THE STUDENT HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Volume 48
2016-2017

THE STUDENT HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Loyola University New Orleans
Volume 48, 2016-17

The Pi Chi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, International History Honor Society, publishes the *Loyola University Student Historical Journal.* Each year the *SHJ* serves as the culmination of the chapter's scholarly activities. Since 1966, the journal has been published to encourage scholarly activity by students and make public their best research efforts. The papers selected for publication were chosen from among those submitted to an editorial board that includes student members of LUSHA and/or PAT. The papers are judged both for their scholarship and quality of writing. Students who wish to submit a paper for next year's publication should contact:

Department of History
Loyola University New Orleans
6363 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70118

A Note on Publication

The editorial board has attempted to reproduce all of the papers in this journal in the same form in which they were first submitted. The board has formatted the papers for the sake of publication. Other than formatting style, however, the following works reflect the writing styles and skills of the individual authors.

Table of Contents

Editorial Commentary

Kevin Anthony Fox Jr.

College is the period where we transition from pubescence to adulthood, and as students we undergo a transformation from lay children scratching the surface of general study to grown folks producing professional scholarship. History students begin their foray into the world of the historian – dissecting people, places, and events long gone by. Historians unearth and describe the context of the contemporary world, the "modern" and even "postmodern" day. We compartmentalize and partition every recording of the human being, describing eras and epochs, elucidating the stories that make up our understanding of the world. From the earliest dawn of antiquity, when humankind first learned to stand upright, communication has been an attempt to share experiences. Singing, gesturing, speaking, writing, drawing – all are the building blocks of expression and conveyance. All are little bits of effort to understand each other. All, little attempts to say "Hey guys, check this out. This is pretty cool, right?"

History, as far as traditional subjects go, can often be cast as being dull or remote to those who have not deigned to look deeper. Many unlucky students have been duped by some combination of boring teachers and lack of imagination. History can seem anything but cool to newly initiated college students, when in fact history is a revolutionary act of creation. We here at the Loyola University New Orleans History Department know this, and we are not so selfish with the rare jewels and fantastic art among our findings. In these pages, you will be treated to a variety of explorations and narratives that will lend you, dear reader, an opportunity to grow in understanding. No mental or emotional expense has been spared by the scholars that have composed these pieces. These are the best of the best.

We have tremendous students at Loyola University New Orleans doing great work. They have interests ranging from folk music to the constitutional ramifications of the death penalty, and none of them has cowered from the feat of serious intellectual inquiry. In this time, more than other periods, we need to have the presence of mind and social awareness that historical knowledge affords. In this current moment, the historical understanding of the American people is being challenged, and our ability to meet this challenge will greatly impact human history going further. Our capacity to empathize with one another and to make informed decisions about the world we want to live in is paramount. As scholars it is our responsibility to take up the practice of history to re-create, re-imagine, and revolutionize the world we live in. We are on the precipice of great change in the republic. We can feel its winds swirling all around us. We cannot say yet what the future will bring, but knowledge of the past can help us predict, prognosticate, and – when necessary – prevent.

Proving Indianness: The Pointe Au Chien and American Indians of the Mississippi River Valley

Outstanding Research Essay Award

Summer AbuKhomra

The Pointe Au Chien Tribe of southern Louisiana consists of approximately 680 members who are believed to be the descendants of the Acolapissa, Atakapas, Biloxi, and Chitimacha Indians. Most members of the tribe still inhabit their ancestral lands in Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes. This French-speaking and largely Christian tribe, like others in the region, was largely influenced by the French colonization of Louisiana. With French, Spanish, and American exploration of Southern Louisiana came an exchange-economy, slavery, disease, exploitation, denial of educational opportunities, and the marginalization of Indian people. For decades, the tribe has worked to gather the necessary information in hopes of obtaining federal recognition from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. While the Pointe Au Chien are recognized as a tribe by the state of Louisiana, they are unable to prove their existence as a cohesive tribe which formed prior to 1900, largely because of the false and inaccurate histories written about them.

Members of the Pointe Au Chien Tribe first applied for federal recognition in 1996, but their plea was denied because of their inability to prove their "Indianness." This inability is largely due to the inaccurate histories, generalizations, and assumption of the Pointe Au Chien Tribe and many other Petite Nations of the Mississippi River Valley. These narratives are uncritically told through the perspective of outsiders, that is, individuals not affiliated with the tribe. Their inaccuracy has proved to be a challenge for the Pointe Au Chien and other tribes of Southern Louisiana in their request for federal recognition. This research aims to analyze the changing narratives throughout Louisiana Indian history and the motives behind them, showing just how essential it is for historians, anthropologists, and all members of academia to advocate for objectivity in scholarship and respect subjects of such scholarship as agentive individuals.

The Pointe Au Chien, like many tribes, has borne the brunt of ignorance from outsiders, both scholars and the general public. Historically, this Indian community survived as fishermen, hunters, and farmers; however, the tribe is no longer able to rely on land cultivation to the same degree because of saltwater intrusion and land loss, although commercial fishing has remained crucial to the economic success of tribal members. The rapid environmental changes in the delta region have, to an extent, occurred because of natural events, the rate at which this change is occurring is largely due to human error. Companies such as Shell Offshore, BP Exploration & Production, and Chevron are responsible for 45% of total U.S. petroleum refining capacity and 51%

of total U.S. natural gas processing capacity.[i] These companies are some of the few responsible for dredging through the bayou in search of oil and natural gas. These natural and unnatural events have destroyed vegetation and resulted in raising sea levels and land loss. Not only is the Pointe Au Chien tribe losing their way of life, but they are also losing their history. Buried under the sinking bayou lay the artifacts and land of the historic tribe, but similarly to other tribes, they are unable to protect themselves from the saltwater intrusion, rising waters, and land loss because they are not federally recognized through the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs. Federal recognition is crucial for all tribes that wish to maintain a distinct community because it provides them with the sovereignty and autonomy to oversee their tribe; this includes education systems, land trusts, grants, disaster relief, and land and water claim settlements.[ii]

The earliest known writings of the Pointe Au Chien were written by anthropologist and ethnologist John Reed Swanton. Swanton was born in 1873 in Gardiner, Maine. Educated as one of the first in his field at Harvard and Columbia Universities, Swanton quickly earned respect from fellow scholars. He was associated with many of the organizations in his field, such as his service as an editor for the *American Anthropologist* and as president of The American Anthropological Association. [iii] Swanton's contributions to methodology, ethnology, and linguistics have had a lasting effect in his field.[iv]

Swanton made it a mission to document Indian tribes of North America, and in doing so, became the first to show an interest in the ethnohistory of Indians of the Mississippi River Valley. In his work, Swanton referred to all Petite Nations south of the Mississippi Valley as "Houma." This included the Pointe Au Chien Tribe, which historically, was not connected to the Houma Indians. the Pointe Au Chien formed from remnants of the Acolapissa, Atakapas, Biloxi, and Chitimacha Indians. This fallacy proved to be destructive in forming a narrative for tribes south of the Houma. Historians, anthropologists, and other scholars have followed Swanton's model of misidentifying this tribe as "Houma."

In 1907, John Reed Swanton published his Field Notes on the Pointe Au Chien, or "Houma" as he called them. The primary goal of his research was to document the language, ancestry, and legacy of Indians in Southern Louisiana. His work strongly reflected a common early 20th century idea that the authentic Indian race would soon disappear—that they would either assimilate into American society or die out because of their refusal to do so. Swanton provided a detailed collection of information, which he gathered by interviewing the Pointe Au Chien people themselves. On the first page of his typewritten notes, Swanton lists information he gathered from Bartholemy Billiout, whose grandfather was a Biloxi chief. [v] Throughout his notes, Swanton often mentions that there is some intermarriage or influence from

other tribes such as the Biloxi, Chitimacha, Atakapas, and Acolapissa; however, he continues to acknowledge this tribe as being "Houma." He notes the three traditional "Houma" family names: Couteaux, Billiout, and Veirdean.[vi] These names have a French origin, pointing to the intermarriage of French settlers within the tribe. There was also a small percentage of African American blood within the tribe; however, members of the tribe were of a fair enough complexion to pass as only Indian, or sometimes white, especially since this was a French-speaking tribe.

In "Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf Of Mexico," Swanton categorizes the Indian tribes of the region in five different groups: the Natchez, Muskhogean (the Houma fall under this category), Tunican, Chitimachan, and Atakapan.[vii] Several other tribes fall under the following categories. It is clear from Swanton's categorization that he has no real understanding that the Pointe Au Chien tribe was formed by members of other tribes that fall under different categories.

In March of 1947, Frances Marian Sanders published her thesis, "What God Hath Wrought – on Pointe Au Chien," which was submitted to the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. In the summer of 1944, Sanders volunteered for missionary work with the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention and was relocated to work with the Pointe Au Chien people.[viii] Although Sanders was fond of the Pointe Au Chien people, there is also a sense of pity in her patronizing narrative. Sanders adds that much of the factual information recorded in her thesis is courtesy of Mr. and Mrs. Berkman DeVille, Mrs. L. Grace Thompson, and the Seminary's records.[ix]

The missionary in Montegut aimed to assimilate the Pointe Au Chien into white, Southern Baptist culture. In 1938, Rev. Berkman DeVille and his family moved into the area to oversee the missionaries.[x] Sanders recalled that the new missionaries found the Indian people to be "a sadly neglected and underprivileged people in every sense of the word."[xi] She says the Indians as a whole are a "quiet and slow-moving people, but one appreciative of and responsive to sincere friendliness."[xii] Although she says this with sincerity, there is a strong sense of pity and infantilization. This fueled their hope of taking the Indians out of their "neglected" way of life.

Sanders wrote that the Pointe Au Chien Indians are descendants of the Houma, building off of John R. Swanton's fallacy; however, she said there are no full-blooded Houma left in the tribe, which, she says also composed of "Choctaw, Biloxi, and Chitimacha, early Spanish, French and unspecified American besides several recent accessions of Filipinos by marriage."[xiii] Sanders reaffirms the notion of previous academics that the Indians of that region are of Houma descent. She also discusses the intermarriage of African Americans within the tribe, even though many "could and do pass as 'whites."[xiv]

Sanders discussed the shift in the, Pointe Au Chien Indian Tribe, henceforth PACIT, economy, noting that the tribal members have moved away from agriculture and towards fishing and trapping for subsistence. Although some members were and still are growing their own food, it is usually on small-scale private gardens, rather than community farms. Sanders says this is due to increasing social and economic pressure from outsiders who "robbed them from their property by an entirely legal process hard to upset in court."[xv] Although this conclusion is true, it is also safe to assume that the Indians of that region already began to suffer from the effects of land loss.[xvi]

From 1932 to 1956, Terrebonne Parish lost 75.28 square miles of land.[xvii] Land loss at this magnitude can be caused by natural environmental changes, but also unnatural causes such as water traffic, offshore drilling, overdevelopment of marshlands, and the introduction of invasive species. Over the decades, these factors have allowed salt water to seep through the bayous, destroying foliage and depleting the soil of its nutrients, making it impossible to farm. Over time, the increasing population of southern Louisiana combined with overdevelopment of land has forced the tribes of this region to abandon aspects of subsistence living.

Aside from providing some historical context in her thesis, Sanders moves on to discuss the bulk of her paper- missionary work. The Home Mission Board she was assigned to work with was located on Pointe Au Chien Road, just southeast of Montegut, LA.[xviii] There were approximately 225 Indians living in that region known as the "cut off," approximately 150 living on Isle de Jean Charles, and about 100 living fifteen miles southwest of the cut off in the lower part of Bayou Terrebonne.[xix] The missionary had a strong presence in the Indian community.

Although many American Indians of southern Louisiana chose to live in rural communities, they were often deprived of opportunities and mistreated because of their race. As Mrs. DeVille put it, "Here was a people that had long been in the grip of whiskey and its aftermath diseases," among those being "intermarriage within families" and "poor housing conditions."[xx] Sanders calls these housing conditions "truly deplorable."[xxi] The people of Pointe Au Chien lived in small, windowless shacks with palmetto roofs and others lived in house boats, both of which did not have running water.[xxii] She talks about the lack of sanitation and medical care, absence of traditional marriage ceremonies, subsistence living, and the tribe's isolation from the outside world. In her discussion of intermarriage with African Americans, Sanders wrote that outsiders often classified the PACIT as African Americans, but that "one sure way to gain their undying animosity is to call them Negroes."[xxiii] At this time, American Indians were not allowed to attend white schools and had no interest in attending black schools. From about 1918 to 1937, there had been attempts by the government and outsiders to educate the PACIT; however, these attempts were short-lived and mildly successful.[xxiv] During this period, many tribal members were illiterate, and few knew

any English.[xxv] This lack of education made it easier for parish locals to ostracize American Indians. For the missionaries, however, deprivation of education and adequate medical care was not as troubling as their "spiritual condition." [xxvi]

There had been an attempt to create a Catholic missionary in Montegut prior to the advent of the Baptist missionary. Although many of the members of PACIT identified as Catholics, they did not practice the sacraments or regularly attend Sunday mass, according to Sanders,[xxvii] she wrote, "The Gospel of Christ who is able to save and lift through simple faith in Him was entirely foreign to them."[xxviii] At this time, the overwhelming majority of Louisianans were devout Christians. To see a community exist without this measure of faith was seen as barbaric, and contributed to its overall deprivation and isolation. This provides the missionaries with the justification needed to modernize or "save" these people. In fact, it would be sinful to not help them. Continuing with this patronizing narrative from Sanders and from the other missionaries, she writes:

> Mr. DeVille stated to the Home Mission Board soon after their arrival that he felt that no fair estimate could be made of the progress of missions on a field like that in less than five years. He realized that the privilege of preaching the Gospel to these people involved the achievement of a social and intellectual enlightenment and a higher standard of living, which could only come through faith, love, patience, and hard work. The hope of their task lay in the next generation. The souls of the present generation could and must be saved, but the establishment of an enlightened Christian community could be realized only in the children of those in whom they could instill the principles of Christianity.[xxix]

This depicts a clear infantilization of the Pointe Au Chien. The missionaries believed that if the Indian people are saved spiritually, their overall quality of life would follow. There is also an understanding that spiritual salvation is their only hope.

The children were seen has having more potential in being saved than the adults, and so the missionary opened a school nearby. As many as fifty-six children were enrolled in the school at one time.[xxx] Some children came over by pirogue from the nearby Isle de Jean Charles and some stayed with relatives living in Pointe Au Chien in order to attend the school.[xxxi] At school, the children were taught to read the Bible, sing gospel songs, and pray, as well as hygiene practices such as how to remove head lice.[xxxii] From Sanders' perspective, the Indian people appreciated the missionary presence and were happy to embrace them. The parents encouraged their children to attend the school, and the son of the chief of Isle de Jean Charles provided a plot of land for the tribe to build a church. The Devilles organized excursions, such as one to New Orleans, to take the people out of their isolated community. There, they visited

Audubon Park, The French Market, and St. Charles Ave.[xxxiii] Remaining in Pointe Au Chien for about three years, the Devilles only left because Mrs. DeVille became ill and was advised to do so by her doctor.[xxxiv] Over the course of the five years, the Devilles were able to lay down a "foundation" for the Indians of Terrebonne Parish in hopes that they would continue with the practices they were taught by the missionaries, however Sanders believes their future appeared bleak.[xxxv] Sanders believed the Indian people are not able to help themselves on their own. There is also the assumption that they desire this help, however, seeing that we only have histories from the perspective of the missionaries in this situation, it is hard to dispute.

While Sanders and the other missionaries did wonderful things for the people of Terrebonne Parish, they also underestimated the strength and endurance of these people who sustained in this region for many years. The Indians of Southern Louisiana have learned to not only adapt, but also act as diplomats throughout their interactions with the Spanish, French, and Americans. They played a crucial role in the political and economic systems with all who lived in the region until they were inevitably marginalized because of the rapid development of the United States and the sense of superiority and entitlement that came with it. The people of Pointe Au Chien were deprived of many opportunities such as education, medical care, and basic infrastructure. The Southern Baptist Convention sought to help the Indians out of pity and an obligation to proselytize, not out of the simple fact that all humans deserve to be treated with respect and dignity.

The misidentification of the Indians of Pointe Au Chien as being Houma continued for many years. In 1965, Ann Fischer published "History and the Current Status of the Houma Indians," in which she documents what she learned living with the Indians of Pointe Au Chien, Bayou Terrebonne, and Isle de Jean Charles in the summer of 1960. She, like historians before her, calls them "Houma Indians" or "So-Called Indians." The term "So-Called Indians" was first coined by sociologist Brewton Berry in his 1963 book *Almost White* and referred to the mix of European and African American blood within American Indian communities. Fisher builds off of Berry's theory of the "So-Called Indian" to discuss the reasons for the underprivileged living conditions in these communities. Fisher makes the argument that American Indians are deprived because they view themselves as being most closely related to the white population as a French-speaking and fair-skinned community. However, the white community who view them as being African American rejects them. The Indians of Terrebonne Parish have denied any association with the African American communities, and so they suffer as a marginalized people.

Fischer notes the use of the term "Sabine," a derogatory term used for Indians of that region, although she says that most of the white population would not be able to identify an Indian as such based on their appearance. On federal recognition, Fischer

writes "A special investigator from the Bureau of Indian Affairs pronounced the Houma to be too mixed to be considered Indian by the Bureau."[xxxvi] Fischer believes that the Houma tribe itself is extinct, and that this tribe (the Pointe Au Chien) is made up of remnants of Muskogean Indians, which came together following their migration west of the Mississippi River during Spanish colonization of Louisiana. [xxxvii] Muskogean Indians have varying physical features, as this term refers to tribes living in the Gulf States. Fischer believes that this, along with intermarriage with whites and African Americans, is what has contributed to the varying appearances within the tribe.

Fischer is critical of John Swanton's work, which she calls "very incomplete, because he only stayed a few days among the Houma."[xxxviii] She says that many of the Indians there were upset with Swanton's chief informant, Bob Verret because he "misrepresented himself and "did harm to the people."[xxxix] Swanton was seen as one of the fathers of anthropology and ethnohistory, and was the first to study Indian tribes of that region and so his research was taken as invariably accurate. To this day, there is little research on the subject, and so few scholars have tried to dispute Swanton's work. Considering Fisher did her research in the early 1960's, it is quite amazing to see a scholar question his work so early on in this field of history.

