking the MMR vaccine to autism and bowel disease and fueled the growing anti-vaccination movement in America. He based his work on twelve cases of autistic children admitted to the Royal Free Hospital in London in 1996-1997. The article has since been thoroughly investigated and found to be definitively false and fraudulent.365 The Lancet retracted Wakefield’s article twelve years after its publication. A retraction from a journal is an unusual event. “Typically, bad science disappears in a fog of irreproducibility, never requiring a formal retraction,” wrote Paul Offit, Professor of Vaccinology and Pediatrics at the Perelman School of Medicine. “Journal editors retract only those studies they believe were falsified or misrepresented.”366

In addition, Brian Deer of The Sunday Times of London, found serious conflicts of interest relating to the funding of Wakefield’s study. Deer found that Richard Barr, a personal injury lawyer who represented the parents of five of the twelve children in Wakefield’s study, had paid Wakefield £435,643, plus expenses, to support his research.367 This research was used in the lawsuit against
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pharmaceutical companies, claiming that the MMR vaccine caused autism.  

Two months after the retraction of Wakefield’s article, the General Medical Council, an independent regulator for physicians in England, concluded a 217-day fitness-to-practice hearing and stripped him from the medical register. After learning of the conflicts of interest, Richard Horton, editor of The Lancet, admitted that “he should never have published Wakefield’s article linking MMR to autism.” The scientific community discredited Wakefield’s work, yet its damage lingers as misinformation.

Still popular within the anti-vaccine movement, Wakefield, who now lives in Austin, Texas, returned to prominence when the Trump administration took office in 2016. Wakefield attended one of the inaugural balls, where he spoke about his ongoing battle against the medical establishment: “What we need now is a huge shakeup at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention – a huge shakeup. We need that to change dramatically.”

Misinformation and Public Health Initiatives

The effects of the anti-vaccination movement are still felt throughout the world. The World Health Organization listed “vaccine hesitancy” as one of the top ten global health
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threats in 2019. Vaccine hesitancy refers to people who hesitate to vaccinate even when vaccines are available. The issue has nothing to do with where the balance of scientific evidence rests, but with the ability of the anti-vaccination movement to convey misinformation to the public. One study analyzed the content of 480 anti-vaccine websites for misinformation, source of their misinformation, and persuasive tactics used. They found that messages are persuasive to parents against vaccination by mixing credible science and parental anecdotes with a “considerable amount of misinformation.”

“The deluge of conflicting information, misinformation, and manipulated information on social media,” said Heidi Larson, director of The Vaccine Confidence Project, “should be recognized as a global public-health threat.” The Vaccine Confidence Project targets misinformation and acts as a myth-buster in hopes of stifling rumors against vaccines before they go viral. The project also created a Vaccine Confidence Index that tracks attitudes toward vaccines and categorizes misinformation into various levels. Examples of poor science like

---


Wakefield’s 1998 article and social media disseminators, who can widely and quickly spread misinformation are included in this index. Social media misinformation creates a cloud of confusion that circulates in the general public, which increases vaccine hesitancy.

Misinformation on social media affects public behavior. For example, after a group in Denmark broadcast testimonies on social media purporting harm done to girls by the human papillomavirus vaccination, the national immunization rates fell from more than ninety percent in 2000 to under twenty percent in 2005. Prominent government officials and their spouses typically have large social media followings and in some cases, have used this platform to propagate misinformation about measles and vaccines. President Donald Trump tweeted about the debunked link between autism and the MMR vaccine: “Healthy young child goes to doctor, gets pumped with massive shot of many vaccines, doesn't feel good and changes - AUTISM. Many such cases!” Darla Shine, the wife of former White House Communications Director, Bill Shine, has also posted false claims that naturally contracting measles fights cancer: “The entire Baby Boom population alive today had the #Measles as kids. Bring back our
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#ChildhoodDiseases they keep you healthy & fight cancer.”376

One cost-effective way to address the sources and distribution channels of vaccine misinformation is to invest further in public health initiatives. A study in the Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health found that the median return on investment (ROI) for nationwide public health interventions was 27.2 and the median cost-benefit ratio (CBR) was 17.5.377 A 27.2 ROI for public health interventions means that for every dollar spent on public health there is about $27 dollars gained in benefits. The CBR divides the benefit of public health interventions by its costs, so the ratio represents $17.50 in benefits for every dollar in costs. In terms of economics, public health spending is an exceptionally good deal for communities.

