LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 7 **2007**

A Publication of the Sigma Kappa Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta
& the Southern Illinois University Carbondale History Department

LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 7 **2007**

The Editorial Staff would like to thank all those who supported this issue of *Legacy*, especially the Undergraduate Student Government, Phi Alpha Theta (Dr. Natasha Zaretsky, faculty advisor) our History Alumni, the SIUC History Department, the students who submitted papers and their Faculty mentors, Drs. Holly Hurlburt, Robbie Lieberman, Jonathan Wiesen, and Natasha Zaretsky.

A Publication of the Sigma Kappa Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta &
the History Department
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
http://www.siu.edu/~histsiu

LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 7 **2007**

Table of Contents

Dylan Burns

Industry and the Second Coming: Socialism in Transition in New Harmony

When writing *The Communist Manifesto* in 1848, Karl Marx stated that "Christian Ideas succumbed in the eighteenth century to rationalist ideas; feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie."[1] This "death battle," as Marx called it, was being fought in the prairie of the American Midwest in the 1820s by two communitarian movements, one based upon Christian faith and the other based upon rationalism and the ideals of enlightenment science and reason. New Harmony, Indiana (originally Harmonie under the Rappites) was a nineteenth-century experiment in utopian community building, involving an experiment of Christian cooperative government.[2] In 1824, the town of Harmonie was bought by Robert Owen and transformed from a religious into a secular utopia. This transformation had a wide impact on the political development of socialism. This paper will examine the transition in Harmonie as a battle in the fight between Christianity and rationalism and as the triumph of rationalism in Western Europe and America.

Communism under the Harmony Society

New Harmony was a utopian community of the nineteenth century, founded by a sect of Christian communists, who believed in an earlier brand of communism vastly different from its Marxist or Leninist descendents. This early brand of communism was based entirely on the teachings of Christ and the Bible. These people were called the Rappites, who are described as "German peasants, primitive Christian, practical communists, and disciples of George Rapp," who came to the United States to create a settlement and await the second coming of Christ.[3] Christian communists believed that all wealth within a community should be shared among the community and found proof of that from the teachings of Jesus Christ rather than Karl Marx. They sought to create a perfect society, a utopia, based on communal living and sharing of wealth and productivity and living strictly by the Bible. The Rappites were one

of many Christian utopian societies that found a haven in America in the early nineteenth century, while awaiting the apocalypse. These people were led by their charismatic leader George Rapp, whose fire and brimstone sermons and vision of the nearing apocalypse solidified his control over the sect. Rapp's sermons of the coming apocalypse, were part of a movement shared by almost all Christian utopians and reflected a strong belief in the almost imminent second coming of Christ. Rapp taught that "the coming of Christ and the 'renovation' of the world were near at hand" and that his group must prepare for this coming by creating the perfect society on earth.[4] This belief in the imminent coming of Christ is called Millennialism, and it drove many Christian sects to create cooperative societies that they saw as the best example on earth of Christ's teachings. "The sum and substance of his [Rapp's] creed was," according to historian George Lockwood, "love to God above all, and to thy neighbor as thyself."[5] This creed would be made possible in a cooperative and sequestered society.

The United States was appealing to the Rappites because of the freedom of religion guaranteed by its rational constitution. Rationalism, or the belief based in the enlightenment ideas of truth based in reason and science played an enormous role in the creation of the United States and the freedoms that its constitution protects. Christianity and rationalism have always, it seems, been at odds since reason and rationalism reject belief based entirely on faith. George Rapp "sought the religious freedom offered in the United States as early as 1803."[6] The religious freedom enjoyed in the United States was appealing to various oppressed religious groups. It attracted groups to a place where they could be free to practice and preach and find salvation for themselves. This sort of religious freedom and the freedom of expression was also associated with danger, as it had been in the autocratic Germany from which the Rappites fled. Historian Anne Taylor writes that "the appearance of the Separatist groups such as the Harmony Society, … always posed a threat to the established order, and nowhere more than in the small states beside the Rhine."[7] The rulers of Swabia, the country from which the Rappites emigrated, wanted the Rappites to leave because their religious radicalism was seen as dangerous. Taylor points out that social grievances were voiced through religious expression, and "religion lay like lees in wine, always ready to come up; whenever that occurred a threat was posed not only to the tranquility of the Lutheran church but also to the state."[8] The Rappites were radicals who challenged the authority of the state

and the state Church of Swabia. In the United States they found a place where religious freedom and development were accepted.

The United States became a beacon of freedom for all peoples oppressed in Europe, and the Rappites came to the United States seeking religious freedom. The relatively recent revolution and the development of the Bill of Rights protected the freedom of religion and expression, and it made the United States a "mecca" for intellectual and religious development in the nineteenth century. Appealing to the concepts of rational political development in the United States, Rapp explained his community's goals in a letter to President Thomas Jefferson, that "understanding by the History of the United States America would be such a place" to find a suitable place where Christian radicals could live and not be persecuted.[9]

The religious freedom celebrated in the United States was not the only reason that the society chose the United States. The United States held symbolic significance to the Rappites. According to Anne Taylor, in her book *Visions of Harmony*,

> As always the Bible was the authority for this decisive step. Rev. 12:1 reads, "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." As all millennialists knew, this woman would bring forth a man child who would rule the world. But first she must sojourn in the wilderness. … George Rapp took the symbol of the woman clothed with the sun to mean his congregation … must leave Württemberg.[10]

The congregation asked to leave Württemberg for the *wilderness* that of the United States. The Rappites needed to sequester themselves, according to Historian Karl Arndt, because "If the Harmonie claimed to be holy, then this also brought with it the highest obligation to excel and to be a model in everything."[11] Harmonie was a model of the way that all people should live and how all society should be structured. By keeping themselves away from the immoral world, they could become a model and an example for the rest of the world to see and follow.

To find a place for his congregation to settle, "Rapp spent a year riding over the state of Pennsylvania looking at land offered for sale," for his congregation to find to live in the wilderness.[12] And on 4 July 1804, three hundred followers of Rapp landed in Baltimore to settle in the community in Pennsylvania, called Harmonie on

the Connoquenessing River, near Pittsburgh. This colony did not last as long as it was expected. In 1804, George Rapp sent a letter to Thomas Jefferson petitioning the president for large tracts of land in Indiana in the United States for his community to settle. In the letter, Rapp wrote that the society had been "acquainted through the grace of god … with the decline of the Christianism since Eighteen Years, so they [the congregation] was going the Way of Piety, after the Sense of Jesus, and formed a proper community."[13]

This petition indicated that the Harmonists were not happy with the land they had in Pennsylvania and wished to move to Indiana, away from increasing populations and rising prices of land.[14] The Rappites moved from Pennsylvania to the wild country of Southwestern Indiana, and settled along the Wabash River, a place where their community could be secluded and left alone.

New Lanark and the English Socialism of Robert Owen

During this same period, the idea of socialism in the U.S. was being developed by the philanthropist Robert Owen. Robert Owen was an English industrialist who owned a communal factory system at New Lanark in Scotland. Owen's philosophy was the precursor to later communist ideas of Karl Marx. This system was started in 1799 and became a new plan for the governing of factories in the newly industrialized British Isles. It involved communal living and cooperation. Robert Owen in his autobiography wrote that:

> This experiment at New Lanark was the first commencement of the measure with a view to change the fundamental principle on which society has henceforth been based from the beginning; and no experiment could be more successful in proving the truth of the principle that the character is formed for and not by the individual, and that society now possesses the most ample means and power to well-form the character of every one, by reconstructing society on its true principle.[15]

When Owen first went to New Lanark in 1799, he found "the people were surrounded by bad conditions, and these bad conditions had powerfully acted upon them to miss-form their characters and conduct."[16] By the time he left, he had improved society, educated the masses, and had changed and improved the people and the factory life at New Lanark. In a speech to Congress in 1825 he helped prove that his system at New Lanark had

worked because, "they saw a population that had been indolent, dirty, imbecile, and demoralized, to a lamentable extent, who had become actively industrious cleanly, temperate, and very generally moral, in all their proceedings."[17] The experiment at New Lanark was Owen's first chance at creating what he called a "New Moral World," a chance for communal living to develop in every person a sense of morality and character, a new order that capitalism could not create.