Fischer also argues against Swanton's assertion that the Pointe Au Chien or "Houma" were being steadily pushed off of their land as early as 1907. Fischer firmly denies this, saying that the tribe has not relocated at all since 1907 when Swanton did his fieldwork. She says that although there are outsiders moving into their area, they have no relocated because as the Indians say "One more step and we will be in the Gulf."[xl] She writes, "They have been pushed back economically and socially, rather than physically."[xli] Swanton's assertion that the Pointe Au Chien were being pushed off their land ties in with his desire to document a "dying race." Swanton was so actively trying to show that the culture of Indian people was fading into assimilation. Fischer argues against that assertion, suggesting instead that these people are not losing their culture and being physically marginalized, but rather struggling to compete with outsiders on a social and economic level. Overall, Fischer is trying to debunk this idea that Indian culture will cease to exist because of an inability to compete with globalization and modernity.

As early as the 1960's, the Indians being to visibly see the effects of oil and natural gas dredging. Fischer notes the abundance of resources in the area and the early fight against the oil companies. This had brought many outsiders into the area. As a result, there was an issue with over-hunting and fishing, and exploitation of resources. [xlii] In this process, the Pointe Au Chien lost their land titles to the oil companies. [xliii] Fischer says that the tribes would pay more in legal fees to dispute this, but it would cost more than the land was worth. When discussing the legal issues the Pointe Au Chien faced, Fisher writes:

> ... many lawyers had looked over the matter and had given up in despair. The Indian interpretation of this has inevitably been that these lawyers were bought off by competing white title holders. My presence in the area has tended to spread hope among the Houma for recovering their land. Even though I have often indicated the practical impossibility of this task, my willingness to listen to the accounts of land problems and to investigate them has resulted in renewed hope.[xliv]

The Indians held very little political authority, especially when it came to land titles. This land was claimed by the Indians, but disputed by the state government, and so it remained public land.[xlv]

Ann Fischer was an anthropologist and Tulane Professor who went to Terrebonne Parish during the summer of 1960 to study medicinal plants. The Indians sought her help in what they believed to be land fraud.[xlvi] Her writings on the Pointe Au Chien reflect a more nuanced and inclusive form of historical scholarship. Her modern view of American Indians differed from Swanton, another anthropologist, in that she acknowledged the complexity of the formation of this tribe. She also looked at the future of the tribe and their endeavor to become federally recognized, not in "dying race" way that Swanton did.

Little has been written about the American Indians of Southern Louisiana, and even less about the Pointe Au Chien. This historiography examines three of the most influential histories of the Pointe Au Chien. What is most important in all of these historical writings is the perspective and motives behind them. For John R. Swanton, a turn of the century anthropologist and one of the first in the field, documenting American Indians was evidence of a common belief in the death of the "noble savage." He hopped from one tribe to another, spending a few days interviewing tribal members, writing down some of the language, family names, diet, and the like. At the time, many people believed it was inevitable that Indians assimilate into white, Christian culture. Frances Sanders, a Southern Baptist missionary, wrote in a tone of pity for the people of Pointe Au Chien. Her goal, and that of the other missionaries, was to convert the Indians to Christianity and introduce them to contemporary lifestyles. There is a sense of superiority in Sander's writing, as she feels obligated to save these people from their indigenous practices. She makes the Indian appear somewhat hopeless and incapable. Finally, there is Ann Fischer, a Tulane professor and anthropologist, who did not go to Bayou Terrebonne with the intention of documenting the tribe. She was compelled to document a tribe that has been denied federal recognition because of an inability to prove their "Indianness."

John R. Swanton was the first to refer to many of the tribes of the lower Mississippi Valley as being of Houma descent. The Pointe Au Chien in particular did not call themselves Houma, but rather the descendants of various tribes: the Acolapissa, Atakapas, Biloxi, and Chitimacha. For decades, scholars continued with this trend by calling them "Houma." This has proved to be a problem for the Pointe Au Chien Indians and their plea for federal recognition. Federal recognition would give the tribe autonomy and authority in dealing with external affairs. Right now, the tribe's greatest challenge is protecting their land from land loss, salt-water intrusion, dredging, and oil spills. The tribe's ancestral lands are now largely underwater. The cemetery is nothing but a plot of land, a quarter of a football field in size, completely surrounded by water. An oil company wanted to dredge right through the cemetery, and regardless of the tribe's plea to the state of Louisiana to stop them, nothing was done because they were unable to prove that they are an Indian community that has existed prior to 1900. This resulted in the tribal members having to take matters into their own hands and spent three days guarding the cemetery, armed with shotguns. They were able to stop the oil company from dredging right through the cemetery, but the companies only dredged in a circle around the cemetery. This small plot of land, only marked by a large wooden cross, is now surrounded by water and is sinking.

Writing history involves finding as close of an objective truth as one possibly can. Although perspective is subjective, it is important for all scholars to recognize the responsibility that comes with historical writing. Dishonesty, misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and the like can prove to be harmful. Unfortunately for the Pointe Au Chien, a large part of their inability to obtain federal recognition is because of the inaccurate histories written about them. Now, the Pointe Au Chien Tribe is still fighting to prove their "Indianness" because of the imposed definitions and narratives of outsiders.

---

[i] "Gulf of Mexico Fact Sheet - Energy Information Administration." Accessed April 29, 2016. http://www.eia.gov/special/gulf_of_mexico/.
[ii] "Indian Affairs | What We Do." Accessed April 29, 2016. http://www.bia.gov/WhatWeDo/index.htm.
[iii] Fenton, William N. "John Reed Swanton, 1873-1958." *American Anthropologist* 61, no. 4 (1959): 663–68. P 664.
[iv] Ibid, p 664.
[v] "Southeast Ethnographic and Vocabulary Notes May, 1907 (John R. Swanton) - Smithsonian Institution Collections Search Center." Accessed May 2, 2016. http://collections.si.edu/search/slideshow_embedded?xml=%22http://sirismm.si.edu/naa/viewer/4201_Gallery/viewer_4201.xml%22.
[vi] Ibid.

[vii] Swanton, John R. "Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf of Mexico." Accessed May 2, 2016. http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UF00080541/00001/15j. p 9.
[viii] Sanders, Frances Marian. "What God Hath Wrought—on Pointe Au Chien." New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. 1947. p 4.
[ix] The DeVilles and Mrs. Thompson were Baptist missionaries assigned to work with the Pointe Au Chien Indian Tribe, or PACIT, for several years.
[x] Ibid.
[xi] Ibid, 7.
[xii] Ibid, 10.
[xiii] Ibid, 7.
[xiv] Ibid, 7.
[xv] Ibid, 2.
[xvi] Louisiana oil was first discovered in Caddo Lake, on the Louisiana Texas border in May 1911. This project (Ferry Lake No.1) was headed by Gulf Oil Corporation and produced 450 barrels of oil a day. Because of this success, Pure Oil and Superior Oil companies built the first freestanding drilling platform off of the coast.
[xvii] U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior. "Land Area Change in Coastal Louisiana from 1932 to 2010." Accessed May 6, 2016. http://pubs.usgs.gov/sim/3164/downloads/SIM3164_Pamphlet.pdf.
[xviii] Sanders, Frances Marian. "What God Hath Wrought—on Point Au Chien." p 3.
[xix] Ibid.
[xx] Ibid, 7.
[xxi] Ibid.
[xxii] Ibid.
[xxiii] Ibid, 8.
[xxiv] Ibid, 9.
[xxv] Ibid. (Remember, this is a French-speaking tribe.)
[xxvi] Ibid, 9.
[xxvii] Ibid, 10.
[xxviii] Ibid.
[xxix] Ibid, 11.
[xxx] Ibid, 12.
[xxxi] Ibid.
[xxxii] Ibid.
[xxxiii] Ibid, 22.
[xxxiv] Ibid, 25.
[xxxv] Ibid.
[xxxvi] Fischer, Ann. "History and the Current Status of the Houma Indians." *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* 6, no. 2 (1965). p 151.
[xxxvii] Ibid.
[xxxviii] Ibid.
[xxxix] Ibid.
[xl] Ibid.
[xli] Ibid.

[xlii] Ibid, 152.
[xliii] Ibid.
[xliv] Ibid, 153.
[xlv] Ibid.
[xlvi] Ellzey, Bill. "Report Tells of Segregation in Terrebonne Schools." Houma Today News. 2014.http://m.houmatoday.com/article/20140701/articles/140709991/1008;jsessionid=15D6889838D55CC8EE494D0BE5F54F04.m1?share=facebook.

A Strumpet, a Lollard, a Deceiver of the People: Margery Kempe and Authorization in Late Medieval England

Jordan Chauncy

The clearly delineated path for female sanctity in medieval Europe was not an easy one: holy women were often mocked and socially reviled or accused of heresy. This social exclusion was incredibly painful, to say nothing of the tribulations women put themselves through, including, as in the case of some canonized women, fasting on nothing but the Eucharist. Amongst the names of female holy women is one Margery Kempe (1373-c.1438), an Englishwoman from the East Anglian town of Bishop's Lynn and the authoress of *The Book of Margery Kempe,* which some scholars consider the first autobiography written in English. While some have argued that Kempe's spiritual practices were an exemplary "reflection of mainstream medieval English piety," she was condemned in her lifetime and arrested several times on suspicions of Lollardy.[1]

As scholar Raymond Powell points out, however, Kempe was not innovative in her piety: all of the idiosyncrasies of her spirituality had continental precedents. All the trademarks of Kempe's performance of sanctity (her fasting, chastity, marriage to Christ, weeping when overwhelmed with religious fervor, and mystic visions) were accepted forms of piety, and many women who displayed their spirituality similarly were already considered holy—Kempe references St. Bridget of Sweden and St. Elizabeth of Hungary in particular, both women in the class of Catherine of Sienna, who was not yet canonized at the time of Kempe's writing. [2] These women, and many female mystics besides them, relied on extra-ecclesiastical authorities to authorize their sanctity, such as the Bible or claims of direct communication from the Holy Spirit. It was therefore not only accepted, but *expected* that holy women be self-authorizing.[3] Despite following orthodox teachings and precedents set by other holy women, Kempe's contemporaries condemned her, due to no fault of her own: because of the temporal coincidence of Lollardy, Margery's mysticism, and a rise in British anticlericalism. The Church could not allow her to self-authorize her mysticism as other female holy women did before her, for fear that it would destabilize ecclesiastical authority. Thus, unable to turn to Church hierarchy to authorize her sanctity, Kempe was left unprotected and open to harassment from her contemporaries.

Over the course of the fourteenth century, crisis after crisis rocked Europe, threatening the authority of the Catholic Church and causing laypeople to question if not necessarily their faith, then the Church hierarchy. Not least of these calamities was the papacy's shift from Rome to Avignon in the early years of the fourteenth century, a phenomenon which resulted in intracontinental tensions followed by the Great Western Schism late in the century, in which three men simultaneously claimed the papal throne. These chaotic events disturbed the faithful by proving how fragile the

ecclesiastical hierarchy was, causing some Europeans to question its necessity. Secular crises such as widespread famine in 1315 and the mid-century appearance of the bubonic plague in Europe, nicknamed the Black Death due to the enormous death toll it amassed left laypeople uncertain that the Church could protect them.[4] England, meanwhile, faced its own struggles during the tumultuous century. With fourteen-year-old Richard II on the throne, groups across England challenged the authority of the nobility in the Rising of 1381, a short-lived peasants' revolt which "foreshadowed the struggles for legitimacy that continued throughout the early fifteenth century."[5]

Coinciding with the crises of the century was the rise of Lollardy in England. Based loosely around the teachings of Oxford theologian John Wycliffe (d. 1384), Lollardy was not so much a movement as a collection of heresies that questioned ecclesiastical authority.[6] The most famous dissent amongst Lollards was the belief that "the Bible [was] the unerring authority" on issues of religion.[7] However, the Bible was only published in Latin for most of the Middle Ages, making the language so important that for much of the period, literacy was defined as "the ability to read, but not necessarily to write, [minimal] Latin."[8] Lollards took issue with what they considered to be the elitist notion that only those formally educated in Latin and trained to be priests should have access to the ultimate religious authority, and so advocated that "any lay person could preach and teach the gospel and that all good people, even the *laïci ydiote* [ignorant laymen], were priests," and should therefore have access to the Bible.[9]

The Church was understandably threatened by the Lollards' stance on literacy and desire for unmediated access to the Bible. The assertion that the text was the ultimate source of religious authority made the ecclesiastical hierarchy completely outdated as a means of interpreting the Bible and communicating its meaning to the laypeople. Lollardy challenged the necessity of the Church as an institution. In 1401, to combat the Lollard threat, King Henry IV issued *De heretico comburendo,* which mandated that unrepentant heretics be burned at the stake.[10]

It was to *De heretico comburendo* that an angry crowd referred when they "shrieked" at Margery Kempe, "You shall be burned, false Lollard! Here's a cartful of thorns ready for you, and a barrel to burn you with!"[11] Two men came to her aid to rescue her from the crowd, and, taking her word that she was "neither a heretic nor a Lollard," brought her safely to the inn in which she was staying.[12] The encounter left Kempe shaken—it may well have been the first time someone so blatantly accused her of heresy, but it was by no means the last.

The nature of Kempe's spirituality is much discussed by historians, and some have come to the conclusion that Kempe was not pushed to the edge of society due to her abnormal performances of piety, but rather, in the context of her own time, was "an exemplar" of conventional, "mainstream medieval English piety."[13] The contexts in which such arguments are couched are valuable, but to argue that Margery Kempe, the

accused Lollard, was an example of mainstream piety is to ignore textual evidence to the contrary. Scholars are correct in pointing out that her spiritual performances followed precedents set by other orthodox holy women, including female saints, and many of the ideas she presented in *The Book* were developed from widely-circulated, orthodox treatises on spiritual meditation.[14] However, following precedents does not necessarily indicate that she followed "mainstream" religious patterns, since the precedents Kempe followed were largely set by those on the edge of orthodoxy, who may be considered to some degree extremists. For instance, in caring for and physically kissing lepers while on pilgrimage, Kempe followed the examples of Saints Francis of Assisi and Catherine of Sienna, neither of whom could be considered "mainstream."[15] One can acknowledge that Kempe followed generally orthodox models of sanctity without watering her piety down to "conventional" or "mainstream." The very presence of threats against her in the text implies that her contemporaries viewed her as subversive or somehow threatening to the Church.

Kempe's specific brand of mysticism threatened the Catholic Church in the same way Lollardy did: by questioning whether or not the ecclesiastical hierarchy was necessary. She drew authority not from Church officials, who refused to acknowledge her piety, but rather from claims of direct communication with God. In addition, she used the reputation of other holy women to bolster her own claims of authority, as seen when God told her, "I spoke to St. Bridget exactly as I spoke to you, daughter."[16] By attaching her holiness to that of a woman already canonized, Kempe hoped to implicitly draw authority from and gain the approval of the Church. However, by claiming a direct connection to God, Kempe's "locus of utterance [threatened] the Church's role as author of God's utterance."[17] That is to say, the Church viewed her claims as dangerous because they threatened the necessity of the priesthood as interpreters of God's word, or "utterance."

As stated above, historians have come to see Lollardy "as a projection of the anxieties of the church [sic] or of the monarchy," rather than as a cohesive movement with an organized set of doctrinal beliefs.[18] Anyone who questioned, implicitly or explicitly, the role or legitimacy of the clergy as an institutional class may have been labelled as a Lollard. Kempe, however, saw herself as inarguably orthodox: she denied accusations of heresy whenever they were made against her, and wrote that God called her "a pillar of Holy Church," implying that she saw her beliefs as fundamentally integrated into Catholic teachings.[19] Her contemporaries, however, viewed her beliefs as distinct from the Church, marked by heterodoxy if not outright heresy. On her way home from pilgrimage, for instance, Kempe was forced to stop in the town of Leicester, where the mayor accused her of Lollardy and told her, "[Y]ou're a false strumpet, a false Lollard, and a false deceiver of the people, and therefore I shall have you imprisoned."[20]

Interestingly, the mayor of Leicester conflated the crimes of heresy and deception with a gendered accusation of sexual impropriety. He likely linked heresy with Kempe's sexuality due to the Lollard emphasis on strong, preaching women (which Kempe certainly was), which orthodox Catholicism condemned as "a reversal in the natural hierarchy."[21] Lollardy, in contrast, taught that "anyone with humility of heart (even a layperson or a female) might have access to the wisdom of the scripture."[22] In one treatise, "self-confessed Lollard" William Brute went so far as to defend women's right to preach, arguing that women "have constantly preached the word of God and converted many to the faith at times when priests were too faint-hearted to speak the word."[23] Brute's defense of preaching women may have been damning for Kempe: it demonstrated how strong women, brave enough to "preach the word," took power in the Church when clergymen were "too faint-hearted" to do so. What Brute meant as a defense could only have frightened the Church and made them see the majority of female spiritual teachers as inherently linked to Lollardy and the destruction of the priesthood.

In all fairness, the clergy's suspicion of Kempe was not fully irrational. Throughout *The Book,* she displayed self-authorization that often came off as borderline-anticlerical. God told her, for instance, "There is no cleric in the whole world, daughter, who can teach you better than I can."[24] When Kempe asked for God's permission to "show this life [meaning her methods of piety] to religious people and priests," God answered:

> No, no, daughter, for that thing that I love best, they love not, and that is shame, humiliation, scorn, and the people's reproofs, and therefore they shall not have this grace. For, daughter, I tell you, he who dreads the shames of the world may not love God perfectly. And daughter, under the habit of holiness much wickedness is covered.[25]

God's pun on *habit,* meaning both the headwear of nuns and ritual practices, was no accident. Kempe noted that priests were proud and criticized them, but, more importantly, and of more threat to the Church, was her note that God could teach her directly better than any priest could, implying that the priesthood was unnecessary, at least to Kempe.

Despite the evidence of anticlericalism that could be linked to heresy, when called before the Archbishop of York on a charge of Lollardy, Kempe defiantly said, "I am no heretic, and you shall not prove me one."[26] After a brief interview in which she proved that "[s]he [knew] her religion well enough," the Archbishop asked her to "neither teach nor censure people in [his] diocese."[27] Kempe, however, refused to stop teaching, and said "God Almighty does not forbid, sir, that we should speak of Him," and quoted Gospel to prove her point.[28]

The clerics at the heresy hearing were scandalized to hear Kempe, an illiterate woman, quote and apply scripture so readily, and declared, "Ah, sir…by this we truly know that she has a devil inside her, as she speaks of the Gospel."[29] The cleric implied here that for a woman to even know scripture was indicative of having read a vernacular Bible, a crime linked to Lollardy. More likely however, Kempe's confessor had read the Bible to her and translated it as he did.[30] Regardless, it speaks to an incredible social and intellectual elitism present amongst the assembled clerics that they assumed that the only way Kempe could have obtained knowledge of the Bible was through a heretically translated, Lollard text.