Vaccinations are a key part of public health interventions and vaccine success rate can drastically alter the CBR. Generally, vaccines save $34 for every dollar spent. These savings come from preventing large amounts of suffering and death—the World Health Organization estimates that from 2000 to 2017, the “measles vaccination prevented an estimated 21.1 million deaths.”378 Even so, not all vaccines are equally effective. While thirty-four to

one is the average, some vaccines are less successful in matching infections. In cases of poor matches, the CBR can be as low as twenty-one to one. Although good matches are crucial for successful vaccines, this is less of an issue for the measles vaccine, since measles does not mutate frequently. A research letter in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* suggests that a “failure to vaccinate, rather than failure of vaccine performance, may be the main driver of measles transmission, emphasizing the importance of maintaining high vaccine coverage.”

**Trendsetting Legislation: SB-277**

Vaccinations cannot save lives and prevent suffering if communities refuse to inoculate. California found an effective means to curtail low vaccination rates—one that harkens back to England’s Vaccination laws in the 1800s. After the measles outbreak in Disneyland, State Senator Richard Pan authored Senate Bill 277, which removed all exemptions—except medical exemptions—from vaccine requirements for children entering school. It also permitted local health departments access to school health information on student vaccinations to determine any immunization deficiencies.

---


Although a large majority of Californians supported vaccinations, opponents voiced their disapproval during the debate over SB-277. One reporter framed the dispute as though it were two equal sides of a contentious argument. Tracy Seipel, from the *East Bay Times*, wrote an article titled, “Incendiary Vaccine Bill Advances in 6-2 Senate Health Committee Vote.” The article refers to vaccines as “Sacramento’s most contentious issue this year.” While anti-vaccination groups protested the hearing, nothing is contentious about the overwhelming consensus of the scientific community regarding the safety and effectiveness of vaccines.

Before SB-277, parents easily opted out of vaccinating their children by using religious or philosophical exemptions. Unvaccinated students were also admitted conditionally if they planned to be vaccinated at a later time. In 2014, one in every three students in California lived in a county with a vaccination rate below ninety percent. Even though the overall vaccination rate in the state was ninety-three percent, it was unevenly distributed among communities—some communities were protected by herd immunity while others fell below the necessary vaccination rate. After the bill took effect in 2016—eliminating all but medical exemptions and curbing conditional admission by requiring students to vaccinate within six months—more than ninety-nine percent of students attended schools in

---
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communities with vaccination rates that achieved herd immunity.382

Fall of 2016 saw the highest vaccination rates in Californian kindergarteners since 1998. In particular, the vaccination rate for measles rose to 97.3 percent in 2016, from 92.6 percent in 2014—the year of the Disneyland outbreak.383 California also saw a twenty-five percent increase in vaccination rates within the worst-performing ten percent of communities.384 Since measles is highly contagious, medical officials suggest a ninety-five percent vaccination rate to achieve herd immunity, which SB-277 has led California to surpass. These numbers show that the legislation worked, and similar legislation in other states could spread these successes throughout the country.

Years after the lessons learned from Disneyland, measles reemerged in Oregon and Washington. Measles is not a disease of a bygone era; it can and has returned. The Disneyland outbreak taught California to handle infectious diseases seriously. California strengthened its policy on school-entry vaccinations and dramatically increased vaccination rates. These policies worked, and the public benefited from effective vaccination legislation. The Northwest should turn to California for guidance.
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New Epidemics in the Northwest

The American Northwest recently experienced one of its most severe measles epidemics in history. Seventy-five measles cases were reported to the CDC by the beginning of 2019, while vaccination rates in Oregon counties have dropped over the past fifteen years. In 2000, the vaccination rate for kindergarteners in Oregon was more than ninety-five percent, but by 2015, it plummeted to thirty percent.386 In response, the Oregon legislature—following California’s model SB227—introduced its own House Bill 3063, which intends to increase the vaccination rates by eliminating philosophical and religious exemptions. Having failed to pass legislation in 2015, Oregon’s current epidemic may be the impetus to push it through this time. The Oregon Pediatric Society, the Oregon Nurses Association, and the Oregon Education Association all endorsed the bill.