New Lanark was conducted on the principles of creating a better and more moral society through education and cooperation. According to Marguerite Young, "New Lanark was to be conducted on humanitarian principles only. From the beginning, Robert Owen used the word 'government' instead of 'management,' as he had no wish to be enthroned himself, being in the act of disenthroning all despotic powers."[18] The power of the community was based in the hands of the workers, an idea called Industrial Democracy, in which the workers, not the foremen, would decide what the factory would build and how much be produced. The plan at New Lanark was threatening to the people in power in London and in charge of other factories, just as the Rappites in Swabia were seen as dangerous. If workers were treated as well as they were at New Lanark, it made it difficult for other entrepreneurs to exploit their workers. Robert Owen's ideas, much like George Rapp's, led to the expansion of cooperative societies in the United States.

Christian Socialism in America

When the Rappites founded their community in Pennsylvania and later at Harmonie, Indiana, they founded it on principles of Christian Communism, which meant that "the members bound themselves … All Cash, Land and chattels of every member to be a free gift for the use and benefit of the community … to give the labor of their hands for the good of the community, and to hold their children to do the same."[19] The Rappites lived together in a communist community where there was no concept of private ownership, meaning that every member worked together for the common good of the community. Historian Anne Taylor states that this system of communal living "… rested upon Biblical authority. Acts 4:32: 'And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; and they had all things common'."[20] This model of cooperative living was championed by other Christian communities that had already found their home in

the United States.

The United States was no stranger to Christian communal living. Historically, there have been an amazing number of societies that came to the United States to find intellectual and religious freedom. Indeed, the concepts that George Rapp's society was founded upon had their intellectual origins in the early ideas of the Puritans. John Winthrop's Puritan Massachusetts served as an example for all people to view and follow. Winthrop wrote of his new utopia that "we must consider that we shall be a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us."[21] The religious nature of both the Puritan settlements in early America and these later utopian societies kept them cohesive and united. According to historian George Lockwood, "We cannot over-estimate the importance of religion as a cohesive force in societies like that of the Harmonists. Upon religious grounds their community was founded; religion was the guiding principle of their daily lives."[22] The idea of the "model religious utopia" is evident in the ideas that Harmony was founded on and the United States became the home for utopian socialism because of its rich utopian history.

The religious aspects of the beliefs of Harmonist settlers also had their intellectual origins in earlier American utopianism. The first utopian society and cooperative community in America was the religious sect known as the Shakers. According to traveler Charles Nordoff, who visited the Shakers in the 1870s, "the Shakers have the oldest existing communistic societies on this continent. They are also the most thoroughly organized, and in some respect the most successful and flourishing … established in 1792 … they assert that the second appearance of Christ upon earth has been; and that they are the only true Church, in which revelation, spiritualism, celibacy, oral confession, community, non-resistance, peace, the gift of healing, miracles, physical health, and separation from the world are the foundations of the new heavens."[23] Millenialism, as a chief tenet of American utopian thought, started with the Shaker church, as well as the advent of Christian socialism in North America, which came around with the founding of the Shaker community of Mount Lebanon.[24] The Shakers and the later Rappite communities were founded on the principles of biblical communism. Early in the history of these utopias, it was Christianity that held these people together. The Owenite revolution at New Harmony led to the destruction of the bond of Christianity, replacing it instead with the bond of rational freedom and the prospect of an improving society.

The Transition

The "death battle" that is described by Karl Marx in the *Communist Manifesto* occurred in 1824 when the Rappites left Harmonie on the Wabash and sold the community to the philanthropist Robert Owen. According to historian Anne Taylor, "Father Rapp asked no more than that the town of Harmonie might prosper quietly until such time as Christ was ready to call him and his followers to their higher destiny."[25] The millennium was still a few years off and the Rappites were growing restless. Historian Marguerite Young writes that "things were getting too easy at Harmony, and the state of Scriptural communism declining towards a state of luxury."[26] The life at Harmony became easy enough that people were no longer being held to the scripture and it became harder to keep people under its control. Rapp was forced to put Harmony up for sale, and he found a buyer in the philanthropist Robert Owen.

Owen wrote in his autobiography that "in 1824, I first went to the United States and purchased New Harmony from the Rappites. … This establishment, however, at New Harmony, afforded to myself and my family much valuable experience and assistance towards attaining my ultimate object—which has been, and is, to change the present system of society."[27] The Rappites had founded a society that was attempting to reach the same goal as Owen's: the creation of a perfect society. But they differed on the reasoning behind their creation.

Robert Owen's ideas came from another source closer to the earth, the rational view of human nature. In order for people to live in a moral society, the society needed to be based on cooperation, because competition and individual interest made a moral society impossible. He stated in a speech given to Congress in 1825 that "In the New System, union and co-operation will supersede individual interest, and the universal counter-reaction of each other's objects; and by the change, the powers of one man will obtain for him the advantages of many, and they will become as rich as they will desire."[28] Owen believed that society could not improve unless a cooperative system was instituted, and New Harmony was supposed to be his experiment in this. Donald MacDonald, a member of Robert Owen's traveling company that made its way to New Harmony in 1824, wrote in his journal that "the union of from 600 to 2000 persons, he [Owen] considered capable of effecting this arrangement. He added that while individual property and private interests were made the groundwork of social institutions mankind

could never attain the degree of improvement which would arise from a union of interests."[29] When people were united they could focus on things that help improve society; schools, libraries, lecture halls could be built and paid for collectively and exist for the betterment of all people.

At New Lanark, Owen experimented with changes in society that brought about a transformation in the moral character of the people that made up that society. Owen improved the educational system, focusing first on the youngest children. Owen wrote in his autobiography that this was accomplished through "instruction from the earliest period by sensible signs and familiar conversations between the instructor and instructed … without fear of punishment, but … love and affection."[30] Owen believed that only positive reinforcement could possibly work to improve a child's, or an adult's, moral character. For example, the amoral attitude of capitalism (the punishment for laziness being starvation) did not lead to more people being able to eat.

Religion similarly led to immorality, according to Robert Owen. He believed that morality is harmed when religion causes humans to forget true human nature. He stated that, "Religion then … is an attempt to force mankind to think against the evidence of their sense and of all facts."[31] In his essay "The New Religion," he attempted to classify all humans by their religious beliefs. For example, the people that believe and follow strictly a religion were "the weak of intellect, with a strong moral sense, which religion makes amiable and conscientiously honest."[32] On the other hand, rationalists "by nature, possess a high degree of intellectual and moral faculty; [and] distinctly perceive the opposition which exists between the fundamental notions on which, alone, all religions rest, and the everlasting laws by which man is governed, from his earliest formation to his decomposition at death."[33] Robert Owen believed that in order for someone to have a true moral character and have a strong intellect, they must follow and understand this rational view of human nature.

Central to Robert Owen's new moral view of society was the destruction of religion and the imposition of his view of human nature. He believed in what he called the "rational religion," which is based not on "any particular person, age, or country; it is the universal religion of human nature."[34] In many ways, Robert Owen came to the U.S. to found this new religion, a rational religion, in a place where he could be free to do so. Later in his "Second Discourse to the Congress," he stated that "for this rational religion

… I, as a citizen of the world, claim for it the full and complete protection which the American Constitution freely offers to mental and religious liberty."[35] Owen came to the birthplace of rational government in order to prove that his experiment in rational religion and governance could work and that a cooperative society could lead to a moral society.