As one cleric pointed out, however, the greatest issue with Kempe quoting scripture was not that she did so in the first place, but that she did so to teach or prove a point to men. He told her "no woman should preach," to which she promptly replied, "I don't preach, sir, I enter no pulpit."[31] Kempe drew a distinction between institutionalized preaching and participating in conversation about God, the former of which was forbidden for women, but the latter of which was acceptable.[32] By denying that she preached, she de-legitimated her teaching, making it less dangerous to Church hierarchy, by not claiming the same authority as a priest, without sacrificing its value as religious discourse by proving that she had a competent grasp of Catholic orthodoxy. Admitting that she was not preaching but merely engaging in religious conversation also cast doubt on the accusations of Lollardy against her, as Lollards frequently and proudly preached regardless of their gender—the aforementioned royal statute *De heretico comburendo* served to "curb the activities of unlicensed preachers," namely Lollards.[33]

Following her heresy trials, Kempe approached the Archbishop of York. After hearing the tale her trials and persecution, he remarked, "I do not know what I shall do with you."[34] It was true that Kempe provided a crisis for the Church: her mysticism undermined the ecclesiastical hierarchy by suggesting that it was unnecessary to have an intermediary between a layperson and God if the layperson's faith was strong enough. With a clergy already destabilized by a century of calamities and building anticlericalism, it was unthinkable that the Archbishop grant mystical authority to Kempe, as doing so would be to implicitly approve her removal of the clergy from her relationship with God. However, she proved repeatedly to be educated in Catholic orthodoxy and to be guilty of no explicit heresy. It was Kempe who suggested that the Archbishop give her what boiled-down to an ecclesiastic hall-pass: "I ask that you let me have your letter and your seal as a testimonial that I have vindicated myself against my enemies, and that nothing is alleged against me, neither error nor heresy."[35] Unable to ask for authority from the Archbishop, Kempe asked only to be allowed to travel in peace, with the Archbishop's seal of approval on her orthodoxy, if not her mysticism. Having received this letter, allowing her safe passage through the Archbishop of York's

diocese, she traveled to London and obtained a similar letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, granting her protection throughout England.[36]

Although the Archbishop of Canterbury's letter protected her from official condemnation and further heresy charges, it could do nothing to protect Kempe from her contemporaries' opinions. Whereas an official commendation or canonization may have quelled complaints about and attacks against Kempe, the letter from the Archbishop provided only the bare minimum of ecclesiastic protection. Perfectly illustrating this fact is an anecdote Kempe recalls about the return trip from London to Lynn, shortly after acquiring the Archbishop's letter: in a town about fifty miles outside of London, a man stopped Kempe and her husband, announced that he was arresting them both for heresy, then "cruelly rebuked them and reviled them, repeating many insulting words." After suffering through the man's harassment, Kempe showed him the letter from the Archbishop, at which point he "spoke pleasantly and well to them, saying, 'Why didn't you show me your letter before?'"[37]

The Book of Margery Kempe is the autobiography of a deeply pious woman seeking spiritual authority using a pre-determined template for the correct way to "perform" female sanctity or female mysticism. She followed the examples of numerous saints, including Saints Catherine of Sienna and Elizabeth of Hungary, however, due to the unstable nature of the Church hierarchy during her lifetime, she could not gain the full approval of the Church, even when following the spiritual paths of other female mystics. Had she been born in a different place or at a different time, she may be remembered at Saint Margery—but due to the events of the tumultuous fourteenth century and rising anticlericalism, Margery Kempe is remembered not as a saint, but as an authoress struggling for authority, of which she was deprived due simply to unlucky timing.

---

[1] Raymond A. Powell, "Margery Kempe: An Exemplar of Late Medieval English Piety," *The Catholic Historical Review* 89 (2003): 3.

[2] Margery Kempe, *The Book of Margery Kempe*, trans. Anthony Bale (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 139; 46.

[3] For a discussion of authorship and authority in medieval texts, see Karma Lochrie, "From Utterance to Text: Authorizing the Mystical Word," in *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 97-134.

[4] Joseph Black et al., *British Literature: A Historical Overview* (Ontario: Broadview Press, 2010), 48.

[5] Ibid., 50.

[6] Wendy Scase, "Lollardy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 15.

[7] Ibid., 19.

[8] Lochrie, "From Utterance to Text," 101.

[9] Ibid., 108.

[10] Black et al., "British Literature," 56.

[11] Kempe, *The Book,* 30.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Powell, "Margery Kempe: An Exemplar," 3.

[14] Ibid., 4.

[15] Kempe, *The Book,* 159.

[16] Ibid., 46.

[17] Lochrie, "From Utterance to Text," 98.

[18] Scase, "Lollardy," 15-16.

[19] Kempe, *The Book,* 31.

[20] Ibid., 102.

[21] Lochrie, "From Utterance to Text," 107.

[22] Scase, "Lollardy," 19.

[23] Lochrie, "From Utterance to Text," 110.

[24] Kempe, *The Book,* 142.

[25] Ibid., 143.

[26] Ibid., 113.

[27] Ibid., 114.

[28] Ibid., 114-115.

[29] Ibid., 115.

[30] See Lochrie for further discussion on Kempe's literacy, including the interesting claim that Kempe actually *was* literate.

[31] Kempe, *The Book,* 115.

[32] Lochrie, "From Utterance to Text," 111.

[33] Ibid., 108.

[34] Kempe, *The Book,* 122.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., 124.

[37] Ibid.

THE CREEDS OF THE DESERT

OUTSTANDING RESEARCH ESSAY AWARD

MICHAEL DELASHMET

INTRODUCTION

Thomas Edward Lawrence, made known to the world as Lawrence of Arabia, has been a paradoxical figure in the complex history of the Middle East and a campaign of British imperialism. Publications of his life tell the story of a heroic freedom fighter of the Arab Nationalist Movement, but some historians have attempted to look past the romanticism and speculation that has been added to his story by sensationalist biographers. Because of this exaggeration, many scholars have come to challenge his reputed importance during World War I, while others have proclaimed the temporal distance from the actual events is too great to separate fact from fiction. Attempting to understand the truth of Lawrence's role in during the Arab Nationalist Movement, two opposing images of him have emerged: one as a champion of Arab nationalism, and one as an agent of Western imperialism. In a detailed and critical analysis of Lawrence's life, it is clear that as a result of his relentless idealism he occupied both of these seemingly contradictory roles during his life. This idealism functioned as a self-serving illusion for Lawrence and many of the imperial officers he worked with, blurring the realities of imperial dominion. Lawrence's experience serves as "a reminder that imperialism is a political relationship more than a perspective; intimacy does not make it go away."[1] T. E. Lawrence's paradoxical activities during and after the First World War presents itself as a unique example of the dangers of idealism in the foreign affairs of world powers.

LAWRENCE & ESPIONAGE

The turn of the twentieth century was, for many Europeans, a time of ongoing disenchantment. Slowly but surely, the romance and mystery of a world "abroad" began to close as many Europeans saw their governments expand in foreign lands, and these foreign lands became part of domestic dominion. European citizens became enamored with new opportunities for both leisure and business. This caused, and later became reinforced by, an outpouring of commercial travel literature that sought to create, explore, and exploit new mysteries that matched the readers' appetites for romance and intrigue.[2]

Many of these novels, such as those written by Rudyard Kipling and Joseph Conrad, utilized imperial settings and tales of espionage to create a "world in which mystery is rediscovered and the disillusioned hero [is] dramatically and redemptively

lost from the realm of politics to the realm of spirit."[3] The tale of the imperial spy in an "exotic" land fed the imaginations of those who desired exploration of the world's mysteries and exploration of themselves in a spiritual sense. Most prominent among these so-called exotic lands was "Arabia," which remained largely unfamiliar to the English. Such unfamiliarity with the Arabian Peninsula fueled curiosity that would manifest in political and social misunderstanding of the region, this misunderstanding created a context where imperialism and romanticism became entwined in surprising ways. Consequently, the need for military intelligence of the previously unmapped area for the war to come drew in such romantics as Lawrence, who sought escape from their bourgeois yet boring homeland. This set of social circumstance unique to the beginning of the twentieth century--alienation from modernity, and a romantic desire for adventure--informed the foundation of the British espionage community on the Eastern Front.[4]

Before acting as an intelligence officer for the British, Lawrence used his predilection and natural aptitude for archaeology as his channel for escape. The focus of his academic interests lay with the history of the Middle Ages.[5] These interests led him to spend the summer of 1909 in Syria and Palestine where he further developed his Arabic skills and travelled to various castles of the Crusades as a part of his studies at Oxford.[6] One year later, Lawrence joined his mentor D. G. Hogarth, future director of the Arab Bureau, on a trip to the ancient city of Carchemish, which lies on the border of modern Turkey and Syria. There he worked for four years cataloguing artifacts and managing the local workforce.[7] Afterward, he received funding by the Palestinian Exploration Fund to search for archaeological sites mentioned in the Bible. This project served the ulterior motive of surveying the strategically significant Negev Desert for the British military.[8] It was later that year that hostilities between the Ottoman Empire and the Western powers of Great Britain and France officially began. Months after, Lawrence was an Intelligence Officer in Cairo, Egypt--Britain's official headquarters on the Eastern Front.

LAWRENCE & ARAB NATIONALISM

As a member of the military intelligence office in Cairo, Lawrence's greatest contributions were his understanding of both the Arab language and Arab people, two assets gained from managing locally hired workers of excavations in Carchemish. When Lawrence joined the Arab Bureau in 1916, Hussein bin Ali, the Sharif of Mecca, had begun the Arab Revolt against their Turkish rulers. The Arab Revolt was supported by the British regime as a way of weakening opposition on the Eastern Front. Initially, Hussein's campaign had made little progress, resulting in doubt among its British masterminds. Additionally, Lawrence's view of the Arabs as a non-traditional and non-

formalized military force fighting within the Ottoman Empire was somewhat cynical at first, Lawrence viewed Arab fighters as "too individualistic to endure commands, or fight in line, or help each other. It would, I think, be impossible to make an organized force out of them."[9] In Lawrence's view, such large gatherings of the desert tribes would only incite internal conflict. The Turks often took advantage of intra-tribal clashes by simply waiting for the dissention to disable the fighting force.[10] His generalizing appraisal of the Bedouin rebels was true in some respects; however, first-hand experience would soon reveal the complex nature of not only the people, but the situation they were embedded in.

Lawrence's understanding of the Arabs and his romanticized view of their homeland is revealed in his own account of the Arab Revolt, *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom.* Through his studies and experiences, he had become acutely aware of Arab culture and of the attitudes of desert wanderers, and his perspective remained in that strange middle ground between outsider and tribesman. Lawrence knew "Arabia" as a land whose "largest manufacture was of creeds," some succeed, some fail: "the fringe of their deserts were strewn with broken faiths."[11] In time, Lawrence learned to appreciate the "creed of the desert," remarking on the Bedouins' willingness to "[cut] material ties" in order to achieve "a personal liberty which haunted starvation and death.[12]

This perspective gave him insight into how best to jump start the revolt. According to his own writings, the primary issue at hand was that of leadership.[13] The Sharif of Mecca was chosen by the British to lead the revolution, but Lawrence felt the Arab Revolt lacked "not intellect, nor judgement, nor political wisdom, but the flame of enthusiasm that would set the desert on fire."[14] This, Hussein evidently lacked. In fact, the Sharif was rather unpopular, likely due to his proclamation to being the King of the Arabs, a contentious statement considering the fierce independence of the various Arab groups and tribes involved in the uprising.[15]

Lawrence began his search for a commander when he followed Ronald Storrs, the British Oriental Secretary in Cairo, on his mission to train the Bedouin in guerilla tactics.[16] Abdullah, the Sharif's son, was both impressed and interested by Lawrence, so much so that he was invited to meet the Sharif himself. Lawrence, on the other hand, found Abdullah and his brothers a disappointment in his search for leadership, finding "Abdullah too clever, Ali too clean, Zeid too cool."[17] He then met Faisal, the Sharif's third eldest son, a leader "with the necessary fire, and yet with reason to give effect to our science."[18] With the help of the other officers in Cairo, Lawrence established Faisal as the military commander of the Revolt, and insisted that Faisal would work with no other British officer than himself.[19] This not only solidified his role as the British liaison for the Revolt, but also set the tone of the campaign to fit more closely with the goals of the Arab fighters. The Arabs fought in the hope of sovereignty, but the British

believed that "in the East nationalism meant nothing, while religion was everything,"[20] explaining why they chose Hussein to lead the Revolt. As the protector of the Holy Places, Hussein could take the caliphate for the British, but by selecting Faisal as the commander of the fighters of the Hejaz, Lawrence set the focus towards Arab nationalism and independence.

Imperial Interests

Lawrence's own goal to see the Arab nationalist cause come to fruition was met with the obstacles of other alternative agendas for the Middle East. Chief among them was the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement between Britain and France, which laid out a post-war scenario wherein France was to take control of Syria, leaving the Arab nationalist cause in the dust, along with the other failed creeds of the desert. It is uncertain as to when Lawrence first heard of the treaty, but it is known that he was aware that "The Arab Revolt had begun on false pretenses," in his own book Lawrence recollects that he "could see that if we won the war the promises to the Arabs were dead paper."[21] However, he also understood that "Arab inspiration was our main tool in winning the Eastern war. So I assured them England kept her word in letter and spirit...of course, instead of being proud of what we did together, I was continually and bitterly ashamed."[22] This inner conflict concerning the agreement is the first of many compromises Lawrence would make in the face of the imperial interests that brought him to the desert. Initially, these interests aligned with his own romanticized ideas for Arab sovereignty, but it did not take long for these two agendas to diverge, leaving Lawrence an imperial puppet, struggling against the strings that guided him.

Another threatening British policy was the dedication to the Zionist goal of building a new Jewish home. At first, Lawrence was in agreement with this policy, and in fact, had high hopes for the potential effect it might have on the Arabs, claiming that the successful integration of Zionists in Palestine "will involve inevitably the raising of the present Arab population to their own material level" and could even "[render] them independent of industrial Europe, and in that case the new confederation might become a formidable element of world power."[23] Lawrence's naive idealism left him unaware of the dangers involved in the British fulfillment of Zionist goals. However, Lawrence soon became aware of these dangers after a meeting in Cairo. At this meeting, Lawrence met Aaron Aaronsohn, a Romanian botanist turned Zionist spy. After leaving Europe, Aaronsohn went to Palestine for the purpose of surveying land for the foundation of Eretz Israel. While in Palestine, Aaronsohn founded Nili, a Zionist espionage ring devoted to delivering intelligence to General Allenby, who was given the task of taking Palestine for the British by Christmas of 1917. Aaronsohn and his spies delivered to

Allenby information on the movement of Turkish troops to assist the general's planned invasion.[24]

The meeting between Lawrence and Aaronsohn left both of them with bad impressions, with Aaronsohn considering Lawrence a "Prussian anti-Semite talking English," and with Lawrence worrying about the future of the Zionist enterprise. In a letter to Mark Sykes, Lawrence expressed this concern, and is shown to have foreseen the great many issues that face the area today. In this letter, Lawrence made a distinction between the Arab Jews already within Palestine, and the colonialist Jews coming in mostly from Europe, and wondered if these colonialists intended to acquire land via "forced sale and appropriation."[25] Additionally, Lawrence brought into consideration the fact that Jews did not regularly hire Arabs to work on their farms, and asked if the Zionists proposed "expulsion of the Arab peasantry or their reduction to a day-labourer class?[26] With the fate of the Middle East still up in the air, he further warned Sykes of the potential geopolitical dangers of placing a Jewish state amongst future Arab nations, such premonitions showed a great deal of foresight on Lawrence's part. Unfortunately, his concerns would not be addressed, as Sykes never received this letter.[27] In the face of these issues, Lawrence's wish for a romantic adventure became a struggle against imperial dominion.

The Mistakes of Heroes and Leaders

Despite the many obstacles presented to Lawrence during the Arab Revolt, he continued to look for ways to make good on his promises to Faisal. His revised plans, as well as the plans of his imperial handlers, revolved mostly around the taking of Damascus, which at this point, had come to represent the grand prize of "Arabia". This point in the campaign proved to be more complex than what came before, as Syria had been promised to the French; however, British officers in Cairo had come to view France's association with Great Britain as a potential source of trouble, and the Arabs resented French involvement. Therefore, Britain began slowly dissociating themselves with France, and sought to exclude them from the Middle Eastern land grab as much as possible.[28]

Britain's plan was to use Australian cavalry to take control of Damascus. From there Faisal's army would be the only Allied force to enter and occupy the city, which would prevent Syrian resistance of Christian occupation. To further avoid arousing the anger of the city-dwellers, the current Turkish administrator would remain in place until a new government could be established in such a way as to avoid further conflict.[29]

Lawrence had his own plans for Damascus: it was his hope that if he could get Faisal into Damascus before the British or the French, they could establish an Arab government and prevent the formation of the imperial power structures of Britain and

France.[30] Unfortunately, his plan would never be realized, and neither would the plan of the British. On 30 September, the entire Turkish administration fled the city with the army. The Australian forces were forced to enter the city to gain perimeter control of the area, and Faisal's troops were several days travel away; everything the British were hoping to avoid.[31] Lawrence, who was advising General Gilbert Clayton, snuck out of his camp early in the morning, and headed for Damascus so that he could salvage his plan before the British officers arrived. Upon arrival, two of his personal enemies--the Abd el Kader brothers, exiled descendants of an Algerian Sharif and proclaimed supporters of Hussein--had taken up position as governors of the city. Upon their departure from the city hall, Lawrence and his ally Nuri el-Sa'id, established their own Pro-Faisal governor (in lieu of Faisal himself) only moments before the General arrived.[32]

Lawrence's attempt at salvaging his plan seem a valiant effort on his part, but his actions only further complicated matters. The establishment of an Arab administration in Damascus meant that General Allenby would have to go through the French to deal with it (in accordance with the Sykes-Picot Agreement). It also meant that Faisal would be put under French supervision in the form of a liaison officer who would accompany Lawrence.[33] Lawrence and Faisal strongly opposed these terms, and as a result he then began to tell his own version of the story, wherein 4,000 Pro-Faisal tribesman snuck into the city the night before (a blatant lie). He then used this version of the story to persuade the British to drop the Sykes-Picot agreement. The response from Clayton was that the Agreement "is in fact dead and, if we wait quietly, this fact will soon be realized."[34] At this point in the campaign, the Agreement was considered to be out of date, but such confidence was to be directly opposed by the determination of the French to take part in the spoils of war.