The Oregonians for Medical Freedom (OFMF), the state’s prominent anti-vaccination organization, also attended the hearings for the new bill. Dr. Paul Thomas serves as Co-Chair for OFMF and authored The Vaccine-Friendly Plan, which promotes vaccine hesitancy and is a best seller on Amazon in the vaccination category. Thomas runs a clinic in Beaverton that has more than 15,000 patients. One parent, who received consultation from Thomas, saw her six-year-old unvaccinated son contract tetanus.387 The CDC reported the case in March 2019, and the story quickly
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became national news. The boy was hospitalized for fifty-seven days and his inpatient costs were more than $800,000.388 After the ordeal, remarkably, the parents still refused to vaccinate their child.389 Before this, the last pediatric tetanus case in Oregon was over thirty years ago.390 Despite the lack of evidence for a causal link between autism and the MMR vaccine, Thomas asserted that House Bill 3063 will lead to hundreds of new cases of autism.391

Although Thomas’ claim that the MMR vaccine causes autism is scientifically unsubstantiated, many other scientific reasons do exist to explain the recent rise in autism. Since the United States began recording autism in 2000, cases have steadily increased. As of now, no test exists, such as a brain scan or blood sample, to diagnose autism. Physicians base diagnosis on observations of their patient’s behavior. The criteria for diagnosis are decided using the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). The CDC set up the Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network in 2000 to collect school and health records for eight-year-old children in designated counties around the country. Every two years, clinicians...
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analyze these records using the DSM criteria for autism, such as social problems and repetitive behavior.392

While this approach has the strength of recording data on all children living in a single area at a particular time, it also has weaknesses. One problem is the notable variation in rates of autism between states. Eric Fombonne, professor of psychiatry at Oregon Health and Science University, says that the variation probably is not due to any natural differences between states, but rather reflects the differences in autism awareness and the services provided in each state.393 The definition of autism over time has changed as well. Before 1980, autism was not listed in the DSM. In 1991, the US Department of Education ruled that autism was a learning disability, which encouraged parents to have their children diagnosed. One study notes that only 60.6 percent of autism cases diagnosed by the previous edition of the DSM will meet the new diagnostic criteria in the most current fifth edition, released in 2013.394 Individuals with autism may have been misdiagnosed in the past. These new diagnostic categories account in large part for the increasing prevalence of autism. The rise of autism coincides with a reduction of other developmental disorders. The decrease in the prevalence of intellectual disability, for example,
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accounted for more than sixty-four percent of the increase in autism.395

Besides the challenges of changing diagnostic criteria and differing levels of autism awareness, the rise of autism in the United States is also linked to biological factors arising from contemporary lifestyles. As men now wait longer to have children, they raise their risk of fathering a child with autism. The chances of fathering an autistic child begin to rise after age thirty, and men older than fifty are over two times more likely to father an autistic child than men under thirty.396 Premature babies also have higher survival rates than they did in the past, and these preterm babies are at a higher risk of autism—the risk rises the earlier delivery occurs.397

Even with a lack of evidence to link the MMR vaccine to autism, Oregonians still diligently avoided vaccination through exemptions. In 2018, Oregon waived vaccinations with non-medical exemptions for kindergarten children at 7.6 percent, by far the highest in the United States, while the national median stood at 2.2 percent.398
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Parents easily acquired a vaccination exemption for their children by watching an informational video.399 Vaccination rates crucially depend on how states handle exemptions—especially the ease with which parents exempt their children or the ease in which doctors write exemptions for children. If Oregon passes House Bill 3063, it will face the same issues California is now facing: the use of medical exemptions as a substitute for philosophical and religious exemptions.