The United States became, much like for the Rappites, a sanctuary for Owen's ideals. For Owen, it was also significant because it was the birthplace of institutionalized rationality. Owen was in awe of the founding fathers of America, and he wrote that "from these men (John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison), full in the spirit of the founders of the constitution of the Republic of the United States and signers of the Declaration of Independence, I obtained their most matured thoughts and the latest experience of their lives; and from each a strong and cordial approval of my 'New Views of Society' which they read and carefully studied."[36] Owen reached out to the founders, to the framers whom he saw influencing his own philosophy. When Owen spoke to Congress, he appealed to the awe that he felt for the steps that the rational constitution had taken, but he also reached out to the Congress to fulfill the promises in the Declaration of Independence. Owen stated that "the Government and Congress of this new empire have only now, as I have previously stated, to will this change, and it will be at once effected; and by such act, they will give and secure liberty, affluence, and happiness, to America and the world."[37] Owen argued that if America and the Congress could follow his plan, they would be able to secure the blessings of liberty, as stated in the Constitution, to everyone. In many ways, Owen effectively embedded himself into the rational tradition championed by Thomas Jefferson and the other founding fathers.

Impact of the Transition

The exodus of the Rappites occurred in May of 1824, and the community fell into the hands of Robert Owen. This exodus of Christian communism from Harmonie led to a vast change in the politics and the philosophy of the west. Historian George Lockwood writes that "the Second community at Harmony was instituted under the most auspicious circumstances. The attention of the whole country had been drawn to the project by the addresses of Mr. Owen at Washington. … The previous success of the Rappites on the very site of the propose Utopia furnished an object lesson in communistic propensity."[38] What Owen embarked upon was an

experiment that had not ever been tried before, a secular utopian community guided by the principles of his "New Moral World." Immediately it seemed the society was under the scrutiny of the world, a model much like the "city upon a hill" of John Winthrop.

This scrutiny came from all directions and most notably from the Rappites themselves, who after leaving New Harmony began to remark on Robert Owen's views on religion and irrationality. As stated before, the majority of Owen's qualms dealt with the advent of religious government and its impact on rational human nature. Owen wrote that "The Religions, so called, of the world, have divided nation from nation, and man from man, from the earliest known period of History to the present."[39] In response to these claims Frederick Rapp, then leader of the Rappites, wrote of Owen that "when one examines his principles, one finds that they are in no way to be differentiated from those of the fallen Angels who also said, we do not wish to be slavish worshipers of a godhead, we are free."[40] Rapp accused Owen's philosophy, which is based on rational liberty and is pitted against religiosity, of being satanic and evil.

This transition from Christian communism to a new brand of secular communism was a battle between two important ideologies of the time. After the British and American enlightenment the Great Awakening ushered in a period of expansive Christian utopian communities. These communities stretched across America from Oneida in the northeast to the Mormons in Nauvoo, Illinois, and later Utah. These communities were important in celebrating the expansion of religious freedom guaranteed under the constitution. While these communities were gaining steam, a growing movement in American and Western European governments began to move away from religiosity. After the transition, these Christian communities, who had formed communal experiments in production and life, became the last bastions of communal Christianity in the West.

Conclusion: The "New" Harmony

With the removal of the Rappites from Indiana, Owen was able to found his community, which he named New Harmony. In his "Second Discourse on a New System" of society, given in front of the Congress in Washington, Owen concluded that

> A New Society is about to be Commenced at Harmony, Indiana. The direct object of this association is to give and secure happiness to all its

> members. This object will be obtained by the adoption of a system of union and cooperation, founded on a spirit of universal charity, derived from a correct knowledge of the constitution of human nature.[41]

Owen saw New Harmony as a beacon of rationality for all people. Whereas the Rappites saw their Harmonie as a means for the improving society by biblical knowledge and adherence, for the ultimate goal of redemption and salvation, the Owenites looked for philosophical and scientific knowledge as the means of societal improvement. Historian Leo Loubere sums it up: "the village, once a stronghold of mystical Christians, became a center of free-thinkers."[42] New Harmony soon attracted free-thinkers such as scientists and philosophers, looking for a part in this new system of society.

Hundreds of free-thinkers from around the United States went to New Harmony to take part in the experiment. [43] Some of these hundreds were scientists who sought New Harmony because of its philosophy of reason. William Maclure, a geologist, made his home at New Harmony, after being convinced to join the community.[44] Historian Anne Taylor wrote that when Maclure was in France he attended many salons, French enlightenment philosophical meetings, and found that "This philosophy [of rationalism] found an eager response in William Maclure. It was the first time in his life that he had been sufficiently impressed to surrender to instruction."[45] Maclure saw New Harmony as a place where knowledge, especially scientific knowledge, would be respected. This of course is completely contrary to the Harmonie under the Rappites.

More generally, the exploration in socialism at New Harmony became an important stepping-stone in the evolution of world economic and political systems. While taking place during the adolescence of Karl Marx, the father of modern communism, the settlement put the wheels in motion for the ideas of larger communistic organization and planted the seeds of future cooperative societies and philosophies. In many of Marx's writings he refers to the experiment of the Owenites in both England and America as steps towards his philosophy. He writes that "the Founders of these systems (Owen's New Harmony) see, indeed, the class antagonisms, as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society[Capitalism]," but he goes on to state that the proletariat was not yet able to revolt and take

over society when these systems were getting started.[46] Although Marxism comes out of an Owenite tradition, there is a massive difference between the two beliefs; Marxism being a more extreme version of Owen's plan. Owen sought to improve society within the bounds of capitalism; whereas the Communist revolutionaries of the modern era violently attempted to overthrow the capitalist societies before them.

The transition can be viewed as the final destruction of religiosity in American government. Although Americans continued to be religious, the idea of religious utopia soon began to die out after the transition of Harmonie to the Owenites. When Owen bought Harmonie from the Rappites in 1824, he helped usher in a new era of understanding and reason, and at least for a little bit New Harmony stood at the forefront of American critical thinking.

Notes

1 Karl Marx, "The Communist Manifesto," in *The Essential Left* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961), 33.

2 The Rappites named the settlement Harmonie, spelled the German way.

3 George Lockwood, *The New Harmony Communities* (Marion, Illinois: The Chronicle Company, 1902), 19.

4 Ibid., 21.

5 Ibid., 22.

6 Ibid., 20.

7 Anne Taylor, *Visions of Harmony: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Millenarianism*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 5.

8 Ibid.

9 Karl Arndt, *George Rapp's Harmony Society 1785-1847* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania UP, 1965), 84.

10 Ibid., 12.

11 Ibid., 105.

12 Taylor, 13.

13 Arndt, 84.

14 Arndt, 133.

15 Robert Owen , "Life of Robert Owen," *The Selected Works of Robert Owen*, vol. 4, ed. Gregory Claeys (London: William Pickering, 1993) , 114.

16 Ibid., 109.

17 Robert Owen, "First Discourse on a New System of Society," *The Selected Works of Robert Owen*, vol. 3, ed. Gregory Claeys (London: William Pickering, 1993), 6.

18 Marguerite Young, *Angel in the Forest: a Fairy Tale of Two Utopias* (New Harmony, IN: Dalkey Archive Press, 1994), 102.

19 Lockwood, *Communities*, 23.

20 Taylor, 17.

21 John Winthrop, *Model of Christian Charity*, University of Virginia, available online at http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/charity.html, 9.

22 Lockwood, *Communities*, 55.

23 Charles Nordhoff, *Communistic Societies of the United States: From Personal Visit and Observation* (New York, Hillary House Publications, 1961), 117-8.

24 Ibid., 117.

25 Ibid., 41.

26 Young, *Angel*, 61.

27 Owen, "*Life*," 303.

28 Owen, "*First Discourse*," 12.

29 Donald MacDonald, "Diaries of Donald MacDonald" Indiana Historical Society (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merill Company, 1944), 159-60.

30 Owen, *Life*, 32.

31 Robert Owen, "The New Religion," *The Selected Works of Robert Owen*, vol. 2, ed. Gregory Claeys (London: William Pickering, 1993), 176.

32 Ibid., 174.

33 Ibid., 171.

34 Robert Owen, "The Second Discourse on a New System of Society," *The Selected Works of Robert Owen*, vol. 2, ed. Gregory Claeys (London: William Pickering, 1993), 20.

35 Ibid.

36 Owen, "Life," 304.

37 Owen, "First Discourse," 11.

38 Lockwood, Communities, 89.

39 Robert Owen, "New Moral World," *The Selected Works of Robert Owen*, vol. 3, ed. Gregory Claeys (London: William Pickering, 1993), 197.