The Fight for Sovereignty

Though most famous for his role in the Arab Revolt, Lawrence's part in the following peace talks proved equally important for the future of the Middle East. Unfortunately, his efforts were met with unassailable resistance on the part of the great imperial powers. By the time of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Lawrence had largely failed to keep his word to the Arabs, and his dreams of Arab sovereignty had remained exactly that. All he could hope to do was battle the Sykes-Picot Agreement and make a case for the Hashemite family regarding their right to rule.

He did so by bringing a map of his own design to the British cabinet. In it, Faisal would rule Syria, which was to be controlled entirely by the Arabs, with no imperial support. He also planned for Iraq to be under the control of Abdullah; however, it would be under direct British administration. It is also important to note that

Lawrence made plans for a Kurdistan, the control of which was undetermined. Faisal and Abdullah's brother Zeid would take charge a separate Arab zone including parts of Iraq whose borders fell along tribal lines and commercial routes. Also included is a land for Palestinians and one for the Armenians. It is unknown if this map would have made for a more peaceful image of the Middle East, however, this division of territory could have caused new modern conflicts. For example, it is not likely that all Arabs would accept the rule of the Hashemite dynasty, who some believed were raiders paid off by the British. Also important is the fact that Lawrence's plan for Iraq did not involve a separation of Sunni and Shi'ite groups, which has proven to be a serious obstacle in the path to peace. And what was to be the fate of Palestine? Would it have suffered the same fate as it did under British mandate? Lawrence clearly had a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between Palestinian Arabs, Palestinian Jews, and European Jewish immigrants than the British imperial government. His plan did reveal some sensitivity to Arab issues, but it seems this map did much to cater to imperial interests, as it was the only way he could get the British to accept it.

Ultimately, Lawrence's efforts at the Paris Peace Conference were a failure. The Sykes-Picot Agreement was in effect, despite protests from the Arabs, and several members of the British delegation. Fortunately, Lawrence would get another chance to make good on his promise to the Arabs in Cairo.[35]

Figure 1[36]

The Cairo Conference of 1921 was a gathering of all of Britain's Middle Eastern experts, and was spearheaded by the new head of the Colonial Office, Winston Churchill.[37] By this time, Lawrence had become the famous hero of World War I,

"Lawrence of Arabia," largely due to the hyperbolic efforts of the American journalist Lowell Thomas.[38] Thomas had travelled with Lawrence during the Arab Revolt, the result of which was a sensationalist multimedia show that played in London. While its reports of Lawrence's exploits were greatly exaggerated, it provided Lawrence with the reputation required to make the kind of difference he sought. He was selected by Churchill to be his advisor at the conference. Churchill had seen Thomas' show several times, and believed it fully, as he was not involved in the Eastern Front during the War. This provided Lawrence with immense influence over Churchill, who was convinced (by Lawrence) that the British owed the Arabs a great deal.[39] The result of this conference was that Faisal would take control of the newly formed Iraq, while Abdullah would become the Emir of Transjordan.[40] Lawrence was happy with this outcome, believing that "England is out of the Arab affair with clean hands"[41] but looking back at the start of his journey reveals a dramatic compromise of values.

Conclusion

Ultimately, Lawrence's exploits in the desert were a personal quest. His book, *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom,* is prefaced with a love poem he wrote for "S.A.", saying: "I loved you, so I drew these tides of men into my hands and wrote my will across the sky in stars To earn you Freedom."[42] It has been widely speculated on as to who S. A. was. Some claim it was a woman, others that it was a land or the Arab people. There has been one claim that it stands for Selim Ahmed, also called Dahoum, who was Lawrence's Syrian assistant at Carchemish. Regardless of who or what it is, the poem suggests that he planned for Arab sovereignty to be a gift, so "that your eyes might be shining for me, When we came."[43] However, Lawrence clearly understood his failures, finishing his poem with: "But for fit monument I shattered it, unfinished; and now the little things creep out to patch themselves hovels in the marred shadow of your gift."[44] Although he was well-meaning, the realities of imperial domination shattered his original hopes for Arab sovereignty. The consequences of his actions, namely, the paving of the way for imperial conquest of the Middle East, transformed his romantic adventure into a tragic tale of subjugation fueled by ignorance and false hopes. His story reveals the dangers of a hero; that even good intentions can be used for imperialistic ends. When a person's decisions affect the lives of many, so to do his mistakes. The Arabs placed their trust in Lawrence, and received broken promises and imperial servility in return. It would seem a degree of distrust for leaders and heroes is a healthy practice, but if the balance between capable leaders and cautious followers cannot be found, the dream of sovereignty may become another broken creed on the fringe of the desert.

[1] Priya Satia, *Spies in Arabia: The Great War and the Cultural Foundations of Britain's Covert Empire in the Middle East*, (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008), 12.
[2] Priya Satia, *Spies in Arabia: The Great War and the Cultural Foundations of Britain's Covert Empire in the Middle East,* 69.
[3] Ibid, 70.
[4] Ibid, 73.
[5] Jeremy Wilson, "T. E. Lawrence: From Dream to Legend," *TE Lawrence Studies*, (2011).
[6] Jeremy Wilson, "T. E. Lawrence: From Dream to Legend."
[7] Ibid.
[8] Sam Moorhead, "The Wilderness of Zin- 100 Years On," (*PEF.com*, Nov 6, 2014).
[9] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East* (New York, NY: Holt, 2009), 222.
[10] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East,* 222.
[11] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," *The Philosophers' Magazine,* 31, *SocialSciencesandHumanities.com*, (2005), 11.
[12] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," 12.
[13] Ibid, 24.
[14] Ibid, 27.
[15] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East* (New York, NY: Holt, 2009), 222-223.
[16] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East,* 226.
[17] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," *The Philosophers' Magazine,* 31, *SocialSciencesandHumanities.com*, (2005), 24.
[18] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom, 25.
[19] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East* (New York, NY: Holt, 2009), 227.
[20] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East* (New York, NY: Holt, 2009), 327.
[21] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," *The Philosophers' Magazine,* 31, *SocialSciencesandHumanities.com*, (2005), 134.
[22] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," 135.
[23] Martin Gilbert, "Lawrence of Judea," *Aish.com*, Azure, (Web: May 9, 2016).
[24] "Aaron Aaronsohn," *JewishVirtualLibrary.org*, (Jewish Virtual Library).
[25] James Barr, "Setting the Desert on Fire: Was TE Lawrence a Zionist?,"*DesertonFire.com,* (WW Norton: Feb 22, 2007).
[26] James Barr, "Setting the Desert on Fire: Was TE Lawrence a Zionist?."
[27] Ibid.
[28] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East* (New York, NY: Holt, 2009), 335.

[29] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*, 336.
[30] "Sykes-Picot, T.E. Lawrence and the Mideast," *TMI-Archives.com*, (Millbrook Independent).
[31] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*, 337.
[32] Ibid, 337.
[33] Ibid, 339.
[34] Ibid, 343.
[35] "Paris Peace Conference - 1919 - and Cairo Conference-1921," *Paris Peace Conference - 1919 -and T.E. Lawrence*, (Clio History, n.d.: May 16, 2016).
[36] Figure 1, From 'Lawrence of Arabia, The Life, The Legend,' Imperial War Museum, London, via NPR, (The National Archive: 2005).
[37] "Paris Peace Conference - 1919 - and Cairo Conference-1921," *Paris Peace Conference - 1919 -and T.E. Lawrence*, (Clio History, n.d.: May 16, 2016).
[38] "Paris Peace Conference - 1919 - and Cairo Conference-1921," *Paris Peace Conference - 1919 -and T.E. Lawrence*.
[39] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East* (New York, NY: Holt, 2009), 499.
[40] "Paris Peace Conference - 1919 - and Cairo Conference-1921," *Paris Peace Conference - 1919 -and T.E. Lawrence*, (Clio History, n.d.: May 16, 2016).
[41] David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*, 529.
[42] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," *The Philosophers' Magazine,* 31, *SocialSciencesandHumanities.com*, (2005), 1.
[43] T. E. Lawrence, "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," 1.
[44] Ibid, 1.

SEEKING A CUP OF CATICHE'S "GOOD COFFEE": ANALYZING NEW ORLEANS' COFFEE CULTURE AND FEMALE LIBERATION THROUGH KATE CHOPIN'S *THE AWAKENING*

BRET BUCKEL

"It is no unusual thing for a business man to say casually: 'Well, let's go and get a cup of coffee,' as a visitor in his office is making ready to depart. It is a little thing perhaps, this drinking of coffee at odd times, but it is very characteristic of the city itself. Men in New Orleans give more thought to the business of living than men in other American cities . . . I have heard Northern businessmen complain bitterly about these little interruptions for coffee or what-not."

- Lyle Saxon, *Fabulous New Orleans*, 1928

New Orleans is a coffee city. With strong cultural ties to France, Spain, other French colonial cities, and the United States, New Orleans has a long history of coffee importation, distribution, roasting, brewing, and consumption. In her book *Coffee Culture*, Catherine Tucker observes, "Hundreds of nations and millions of people produce or consume coffee. But what it means to people varies greatly . . . In some places, coffee has become so integral to daily life that it has become a part of national identity."[1] While most critics focus on coffee as a symbol of nationhood and the process of forming a unified national identity, this paper emphasizes the importance of coffee in forming a more localized regional identity. Before coffee became a staple of the American dinner table around the turn of the twentieth century, New Orleans already had a deeply rooted coffee tradition that involved coffee at multiple meals as well as servings interspersed throughout the day. By the early nineteenth century, "Rose Nicaud, who had earned her freedom from slavery, set up a portable coffee stand near the French Market that was so successful that many more free women of color set up their own stands, serving their own coffee blends."[2] It is not surprising, then, that one of these independent coffee stands shows up near the end of the century in Kate Chopin's *The Awakening.* Characters travel all the way to the suburbs of New Orleans for a cup of Catiche's, a mulatresse woman's, "good coffee," and Chopin's protagonist, Edna Pontellier, asserts that she practically lives in the shop's garden. Both of these examples highlight the pervasiveness and import of coffee in New Orleans culture and tradition.

Associations between New Orleans' coffee culture and coffee as a symbol of both freedom and oppression are also developed in Chopin's work. Critics Steven Topik and Michelle Craig McDonald connect citizens' perception of coffee re-exportation following the American Revolution as an act of independence and "patriotism" with Caribbean and Latin American slave labor.[3] They argue that coffee throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is paradoxically associated with

both American freedom and slavery. Similarly, coffee in *The Awakening* acts as both a means of betterment for women of color as well as a reminder of the societal structures that limit the advancement of women both black and white. The scene in which Edna travels to Catiche's is a pivotal moment for Chopin's protagonist, in which she dines alone, smokes with her coffee, and even confronts her male companion, Robert, in an "unwomanly" manner.[4] Yet the appearance of Robert when Edna plans to dine alone at Catiche's over her "always hot" coffee serves as a reminder of the societal structures that reprove women like Edna for their independence. Coffee culture in *The Awakening* acts as a cultural idiom for the position of women in the late nineteenth century as well as an indicator of New Orleans' cultural past and larger economic structures.

Before examining Chopin's work, it is germane to give a brief overview of the history of coffee in the United States and Louisiana. As critics Topik and McDonald argue, the history of coffee in the United States is one of both freedom and slavery. Following the American Revolution, the United States signed a preferential treaty with France that allowed U.S. importers access to the French Caribbean colonies.[5] "Political advocates of free trade portrayed re-export merchants as 'patriots,'" and their contributions were seen as a crucial trade link between the United States and the rest of the world.[6] By 1800 the U.S. made more from the "re-exportation of coffee overseas than from re-exports of tea, sugar, and molasses combined," with coffee representing "10 percent of all U.S. trade income and 25 percent of its re-export income."[7] Due to the travel writings of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Topik and McDonald surmise that Americans knew "where and how their coffee was produced" on coffee plantations.[8] However, coffee, with its ties to the newly formed nation, was never boycotted in the U.S. like sugar due to its slave-labor origins.[9] This paradoxical narrative surrounding the history of coffee in the United States is apparent in Chopin's work in which coffee comes to represent both a means of asserting autonomy and a reminder of oppressive societal structures.

Despite the significance of coffee on the United States' early national economy, the amount of coffee brewed in America remained "roughly equivalent to [that] of tea" until the twentieth century.[10] In his essay on the rise of coffee in the United States, Jonathan Morris argues, "It was only as increasing numbers of immigrants arrived from Europe, bringing not so much a taste for coffee as the cultural aspiration to be able to afford it, that consumption really took off" after the 1880s.[11] By 1900, however, America was the world's largest coffee market. But the rise of coffee relied on two key developments: "the drink had to be Americanized, and it had to become a mass beverage."[12] While coffee was important in the United States as a commercial product since the late eighteenth century, most historians agree that coffee on average did not witness a drastic increase in consumption until the twentieth century. That is not to say that coffee was not of huge cultural consequence, as re-export accounted for

a large segment of the economy, but coffee did not make the transition from luxury commodity to mass consumption until much later.

Conversely, New Orleans had a long-established coffee tradition well before the turn of the twentieth century. The significance of coffee in New Orleans can be linked back to its colonial history, stemming from its relations to France, Spain, and the French Caribbean colonies. By 1789, Saint Domingue was "the largest coffee-exporting origin in the world," and the French colonies generated over two-thirds of the world's supply.[13] This growth in exports can be connected to the expansion of demand in France.[14] Soon after the foundation of French New Orleans, one of the city's most iconic drinks was already storming France: "the combination of coffee with warm milk in the form of *café au lait* created a beverage sufficiently close to chocolate in its sweetness and calorific value to become the new breakfast favorite. Recipes . . . appeared in French cookbooks after the 1730s. By the late eighteenth century, even the lower classes were drinking a version of *café au lait*."[15] Morris's findings indicate the early spread of coffee throughout France and, in turn, New Orleans as compared to the rest of the United States. By the nineteenth century, coffee had shifted away from a purely aristocratic drink to one consumed widely and habitually and with its own unique way of being prepared. Around the same time, William Ukers observed, "In New Orleans, coffee is often served at the bedside upon waking, as a kind of early breakfast function," paralleling the French tradition.[16] In her brief profile of coffee in New Orleans, Annabelle Smith notes that after the city's foundation, "Coffee crops would soon follow and become part of the city's culture, even as ownership of the port would switch from French to Spanish to French and finally to the United States . . . By 1840, the port of New Orleans was the second largest importer of coffee in the United States."[17] Coffee culture in New Orleans was more than just habit; it represented the city's ties to its colonial beginning and economic structure, especially trade with French Caribbean colonies.

This is also evinced by the proliferation of coffee stands in the early nineteenth century, beginning with Rose Nicaud.[18] These coffee stands were not only a means of advancement for free women of color but also an indication of the demand for coffee in the city. As these coffee shops continued to expand, they gained a social aspect and "most of the big business of the city was transacted in the coffee houses."[19] In addition to being served at meals, coffee was consumed throughout the day in New Orleans. In *Fabulous New Orleans*, Lyle Saxon observes, "It is not an unusual thing for a business man to say casually, 'Well, let's go and get a cup of coffee' . . . It is a little thing perhaps, this drinking of coffee at odd times, but it is very characteristic of the city itself."[20] Saxon furthers, "I have heard Northern business men complain bitterly about these little interruptions for coffee and what not."[21] It is important to note that coffee was being consumed throughout the day in New Orleans – not yet a common practice in the North

- and was not just a luxury consumed by the wealthy with meals. Coffee houses within the city became hubs of conversation and business dealings, imparting a layer of social importance on the consumption of coffee. Over coffee, people could have serious conversations, which is why we see coffee served at dinners, over business deals, and upon the reception of guests in *The Awakening*. Coffee sets the tone for roused conversations and for characters to talk freely about their own struggles, colored by the societal expectations embodied in the cultural significance of coffee.

The scene in which Edna travels to Catiche's foregrounds the transgressive actions of Edna and the exceptional spaces she inhabits in the novel. Catiche's small café is described at length, and the opening paragraph stresses, "There was no one who could make such excellent coffee or fry a chicken so golden brown as she."[22] This description, from an omniscient third-person narrator, leaves no room for contestation; Chopin emphasizes the success of the space Catiche has built based on skills she was able to monetize. Catiche and her coffee shop represent the success of an independent woman, who has built and operates her own business. It is befitting that Edna chooses to spend hours at a time at Catiche's as she seeks to find her own independence from her husband and children and the role she has been assigned by society. At Catiche's, "the last place in the city where [Edna] would have expected to meet any one she knew," Edna is able to shirk her traditional role as a mother-woman.[23] Though Edna often dines at Catiche's alone – an assertion steeped in its own implications as Edna shuns the social importance of dining in Southern culture – on this particular evening Edna encounters Robert, a lover she has not seen in a year since their affair on Grand Isle. This meeting sets the tone for Edna to come face-to-face with her struggle to define herself outside of her family.

Though Robert acts as a reminder of Edna's obligations to her husband – and her transgression from them – she is unfazed by his entrance. She immediately commands, "[Catiche]'ll bring you a plate, and you will share my dinner."[24] Edna is assertive and authoritative, despite her initial resolve "to be indifferent and reserved" when she met Robert again.[25] In the next paragraph, Edna confronts Robert as to why he "has kept away" from her, and Robert, stunned, asks, "Why are you so personal, Mrs. Pontellier?"[26] Robert's confusion surrounding Edna's brazenness highlights the confidence Edna has discovered in the year that has passed. She has left her husband, moved into a home of her own, and feeds her ambition with her art. Edna responds to Robert, "I suppose this is what you would call unwomanly; I have gotten into a habit of expressing myself. It doesn't matter to me, and you may think me unwomanly if you like"[27] Though Edna is no longer bound by the strict expectations of her family and upper-class New Orleans society, Robert acts as a reminder of these expectations and the astonishment of her peers at her actions. This narrative on freedom in the face of oppressive forces is foregrounded against the backdrop of Catiche's coffee shop, which

shares similar symbolism. Though Catiche has been successful in circumventing the lack of opportunities which women, especially women of color, faced in the nineteenth century, her coffee shop still acts as a reminder of the obstacles she has overcome in order to gain her autonomy from oppressive societal structures.