**Extraordinary Exemptions**

Californian officials anticipated a small rise in medical exemptions after passing SB-277. They assumed that some medically exempt children opted for religious or philosophical exemptions because they were easier to acquire, but SB-277 removed that option. Parents needed a doctor’s note to waive the vaccine requirement. Yet officials did not anticipate the more than threefold increase in medical exemptions.400 Doctors estimate that at most only three percent of the population qualify for medical exemptions—as a result of medical conditions such as an allergy to gelatin or chemotherapy treatment. Strikingly, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that in fifty-eight schools across California, as many as ten percent of children were medically exempt in
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fall 2016, and seven schools had twenty percent or more medically exempt children. Curiously, one school, Sunridge Charter, gave medical exemptions to forty percent of its student body.401 These schools, well below the vaccination rate to achieve herd immunity, endanger their students to a measles epidemic.

States have the authority to mandate vaccinations, so medical exemptions are a delegation of state authority to physicians for the protection of public health. Senator Richard Pan notes that, “Essentially, physicians are fulfilling an administrative role: certifying to the state that a patient meets professionally recognized criteria that justify granting an ME [medical exemption].”402 West Virginia is another state, like California, that accepts only medical exemptions for school vaccinations. They require the child’s physician to submit an exemption to a State Immunization Officer, who is a licensed physician in West Virginia and employed by the State Bureau for Public Health. The officer then determines the validity of the medical contraindications for each vaccine based on guidance from the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Academy of Family Physicians.403 This model avoids placing school
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administrators in the position of arbiter of medical exemptions.

One study surveyed the experiences of health officials and immunization staff who worked with medical exemptions in California after SB-277 went into effect. The study concluded that if the state does not make legal changes to include a standardized review board for medical exemptions, the long-term success of SB-277 is questionable. The 250 percent increase of medical exemptions since the implementation of SB-277 is in part due to physicians writing exemptions to please vaccine-hesitant parents.404

After legislators passed SB-277, about 200 doctors, lawyers, and scientists—all opposed to pro-vaccination laws—organized into the Physicians for Informed Consent. One founding member is Orange County Pediatrician Bob Sears.405 Sears was convicted of gross negligence, “in that he did not obtain the basic information necessary for decision making, prior to determining to exclude the possibility of future vaccines” for his two-year-old patient.406 On June 27, 2018, the Medical Board of


California placed Sears on probation for 35 months, during which time his practice of medicine will be monitored.  

Concern has risen about such negligent doctors or even physicians who “monetize their license” by selling exemptions. Members of the Health Officers Association of California, who dealt with medical exemptions in the wake of SB-277, told of some bizarre schemes to circumnavigate vaccinations and acquire questionable doctors’ exemptions. “I’m getting a very high volume of medical exemptions from one provider…[Patients are] not charged for the office visit; they’re charged to view a video. She used to just give permanent medical exemptions, and now she’s giving temporary [exemptions] for three months…Now families have to go back every three months and pay $300 to get their temporary medical exemption updated…” said an immunization coordinator. In some cases, the exchange of exemptions for money is not even conducted in person: “When we talk to the parents, come to find out they never actually were examined by this physician. They just made a phone call and got this letter for $100,” a communicable disease coordinator said.

There have been attempts to intimidate health officials assigned with evaluating medical exemptions:
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“When they named me and my boss and our county [in a federal civil lawsuit], it was really a way to try and scare us away from doing our job and to signal to other local health officers that this is what they have coming to them if they continue to do their job,” said a health officer in an urban jurisdiction.411 Health officials do not intend, however, to question the authority of doctors who write exemptions. “We’re not the auditors of the physicians. If a licensed physician in California says this child has a medical exemption, we’re not going to go do investigative work to say oh no, that’s not valid,” said one health official. “That would be an entirely different role for the health department that I don’t really think we should be in. So, we trust their judgment that there’s a medical exemption…”412

The issue boils down to the proportion of medical exemptions that communities can withstand before they jeopardize herd immunity, and also to what extent the community can persuade parents to vaccinate their children. Medical exemptions are not simply a legal issue; they have epidemiological consequences since community safety from infectious disease is at stake.413