40 George Rapp, "Reply to John Solms in Transitions," *Harmony on the Wabash in Transition*, ed. Karl Arndt (Worchester: Harmony Society Press, 1982), xxvii.

41 Owen, "Second Discourse," 30.

42 Leo Loubere, *Utopian Socialism: Its History since 1800* (Cambrige: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1974), 75.

43 Taylor, Visions, 106.

44 Ibid., 124.

45 Ibid., 127.

46 Karl Marx, "The Communist Manifesto," *The Portable Karl Marx*, ed. Eugene Kamenka (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 237.

Latisha D. Emery

A Case Study in Modern Racist Ideology: Hitler and Blacks in Nazi Germany

> The triumph of Germany means of every force calculated to subordinate darker peoples. It would mean a triumphant militarism, autocratic and centralized government and a studied theory of contempt for everything except Germany—Germany's above everything in the world. The despair and humiliation of Germany in the eighteenth century has brought this extraordinary rebound of self-exaltation and disdain for mankind. The triumph of this idea would mean a crucifixion of darker peoples unparalleled in history.
>
> —W.E.B. Dubois[1]

The history of African people and their position in the world is quite peculiar. Beneath the stories one has been told lies a deeper truth to the history of African people throughout the world. One may pose the question when thinking about the history of Hitler and Nazi Germany in relation to African people: Is there a history of African people in Germany? Has any scholarly work been done on this topic? In recent years several scholars have taken on such questions, and have produced works detailing the African experience in relation to Germany. However, relative to other topics of study in the area of Nazi German history, these works are few. The erasure of African history is due in part to the European quest for global power. As time continues to pass those who have been under the oppressive yoke of European hegemony are rising and challenging the world to examine history outside the framework of European eyes. This essay has sought to shed light on one of these under-explored themes in the history of Black people.

The aim of this paper is to provide an understanding of European ideas of African inferiority and European superiority, and to demonstrate how Germans used these ideas as a basis for imposing

their racist ideology on those categorized as "other" in Germany. The paper will also use Nazi Germany as a means of viewing how the idea of white supremacy could be seen in the United States during the 1930s and 1940s. Hitler took the idea of white supremacy to another level, seeking to make "Aryans," whom he saw as the purest of Europeans, "the master race." To do so he would have to rid Germany of all "others." Those others included Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, the mentally disabled, Jehovah's Witnesses, and, most important to this study, African people.

This paper will proceed by first discussing the creation of the idea that African people were inferior. It will then provide a brief discussion of the relationship between Germany and Africa, proceed with a detailed discussion on the means Hitler used to rid Germany of its Black African population. Finally, in order to provide a clear understanding of how widespread the idea of African inferiority was among Europeans, the paper will look at the United States as a mirror image to Nazi Germany.

Before embarking on this discussion one may pose the question: How many Africans were in Germany at that time? There were, in fact, several hundred thousand African people in Germany upon Hitler's ascension to power. It is not clear when the first Africans arrived on German soil, but portraits of Africans living in Germany date back several centuries. However, the largest influx of Africans appeared in Germany in the 1880s following Germany's occupation of African lands. They came from Togo, Cameroon, Namibia, present day Tanzania, Rwanda, and Burundi — territories Germany acquired during the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885. Germany's time in Africa would not be pleasant for African people, especially the Herero of Namibia. Germans would facilitate their first crime against humanity with the genocide of Africans, in the years 1904 to 1907.

The course and face of Germany changed forever when Hitler and his regime took power in 1933. After suffering a severe defeat in World War I, Germany lost all its colonies and was stuck with the Treaty of Versailles, which many Germans felt was unfair. When Hitler took power, he pushed for mobilization of the German people, but only pure-blooded Aryans; all non-Aryans would suffer tragically from Hitler's racist ideology. History has primarily focused on the atrocities suffered by Jews and other racial minorities in Germany. Historians have all but neglected African people and the crime committed against them by Hitler and his Nazi regime. Racist ideas about African people were not, of course, exclusive to

Hitler's regime. The racist idea that Africans were inferior existed before Hitler seized power. Indeed, the idea of African inferiority could be found in the collective consciousness of Europeans for many centuries. Although racism against Africans was present in Germany before 1933, no efforts were made to actually rid Germany of them until Hitler took power. Hitler campaigned to exterminate or sterilize non-Aryans including Africans, and some were even killed. However, Hitler did not create a campaign for the total annihilation of Blacks. This was not because he was sympathetic towards them but because he had a specific political agenda about "Judeo Bolshevism" that had to be fulfilled.

The use of propaganda played an integral role in enforcing the idea that whites were superior to Blacks in Germany. Hitler's objective during his regime was to use propaganda as a means of convincing and reinforcing the idea that what he was doing was for the benefit of the Aryan race. Propaganda was also used to portray African men as bestial, and unable to control their urge for white women. Images of Africans as inferior beings were also shown throughout pre-1933 Germany. The degenerate images of African people were used as a means to unite Germans and other Europeans in their belief in white supremacy. Prior to Hitler's coming to power and Joseph Goebbels becoming the Nazi propaganda chief, Germans already understood the ideological value of images and their use as propaganda. Propaganda emphasized the inferiority of Africans, and it eventually assisted in mobilizing Nazi Germany against Black people. The Nazis' plan to exterminate or sterilize African people would not be as much of a priority as the Jews and other racial minorities but nonetheless, over the course of the Third Reich between 50,000 and 65,000 Africans were exterminated, and 350 to 400 others sterilized, while still other were forced or asked to go back to Africa. The atrocity that Hitler committed in Germany would not go unnoticed by the world, but countries like the United States could not criticize Hitler's actions, due to the fact that African people in America were suffering under Jim Crow laws, segregation, brutality, and a plethora of other racial injustices. Before examining Germany and the United States in closer detail, it is important to understand European understandings of African people.

The Roots of African Inferiority

Long before the Third Reich there existed in Europe what philosopher Charles W. Mills has referred to as the "racial contract." According to Mills, within the framework of the "racial contract"

there exists a set of informal and formal agreements established by Europeans that created the "others" of the world, all being non-Europeans. This exploitative and hierarchical agreement "is a contract between those categorized as white over the non-whites, who are thus the objects rather than the subjects of the agreement."[2] This idea has allowed for white supremacy to exist in the world. It also allowed for Nazi Germany to inflict on non-Aryans its ideal of a racially pure Germany. However, this agreement is not regional and restricted to racial others in Europe. Rather, it is global. It is not mere rhetoric that proves the existence of this "racial contract." The concept of colonialism has depended upon the existence of this contract. There had to exist in the collective consciousness of Europe that white was superior. Had it not, Europe would not have been able to assert its "power" over the world. "Enlightened" thinkers proclaimed their ideas as universal, but this contract was meant to be applied to race.[3] This racial framework that Mills refers to is quite beneficial in examining the racist idea of African inferiority in pre-Nazi Germany and during Hitler's regime, for Germany gave birth to many race theorists.