Throughout this scene, coffee acts as the link between characters and the struggles they face. Coffee's importance in the passage is furthered when Edna admonishes Robert for putting too much sugar in his: "Three lumps! How can you drink it so sweet? Take some of the cress with your chop; it's so biting and crisp."[28] Edna once again asserts her own opinion frankly but also subtly alludes to the coffee tradition of New Orleans. There is a proper way in which coffee is prepared and consumed, and Edna cannot help but to comment on Robert's divergence. It is pertinent to note characters' keen awareness of acts of transgression and an interesting parallel that even coffee, acting as both a symbol freedom and oppression, can be transgressive as well. Though Robert acts as a reminder of the expectations of Edna's husband and friends, he never admonishes her frankness or disobedience like Leonce, her husband, or her other contemporaries. Robert has, after all, already contravened the ordinances of marriage in his affair with Edna. In this way, coffee highlights the distinct deviations from societal norms each character holds and also the oppressiveness of those norms. This observation is bolstered in the next sentence when Edna lights a cigarette for herself and remarks, "There's the advantage of being able to smoke with your coffee out here."[29] Robert is once again shocked by Edna's openness and apathy for the rules of upper-class society. Edna merely remarks that she likes Catiche's because she can smoke in public with her coffee, unlike in the city where it would be "unwomanly" to do so. Coffee acts as a companion to another one of Edna's many nonconformities and acts of autonomy.

Coffee's relation to this autonomy is cemented in the conversation that follows. Robert laments Edna's obligations to her husband and confides that he had dreams of Leonce setting her free: "Oh! I was demented, dreaming of wild, impossible things, recalling men who had set their wives free."[30] Robert continues, "Religion, loyalty, everything would give way if only you cared."[31] Robert asserts his willingness to abandon society for Edna, portraying himself as a savior who would free her from the confines of her marriage. Edna immediately undermines Robert's claim, chiding, "You have been a very, very foolish boy, wasting your time dreaming of impossible things when you speak of Mr. Pontellier setting me free! I am no longer one of Mr. Pontellier's possessions to dispose of or not. I give myself where I choose. If he were to say, 'Here, Robert, take her and be happy; she is yours,' I should laugh at you both."[32] Edna's language mirrors the effect of the coffee on her conversation, saying that she has been "awoken" from "a life-long, stupid dream."[33] Edna and Robert's conversation has built to this point, culminating in Edna's direct declaration of her own freedom

from her husband and her lack of desire to be owned again by Robert. Despite Robert's attempts to remind Edna of her marital duties and role as a mother and wife in the nineteenth century, she is confident in her independence and unlocks a way for her to define the terms of her reunion with Robert. The presence of coffee throughout the novel underlines this narrative of female liberation but also acts as a reminder of the obstacles women in the nineteenth century had to overcome for their autonomy and the ability to seek out their own desires.

This is related to coffee's importance and omnipresence in New Orleans society before the turn of the twentieth century. The amalgamation of cultural influences that converge to form New Orleans' coffee tradition – of chicory, *café au lait*, and constant consumption by all classes and races by the nineteenth century – sets the tone for Kate Chopin's novel. Its pervasiveness in social settings not only indicates the economic importance of coffee in Louisiana – as importers, brokers, roasters, and consumers – but also the city's strong ties to France and its colonies. The rise of coffee in New Orleans parallels the French tradition, which correlates to the rise of coffee production in French colonies. Coffee acts as a signifier for these cultural connections, which are bolstered by the French idioms that are used throughout the novel, i.e. *madame, monsieur, allez-vous, café au lait/negro, etc.* More importantly, however, coffee acts as a metaphor for Chopin's protagonist and the role to which women, both black and white, are conscripted in Southern society in the late nineteenth century.

[1] Catherine Tucker, *Coffee Culture: Local Experiences, Global Connections* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 57.
[2] Judy Walker, "Coffee: *The Times-Picayune* Covers 175 Years of New Orleans History," *NOLA.com/The Times-Picayune*, last modified February 2, 2012, www.nola.com/175years/index.ssf/2012/0 2/coffee_the_times-picayune_cove.html.
[3] Steven Topik and Michelle Craig McDonald, "Why Americans Drink Coffee: The Boston Tea Party or Brazilian Slavery," in *Coffee: A Comprehensive Guide to the Bean, the Beverage, and the Industry*, ed. Robert W. Thurston, Jonathan Morris, and Shawn Steiman (Lahman, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013), 238.
[4] Kate Chopin, *The Awakening* (University Park, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008),110.
[5] Topik and McDonald, "Why Americans Drink Coffee," 237.
[6] Ibid., 238.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Jonathan Morris, "Coffee, a Condensed History," in *Coffee: A Comprehensive Guide to the Bean, the Beverage, and the Industry*, ed Robert W. Thurston, Jonathan Morris, and Shawn Steiman (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013), 220.
[11] Ibid.

[12] Topik and McDonald, "Why Americans Drink Coffee," 240.
[13] Morris, "Coffee, a Condensed History," 218.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid., 218-9.
[16] William H. Ukers, *All About Coffee* (New York: The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1922), 756.
[17] K. Annabelle Smith, "The History of the Chicory Coffee Mix That New Orleans Made Its Own," *Smithsonian.com*, last modified March 5, 2014, www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/chicory-coffee-mix-new-orleans-made-own-comes-180949950/.
[18] Walker, "Coffee."
[19] Ukers, *All About Coffee*, 175.
[20] Lyle Saxon, *Fabulous New Orleans* (Gretna, Louisiana: Pelican Publishing, 1988), 137.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Kate Chopin, *The Awakening*, 110.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid., 111.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid., 112.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid., 113.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid., 114.

Furman v. Georgia: The Evolution of Capital Punishment

Hannah Goodman

The twentieth century was plagued with instabilities, social, political and philosophical as the experiences of World War I and World War II created a much different America than the one the previous century had seen; transforming the nation into a leading world power. Both wars forced the United States government to make decisions that would challenge the nation's moral conscience, most significantly the decision to use chemical weapons during World War II, which resulted in the deaths of over 200,000 innocent civilians.[1]

The atomic bombs dropped on the belligerent Japanese enemy was used to force the Axis powers to recognize the United States as a powerful nation. America intended to triumph in the conflict, even if that meant voluntarily killing innocent civilians. There was great controversy over dropping the atomic bomb, as it could have been considered "cruel and unusual." The use of chemical weapons in the context of WWII foreshadowed a domestic crisis of conscience as to whether such weapons were appropriate when use against American citizens, even citizens who had been accused and convicted of crimes. Chemical weapons were similarly used to execute prisoners on death row, with the use of gas chambers and lethal injection. Their uses have been long debated by proponents and opponents of capital punishment. As the death penalty continues to be debated today, it is important to examine evolving historical perspectives on the use and practice of the death penalty. Within this historical context, several key death penalty cases and their constitutionality are examined, including *Furman v. Georgia*, *Jackson v. Georgia*, and *Branch v. Texas*. *Furman v. Georgia* was the leading case, with the latter two being decided under Furman. This Supreme Court decision was a pivotal one in the postwar era because of its challenge of the Constitution, its effects on the law, and its ability to question America's traditions and its future.

The death penalty dates as far back as ancient Mesopotamia and the Code of Hammurabi[2] and has been a recorded part of legal processes of various societies throughout history. In this ancient civilization, there was an extensive list of crimes that warranted capital punishment. Executions were often accomplished by a mob stoning the offender.[3] Among the Greeks and Hebrews, individuals were executed by stoning if they were accused by two witnesses with good community standing.[4] In China, death by a thousand cuts was the method of execution, and during the rule of the Rajahs in nineteenth century India, elephants were frequently used.[5] England also has a long history of punishing certain crimes with the death penalty. From the middle of the twelfth century to the nineteenth century, English citizens convicted of a crime were

hanged, or drawn and quartered.[6] The methods of executions greatly depended on the gravity of the crime, as well as the offender's class and gender.[7]

The British norms of punishment were the most influential on the American legal system because America's colonial heritage. The first prisons were not established until the end of the eighteenth century, but the first execution on American soil occurred in 1608 at Jamestown when George Kendall was executed by firing squad for theft.[8] Hanging was the most common execution method in the United States. Hangings were public events and often attracted thousands of onlookers. The point of public executions was to deter possible offenders from committing crimes. It was "...an example and warning, to prevent others from those courses that lead to so fatal and ignominious a conclusion."[9] Executions were reported in newspapers and discussed in church sermons, and were usually the talk of the town.[10] In the nineteenth century executions began to move from the public to private arena, which challenged an execution's function as a legal deterrent to criminality. With the adoption of the prison system, capital punishment was used less frequently, especially for petty crimes.[11]

The method of execution in the United States also evolved from its earliest seventeenth century form. Hanging was initially the most widespread method, but electrocution became the new and more common method at the end of the nineteenth century. At this time, cities started running on electricity, a technological advance which altered the form of executions as individuals witnessed accidental electrocution deaths.[12] Execution by lethal gas was another method discovered at the end of the nineteenth century.[13] Some believed that this was a more humane method of killing someone. Lethal injection became a new popular method toward the end of the twentieth century, with twenty-seven states adopting it by 1997.[14] Currently, thirty-six states still administer five different methods of the death penalty, including electrocution, lethal injection, firing squad, lethal gas, and hanging.[15] The development of the physical and technological mechanism of the death penalty is extensive and is crucial to understanding how our society functions today in regards to the penal system.

The humaneness of the death penalty has frequently been a subject of constitutional debate. But how did the government determine what was humane and what was not? By 1788, the newly independent United States ratified the Constitution, with the Eighth Amendment ratified by 1791.[16] The Eighth Amendment declares: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."[17] The ideas of excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment first appeared in the English Bill of Rights of 1689, an incredible influential body of penal law that was adapted by the American colonies years earlier.[18] Most importantly for this discussion of the death penalty, America's Founding Fathers embraced the cruel and unusual punishment clause, this clause had been a commonly accepted norm in their society for years preceding the ratification. Because there was

so little debate regarding this clause, it is hard to parse out what Americans, both political elites and the general public, considered to be cruel and unusual at the time the Constitution was being created.[19] The severity of the consequence was usually determined by the severity of the crimes; this was common knowledge between Enlightenment thinkers, including Beccaria and Montesquieu.[20] If the punishment was too severe for the crime, that would have been viewed as cruel and unusual: "Some understood cruel and unusual punishment to refer to punishment unauthorized by law and therefore outside the authority of a court to impose."[21] Some believed that the penalties for crimes were too harsh and that the courts had overstepped their authority. The third meaning of this clause that was understood by the public was that it only referred to the methods of execution.[22] At the Virginia ratification convention, Patrick Henry stated that without a ban on cruel and unusual punishment, "Congress might introduce the practice of France, Spain, and Germany--of torturing, to extort a confession of the crime."[23] Henry captured a communal fear; without this clause in the Eighth Amendment, the government would be able to assign any punishment they deem fair. There had to be a written rule that Congress could not exceed its power. It was crucial that such measures be taken so the rights of the citizens be protected from the government itself, that is--the overstepping of their power.[24]

In the nineteenth century, there was little debate in America against the death penalty and its constitutionality. *In Wilkerson v. Utah* in 1879, the defendant had argued that the use of the firing squad method was unconstitutional because it was considered cruel and unusual punishment.[25] The case was appealed in the Supreme Court, but the majority ruled in favor of the state of Utah, declaring that this method of execution did not constitute cruel and unusual punishment.[26] The firing squad still remains a method of execution in Utah today.

The "cruel and unusual" clause of the Eighth Amendment is important not only in regard to declaring the death penalty unconstitutional, but also in stating when the death penalty has gone too far in its use. In *Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber* in 1945, the question surrounding the case was: "Does a second attempt at execution after a technical failure constitute cruel and unusual punishment?"[27] The specifics of this case concern Willie Francis who was sentenced to death for committing murder when he was fifteen years old. He was placed in the electric chair and received a strong jolt of electricity, but there was a technical difficulty and the jolt did not kill him. The officials decided to take him back to his prison cell and rescheduled the execution for several days later.[28] Francis and his lawyers argued that the psychological stress of having to prepare for two executions was torturous and constituted cruel and unusual punishment. In a 5-4 decision, the court ruled that it would have only been cruel and unusual punishment if the state had purposely done this to Francis, but that could not be proven. Francis was executed two years after the initial attempt.[29] A case could have

also been made regarding the defendant's age; is it cruel and unusual to sentence a minor to death? At this time the court did not concern itself with this more complicated issue of age.

Cruel and unusual punishment was not determined solely in death penalty cases. In *Trop v. Dulles* of 1958, the Supreme Court was called upon to determine if Albert Trop had been treated in an unconstitutional manner.[30] Trop had been stripped of his citizenship for fleeing the army during World War II. This incident had occurred in 1944, but when he applied for a passport in 1952, he discovered that he had been denationalized under the Nationality Act of 1940.[31] Chief Justice Warren delivered the majority opinion of the Court, stating that this action was cruel and unusual punishment because "the basic concept underlying the Eighth Amendment is nothing less than the dignity of man."[32] This case was important for establishing precedent for the constitutionality of capital punishment. Capital punishment was still widely accepted by the public, but those who opposed this action were inspired by the decision in Albert Trop's case.[33] This case forced one to question what constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. If denial of a passport was considered to be cruel and unusual but execution was not, the very concept of cruel and unusual punishment appeared to be paradoxically and dangerously subjective.

These three cases all deal with the cruel and unusual clause of the Eighth Amendment. Though they are alike, they do not share the same theory regarding this clause. However, they do share the same "seeds" of two different approaches that are similarly in play by the five concurring opinions in Furman's case.[34] The two theoretical legal approaches to the Eighth Amendment are the analytical approach and the normative approach.[35] The analytical approach is used as a way to gather separate constitutional theories and analyze them together to see how they can similarly relate to the specific case. This was the approach taken by Justices William O. Douglas, Potter Stewart, and Byron White.[36] The normative approach is a way of viewing the Eighth Amendment through questioning the values and morals as it is written in the Constitution. This approach was taken by Justices William J. Brennan and Thurgood Marshall.[37]

In the 1960s and 70s, discussion of abolishing the death penalty was circling American society. The execution of Caryl Chessman, who had fought through eleven appeals, was an important factor in bringing the conversation about capital punishment to the forefront of the American consciousness.[38] Another major reason for such discussion was the social unrest developing in America at this time. The Civil Rights Movement created a new rhetoric centered on social justice and equal rights to tackle the issue capital punishment. While people were fighting for the rights of African Americans, they were simultaneously taking notice of other social issues especially the Vietnam War. Americans began to witness injustice at home and abroad witnessing the

violence segregationist inflicted upon African Americans and the violence American soldiers suffered through in Vietnam. This was a period where Americans consumed domestic and foreign horrors because it appeared on television and throughout the media.

With death so visible and apparent, the concept of the death penalty as a legally sanctioned part of American society became shocking and abhorrent to Americans. In 1966, death penalty support was at an all-time low of forty-four percent, with the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War having a strong impact on this wavering support. The American Civil Liberties Union, or ACLU, started selecting cases that involved the death penalty, especially when they felt that such cases involved racial or class biases.[39] In 1965, the ACLU commented on the continued use of capital punishment: "The fact that capital punishment has been acceptable in the past is no reason for its continuation. The rack and the screw; drawing and quartering; flogging—all have been used and subsequently rejected as maturing and sensitizing notions of the essential commands of human decency demonstrated the barbarity of the practices."[40] They believed that a modern more socially conscious America should translate into the abolishment of capital punishment. In 1967, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, or the NAACP, became involved in all death penalty cases and within a year, almost all scheduled executions were halted because of the many lawsuits.[41] Many of these cases argued in favor of black Americans who were being discriminated against in courts, especially those in the south.[42] American ideals were shifting in this era, leading up to a crucial Supreme Court decision in *Furman v. Georgia*.

A momentous decision involving the death penalty occurred in 1972, in the case of *Furman v. Georgia*. At the time of the crime in 1967, William Henry Furman was twenty-six years old, but the Supreme Court decision was not decided until roughly five years later. Furman was a black man from Georgia with no higher than a sixth-grade education. The Georgia Central State Hospital diagnosed Furman as mentally deficient and subject to psychotic episodes.[43] Though he had a low IQ, the courts denied any type of insanity plea. On the night of August 11, 1967, William Henry Furman entered a home in Savannah, Georgia. The resident of the home, William Joseph Micke Jr., heard a commotion and upon examination, he found Furman burglarizing his home. Furman attempted to flee but he fell and the gun accidentally went off, striking the resident and killing him.[44] He was arrested near the scene of the crime, was convicted of murder, and sentenced to death after a trial that only lasted for one day.[45] Furman appealed this decision to the Supreme Court on the grounds that he was being subject to cruel and unusual punishment, under the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution. Two other cases were decided alongside *Furman v. Georgia*: *Jackson v. Georgia* and *Branch v. Texas*.[46] Both Jackson and Branch were accused of sexual assault and

sentenced to death.[47] The lawyers of these cases had similar arguments to Furman, so they were consolidated under *Furman v. Georgia*. The Supreme Court judges of these cases included Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Justices William O. Douglas, Byron White, Harry Blackmun, Lewis F. Powell Jr., Justice Potter Stewart, Justice Thurgood Marshall, Justice William Rehnquist, and William J Brennan Jr.[48] Justice Douglas, Brennan, Potter Stewart, Marshall, and White ruled in favor of Furman, but each wrote a different opinion. The opinions centered on the question of whether or not the death penalty was being applied to the three men fairly, and whether such alleged unfairness could constitute cruel and unusual punishment, violating the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution.

In Justice Douglas's concurring opinion, he stated that the death penalty in these cases did in fact violate the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. He pointed out that as humanity evolves, so must the laws and codes of society. He referred to *Trop v. Dulles* when he stated that the Eighth Amendment "Must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society."[49] This also referred to the fact that most of the justices decided that capital punishment itself is not cruel, but the way it is carried out may be. If the method of execution is deemed inhumane, then capital punishment in that specific instance would be considered cruel and unusual punishment. Douglas also declared, "It would seem to be incontestable that the death penalty inflicted on one defendant is "unusual" if it discriminates against him by reason of his race, religion, wealth, social position, or class..."[50] If the punishment is unusual or is determined by the color of one's skin, their religion, or economic class, then it would violate the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. Douglas referred to the English Bill of Rights of 1689 because it is where the Eighth Amendment in the United States Constitution stemmed from. In a British context the Bill of Rights was primarily concerned with the harshness of penalties and how they were decided and applied.[51] It applies to these three cases because the Eighth Amendment provides no basis "for determining in any particular case whether the death penalty imposed was proportionate to the crime."[52] The cruel and unusual clause is ambiguous and it is hard to determine whether or not it is being applied fairly.