**Neglecting Vaccinations and States of Emergency**

Senate Bill 277, along with prevention of spurious medical exemptions, protect counties and avoid situations where state authority asserts heightened control of
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communities for public safety. The recent declarations of states of emergency in the Orthodox Jewish communities in Brooklyn and Rockland County are two cases that demonstrated what authorities can and will do to maintain public health if vaccinations are neglected and outbreaks run rampant.414

In the fall of 2018, a measles epidemic erupted in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio declared a state of emergency requiring unvaccinated children to receive the measles vaccine or face a city violation and possibly a fine of $1,000.415 By the following mid-April, 329 cases were confirmed—largely confined to the ultra-orthodox Jewish community.416 Hospitals admitted twenty-one patients, of which the intensive care unit admitted five. Despite some progress addressing the problem, de Blasio decided, “it was time to take a more muscular approach.” The city’s health commissioner, Dr. Oxiris Barbot, noted that “the point here is not to fine people but to make it easier for them to get vaccinated.”417 The executive order pulled nearly 6,000 children from school, distributed almost 17,000 doses of the MMR vaccine in twenty-six weeks, and launched a health campaign where health officials, doctors, and rabbis demonstrated the value of immunizations.418

Even so, a preschool did not cooperate with authorities and became the first school to be shut down by the city to stave off the epidemic. Officials closed the United Talmudical Academy’s preschool, which serves 250 students, for violating a Health Department order that required it to provide medical and attendance records during the outbreak. Previously, the city issued violations to twenty-three yeshivas and day cares for not following the order. Nick Paolucci, the spokesman for the city’s Law Department, said that they “are confident that the city’s order is within the health commissioner’s authority to address the very serious danger presented by this measles outbreak.”

Failing to follow the city’s emergency order, the court issued summons to three parents, who will be charged $2,000 if they fail to respond. It has been at least a century since authorities have issued fines for such violations. A Brooklyn judge sided with New York officials to uphold the order and dismissed a lawsuit from a group of parents who claimed the order overstepped the city’s authority. Judge Lawrence Knipel said, “A fireman need not obtain the informed consent of the owner before extinguishing a house fire. Vaccination is known to extinguish the fire of contagion.”

Rockland County, a northern suburb of New York City, went as far as to bar unvaccinated children from public
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places. The outbreak within Rockland also was mostly contained within the Orthodox Jewish community, which has ties to Brooklyn. Rabbi Yakov Horowitz, founding dean of Yeshiva Darchei Noam, supports vaccinations but was concerned that Rockland’s declaration may lead to harassment against ultra-Orthodox Jews. In addition, Lawrence Gostin, Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University, said that the order was constitutionally problematic. Gostin advocates mandatory vaccinations for school entry, but questions the constitutional legitimacy of prohibiting children from public places.422

**Conclusion**

The vast majority of the public is on board with vaccinating against preventable diseases. Vaccine hesitancy is not a matter of scientific controversy, but rather an effect of misinformation and confusion within small pockets of the population about the safety of immunization and the dangers of measles. Having once declared the elimination of measles, the United States once again suffers from epidemics across the country. As Oregon pushes forward with legislation in line with SB-277, their measles epidemic may be the impetus needed to pass their House Bill 3063. States will need to handle unscrupulous medical exemptions as they come to pass similar legislation preventing religious and philosophical exemptions for school-entry vaccinations. These exemptions are not completely legal issues. They have epidemiological significance when they threaten to lower vaccination rates below herd immunity. SB-277 is a model
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of effective state legislation that keeps communities safe and avoids the threats of serious epidemics—as seen recently in Brooklyn and Rockland County that warranted declarations of emergency to quell outbreaks. The measles outbreak in Disneyland caused California to reconsider its vaccination policies. SB-277 increased vaccination rates, and if adopted by other states, they too could have similar success. While measles has re-surfaced from American history, significant policy changes are poised to eliminate so much preventable suffering.
Book Reviews