One of these theorists was German scientist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, who published "On the Natural Variety of Humankind" in 1776. Blumenbach divided the world into five groups: Caucasians, Mongolians, Ethiopians, Native Americans, and Malays. Blumenbach created the term used to racially classify Europeans as Caucasians. He felt that the area around the Caucascus mountain range "produced the most beautiful men."[4] Operating inside the framework of the "racial contract" of Europe, Blumenbach's creation of this racial hierarchy laid the groundwork for European world imperialism. He also provided the conceptual framework for the ideological and moral justification of slavery, colonialism, and mass genocide on an international scale. Blumenbach's fallacy of race allowed for Europeans to create ideas about the inferiority of African people and other people of the world. Although not a German native, French noblemen Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, the father of modern racist ideology, wrote in a similar vein to Blumenbach. His "Essay on the Inequality of Human Races" contained the following: "History shows that all civilization derives from the white race. … The Black race is the lowest, and stands at the foot of the ladder."[5] Gobineau viewed race not only in biological and natural terms, but also in social terms. Gobineau influenced Hitler and the Nazis greatly, allowing for them to attempt to make themselves "master of the master race" and to subjugate

African people. [6] Alongside Gobineau were German philosophers Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, whose works reflected the idea of a systematic race hierarchy where Europeans were at the very top.[7] Kant wrote:

> The Negroes of Africa have by nature no feeling that rises above the trifling. Mr Hume challenges anyone to cite a single example in which negroes have shown talents, and asserts that among the hundreds of thousands of blacks who are transported elsewhere from their countries, although many of them have been set free, still not a single one was ever found who presented anything great in art or science or any other praiseworthy quality, even though among the whites some continually rise aloft from the rubble and through superior gifts earn respect in the world. So fundamental is the difference between these two races of men, and it appears to be as great in regard to mental capacities as in color.[8]

Kant regarded African people as uncivilized and barbarous. He felt that they lacked the ability to achieve intellectual thought, unless they were civilized by the Europeans—the civilized race. Hegel echoed his sentiment when he wrote in his *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* that "negroes are to be regarded as a race of children who remain immersed in their state of uninterested naivete.[8] They are sold, and let themselves be sold, without any reflections on the right and wrong of the matter."[9] Hegel also made it a point to differentiate between Europeans, who were "civilized," and African people who he perceived as primitive. According to Hegel, "as soon as man emerges as a human being, he stands in opposition to nature. But if he has merely made a distinction between himself and nature, he is still at the first stage of his development: he is dominated by passion, and is nothing more than a savage."[10]

These ideas do not reflect universality in any way. What they do reflect is that through this "racial contract," European "enlightened" thinkers made Europeans the highest of all civilizations, and because of this, they were in possession of a truth that every person in the world would have to live under. This view that Europeans were civilized, and all "others" were not, in European minds justified their "civilizing mission" of the world; it also laid the groundwork for Germany's colonization of Africa and Hitler's plan for a racially pure Germany. [11]

Germany's Relationship with Africa

In 1885, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck called together the major western powers of the world to negotiate questions and end confusion over the control of Africa. The Berlin Conference of 1884-85 divided Africa up among several European countries, including Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Germany. At the time of the conference only areas around the coast had been colonized. The Berlin Conference sparked the scramble of European colonial powers to gain control over the interior of Africa. Bismarck welcomed the opportunity to expand Germany's sphere of influence over the continent.[12] However, African people would pay the cost with their lives for Germany's expansion and control over their lands. Germany successfully established its supremacy in Togo, Cameroon, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, and Namibia.

German colonists penetrated the interior by force. Concentration camps were created for the Africans who had been misplaced by German penetration and many of the people were conscripted to forced labor for public works projects. Those who refused to work were beaten and fined. The instituting of forced labor led to the death of thirty percent of Cameroon's population. This was due in part to the military force that had been imposed on the people of Cameroon because they revolted against German colonials. According to Cameroon's first Governor, the people of Cameroon were the "laziest, falsest, and meanest rabble on whom the sun ever shone, and it would certainly have been best when the country was conquered in 1884 if they had been, if not exterminated, at least expelled from the land."[13] However, the cost of having to send military force into Africa to contain the people and to maintain the colonies was too high, and Germany implemented a hands-off government. European schools that produced a "Germanized" African elite allowed Africans to enter into the lower level of German administration in most countries.[14] This was Germany's way of creating loyal African subjects and reducing the cost to maintain colonies.

German explorer Carl Peters risked confrontation with the African population by claiming enormous quantities of land and exercising tyrannical rule in east Africa. From 1905 to 1907, East Africa experienced a series of revolts that led to the deaths of 75,000 to 100,000 Blacks.[15] Southwest Africa became the site of a continuing clash between German imperialist and indigenous Africans. As the number of German colonists increased in Southwest Africa

(present-day Namibia), conflict led to a deliberate extermination of most of the Black African population of Namibia.

Crisis in Namibia

Following German penetration and the increase in the number of German colonists in the area of present-day Namibia, the German imperialist government tried to utilize the tactic of divide and conquer on the indigenous population of Namibia. Southwest Africa had been settled by several different ethnic groups, and the largest of these groups were the Herero and Nama. By 1897, German colonist had succeeded in moving most of the Herero onto reservations, and by 1903, more than half the Herero cattle had passed into the hands of colonists, whose farms were encroaching alarmingly on Herero pasture land.[16] The Herero became angered by the loss of their land and cattle and feared that the colonists would never stop expanding. These fears led the Herero (joined by the Nama, who had been engaged in guerilla warfare against German imperialist throughout the 1890s) to declare against the German colonists. The war would last from 1905 to 1907. Under the command of General Lother von Trotha, an expeditionary force of 14,000 troops sought to exterminate the Herero. An extermination order was issued by Gerneral von Trotha:

> The Herero nation must leave the country. If it will not do so, I shall compel it by force. Inside German territory Herero tribesmen, armed and unarmed, with or without cattle, will be shot. No women and children will be allowed in the territory; they will be driven back to their people or fired on. These are the last words to the Herero nation from me, the great general of the mighty German emperor.[17]

The battle between the Herero and German imperialists ended in 1906. By 1906 less than 20,000 of the 80,000 Herero remained. The Nama held out against German forces longer than the Herero, but by 1907 over half the population had been killed due to warfare. German imperialists succeeded in killing over sixty percent of the African population in South and Central Namibia. Indeed, colonial Germany set a "historical pattern" of racism and discrimination against African people in Africa, and Adolf Hitler would inflict similar injustices on Blacks in Nazi Germany. [18]

Hitler's Plan for the Africans in Germany

The racist idea that African people were inferior to Europeans

enabled German colonists to inflict terror on the continent of Africa, and it also allowed for anti-Black racism to exist in Germany both prior to and following Hitler's ascension to power in 1933. Africans who lived under German colonial rule between the years of 1885 and 1918 experienced a number of hardships. Blacks residing in German Southwest Africa, Togo, Cameroon, and German East Africa experienced genocide, imprisonment in concentration camps, starvation, forced labor, deportation, seizing of their lands, and a mixed marriage law that was sanctioned by the Reichstag, which prevented Blacks from marrying white colonists.[19] The atrocities that African people suffered under German colonial rule did not, however, make their way to Germany until after Hitler came to power.

In the years German colonial forces were occupying territory in Africa, there was an influx of Africans into Germany. In comparison to other "racial" groups, Blacks never resided in Germany in large numbers. This fact, however, did not prevent Hitler and the Nazis from implementing ways to rid Germany of the racially inferior Africans. However, according to Robert Kesling, "no systematic plan or coordinated effort to eliminate African people compared to Nazi plans for the systematic elimination of other minorities in Germany."[20]

During the latter years of the nineteenth century, the racial hygiene movement emerged throughout the world as a response to fears about the degeneration of the white race. It became quite popular when Hitler and his regime came to power in 1933. Hitler and the Nazis gave credit to race hygienists who provided them with the biological foundations for the Nazi racial state.[21] This idea allowed for the approval of compulsory sterilizations in Nazi Germany. Many African people would fall prey to the Sterilization Law of 1933, implemented by the Nazis. This piece of legislation was aimed at children born from mixed marriages, and from the period when French African troops occupied Germany's Rhine after World War I. These children became one of the central targets of sterilization.