Justice Brennan began his concurring opinion by questioning whether or not it is beyond the power of the State to sentence someone to death because of a crime they committed.[53] He believed that it was hard to determine what the Founding Fathers had defined as cruel and unusual punishment. He further explained what discussions the Founders had on the matter and that the decision to include the Eighth Amendment in the Bill of Rights was almost universally accepted.[54] Brennan referred to *Wilkerson v. Utah* when he said, "...punishments are cruel when they involve torture or a lingering death; but the punishment of death is not cruel, within the meaning of that word as used in the Constitution."[55] This means that the State directly killing a prisoner is not in itself

cruel and unusual punishment, but the way an execution is assigned and carried out may be deemed as cruel and unusual. Brennan was greatly focused on what defined cruel and unusual punishment and how it is difficult to determine solely based off what is written in the Constitution.[56]

Justice Stewart did not see the death penalty as completely unconstitutional in all cases, as two other justices did. He discussed several states and their laws on which crimes constitute capital punishment.[57] Stewart examined the ability of government to determine who should be sentenced to death, "We would need to decide whether a legislature--state or federal--could constitutionally determine that certain criminal conduct is so atrocious that society's interest in deterrence and retribution wholly outweighs any considerations of reform or rehabilitation of the perpetrator..."[58] In other words, what crimes are so terrible that whoever commits one does not deserve help or rehabilitation services, but deserves to be killed? It is a difficult question to answer because it is unclear who decides what defines a "terrible crime." Justice Stewart stated that the constitutionality of the death penalty was not the primary object to be determined in the three cases and that if there was a mandatory death sentence for murder and rape, it would be a completely different argument.[59] The men selected for death in these cases were being subject to cruel and unusual behavior because they had been unfairly chosen. The imposition of the death penalty is seldom and seeming randomly chosen.[60] Justice Stewart argued that there needed to be a clearer and fairer process for choosing those sentenced for execution.

Justice Marshall's concurrence was similar to that of Justice Brennan's. He believed that the death penalty was excessive and discussed the similar issues of "excessive bail" and "excessive fines" from the Eighth Amendment. He also believed that a punishment is unconstitutional if the public majority finds it unacceptable.[61] Marshall concluded that because there was no rational basis for imposing the death penalty onto the three men of these cases, it should be considered cruel and unusual punishment, therefore violating the Eighth Amendment.[62]

Justice White gave the last concurring opinion. He began his argument by asking whether or not the execution of these three men would violate the Eighth Amendment.[63] White then debated the frequency of the imposition of the death penalty. If it is sparsely being used then it is not acting as a deterrent for crime, which historically had been the main rationale for the creation and practice of capital punishment. Justice White stated that the death penalty would lose its credibility because of its infrequency and therefore would not keep possible offenders from committing a crime.[64] Because of its infrequency "...the moral justification for the use of the punishment is compromised."[65] He concluded with the idea that capital punishment has lost its purpose in controlling crime and therefore violates the Eighth Amendment in these cases.

Each dissenting justice believed that the legislatures should decide the rules regarding the death penalty, not the courts.[66] The three of them examined the Founding Fathers and considered what they had meant by the cruel and unusual clause in the Eighth Amendment, "The several concurring opinions acknowledge, as they must, that, until today, capital punishment was accepted and assumed as not unconstitutional *per se* under the Eighth Amendment or the Fourteenth Amendment."[67] There have been many previous cases before Furman that allowed for the death penalty to be carried out, so the justices argue, why should this one be any different? The Court theoretically had the right to strike down the death penalty as unconstitutional in any previous case, yet it only did so with these particular cases.[68] The concurring justices seemed to think that progress has been made in American attitudes since the previous cases and therefore called these cases unconstitutional.[69] Justice Blackmun even said that if he were a legislator, he would absolutely support the abolition of the death penalty.[70] It is important to acknowledge that even though Justice Blackmun ruled against Furman, Jackson, and Branch, did not mean he was in favor of capital punishment. He separated his bias toward capital punishment and ruled in favor of his analysis of the Constitution. He did not allow biases to get in the way of his job as a Supreme Court justice. Each justice argued for judicial restraint and believed that it was the states' rights to determine when the death penalty should be administered. Justice Rehnquist stated, "The Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment were never intended to destroy the States' power to govern themselves".[71] They believed that the Court was overstepping its power and the constitutionality of this case should not have been determined by them.

The *Furman v. Georgia* decision was crucial in setting precedent for future cases involving the death penalty. The Court decided that state capital punishment laws were too ambiguous and needed to be rewritten. Because of this conclusion, a nation-wide *de facto* moratorium on every execution ensued.[72] According to the Cambridge English Dictionary, *de facto* is defined as: "existing in fact, although not necessarily intended or legal."[73] A *de facto* moratorium is a halt of something, though it may not be politically or governmentally enforced. The moratorium on the death penalty was not legally enforced, but Furman's case did halt all of the executions scheduled in the United States from 1972 until 1976. Because of the decision, every state had to write new execution statutes and laws, which they did quickly so as to continue the execution process.[74] Florida was quick to rewrite their laws and by the end of 1973, the state had its first death row prisoner.[75] By 1976, most states had written new laws and were eager to test them out. *Gregg v. Georgia* ended the four-year moratorium on capital punishment. Troy Gregg was charged with armed robbery and murder. The jury found him guilty of two counts of armed robbery and two counts of murder and sentenced him to death.[76] In the Supreme Court appeal, the justices agreed with the jury in a 7-2

decision, with Justices Brennan and Marshall dissenting. The question once again was whether or not the sentence violated the Eighth or Fourteenth Amendments.[77] The concurring justices believed that the death penalty laws in Georgia fairly determined that Gregg deserved to be sentenced to death. Justices Brennan and Marshall believed, similarly to the Furman decision, that, "'The Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause' must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society."[78] They disagreed with the use of the death penalty because it did not fit into the progress of the American culture.

An event that was also crucial to the end of the moratorium of the death penalty was the execution of Gary Gilmore. In 1976, Gilmore had been sentenced to death by firing squad for committing two murders.[79] His lawyers appealed this decision but he had not wanted them to. With his new lawyers, Gilmore described that life imprisonment would have been "cruel and unusual punishment," not the death sentence. He intensely advocated to be executed by firing squad and a hearing board finally gave in.[80] In January of 1977, he was executed. His willingness to be executed made many question whether or not the death penalty is actually a violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. If he voluntarily chose the death penalty as a punishment for his crimes, why should others not be subject to the same punishment? In May of 1979, John Spenkelink became the first prisoner to unwillingly be executed in the modern capital punishment era.[81]

As of 2016, there were thirty-one states that still administer the death penalty, with Delaware being the most recent to abolish the statute.[82] Lethal injection is the primary method for every capital punishment state.[83] States either use a one, two, or three drug system. In a three-drug protocol, the drugs used are an anesthetic or sedative, followed by pancuronium to paralyze the prisoner, and ending with potassium chloride to stop the heart.[84] Currently, there is a great deal of controversy over the use of lethal injection. In 2014, Joseph Wood of Arizona was sentenced to death by way of lethal injection.[85] Even though the correct protocols were followed, it took almost two hours for him to die, which caused his lawyers to state that it was a violation of the cruel and unusual punishment clause in the Eighth Amendment.[86] Eyewitnesses described how gruesome it was to watch as Wood gasped for air. Arizona used the combination of midazolam, an anesthetic, and hydromorphone, a narcotic painkiller.[87] Sometimes a third drug is needed, but one was not used in this case. There is controversy surrounding the use of the two drugs and people wonder why the State does not use only one drug. The biggest controversy is centered on the use of midazolam. According to the National Institutes of Health, its side effects may include uncontrollable shaking, seizures, and trouble breathing.[88] Drug companies and the European Union have banned their drugs from being sold to the United States for the purpose of the death penalty.[89] Most

developed nations have abolished the death penalty and do not want to be associated with its continued use.

The use of the death penalty as a punishment for heinous crimes has been long debated inside and outside of the United States. Execution methods have been revised throughout history so as to make capital punishment more humane. As seen in *Furman v. Georgia*, *Branch v. Texas*, *Jackson v. Georgia*, as well as other aforementioned cases, the constitutionality of the death penalty has been greatly challenged. The Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments are the most heavily referred to articles of the American Constitution. The Eighth Amendment promises that no one can be subject to cruel and unusual punishment, while the Fourteenth Amendment states that no person can be denied life, liberty, or property without due process of the law. Both amendments were violated in the Furman cases and justice was sought. The Courts analyzed the Constitution to determine whether or not people's basic rights were being infringed upon. The Founding Fathers were unclear in what they considered "cruel and unusual punishment" and because of their ambiguity, this nation continues to face difficult decisions regarding capital punishment cases.

---

[1] AJ Software & Multimedia, "Total Casualties", Atomic Archive.
[2] Michael H. Reggio, "History of the Death Penalty", *PBS*, (1997).
[3] Mark Costanzo, *Just Revenge,* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 3.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid. 4.
[7] Ibid. 5.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Stuart Banner, *The Death Penalty: An American History*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 2002), 10.
[10] Ibid. 11.
[11] Ibid. 86.
[12] Ibid. 178.
[13] Ibid. 196.
[14] Mark Costanzo, *Just Revenge,* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 13.
[15] "The Death Penalty: Methods of Execution", The Clark County Prosecuting Attorney.
[16] Stuart Banner, *The Death Penalty: An American History*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 2002), 231.
[17] Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, *Capital Punishment in the United States: A Documentary History*, (Westport: Greenwood Press 1997), 24.
[18] Stuart Banner, *The Death Penalty: An American History*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 2002), 231.
[19] Ibid. 232.
[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid. 233.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, *Capital Punishment in the United States: A Documentary History*, (Westport: Greenwood Press 1997), 23.
[25] Ibid. 66.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid. 93.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid. 102.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid. 103.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Daniel D. Polsby, "The Death of Capital Punishment? Furman v. Georgia", (*The University of Chicago Press*: 1972), 11.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid. 12.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, *Capital Punishment in the United States: A Documentary History*, (Westport: Greenwood Press 1997), 109.
[39] Ibid. 110.
[40] Ibid. xxxi.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] "Furman v. Georgia: 1972", in *Law Library- American Law and Legal Information.* Net Industries.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, *Capital Punishment in the United States: A Documentary History*, (Westport: Greenwood Press 1997), 140.
[47] Ibid. 141.
[48] Peter W. Martin, ed., "Furman v. Georgia", (*Legal Information Institute*: 2016), 239.
[49] Ibid. 242.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Anderson E. Bynam, "Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments: The Death Penalty Survives", (*The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*: 1988), 9.
[53] Peter W. Martin, ed., "Furman v. Georgia", (*Legal Information Institute*: 2016), 258.
[54] Ibid. 262.
[55] Ibid. 265.
[56] Daniel D. Polsby, "The Death of Capital Punishment? Furman v. Georgia", (*The University of Chicago Press*: 1972), 17.

[57] Peter W. Martin, ed., "Furman v. Georgia", (*Legal Information Institute*: 2016), 307.
[58] Ibid. 308.
[59] Daniel D. Polsby, "The Death of Capital Punishment? Furman v. Georgia", (*The University of Chicago Press*: 1972), 14.
[60] Ibid. 15.
[61] Ibid. 22.
[62] Ibid. 24.
[63] Peter W. Martin, ed., "Furman v. Georgia", (*Legal Information Institute*: 2016), 311.
[64] Ibid. 312.
[65] Daniel D. Polsby, "The Death of Capital Punishment? Furman v. Georgia", (*The University of Chicago Press*: 1972), 16.
[66] Mark S. Hurwitz, "Given Him a Fair Trial, Then Hang Him: The Supreme Court's Modern Death Penalty Jurisprudence," (*The Justice System Journal:* 2008), 246.
[67] Peter W. Martin, ed., "Furman v. Georgia", (*Legal Information Institute*: 2016), 408.
[68] Ibid. 409.
[69] Ibid. 410.
[70] Ibid. 410.
[71] Mark S. Hurwitz, "Given Him a Fair Trial, Then Hang Him: The Supreme Court's Modern Death Penalty Jurisprudence," (*The Justice System Journal:* 2008), 246.
[72] *Citizens United for Alternatives to the Death Penalty*, "History of Furman and Gregg Decisions", The Abolitionist Action Committee.
[73] *Cambridge University Press*, "Definition of De Facto," Cambridge University.
[74] *Citizens United for Alternatives to the Death Penalty*, "History of Furman and Gregg Decisions", The Abolitionist Action Committee.
[75] Ibid.
[76] *Gregg v. Georgia*, 153 S. Ct, (July 2, 1976).
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Lily Rothman, "The Strange Story of the Man Who Chose Execution by Firing Squad", (*Time*: 2015).
[80] Ibid.
[81] *Citizens United for Alternatives to the Death Penalty*, "History of Furman and Gregg Decisions", The Abolitionist Action Committee.
[82] "States with and without the Death Penalty", Death Penalty Information Center.
[83] "Lethal Injection", Death Penalty Information Center.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ben Brumfield, "Arizona Execution Raises Questions over Novel Lethal Injections", CNN, 2014.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid.

Links on the Chain: The American Folk Music Tradition and Cultural Protestors Woody Guthrie, Bob Dylan, and Phil Ochs[1]

Outstanding Senior Thesis Award

Emily Edwards

The broad concept of 'folk culture' and the more specific phenomena of 'folk music' have existed as long as there have been working folks. Folk music looms so centrally in the American characters that to "define the nature of American folk culture is implicitly to define America."[2] The nature of American folk music is at once both attractively subversive and bonding—folk music combined a stinging critique of American life and American values that revealed the constant suffering and struggle "the other half" of the nation experienced, while offering the language of the folk song to bridge this gap and to facilitate not just a discourse on injustice and struggle, but to give voice to the entirety of the nation and, therefore, forge a genuine, authentic American character through song.

Woody Guthrie and his protégées, Bob Dylan and Phil Ochs, and contemporary artists such as Old Crow Medicine Show, Wilco, Billy Bragg, Ani DiFranco, and Tom Morello define the legacy and function of the American folk music tradition as not merely a musical genre, but as a tool of cultural protest and a process of self-discovery. This linkage between Guthrie, Dylan, Ochs and contemporary artists demonstrates how conflict defines the American experience and forms American identity: conflict against environmental forces, conflict against institutions, and even conflict against oneself. Relegating the American folk music tradition to purely artistic or the narrowly political minimizes its narrative importance as an expression of a diverse set of American voices, the voices that speak to the often violent and always active struggle at the very center of the American character.

Folk music embodies the process whereby musicians and listeners engage in self-definition and confront their own history and the history of struggle in America. Folk music is the story of America's hidden history, a history that is not defined by freedom, upward mobility and self-determination but rather a history of exploitation, poverty and discrimination, a history of conflict that culminates not in greatness but often in loss. From the early labor-song poems to the radical folk of Guthrie, through to the 1960s folk revival and on to contemporary folk artists, there exists a linkage that, while fraught with contradictions, reveals an important narrative of cultural protest. The legacy of Woody Guthrie that runs through the work of both Bob Dylan and Phil Ochs reveals the power of American folk music, and why folk songs and folk music are so key to the American imagination and our definition as a people and a culture.

Folk music allows a musician to access a "tradition" that gives context and legitimacy to his or her present struggles as connected to a greater legacy of suffering and to apply this work to contemporary or topical experiences. Read as an artistic site of conflict, we can see the primacy of struggle through the lyrics of Guthrie, Ochs and Dylan.

Folk music must be approached as an audible representation of social conflict, which allows a new American narrative to emerge, an American narrative that is not defined by linear progressivism but rather is wrenched forward by masses pushing for change. A good folk song is never about complacency, there is always a yearning or desperate element to American folk music. This frenetic energy is created through the singer's confrontation of realities and systems defined by inequalities.

The two dominant historical narratives of folk music in the United States presented by historians and musicologists connect the proliferation and popularization of folk music to either the leftist Popular Front as a 'cultural weapon' among members of the American Communist Party,[3] or to initial academic interest from musicologists and folklorists such as Charles Seeger and John Lomax. American folk music must be examined from a more holistic lense that takes into account both its political heritage as a tool of labor organizing with its antecedents in the early 1800s but also as a form of identity-formation and cultural defiance against both dominant commercial and elitist narratives of a homogenous and sanitized American experience.

Music critic Wilfrid Mellers contextualizes this American experience where folk music remained the only outlet for the lowest social strata to express their identity and to agitate against or alleviate social, economic and environmental oppression, "The [American] land was gouged and scarred, the streams polluted, animal life decimated, human life materially and spiritually impoverished. Yet out of deprivation men and women wrested a music which, if niggardly, attained nobility."[4] This description of the working folks in American history is timeless, describing both the postbellum poor to the modern members of an economically disenfranchised class.

Singer and activist Woody Guthrie stands most prominently in the American consciousness as a true folk artist and classic troubadour. Producing much of his work during the Great Depression in the 1920s and 1930s, Guthrie reached only a moderate level of commercial success due in part to his own penchant for wandering and his radical leftist politics.[5] National recognition for Guthrie only blossomed in the 1950s when commercial groups like The Weavers began to cover one of his moderately popular songs, "This Land is Your Land" (albeit stripped of its original protest base) and "So Long It's Been Good to Know You." Bob Dylan and the lesser known Phil Ochs connect directly to the mythology surrounding Woody Guthrie, each man stumbled upon Guthrie's work in the late 1950s and became inspired to make their own folk music in the Greenwich Village scene in the 1960s.

Guthrie began writing and singing himself after experiencing economic and social deprivation as part of the Okie migration to California, this experience shaped Guthrie to create music which centered on poverty, racial injustice and the fight against fascism. Guthrie especially viewed fascism as a danger at home and abroad. Guthrie vigorously sang and organized against the rise of European fascism. American wealthy elites were viewed by Guthrie as homegrown fascists. He frequently sang about the power of unions against the excesses of "the bosses." American fascism drew its power not from political totalitarianism but rather from a predatory capitalist system. Guthrie avowed, "Folk music ought to be called workers music or fighting music."[6]

For Guthrie, the true folk singer must be engaged in the overt political struggle against fascism, commercialism and economic injustices perpetuated by the exploitative capitalist system. It is clear that during his own life, Guthrie viewed himself as first and foremost as an artist engaged in overt struggle with folk music as a weapon.

"This Land is Your Land," best describes Guthrie's impression of America's physical and social geography. Guthrie wrote "This Land is Your Land" as a response to Irving Berlin's patriotic tribute "God Bless America" after hitch-hiking cross country to New York City in the dead of winter.[7] In the two most often omitted stanzas in the ballad Guthrie paints a bleak portrait of America in contrast to the "redwood forests and Gulf Stream waters" when he sings:

As I went walking
I saw a sign there
And on the sign is said "No Tresspassing."
But on the other side
It didn't say nothing,
That side was made for you and me.