Over the past two decades, Brooklyn has undergone a renaissance, sparking historical inquiry into the borough’s unexplored history. In *When Brooklyn Was Queer: A History*, Hugh Ryan, a gifted historian and storyteller as well as the founder of a pop-up LGBTQ museum, seeks to fill a gap in the history of New York City. Ryan, a relatively recent Brooklynite, describes how despite his academic training in the history of sexuality and gender, he stumbled upon the subject matter of his book by chance while working as a reporter in the borough. Ryan’s work is in dialogue with and is influenced by George Chauncey’s 1994 *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940.* However, Ryan’s work has a much broader focus than Chauncey’s classic work. While Chauncey focused on gay men and culture in Manhattan, Ryan explores the rich, but what he categorizes as forgotten, history of “queer people” in Brooklyn from the mid-nineteenth century to the pre-Stonewall era.

The title of the book is both a play on words and represents a challenge to the contemporary era’s conception of sexuality, as well as the repeated foolhardy attempts to impose views on gender and sexuality on the past. Brooklyn,

---

in Ryan’s view, was “queer” because it possessed an odd and quirky character that differed from Manhattan. The title’s second meaning challenges the contemporary era’s notion of the fixed nature of sexuality and its sexual labels.

Despite recent attempts to reclaim the term, “queer” remains a controversial word in the LGBTQ community due to its long history as a slur. Thus, Ryan’s use of the term may be controversial for some general readers at first glance. However, Ryan persuasively describes how the use of “queer” is more appropriate than the use of contemporary terms when referring to sexual minorities and gender nonconformists who lived in prior generations. Ryan explains how terms like gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transsexual are anachronistic terms when describing men and women in the past, as people in the past did not share current understandings of gender and sexuality. Instead, Ryan uses the all-comprising term “queer” to describe a wide array of sexual minorities and gender nonconformists, including what the contemporary era refers to as gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, transgender individuals, as well a collection peoples who challenge dominant gender stereotypes. Ryan’s wide focus allows him to explore people that sometimes fall outside of the traditional scope of LGBT history.

Ryan’s exploration of the history of “queer people” in Brooklyn, sheds valuable light on notions of gender and sexuality in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially of often-overlooked working-class “queer people.” Specifically, Ryan does his best work in his analysis of how various forces and events shaped notions of gender and sexuality and how these forces and events
interacted with “queer people” and “queer spaces” in Brooklyn in the pre-Stonewall era. These factors and events include urbanization in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Progressivism in the early 20th century, both World Wars, the Cold War, and deindustrialization, as well as demographic changes in the mid-20th century. In doing so, Ryan challenges the contemporary era’s notion of the fixed nature of gender and sexuality.

Divided into seven chapters, Ryan traces the history of “queer people,” beginning with the public emergence of “queer spaces” and “queer people” in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Then, Ryan traces how various events, including the Progressive Era, the roaring 1920s, the Depression, World War II, and the Cold War impacted Brooklyn’s “queer people” and “queer places.” In Chapter Seven, Ryan describes Brooklyn’s “queer history” as erased, in large part, due to the post-World War II era destruction of many “queer places” in the borough. According to Ryan, Brooklyn’s “queer history” was intrinsically linked to several waterfront communities, including Brooklyn Heights, Coney Island, and the neighborhoods surrounding the Brooklyn Naval Yard. The deterioration of waterfront neighborhoods in the middle of the twentieth century due to a host of factors including deindustrialization, changes in the public’s tastes in entertainment, the closure of the Brooklyn Naval Yard, changing demographics, and city planners that destroyed large tracts of waterfront in the city, erased the memory of places previously linked to “queer people” in Brooklyn.

Ryan’s book draws heavily on a rich collection of primary and secondary sources. His work is in dialogue with and draws upon insights of prior scholarly works in the field of the history of sexuality, most notably Chauncey’s *Gay
New York. Moreover, Ryan’s book fills gaps in the prior research as he draws upon varied underworked sources, including the memoirs, papers, and interviews of a wide range of “queer” Brooklynites. Thus, Ryan’s book not only draws upon the writings of such famous men like Walt Whitman and Hart Crane (most famously known for The Bridge) from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but also explores the lives of relatively unknown “queer people.” For example, Ryan introduces the reader to collection of interesting characters including little-known female researchers and writers, cross-dressing entertainers, muscle boys and bearded ladies from Coney Island, working-class men and sailors who occasionally slept with other men, lesbian steelworkers during World War II, as well as ordinary “queer” people who sought to live and love in relative anonymity in various neighborhoods in Brooklyn.