French African Troops in Germany

Following Germany's defeat in World War I and the enactment of the Treaty of Versailles, France, Belgium, England, and the United States sent troops as part of their occupation armies to police German borders between 1919 and 1921. The French sent the most troops to the Rhineland. Approximately 20,000 to 45,000 troops, primarily from their African colonies in Senegal, Algeria, Tunisia,

Morocco, and Madagascar, occupied the borders. The presence of the troops became a major public issue, as it served as a reminder of Germany's defeat in the war. Hitler also felt that the Jews, the Nazis greatest enemy, had something to do with the presence of Africans on the Rhine.[22] According to Kesling, "Hitler in *Mein Kampf* charged that Jews had brought the Negroes into the Rhineland with a clear aim of ruining the hated white race."[23] Hitler did not view the troops as a force sent to police Germany's borders but as another way to destroy whites. While stationed on the Rhine, African troops engaged in sexual relations with white German women, and some even married. However, African men were viewed by Germans, as well as other Europeans, as sexually uncontrollable rapists of white women.[24] Troops were also accused of theft and a number of other crimes, which heightened the Germans' fear of Africans.[25]

"Rhineland Bastards"

Troop occupation became a permanent thorn in the side of German nationalists. This was so because of the children that African troops had left behind. Just as the presence of troops on the Rhine reminded Germany of its defeat in World War I, so did their offspring. They also represented the contamination of German blood.[26] It is estimated that between 500 and 800 children were born as a result of the liaisons between African soldiers and white German women.[27]

From the beginning of his reign Hitler and other Nazi leaders advocated for the elimination of the "Rhineland Bastards." Germany's first measure was to place these children into orphanages. May Opitz tells of her experiences in Nazi Germany as a product of interracial sexual relations. Opitz was placed into an orphanage by her mother because she did not want to deal with the discrimination she would possibly encounter from having a racially mixed child. She also writes about how her blackness was evident in her everyday life.

> Sadness is when a child thinks she's too black and too ugly. Horror, when mama won't wash the child white. … Who destroyed my dream? The dream of "whiteness" ruined because of my parent's unwillingness and the weak cleaning power of soap. … That's my father! He's really Black. … One time my father came to visit, all the kids ran away.[28]

When this plan did not prove fully effective in the eyes of

Germans, sterilization became the means of eliminating the "racially inferior" African. In 1933, Dr. Hans Macco published a pamphlet entitled "Racial Problems in the Third Reich." Macco demanded that strong measures be taken to mitigate the danger that these children posed to the racial purity of Germany.[29] It is worth quoting Macco at length:

> Another essential reason for our racial deterioration is mixture with *alien* (emphasis added) races. In this regard there remains a residual of the Black shame on the Rhine that must be eliminated. These mulatto children are either the products of violence or their mothers were whores. In both cases, we haven't the slightest moral obligation to this progeny of an alien race. Approximately fourteen years have passed; those of the mulattoes who remain are now coming of reproductive age; thus, there is little time for long explanations. Let France and other nations deal with their racial problems as they like; for us there is only one possibility; the eradication of all aliens, particularly those born of the damage of wrought by this brutal violence and immorality. As a Rhinelander I demand the sterilization of all the mulattos left to us by Black Shame on the Rhine. These measures must be taken within the next two years or else it will be too late, and this racial deterioration will be felt for another century. Nothing can be achieved through the legal prohibition of marriage with alien races, for what is not possible through legal channels happens illegitimately.[30]

Macco's sentiments paved the way for sterilization to take place in the following years. The Sterilization Law of 1933 legalized voluntary and compulsory sterilizations. Most of the sterilizations were carried out in 1934 and 1935, just as Macco had instructed. The exact number of sterilizations is difficult to determine because Hitler outlawed the release of this information to the public in 1936. However, of the estimated 500 to 800 "Rhineland Bastards," approximately 385 were sterilized.[31] Also in 1937, a number of children were taken into custody by the Gestapo under secret orders.[32] Hans Hauck, who was considered a "Rhineland Bastard," recalls being sterilized:

> [When I got older and was clearer] about my heritage,

> about my existence … it was too late by then. Hitler was already in power and during my apprenticeship, in 1936, I was sterilized. I was called up by the police with my grandmother. And I was sentenced in a pseudo-court proceeding and sterilized.[33]

The experiences of Opitz and Hauck were not shared by all those who were considered "Rhineland Bastards." Some were able to survive in German society under Hitler without being sterilized. Hans J. Massaquoi was born to a white German mother and a Liberian father, who was the son of a Liberian diplomat who had come to Germany as the country's first African Ambassador. In his autobiography Massaquoi describes his experiences as varying greatly. He could not recall during his very young years having any racist acts committed against him. As he grew older, and Hitler came to power, he recalled having to endure countless racial taunts. However, Massaquoi managed to escape sterilization by Nazi German forces. The fact that he was the grandson of nobility contributed to his experience as a person of mixed parentage in Nazi Germany. He was one of the few who avoided sterilization, and he was also able to make a life for himself in the United States following Hitler's death in 1945. He speaks of living in constant fear while living under the Third Reich, but he attributes to his mother his ability to survive and travel to Liberia, where his father was, three years after World War II.

Sterilization of the "Rhineland Bastards" was not the only way that African people were targeted as being racial inferiors in Germany. Many African people, after having completed mandatory education, were ostracized from German society. They were unable to seek employment, welfare, housing, health care, and other rights granted to citizens, due to racial discrimination.[34] The color of their skin also prevented them from pursuing higher education, and their destinies were determined by Hitler and the Nazis. Fasia Jansen, a survivor of Nazi Germany, recalls the suffering she endured under the oppressive Nazi regime. Jansen was born in Hamburg, Germany in 1929 to a Liberian father and a German mother who worked at the Liberian Consulate. Jansen relates that she loved to dance and as a student at one of the universities she was asked to leave without explanation. The Third Reich had passed a law on 25 April 1943, against the overcrowding of German Universities with non-Aryan students. On the basis of her expulsion from the school, Jansen asked to be compensated after the war. Her request

was denied.[35]

In 1940, an ordinance was enacted to establish a curfew for Africans. This was done because Nazis were concerned that Blacks who were walking around freely would engage in sexual misbehavior.[36] African people were also subjected to involuntary medical experiments performed by Nazi race doctors. On 20 July 1942, Dr. Ernest Grawitz, S.S. Chief Physician, reported that racial blood testing had been performed by Eugene Fischer on blood serums of Blacks. Fischer served as an integral part in sterilization and scientific experiments done on African people. He was Director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology in Berlin-Dahlem from 1927 to 1942, and a judge on the "Supreme Genetic Health Court."[37] Fischer spearheaded the experiments done on African people. However, other measures were also taken by Hitler and the Nazis to exterminate Blacks.

Africans in Concentration Camps and the Murder of African Troops

Just as Africans had been placed into concentration camps in Germany's colonies in Africa, so too were Blacks placed in concentration camps during the Third Reich. The number of Blacks in concentration camps is unknown, but in comparison to other groups it was quite small. Most were African troops and children of mixed parentage. Some of these inmates were used as slave laborers, and others were killed once they entered the camps.[38] African-French soldiers who were captured by German forces were employed as slave laborers in Front-Stalags in France, in 1940 to 1941. Approximately fifty percent of them died of starvation and mistreatment. In another incident in 1940, the 212 African survivors of a battle between African-French troops of the 25th Infantry Regiment and German S.S. Panzer Division were lined up by German forces and executed after they had been defeated.[39] African-American troops were also executed by Nazi forces. On 1 September 1944, near Merzig, Germany, two former SS guards alleged they saw "Negro American soldiers being executed after they were ordered to dig their own graves." Also, they alleged, "Negroes were not to be taken prisoner."[40] Robert Kesling writes of several instances where African people were killed in concentration camps but there is no evidence of a systematic plan used to round up Blacks and march them off to the camps.