In the shadow of the steeple
I saw my people
By the relief office
I seen my people;
As they stood they hungry,
I stood there asking
Is this land made for you and me?[8]

Such a contrast heightens the desperation and contradiction embedded in the American landscape that offers incredible native beauty but also a political-economic system that degrades this potential utopia. The body of work Woody began to create in California and later in New York expanded far deeper than the American fable presented in "This Land is Your Land," and while it is his most 'conventional' ballads that have become standard, Woody's engagement with radical political and revolutionary ideologies is

present throughout his collection of work. Reminiscing of his work, Guthrie said that " I have had several good radio jobs which were of a short and bitter duration because I would not cut verses that were controversial, were too bloody, were too vulgar, too this or too that, too left wing, or too something or other."[9] Although his message and his music were one in the same, Guthrie's brand of folk was inherently radical, it was fighting music. Woody was an incredibly talented painter of American life, both figuratively and literally,[10] but the most enduring facet of his creative legacy was his ability to synthesize his talent for cultural description with a strong message of political protest in his music.

Before commercialized folk was in vogue, it was the dirty, dusty and sharp ballads from Guthrie that defined the folk movement, the folk experience and the folk singer. For Guthrie to be a folk singer was not to sing *Dink's Song* in a coffeehouse but to sing for and with the people in union halls and railcars, to sing with a distinct social and political purpose. That was the hallmark of a folk singer. Today, Guthrie's radicalism and protest seems minimized in the popular imagination, while his sense of American identity and the best parts of American virtue—individualism, connection to the land and communalism—appear amplified.

During the 1960s, Guthrie's protest folk music became the anthems of the Leftist leaning sons and daughters of the white middle class.[11] Known as "Woody's Children" —Joan Baez, Ramblin' Jack Elliot, Bob Dylan and Phil Ochs—their work reprised the topical folk produced decades earlier, and was labeled as a folk "revival"[12] of the earlier American folk music tradition.

This 1960s folk movement grew out of the liberal political scene. As the post-World War II euphoria faded, domestic issues such as segregation, sexism, and the military-industrial complex faced heightened criticism by a new, more-empowered generation. The literary counter-cultural movement of Beat Generation writers Allen Ginsberg and Jack Kerouac who wrote instead of sang about self-discovery, isolation and consumerism was also on the rise. Folk singers wrote topical songs about personal injustice, often tied to Civil Rights activism, reshaping the American folk music tradition to accommodate a sharper and more personal critique on American individuality and cultural politics. Like Guthrie, artists such as Joan Baez and Pete Seeger utilized folk music as a vehicle to voice criticism of the Vietnam War and racism and to rally young students into political organizing.

Although the consensus on the validity of the 1960s folk revival as either a 'revival' or a continuation,[13] or even as authentic 'folk music' remains elusive, it is clear that the folk singers of the 1960s were singing folk music in the same spirit as Woody Guthrie, as a cultural expression and a criticism of the American narrative. The classical analysis of the 1960s folk revival is rather uncharitable to the artists and the audiences of the period. The folk music scene of the 1930s epitomized by Guthrie's

rough and tumble lifestyle and intimate labor and Communist connection to music production is frequently contrasted to the rather 'diluted' music of the 1960s performed not by organizers, hobos or Reds, but by white middle-class college students and drop-outs at coffee-houses, who suffered no threat of arrest or imprisonment. For many scholars the 1960s folk revival was either an unwelcome precursor to the rampant commercialization and proliferation of the music of MTV and later internet eras, or the last rage against the dying light of true, authentic American music.

Bob Dylan, whether or not he is a genuine 'folksinger,' has always told a story about America with his music. Dylan's work, from his 'folk period' beyond has captured a portrait of America that rivals the ingenuity, honesty and authenticity of one artist—Woody Guthrie. Some of Dylan's earliest and most authentically 'folk' work in fact draws its strength from traditionalism without any meaningful contemporary intervention or commentary to raise the songs from commonplace ballads to pieces of cultural protest and revisions of American identity.

From 1962 to 1965 Dylan released several folk albums, *Bob Dylan, The Freewheelin' Bob Dylan* and others, including protest standards such as "Blowin in the Wind" and "Masters of War." Hiis creative work encapsulated a clear political focus that was similar yet distinct from the folk ballads produced during the 1930s. It was also during this period that Dylan's work mirrored much of Ochs' material. Dylan and Ochs released several albums around the same time, played at similar events and were considered friendly rivals on the folk scene.[14] Dylan's politics are notoriously inscrutable, but in his folk period he was necessarily aligned with an active and radical social set.

This shift to a more cerebral articulation of the American experience departs from Guthrie's maximum that "all you can write is what you see"[15] and have experienced, as Dylan began to write what he imagined. This transition from chronicling the physical realities of American life to crafting poetic and descriptive images shifted Dylan's song content from centering tangible struggles and difficulties to instead evoking experiential feelings of loss, hardship and bewilderment. Moving from tangibility to conceptual narrative structures in his ballads, Dylan surpassed the limits of his own lived experience that bounded him with the release of his rock-inspired album *Highway 61 Revisited.* The abstract and imaginary scenes and characters he created in his songs broke down not simply boundaries of genre but the constraints of reality, Dylan was free to image a new America—however dark and disturbing it might be.

Although Bob Dylan remains ever enigmatic, in a retrospective analysis of his work, it is clear that despite the discourse and contradiction, as an artist Dylan has remained a figure that has supported and carried the torch of the American folk music tradition, even if he did so in untraditional ways. Dylan offered a more complicated

comment on folk music later in his career:

> I became interested in folk music because I had to make it somehow...Certainly I haven't turned my back on it or anything like that...folk music is the only music where it isn't simple. It's never been simple. It's weird, man, full of legend, myth, Bible and ghosts. I've never written anything hard to understand, not in my head anyway, and nothing as far out as some of the old songs.[16]

Dylan's evocation of the American landscape, the 'road,' and of a staunch individuality can be traced through his work in all phases. Most recently Dylan was surprisingly awarded the 2016 Nobel Peace Prize in Literature, which can be understood as an institutional recognition of the wider American folk music tradition: "Dylan's Nobel Prize rightly blurs the boundaries between high art and popular art. The American folk music tradition, and especially Dylan's body of work, shows that a folk ballad can be both."[17] This has been the enduring power of Dylan's work, to chronicle, criticize and reimagine the American experience from the perspectives of the marginalized masses in such a way that is both intelligent and artistic. Dylan remains a great innovator and leader of folk music to this day.

Phil Ochs was another innovative artist who emerged during the 1960s alongside Dylan. His legacy that ended in depression and suicide is harder to parse out, but is important in the Guthrie tradition and has hitherto received little scholarly attention. Like Baez and Seeger, Ochs carried on Guthrie's focus on folk as "fighting music."

Ochs, like Guthrie, found a natural home in performing for students, activists, and workers. Ochs took contemporary events and applied a musical structure and sense of wry humor to voice his critique of government hypocrisy and American neo-imperialism through the form of a folk song. The topical folk ballads strength was in its immediacy, its recognizable nature and its pithy prose, but these strengths would also prove to be failings as, just like the news, a song could quickly become outdated when not tied to larger more universal themes that could cross temporal and generational lines. With Elektra Records Ochs would release *All the News That's Fit to Sing,* and the anti-Vietnam War album *I Ain't Marching Anymore.* Both albums would be a homage to topicalism and protest songs. Ochs sang about the Cuban Crisis, the Vietnam War, and the Civil Rights Movement, all key platform issues of the establishment left.[18]

Despite this intensely political focus, Ochs began to branch out from his more journalistic ballads and explore less traditionally topical material. In the 1970s, Ochs sought to meld his personal and political personas which he described as a rather discordant amalgamation of Elvis and Che Guevara. At his concert at Carnegie Hall

Ochs, dressed in a gold lamé "Nudie" suit said, "If there's any hope for America, it lies in a revolution, and if there's any hope for a revolution in America, it lies in getting Elvis Presley to become Che Guevara."[19]

At the 1974 benefit, "An Evening with Salvador Allende" Ochs' orchestrated a last great musical feat of 1960s folk artists and his last meaningful contribution as a political activist. The benefit Ochs organized to support victims of the earlier Chilean coup was a mixture of past and present. "An Evening with Salvador Allende" was a brief reprisal of the 1960s folk scene and also a final goodbye to the era, the next day would see the end of the marriage of political activism and folk music. American folk music's function as a tool of cultural protest in a new era would remain ambiguous and unrecognized until a returning interest in folk culture in the new millennium. Perhaps the best and most insightful review of the evening came from Phil Ochs himself, in a scrapbook with various articles and pictures of the event, Ochs pasted Dylan's picture with the caption "Bob Dylan: political at last."[20]

Phil Ochs' untimely death in 1976, and his life, have frequently been left unexamined or, as scholar and fan Howard A. Doughty writes, rather "artlessly" reduced to a myopic focus on Ochs' "'inner demons'"[21] or either a grandiose and uncritical comparison between his political disillusionment and suicide.

Ochs' contributions as a folk singer are immense, he provided a record and a story of not merely American political dramas of Vietnam, Birmingham and Chicago but with his humor and his wit he provided a legacy that showed how folk music could not only be used as a tool of cultural protest but showed how folk music, more so than any other genre of music or artistic medium, best embodied the American voice: critical, and resilient but incredibly lively and ever hopeful. To listen to Phil Ochs' songs is to hear another side of the 1960s, one that Dylan lacks the emotional vulnerability to represent, Ochs' music showed the earnestness of America, he saw the hypocrisy of violence, corruption and injustice, but could still dream for new American reality void of those troubles. In an early essay Phil Ochs discussed the historical function of a folk singer "before the days of television and mass media, the folksinger was often a traveling newspaper. Spreading tales through music."[22] Ochs' ballads tell an important chapter in the tale of the American folk music tradition, his untimely death parallels a period of stagnation, of metaphorical retirement of the American folk song as a tool of cultural protest as both activists and listeners shift to new mediums of art and message creation.

Guthrie, Ochs and Dylan each had a vision of America. Guthrie's ballads and his words formed and continue to form an indelible impression on his listeners, Guthrie's America was raw, vibrant and hopeful, and it invited listeners to participate in the creation of that American through their own music. Ochs' America was steeped in the tradition and the historicism of the folk music movement despite his focus on

topical material, his image of the American character utilized contemporary events to give criticism and humor to daily injustices and political hypocrisy. Dylan took a tangible image of America and inverted it in a dystopian and imaginative way that looked beyond any constraining temporality to narrate a timeless condition of American struggle and isolation. These three men all continue to give voice to different stories within the American landscape, but their importance lies in their connection to the greater story of the American folk music tradition, a story that continues to be re-made and re-imagined by new groups of musicians and listeners as the words of Guthrie, Dylan and Ochs reach individuals and audiences far beyond any redwood forests or Gulfstream waters with the advent of new technologies that enable a global renaissance of appreciation of American folk.

---

[1] This essay represents an abridged version of an Honors Thesis of the same title presented in 2016.

[2] Mellers connects the historical lineage of American folk music to European folk traditions, but characterizes American folk music by its "work songs" that were designed to "obliterate barriers between physical activity and metaphysical experience" (33) for the isolated and poor immigrants coming to the new American geography. As such, folk music emerged as a crucial tool cultural expression for the lowest strata of American society. Wilfrid Mellers, *A Darker Shade of Pale: A Backdrop to Bob Dylan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 15, 33.

[3] The Communist Party in the United States (CPUSA) was certainly connected to the first folk movement in the 1930s. Guthrie was deeply affected by Communist ideology and viewed social inequality as stemming from class struggle and economic exploitation, but the political reality of the folk scene was much more fluid. As a member of The Almanac Singers Guthrie found himself "entertaining mostly for middle-class radicals rather than working-class salts of the earth," despite this most of Guthrie's material dealt with "major aims of the Communist movement: anti-fascism, anti capitalism, anti-imperialism, and international labor solidarity." Will Kaufman, *Woody Guthrie, American Radical* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011), 73, 91.

[4] Mellers, *A Darker Shade of Pale: A Backdrop to Bob Dylan*, 51.

[5] Guthrie, never a man for formal and constricting official party affiliation, remarked once that "I ain't necessarily a communist. But I've been in the red all my life." Woody Guthrie, Dave Marsh, and Harold Leventhal,: *A Self-Portrait*, (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1990), 163.

[6] Woody Guthrie, "Folk Music," July 25, 1994, Woody Guthrie Manuscripts Collection, Series 9: Miscellaneous (Merchant Marine, WWI, Family & Other Writings), Box 4, Folder 7, Woody Guthrie Archives.

[7] Kaufman, *Woody Guthrie, American Radical*, 28.

[8]Woody, Guthrie, "This Land is Your Land," Woody Guthrie Publications, Inc. & TRO-Ludlow Music, Inc. (BMI).

[9]Woody Guthrie, "Singing High Balladree." January 23, 1947. Page 3. Woody

Guthrie Manuscripts Collection, Series 8: Ship Story, Box 3, Folder 46, Woody Guthrie Archives.

[10] In addition to being a talented songwriter, Guthrie was painter. He often painted signs as a way to support himself on the road but throughout his writings appear caricature and pictures on the same subject matter as his songs. Klein, *Woody Guthrie: A Life*, 65.

[11] The passage of Guthrie's material to young people was often filtered through CPUSA and other leftist labor summer camps, including the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee, that taught racial justice and social organizing. Allen Ginsberg, a leading figure of the Beat Generation attended Communist summer camps in New York where he sang folk labor songs. Peter B. Levy, *The New Left and Labor in the 1960s*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 8.

[12] There is considerable lack of consensus of the periodization of the American folk music movement. Scholars Eyerman and Scott Barretta periodize the 1930s and 1960s folk music movements as separate occurrences, the first influencing the other. I will agree in considering the 1960s period a 'revival' of songs, artists and subject matter of previous generations, but as such I will not use 'revival' to intimate that the 1960s were an imitation of the 1930s. The 1960s revival contained characteristics and nuances unique to its time and incorporated influences from pre-1930s folk. Ron Eyerman and Scott Barretta, "From the 30s to the 60s: The Folk Music Revival in the United States," *Theory and Society* 25, no. 4 (1996): 501-43. doi:10.1007/bf00160675.

[13] In the short essay "Folk and the Folk Arrival" Sandy Paton skillfully outlines the debate between the 'arrivalist' and 'revivalist' camps, arguing the 1960s as folk's 'revival'' in metropolitan centers scenes as rather an arrival of long-standing cultural practices in urban scenes. Again, for clarity and continuity I will continue to use the term 'revival' in the spirit of the almost spiritual excitement and rejuvenation of the folk scene. Sandy Paton, "Folk and the Folk Arrival," in David A. De Turk and A. Poulin, *The American Folk Scene: Dimensions of the Folksong Revival*, (New York: Dell Pub, 1967).

[14] Ochs would always have friendlier feelings towards Dylan than Dylan had to him. He would defend Dylan's performance at Newport saying; "The folk scene has continually suffered from a vacuum of perspective, intelligent comment, and it's a shame to see welcome new penetrating critics getting bogged down in petty observations about Dylan's 'flunkies' and his behavior patterns. I'd like to straighten out a couple of other common misconceptions that have been floating around. Dylan and I are not in competition with each other; we're in competition with our individual creative processes, trying to stimulate our minds to produce the greatest amount of quality we can. Of course, I hope someday to write ten thousand times better than Dylan, but I also sincerely hope that Dylan will someday write ten times better than Dylan."
Ochs, Phil, "Ochs: It Ain't Me Babe," *Village Voice*, August 12, 1965. The Phil Ochs Papers. Series 9: Articles and Clippings, Box 26, Scrapbook Item 01, Woody Guthrie Archives.

[15] Woody Guthrie, "All you can write is what you see," Woody Guthrie Center.

[16] Interview by Nora Ephron and Susan Edmiston, "The Bob Dylan Interview," 1965. Reprinted in *Bob Dylan: A Retrospective* Craig MacGregor, (Marrow, New York 1972).
[17] Emily Edwards, "The Order is Rapidly Fadin' Bob Dylan and the Nobel Prize," *Public Seminar,* October 17, 2016.
[18] Rodnitzky comments that Ochs' first album "mirrored the sentiments of the Democratic Party's left wing." Rodnitzky, "The Sixties between the Microgrooves: Using Folk and Protest Music to Understand American History, 1963–1973," 67.
[19] Ochs made the remark his Carnegie Hall Concert on April 3rd, 1970. Mark Brend, *American Troubadours: Groundbreaking Singer-Songwriters of the '60s*, (San Francisco, CA: Backbeat Books, 2001), 108.
[20] "Dylan Picture," Phil Ochs Papers, Series 1: Personal Papers, Box 25, Folder 07, Journal Item 06, Woody Guthrie Archives.
[21] Doughty, "Phil Ochs: No Place in This World," 3.
[22] Phil Ochs,"The Need for Topical Music," Phil Ochs Papers, Series 9: Articles and Clippings, Box 26, Folder 01, Scrapbook: Item 01, Woody Guthrie Archives.

To Be Displaced

Summer AbuKhomra, Molly Mulroy, Joseph Sweet

The following work is excerpted from a long-form photo research project. We have chosen to feature "To Be Displaced" to highlight the importance of non-traditional story-telling in the historical discipline and to feature the importance of individuals who are frequently subjects of historical inquiry taking authorship of their own narratives. "To Be Displaced" displaces the voice of the historian or researcher in favor of giving authority to these individuals. We are pleased to share these oral history interviews in the journal as this project reflects our mission of publishing works that capture a sense of historical and social justice.

To Be Displaced is a Loyola University New Orleans student-based initiative founded by Summer Abukhomra, Molly Mulroy, and Joseph Sweet. We created a Facebook and Instagram account that documents the stories and experiences of refugees around the world with a photo and a direct quote. Our hope is that these sites will raise awareness about the refugee crises worldwide, but specifically that these images and stories will put a human face to these experiences. Through the use of social media we allow ourselves to disseminate the information to a broader audience.

We used an Informed Consent form to make sure that every interviewee was aware of the purpose of this project. We also made sure that all interviewees knew that they will be able to retain as much anonymity as they prefer, both for their comfort and for their safety. Each of us reached out to local organizations and communities to locate specific interviewees, conducting five interviews each. These interviews consisted of a few photographs and semi-structured, open-ended interview questions. Since all three of us have access to the account, any or all of us post the story and any and all of us can edit. We were able to present our project and our outside research at the 9th Annual Loyola Peace Conference.