The book is the product of extensive archival research at various libraries in the New York City area, including at the New York Public Library. Specifically, Ryan’s extensive archival research as a Research Fellow at the New York Public Library provided him insight into how various reform groups interacted with Brooklyn’s “queer” communities. For example, Ryan explored the activities of groups like the Committee of Fourteen, a Progressive reform group in the early twentieth century, that sought to suppress both commercial sex as well as public sex between men. Moreover, Ryan explored the papers of organizations like the Committee for the Study of Sex Variants that sought to study sexuality in the 1930s. In the view of Ryan, social reformers, as well as the scientific community, played a
significant role in providing the intellectual justifications for what is now referred to as homophobia.

Ryan’s extensive research reveals how notions about sexuality in the nineteenth century differed markedly from the mid-twentieth century’s rigid division of sexuality into “homosexual” and “heterosexual” camps. In Ryan's view, the nineteenth century was relatively ambivalent towards those people who challenged dominant gender stereotypes. However, hostility towards “queer people” hardened in the early twentieth century as social reformers, the medical community, law enforcement, and courts used the power of the state, science, and the legal system first to categorize and then to criminalize “queer people.” Ryan details how the Cold War further played a role in shaping what Ryan describes as the relatively recent phenomenon of homophobia, as homosexuality and sexual difference emerged as both a moral and political threat during the hysteria of the McCarthy era. The Stonewall uprising and the political organizing of the 1960s, in Ryan’s opinion, was a backlash to the hardening of homophobia and sexual repression of the 1950s.

Despite the work’s many strengths, the book is not without its flaws. However, Ryan’s Epilogue directly addresses one of the few possible criticisms of his work, i.e., the book’s relatively cursory exploration of “queer people” of color. In addressing this criticism, Ryan persuasively explains how racism in the past that included red-lining and segregation, as well as the lack of primary sources, made it difficult to explore the lives of “queer people” of color in the pre-Stonewall era. Thus, Ryan hints at future research projects for enterprising historians of sexuality, African American, and New York City history who are willing to
take up his call for further study of Brooklyn’s “queer people” of color.

*When Brooklyn Was Queer: A History* is a must-read for the general reader as well as scholars with interest in New York City history and the history of sexuality. Ryan masterfully introduces the general reader to the insights of leading historians of sexuality and New York City. At the same time, he weaves in copious quotes and stories from the famous and ordinary “queer” Brooklynites which shed light on many chapters of Brooklyn’s forgotten “queer history.” This rare combination renders Ryan’s work both an entertaining and informative page-turner for the general reader and the scholar alike. In particular, Ryan’s work should also be assigned reading for any aspiring historian. Ryan’s work serves as an example of how to write in clear, engaging, and accessible historical prose while simultaneously weighing into heady historiographical debates like the origins of homophobia, the nature of gender and sexuality, and the interaction between various forces, events, and the “queer community.”

—James Barney, University of Memphis

Historians of modern India continue to debate when people across the subcontinent started to see themselves as part of a shared “India?” When did Indians, whether in Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, or Tamil Nadu see their fates linked together as part of a national project? Scholars can be tempted to focus attention on larger, more obvious moments like India’s 1947 declaration of independence or on one of the repeated conflicts with Pakistan. A new book suggests a different moment in time, when Indian nationalists fashioned a new national space around a shared purpose and future, with the thinking that a tragedy in one region was a tragedy to the nation as a whole.