Hitler's Dilemma

Although Hitler could not stand the idea of race mixing and hated the sight of African troops, he did not, however, treat them in the same capacity as the "others" in Germany. This is not to suggest, however, that the 55,000 to 65,000 Africans killed in comparison to Jews and other "racial inferiors" is less important or any less of an atrocity.[41] Although no systematic plan was created to facilitate the extermination of Africans during Hitler's reign, Hitler was the first and only German to exterminate African people in Germany. The context of this is key: Hitler's aim was racial and political. He sought the acquisition of land, and this was apparent when he set out to conquer territories in Eastern Europe and later Germany's colonies, which had been taken away following World War I. His ambitions could never be separated from the broader racial view that these territories were inhabited by what he considered to be lesser people. This drive for the acquisition of colonies was not initially part of Hitler's aims. In *Mein Kampf* (1925) his interest lay in Europe:

> It must be said that such a territorial policy cannot be fulfilled in the Cameroons, but today exclusively in Europe. We must therefore coolly and objectively adopt the standpoint that it can certainly not be the intention of Heaven to give one 50 times as much and soil in this world as another. … For Germany, consequently, the only possibility for carrying out a healthy territorial policy lay in the acquisition of new land in Europe itself. Colonies cannot serve this purpose unless they seem in large part suited for settlement by Europeans. [42]

Despite this European focus, the stability of Hitler's Germany depended upon its ability to provide for the people and sustain its economy. It is known that the land of Africa contained a substantial amount of raw materials, which served as the driving force behind Europeans taking over the continent of Africa.[43] Of the two groups of territories that Germany had, Africa was by far the most important. Hitler understood that Germany lacked raw materials and after coming to power, he would push for the return of African colonies.[44] The push for the re-acquisition of colonies came in 1936 when, according to Alan Bullock, "Nazi penetration was actively pursued in Southwest Africa and more obtrusively in Tanganyika."[45] The Nazis' lack of a systematic plan was not because the African community in Germany was small, but because Hitler and the

Nazis understood that, if they regained their colonies in Africa, they needed "fit" Africans to run it.[46] Hitler knew he would suffer greatly if he overtly attacked African people in Germany because the network that existed between African people in Germany and those on the continent could work against him and the Nazis.[47] In 1934, the German Foreign Office issued a statement that read:

> The general mood of the population on the race question has frequently exposed Negroes to personal offenses and slights. … That this situation breeds ill-feelings among the Negroes is obvious. These ill-feelings are especially unpleasant for us, as they are not confined to the Negroes living here. Because of the relationships that they naturally have to Africa, they also have an effect there. … If the question of a German colonial mandate in Africa should suddenly become urgent, these circumstances can have extremely unpleasant repercussions for Germany. … Thus, if possible, we should try to eliminate the reasons for the ill-feeling of the Negroes living here.[48]

Hitler and the Nazis tried to differentiate between African people of mixed parentage, those from Germany's colonies, and others from throughout Europe and America. They felt that by doing so, it would allow Germany to regain colonies, and strengthen diplomatic relationships with the rest of the world due to the Allies allegations that Germany failed to treat their colonies in a civilized manner.[49] Hitler's political agenda was reflected in the treatment of African people; Nazis prevented the mobilization of Blacks and instilled a level of fear in those who remained in Germany, especially those of mixed parentage. For Hitler, race and politics could not be separated. His views of race in Germany were reflected in his ambitions outside of Germany. After World War I the Mittelafrika plan was implemented, with the goal of obtaining territory that stretched across the Congo Basin. This, in turn, would unify the German colonial Empire that had been taken by the winning powers in World War I. Nazi land policy allowed for the reimplementation of this plan, but it would extend beyond prewar colonial boundaries. In 1938, after the annexation of Austria, the British offered Hitler African colonies as part of the detente in Europe. Hitler did not take them up on their offer, however, and during the summer of 1940 after the war began, Hitler was willing

to make the return of colonies, in conjunction with the recognition of the division of Poland, the price of peace. *Mittelafrika* would create a system of apartheid in the German colonies and the subjugation of African people would continue to exist.[50] Hitler did not want to sour relations with the Africans in Germany because of his political agenda.

Seeing their Reflection

You tell me that Hitler is a mighty bad man.
I guess he took lessons from the Klu Klux Klan.
You tell me Mussolini's got an evil heart.
Well, it must-a-been in Beaumont that he got his start.
Cause everything that Hitler and Mussolini do
Negroes get the same from you.
You Jim Crowed me before Hitler rose to power—
And you're still Jim crowing me, right now, this very hour.
Yet you say we're fighting for democracy
Then why don't democracy include me?
I ask you this question cause I want to know,
How long I got to fight BOTH HITLER—AND JIM CROW.

—Langston Hughes,
"Beaumont to Detroit, 1943."[51]

Germany's mistreatment of African people in its colonies and under Hitler's regime was not so different from the treatment of Blacks in the United States. The implementation of segregation laws, sterilizations, experimentation, and other forms of social injustices inflicted on Africans in Germany was in some concept of the ways a mirror image of the abhorrent situation of Blacks in America. The "racial contract" must also be applied to the domination of white supremacy in the United States. The ideas of modern racism can be viewed with respect to Blacks in America, it is therefore necessary to explore the mirror image between Germany and the United States. Nazi Germany was not the only country that sought to make itself "Master of the master race"; white Americans sought to do the same. As mentioned earlier, the idea of European race superiority was a shared reality for whites in many different parts of the world, and this becomes more evident when Nazi Germany and America from the 1930s to the 1960s are viewed side by side.

Before the onset of Nazism in Germany, whites in America sought to make themselves the master race. In fact, the eugenics movement, which Hitler utilized to justify the sterilization and

extermination of "racial inferiors" in Germany, had its origins in the United States. It was, however, perfected in Germany. Joseph DeJarnette, Superintendent of Virginia's Western State Hospital stated in 1934, "Hitler is beating us at our own game."[52]

The movement was conceived in the United States at the onset of the twentieth century, and was spearheaded by some of America's wealthiest, most powerful, and most learned men. Prior to World War II, the Nazis practiced eugenics with open approval from American eugenic crusaders.[53] The eugenics movement in the U.S. and Nazi Germany sought to terminate all those who they considered to be racially and economically inferior. [54] Eugenicists also wanted a "purely Germanic and Nordic super race."[55] Not only was the eugenics movement utilized by Germany, but the segregation laws, termed Jim Crow, could be found in Germany following Hitler's ascension to power in 1933. Hans J. Massaquoi recalled a sign being placed in the park near his house with the words: "Non-Aryans are sternly prohibited from entering this playground" painted on it. [56] Similar signs during the 1930s and well into the 1960s could be found in America. These signs read "White Only" or "Coloreds Only." These signs could be found hanging in restaurants, movie theaters, water fountains, playgrounds, and restrooms. Blacks in America had been marginalized and disfranchised by whites in America, who sought to impose the idea of their racial superiority. In the 1930s when the United States attacked Germany for its harsh treatment of "racial inferiors," Nazis reminded white Americans of southern racial policies.[57] Many whites in America condemned Nazi racism but refused to recognize the similarities between Nazism in Germany and Jim Crowism in the American South. Indeed, both Nazis and American whites saw Black people as a threat to white civilization or better put—white supremacy, and the carrying out of the "racial contract."

A comprehensive look at Germany in relation to Hitler and Blacks in Germany serves as a means to examine or view the continuous attack on African people throughout the world. The European creation of the idea of Black inferiority laid the groundwork for the atrocities committed against Africans through slavery, colonialism, apartheid, and other social injustices. Hitler was able to apply modern racist ideas not only against Blacks but also against Jews and other "racial inferiors." The number of African people killed during the Third Reich does not compare to the numbers of the Jews and the Gypsies. Nonetheless, the 50,000 to 65,000 Blacks killed added to the millions that have been killed by those who created and have

allowed for these ideas to determine the way they viewed Africans in the last 500 years. In his treatment of Blacks, Hitler was not so different from those who sanctioned the slave trade or those who imposed imperialistic ideas on the African continent. However, Hitler's aim was political; therefore, he made sure to operate within a political framework. The regaining of colonies was necessary for sustaining the "growing" German population, but it was not viewed with any immediacy. The primary agenda of the Nazis was to rid Germany of the Jews, Gypsies, and those of mixed parentage. Hitler also understood that Blacks could never achieve the status of white men because of modern racist ideas. He did not have to focus much attention on Blacks because the small African population did not pose any threats to the economic or political stability of Nazi Germany. The scholars who have taken on the subject of African people in Nazi Germany are aware of the fact that, as time continues to pass, the unexplored aspects of Black history will continue to be uncovered. The history of Blacks throughout the world must be explored not only in America, but also in the Caribbean, South America, Asia, Africa, Europe, and Australia. Doing so will provide many with a clear understanding of the pivotal role African people have played throughout history. It will also allow one to understand ways in which African people have suffered under colonialism, the institution of slavery, and other maleficent behavior. There must continue to be a desire for more knowledge of those who have been forgotten by many historians.