In the future, we hope to partner with other organizations and other initiatives to expand the scope of the project (i.e., universities and NGOs in the U.S. or even international refugee camps). We do not foresee the worldwide refugee crisis ending in near future, and thus we hope that other students will be able to continue our work in the years to come.

Note on Process and Procedure of Interviews

In order to better tell the story of refugees worldwide, we conducted interviews with refugees from all across the globe. Below we have included the excerpts from these interview (done colloquially and without a recording device).

SIERRA LEONE
INTERVIEW: MARCH 5, 2017

"I haven't seen my father since 1999. They took him away from me. He was the chief — like a mayor — of our small town. At the school where I went, the students would make posters and things that said 'We Want Peace' and all that, and one day the terrorists came in and they would ask you whether you want long sleeves or short sleeves. If you said long sleeves, they cut your hand off. If you say short sleeves, they cut off half your arm. And so they came to the school and said they would give us long sleeves, in our uniforms … I watched four of my friends in front of me. And my father was there and he was pleading with them, begging them to leave the kids alone. So they shot him … And when they tried to cut me, they didn't see my hand and they only cut here. See, that's why my hands are a little uneven? And after they cut, you were supposed to run away, so when they saw me running away, they shot me. I woke up in a military hospital in Gambia, and a British Marine told me 'When you go to that place, we are with you. You were the only survivor. We were about to leave and someone said she saw some movement — a little boy with a uniform lying there.' I was 17."

VIETNAM
INTERVIEW: MARCH 26, 2017

"The man behind the trip was my dad's uncle. He owned five boats and he was involved in politics, so he knew that South Vietnam was about to be in trouble. We lived in a little village in South Vietnam, but this was all before the loss of Saigon. He was asking for navigators and selling space on the boats. My dad was a navigator, so he told him that our whole family could go with him for free. There were two other families on our boat, both from Saigon. Originally, the plan was to go to Australia, but then the navigators decided to go to the U.S. instead. More opportunities there. As we were leaving Vietnam, the Republican soldiers started shooting at us, because they wanted to leave. They were trying to escape the Communists, too. We let some of them onto our boat. I remember everything." (White sweater, once arrived in the U.S.)

CUBA
INTERVIEW: APRIL 12, 2017

"When we left Cuba, my parents weren't really political, but they were very Catholic. And when Fidel came to power, he shut down the Catholic Church, and expelled all the priests and nuns, and closed a lot of the churches. My uncle had already been a part of the refugee resettlement process in the U.S., so my parents applied. They didn't think it would be permanent. They figured we would just go 'sit out' the war. But when the government found out we had applied to leave, they came in and expropriated everything. They came in, took note of everything — 'four silver forks, three dishes…' — and they said 'Now everything you own is ours.' So then my parents were really ready to go. I was only 4. When you're a kid, you might not understand everything factually or politically, but you absorb the stress and the tension and you can tell things are not normal."

KOSOVO
INTERVIEW: MAY 9, 2017

"In 1999, when the Yugoslav paramilitary groups started shooting at our house, we left. My mother packed up cheese and jam and bread that she had made herself because all of the stores were closed. But my sister forgot her bag, and I ran back to the house with her. The paramilitary were shooting at our feet, but I remember thinking, 'Why are these stupid people shooting at us?' and not being scared for my life. I guess it was a type of defense mechanism. I was 14, the youngest of five siblings. I was kind of a kid still, so I didn't fully understand what was happening. Now that I'm grown up, and I know about what happens to women in war, I realize why my sisters were so frightened and what could have happened to us. We lived in a field on the border of Macedonia for five days before being allowed into Macedonia, but all the cities were already filled with refugees. Then the Albanians in Macedonia let us live with them for 3 months. Even with all this tragedy, you can see there is still hope. These people opened their houses to us without even knowing us. And I think that is important to remember, especially in this time. I didn't become a refugee because I wanted to. Refugees are not refugees out of their own will. And if they are left in camps, in the road, like they're not human beings, that's not fair. We are all human beings."

REFUGEE CAMPS
INTERVIEW: MAY 7, 2017

"After one of the most populated camps on Greece's border was shut down, a lot of people were displaced. In late July 2016, a philanthropist bought an old factory to prove that refugees could be housed in humane conditions, instead of just in camps. A non-profit organization provided the volunteers, and the Greek military still helped sometimes, but they didn't really interfere very often. The organization wanted to create a self-sustainable camp run by the refugees themselves. It's called Elpida, which is Greek for hope. I arrived there in August and worked there for about five weeks, teaching English. It was hard when I would work on my lesson plans, since I was trying to avoid topics that would bring things up or trigger anyone. But then I began to realize that this is their reality, and sometimes it would help people to talk about it. There are lots of opportunities for people who want to get involved with this type of work. People can do this. There are Facebook groups that ask for volunteers, so you can just search for the area you want to work in."

IRAQ

INTERVIEW: FEBRUARY 19, 2017

(MA): "I used to run a lot of marathons when I went to college in Baghdad, but that all changed. I actively protested Saddam Hussein's regime, and in 1991 I changed my identity and fled to a refugee camp on the Iraqi-Saudi Arabian border, leaving behind my wife and two daughters. But back in Iraq, the regime was looking for me; they went to my house and tortured my brothers and took my dad away. I never saw him again."

PHILIPPINES

INTERVIEW: APRIL 22, 2017

(LA): (pt 1/2) In 1972, Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law on the Philippines. I was in the seminary training to be a priest and I was assigned to work in a place called the Smokey Mountains. It was called the "Smokey Mountains" because that is where the dump trucks would come to bring the trash. The people living there were in extreme poverty. Every day at 6 o'clock, the people would wait for the trucks to bring in the trash and they would go through it looking for clothes or food. It was there that I uncovered the work of the predators in charge of the entertainment industry. They went to the Smokey Mountains to look for young girls and boys to take advantage of and sell to tourists or wealthy people as maids or sex workers or tour guides. It was human trafficking. After uncovering this, myself and a group of university students staged a walk-out, and even managed to publish the names of the entertainment businesses involved. Marcos had me on a list of subversive people, and for that, I was tortured."

Catholic Charities Immigration and Refugee Resettlement, New Orleans

Interview: April 3, 2017

(LA): "Working with refugees has taught me a lot. They've taught me incredible strength and resiliency, and they've taught me how fragile societies can be. If you are someone who holds up American values, you'll realize that part of it is inclusivity. We need to learn from each other. Closed-minded and closed-hearted people who do not want refugees and immigrants are rejecting the same dream their ancestors had."

Susan Weishar, Ph.D., former Director of Refugee and Immigrations Services at Catholic Charities New Orleans

Syria

Interview: March 23, 2017

(LA): "I used to gather everyday with my family before the conflict. Life was normal and my family used to own a house of our own. When the struggles broke out and the fighting spread throughout the countryside, I found myself getting stopped at random checkpoints where soldiers or militiamen would check my government issued ID. Because it stated I was Sunni and not Alawi, I would sit for hours at the checkpoints while they tried to find any reason to arrest me. I lost my job once traveling became too difficult and dangerous and stayed home because I felt the moment I walked out the door, my wife and son would be rounded up by Al-Assad's thugs. The day I realized we had to flee came when militiamen with Lebanese and Iranian accents began to move through our village, throwing bombs through the windows of any house with Sunni people inside. My wife took my son and placed him in the corner of the farthest wall from the street. She threw herself around him to protect him from the metal shards coming in through the roof. We managed to smuggle ourselves to the Jordanian border where the International Organization for Migration sheltered us and helped us go through the background checks needed for entry to the United States. Even now, when my wife or son hear thunder outside, they call to me and will not calm down until the storm leaves and we are all together."

SYRIA

INTERVIEW: APRIL 2, 2017

(LA): "Living in a majority Christian neighborhood in Hama saved me from much of the violence which began in 2011. I owned a motorcycle shop and offered my services to the entire community. People mostly got along no matter their religion. After the government began setting up ID checkpoints and harassing me for my Sunni beliefs, I fled to Damascus with the money I made from my business. I guess I thought that the conflict would end as soon as it began. I put my father and I up in a small apartment in a diverse area and waited for life to resume as normal. Over the next few months the conflict began spreading with some in the apartment block whispering of an assault on the city by the Free Syrian Army. Once the fighting reached Damascus I knew we were not safe. A missile tore the entire apartment building in two. Outside in the rubble people were screaming that Al-Assad's forces and those of the Free Sryian Army were clashing. I managed to get out of the city on a truck but my father had a leg blown off in the explosions and I could not carry him. I left money with a friend and asked him to take care of my father until I could figure something out. I made my way to a cousin's farm in the countryside where I found out my mother back in Hama had been killed. I did not want to know how she died. My father sent me word of his safety back in Damascus and I arranged to be smuggled into Jordan. I worked there for a few years while I applied constantly to be taken elsewhere as a refugee. One day an American working for the International Organization for Migration told me I was going to America. Living here is nice and the Americans have been very respectful of me while I adjust to a life free of war."

SYRIA

INTERVIEW: APRIL 18, 2017

(LA): "I worked as a plumber in Homs and had a home there. I lived as a Sunni in a predominately Christian and Alawi district. Before the checkpoints began showing up in 2011, there was a sense of calm and co-existence. Once the violence began with the Revolution, I began to fear the police officers and their ways of dealing with people. Over time, we came to call police officers, 'Assad Gangsters'. I left the city to be with my brother in a village a few miles away, thinking the trouble would stay in cities. Soon, soldiers and militiamen came through the villages arming Alawi citizens with machine guns and confiscating anything thought to be dangerous from any Sunni. One morning I awoke to find the central area of the village covered with bodies. I did not know how I could not have woken up when gunshots were going off. Then I realized they had garroted the people to death in the middle of the night, so none could hear the screams. On my way to the Jordanian border, I was captured by militiamen with Iranian accents and was blindfolded. I think it was around 6AM. They beat me with the stocks of their Kalashnikovs and cursed me for being a terrorist. By the grace of God, they grew bored of beating me and decided not to put a bullet through me. I managed to escape into Jordan after only five months. But I feel as if I have aged years and find more and more grey hairs on my head every time I go to comb".

Reflections

Below we have included final reflections written separately by each member of our team, highlighting what we have learned throughout the process, as well as what we hope we have accomplished.

Summer AbuKhomra

When we initially began working on this project, I expected most, if not all of our interviewees to be natives of the Middle East and North Africa. To my surprise, we have interviewed refugees hailing from various regions of the world, each with a unique story. It has been discouraging to see that all of our interviewees fled their home countries for political reasons and/or military conflict, an issue which is clearly all too common. What has impacted me most in doing this project was what I learned about the human condition. This project has opened my eyes to the overwhelming sadness and hopelessness many people face as a result of being displaced from their homeland. Refugees lose their families, their friends, language, culture, familiarity, and community. Some refugees never return to their home country, and migrate to regions where they are often marginalized and seen as threat to the national identity of the state they now live in. I have seen that refugees still suffer from the horrific memories of their past which they have yet to be able to make peace with. We had difficulty in finding people to interview, as many people were too scared to share their stories with the public out of fear of persecution and also because these memories were too fresh for some. These memories taunt them in their daily lives and in their dreams, and I have seen a strong sense of hopelessness. This hopelessness stems from the worsening conditions in their homeland, and the thought that they may never be able to return to the life they once had. I have seen how delicate the soul is, and how the smallest act of kindness can rejuvenate some of the hope they have lost. Most importantly, my interviewees have been touched by our desire to hear their stories, as they are rarely asked about their lives as refugees. I believe we have successfully completed this project because we have successfully put a human face to an international crisis.

Molly Mulroy

At the same time that I was working on this project, I was also in the midst of my thesis project for the Loyola Honors program. Throughout both projects, I was constantly surprised at the similarities. For my thesis, I conducted interviews with formerly-incarcerated people in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge area about their experiences coming back to society after prison. Both sets of interviewees had experienced trauma at the hands of the state, and the way they approached telling their personal narratives was often similar. Both the formerly incarcerated and the formerly displaced wished to use their stories as cautionary tales for the future -- particularly in the way that people reacted to their situations. My formerly incarcerated interviewees, on the one hand, wished that people had been more welcoming and more forgiving when they came home from prison. Many were denied access to housing, education, employment, and all were denied the right to vote. Similarly, the refugee interviewees wanted to convey the pain they felt at the way refugees are treated today, particularly in this political climate, around the world. Refugees are villainized, violated, and used as scapegoats by governments and by everyday people. Through these two projects, and especially since I worked on them simultaneously, I truly solidified my belief that people should not be judged based on their situation. Governments often enact harsh conditions and punishments on people it finds to be deserving of said conditions and punishments, but at the end of the day, human beings are human beings. People make mistakes, but they deserve compassion no matter what their situation may be. I hope that people will take away this listen from both of the projects that I worked on this year.

Joseph Sweet

Meeting with the Syrian men, I did not know what to expect. All of my work on the project beforehand had me staring at data and charts; never staring at those who had seen such conflict right in the eyes. As the sun went down, tea and cigarettes made their way to the table. There, over laughter and a few comical translation mishaps, the men spoke with me bluntly about their time in Syria and new lives in the United States. The remembrance of family and peaceful gatherings served as the main connection which tied them all together. One had been beaten and tortured by fighters as he attempted to flee the country. Another watched from a window as bombs rained down onto the town he moved his elderly father, thinking that the conflict would end quickly. These men and some members of their family made it out alive, but they all expressed guilt and shame for not being able to bring over everyone in their hearts. The experiences relayed to me through these men highlight their experience with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder their feelings of constant fear that even though they possess legitimate residency in the United states, some day they will be forced back into Syria. As citizens, if Americans would like to claim they care about refugees and the protection of human rights then more needs to get done in motivating large and wealthy countries to allow in more refugees. With the resources and infrastructure that the United States possess, there exists little excuse for barring coastlines to those who only wish to escape injustice and death. As it stands, each man interviewed mentioned that it took several years of constant applications to even become approved to stay in the United States. Those in power in Syria and other conflict zones around the world persist in the killings and bombings which continue cause terror for the men, women and children lucky enough to survive them.

Additional Sources Concerning the Refugee Crisis and Individual Global Conflicts

Sierra Leone

"Sierra Leone Country Profile." BBC News. January 04, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-14094194

McHugh, Richard . "Revolutionary United Front (RUF)." Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Revolutionary-United-Front.

Miesen, Floreana. "Blood Diamonds." D+C Development and Cooperation. June 2013. https://www.dandc.eu/en/article/blood-diamonds-fuelled-sierra-leones-civil-war.

Remoe, Vickie. "On this day in Sierra Leone's Civil War: Operation No Living Thing." Sierra Leone News. January 06, 2013. http://www.switsalone.com/18923_on-this-day-in-sierra-leones-civil-war-operation-no-living-thing/.

Vietnam

"Vietnam Profile – Timeline." BBC News. June 12, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-pacific-16568035

"Vietnam War." HistoryNet. http://www.historynet.com/vietnam-war

Trueman, CN. "The Impact Of War On Vietnam" The History Learning Site, March 27, 2015. historylearningsite.co.uk.

"The War's Effect on the Vietnamese Land and People." Vietnam War Reference Library. *Encyclopedia.com.* (July 7,2017). http://www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/wars-effect-vietnamese-land-and-people

CUBA

"History of Cuba Historical Background." History of Cuba – Nations Online Project. http://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/History/Cuba-history.htm

"Cuba Country Profile." BBC News. July 4, 2017 http://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin- america-19583447

"Fidel Castro." History.com. 2009. http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/fidel-castro

DePalma, Anthony. "Fidel Castro, Cuban Revolutionary Who Defied U.S., Dies at 90." The New York Times. November 26, 2016. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/26/world/americas/fidel-castro-dies.html

Rodriguez, Mercedes B. Arce. "The Human Cost: Cubans and Cuban Americans talk about their lives and the U.S. Embargo." The Latin American Working Group Education Fund and Washington Office on Latin America. 2011.

KOSOVO

"The World Factbook: KOSOVO." Central Intelligence Agency. June 29, 2017. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kv.html

"Kosovo Country Profile." BBC News. May 14, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-18328859

Gessen, Marsha. "For 15 Years, Putin Has Been Planning His Revenge for the U.S. Bombing of] Kosovo. Crimea Is That Revenge." Slate Magazine. March 21, 2014. http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/foreigners/2014/03/putin_s_crimea_revenge_ever_since_the_u_s_bombed_kosovo_in_1999_putin_has.html

"A Kosovo Chronology. PBS. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/kosovo/etc/cron.html

"Monitoring – Milosevic's statement: 'Defend the country'." BBC News. March 24, 1999. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/monitoring/302775.stm

REFUGEE CAMPS

"Together for Better Days." http://www.betterdays.ngo/

"Greek police move to shut down Idomeni refugee camp." AJE News. May 24, 2016. http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/05/greece-begins-idomeni-refugee-camp-evacuation-160524051404401.html

"Soup & Socks."Heidelberg, Germany. https://soupandsocks.eu/

"Care 4 Calais." http://care4calais.org/

IRAQ

"Iraq Country Profile." BBC News. December 05, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-14542954

MacFarquhar, Neil. "Saddam Hussein, Defiant Dictator Who Ruled Iraq With Violence and Fear Dies." The New York Times. December 29, 2006. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/30/world/middleeast/30saddam.html

Cockburn, Andrew. "Iraq's Oppressed Majority." Smithsonian.com. December 01, 2003. http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/iraqs-oppressed-majority-95250996/

Hahn, Peter. "A Century of U.S. Relations with Iraq." Origins Current Events in Historical Perspectives. The Ohio State University and Miami University. Vol 5, Issue 7. April 2012. http://origins.osu.edu/article/century-us-relations- iraq

PHILIPPINES

"Philippines Country Profile." BBC News. December 05, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-15521300

Gross, Jane. "Ferdinand Marcos, Ousted Leader of Philippines, Dies at 72 in Exile." The New York Times. September 28, 1989. http://www.nytimes.com/1989/09/29/obituaries/ferdinand-marcos-ousted-leader-of-philippines-dies-at-72-in-exile.html

"Inaugural Address of President Marcos, December 30, 1965." Delivered at the Quirino Grandstand, Manila. The Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1965/12/30/inaugural-address-of-president-marcos-december-30-1965/

CATHOLIC CHARITIES IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of New Orleans. http://www.ccano.org/immigration-services/

SYRIA

"Syrian refugee crisis: Facts you need to know." World Vision. April 13, 2017. https://www.worldvision.org/refugees-news-stories/syria-refugee-crisis-war-facts

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). "Syrian Regional Refugee Response." http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php

SPECIAL THANKS

The Loyola University New Orleans History Department

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences

Phi Alpha Theta International Honor Society