Boston University Professor Benjamin Robert Siegel’s superb debut monograph, Hungry Nation (based on his 2014 doctoral dissertation), argues that the genesis of modern India is the 1943 Bengal famine. The severity of the famine, in which three to four million lives were lost due to hunger and malnutrition, is not what makes it the starting point of contemporary India. Rather, the famine created a breaking point in Indian frustration with English colonial rule and disgust with British attempts to whitewash their culpability in the death toll. Most importantly, the famine contributed to the emerging idea that a free India would make real the promise of food for all. Indian nationalists imagined food, and its abundance, as the ultimate symbol of self-determination, and Siegel skillfully explores the relationship between food, rights, and citizenship. The Bengal famine occurred in an India replete with telegraph wires, terrestrial radio waves, and thousands of miles of
railroad tracks. It was the dawn of an era where mass media provided first-hand accounts and photographic evidence of starvation. As much as they tried, British colonial authorities could not censor every publication. Indians living from Kanpur to Kochi saw their fellow countrymen and women dying. It was no longer possible to believe that only some cities and regions were suffering and Indians came to understand that the problem of feeding people was a national problem.

Incorporating English, Hindi, Urdu, and a smattering of Bengali sources, Siegel’s *Hungry Nation* weaves together many threads, exploring how India’s first generation of leaders came to recognize that achieving food security was paramount in postcolonial nation-building. India’s first generation of leaders recognized that if the new state could confront and conquer the bedeviling food problem, its governing expertise and authority would see fewer challenges by the newly free citizenry. Siegel’s book demonstrated the many ways independent India tried to feed itself and how different stakeholders pushed back on one another. Siegel’s account highlights Indian citizens such as farmers, grain merchants and landless laborers, who craved not just enough to eat, but hoped self-rule would usher in a future India that had achieved true freedom from want.

*Hungry Nation* unfolds over an introduction, six chapters, and a concise conclusion. The early chapters investigate the last years of British colonial rule and the 1943 Bengal famine which resulted in a mandate for self-rule and a fundamentally different polity and economy. In its earliest years of independence, India became “food-minded” as it drafted ambitious, yet unsuccessful, plans for self-
sufficiency by the start of the 1950s. The middle chapters examine Indian central government schemes to grow more food, transform diets, and encourage Indian citizens to skip meals. In public, from Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru down, Indian officials talked up their proposals as if hope could will food into existence. In private, they grew concerned that they had overpromised what they could deliver to their citizens and worried that Indian citizens were unwilling to cooperate with the growing number of regulations and top-down mandates. The final chapters reveal how food became a protracted political fight between nascent right-wing Hindu organizations, the ruling secular and center-left Congress Party, and more left-leaning groups. These left-leaning groups believed India’s battle with hunger could be solved through collective farming, reducing the influence of India’s propertied classes, and the redistribution of millions of acres through land reform. It is these chapters that are the book’s strongest—particularly Siegel’s analysis that India’s leaders surrendered the larger fight for social equity in an attempt to solve the issue of food security. Increased agricultural production won out over structural reforms to the detriment of small farmers and landless laborers who saw the rich get richer, gain control of land and resources, and wield greater political clout to protect and ensure their hegemonic class.

Siegel’s book covers the 1940s through to the 1970s, but his transition from decade to decade is rocky at times, jumping back and forth too quickly and between different Indian leaders leaving this reader briefly confused. Chapter Three introduces a fascinating gender dynamic to India’s quest to feed itself by profiling the All India Women’s Conference. In this chapter, Siegel explores how the conference appealed to women as the “food ministers” of
their households, with their own unique part to play in independent India. The book would have been stronger if this gendered thread had been carried through more of the work and it would have been useful for the author to explore Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s approach to gender in greater depth. Lastly, the striking conclusion that India’s planning and agricultural policy decisions actually increased inequality could have been highlighted earlier in the book. A more accurate subtitle for Siegel’s book might state how food, famine, and inequality made modern India.

Overall, Siegel produced an excellent account of how food became the final issue in the nationalist push for independence and the first challenge of the new Indian state. This work is a profound contribution to multiple fields of literature, from modern India, to South Asian history, as well as food studies and human rights. *Hungry Nation* offers valuable insights on postcolonial nation building, the successes and failures of development planning, and the role of food in modern political and economic histories. If Siegel’s goal was to bring food into the larger discussion of political and economic life, his book definitely secured it a place at the table.

—Marc A. Reyes, University of Connecticut