Notes

1 W.E.B. Dubois, "World War and the Color Line," *The Crisis* (November 1914), 28-30.

2 Charles W. Mills, *The Racial Contract* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 12.

3 Clarence Lusane, *Hitler's Black Victims: The Historical Experiences of Afro-Germans, European Blacks, Africans and African Americans in the Nazi Era* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 21-3.

4 Ibid., 24

5 Arthur de Gobineau, *Essay on the Inequality of Human Races*, tr. Adrian Collins (London: William Heinemann, 1915).

6 Harold Issacs, "Color in World Affairs," *Foreign Affairs* (1969), 235.

7 Fatima El-Tayeb, *Dangerous Liaisons: Race, Nation, and German Identity in Not So Plain As Black and White: Afro-German Culture and History, 1890-2000* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2005), 31.

8 Immanuel Kant, "This fellow was quite black … a clear proof that what he said [was] stupid," in Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, ed., *Race and Enlightenment:*

A Reader (New York: Blackwell, 2000), 55, quoted in Lusane, 25.

9 Quoted in Lusane, 25.

10 May Opitz, Katherine Oguntoye, Dagmar Schultz, eds., *Showing Our Colors: Afro-German Women Speak Out* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 9.

11 Opitz, Oguntoye, Dagmar, 11-21; Sara Friedrichmeyer, Sara Lennox, Susanne Zantop, *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998), 18.

12 Matt Rosenberg, "The Colonization of the Continent by European Powers." http://geography.about.com/cs/politicalgeog/a/berlinconferenc.htm., accessed on 10 October 2006.

13 Friedrichmeyer, Lennox, Zantop, 11.

14 Ibid., 12.

15 "The Maji Maji" revolt of 1905-1907, which was a result of multiple uprisings of African people against German colonial rule.

16 Jan-Bart Gewald, *Herero Heroes: A Socio-Political History of the Herero of Namibia, 1890-1923* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1999), 141-91.

17 Friedrichmeyer, Lennox, Zantop, 13.

18 Fripo W. Carr, *Germany's Black Holocaust 1890-1945: The Untold Truth! Details Never Revealed Before* (Kearney, NE: Morris Publishing, 2003), 13.

19 Lusane, 44-6.

20 Robert W. Kesling, "Blacks Under the Swastika: A Research Note," *The Journal of Negro History* (Winter 1998), 85-9.

21 Ibid, 89.

22 Lusane, 69-77.

23 Kesling, 87.

24 Opitz, Oguntoye, Dagmar, 44-53.

25 Lusane, 74.

26 Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kamp*f (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), 400-03.

27 Lusane, 79.

28 May Opizt tells her story in Opitz, Oguntoye, and Schultz, eds., *Showing Our Colors*, 206-8.

29 Tina Campt, *Other Germans: Black Germans and the Politics of Race, Gender, and Memory in the Third Reich* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 2004), 72-80; Kesling, 89-90.

30 Hans Macco, *Rasseprobleme in Dritten Reich* (Berlin: P. Schmidt, 1933), 13f, as cited in Campt, 74-5.

31 Ibid., 73.

32 Kesling, 90.

33 Hans Hauck interview as cited in Campt, 73.

34 Kesling, 90-2.

35 Campt, 138-49.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 Kesling, 93.

39 Ibid., 95.

40 Robert W. Kesling, "Forgotten Victims: Blacks in the Holocaust," *The Journal of Negro History* (Winter 1992), 32.

41 Number gathered from Robert W. Kesling in "Blacks Under the Swastika."

42 Hitler, 138-9.

43 Chancellor Williams, *The Destruction of Black Civilization: Great Issues of a Race from 4500 B.C. to 2000 A.D.* (Chicago: Third World Press, 1987), 1-49.

44 A.L.C. Bullock ed., *Germany's Colonial Demands*, edited from the reports of the Oxford University British Commonwealth Group (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1975), 1-46.

45 Ibid., 48.

46 Lusane, 98.

47 Ibid., 99.

48 Tina Campt, Pascal Grosse, Yara-Colette Lemke-Muniz de Faria, "Black Germans, and the Politics of Imperial Imagination, 1920-1960" in Sara Friedrichmeyer, Sara Lennox, Susanne Zantop, *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*, 215.

49 Heinrich Schnee, *German Colonization Past and Future: The Truth about the German Colonies* (London: Ruskin House, 1926), 62-73. Dr. Schnee served as the Governor of German East Africa during the Weimar Republic.

50 Friedrichmeyer, Lennox, Zantop, 14-25.

51 Langston Hughes, "Beaumont to Detroit, 1943," *Common Ground* (Fall 1943), 104.

52 Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (New York, NY: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003), 7.

53 Ibid., 279-318.

54 The noun termination is used to describe the eugenics movement because the act of sterilization, experimentation, and systematic genocide would ultimately lead to deaths or decrease in population of many African people on a mass scale. Thus, the termination of Blacks would be inevitable.

55 Ibid., 7.

56 Hans J. Massaquoi, *Destined to Witness: Growing up Black in Nazi Germany* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1999), 47.

57 Johnpeter Horst Grill, Robert L. Jenkins, "The Nazis and the American South in the 1930's: A Mirror Image?" *The Journal of Southern History*, (November 1992), 667-9.

Jack Reid

Brother Can You Spare a Lyric? A Study of Bob Dylan's Relationship with the Culture of the 1960s

I never let my schooling get in the way of my education.
—Samuel Clemens

Buy the ticket. Take the ride.
—Hunter S. Thompson

Keep a good head, and always carry a light bulb.
—Bob Dylan

"We sit here stranded, though we're all doin' our best to deny it."[1] These lyrics comprise part of the opening verse of the classic song "Visions of Johanna" by Bob Dylan. The lyric delves into the feeling of isolation so many people feel, but never find a way to express in a meaningful way. Lyrics like these are what make Dylan's music so explosive and nurturing for people, because he finds a way to put on paper the many doubts and problems people share, but never find a way to talk about. Bob Dylan's lyrics became a focal point for the burgeoning youth culture that developed in the 1960s.[2] In these songs, many young people felt Dylan was talking directly to them. Listening to songs such as "Blowin' in the Wind" and "The Times They are a Changin'" gave them a sense of community with other people their age. By the late 1960s Dylan had an immense following picking apart his songs and life in general for symbolic meanings and direction. Many argued over lyrics of his songs, and "got in the habit of asking where he (Dylan) was taking us next."[3] Bob Dylan's song writing in the 1960s blazed a new trail of art through the American consciousness that gave youths and lost adults alike a voice to guide them; furthermore, Dylan is one of a small group of singers who was able to bring intellectualized authentic music into the realm of popular culture effectively.

In order to explain Dylan's impact with any objectivity, his roots must first be explained. First, it is important to note that Dylan's real name is not Dylan at all; it is actually Robert Zimmerman. He

was born in Duluth, Minnesota on 24 May 1941. After his birth, his family moved from Duluth and lived in Hibbing, Minnesota, a small mining town amidst the Iron Range. Robert Zimmerman showed a keen talent for writing at a young age as he wrote poems for his parents, and began secluding himself in his room for long periods of time. For example, the young Zimmerman's first known poem, a gift to his mother on Mother's Day, reads "My dear mother, I hope that you / Will never grow old and gray / So that all the people in the world will say: Hello young lady, Happy Mother's Day / Love, Bobby."[4] After graduating from high school, Zimmerman decided to leave Hibbing at the age of eighteen and attend the University of Minnesota. Zimmerman's aspirations at the University had little to do with school, where he spent only six months before he left.[5] In his eyes college was simply a launching point. "I suppose what I was looking for was what I read about in *On the Road*—looking for the great city, looking for the speed, the sound of it, looking for what Allen Ginsberg had called the hydrogen jukebox world."[6] In an ironic twist of fate, the starry eyed young Zimmerman's idol Ginsberg would later shower him with praise and become a close friend in the sixties.[7] After a short time in Minneapolis Robert Zimmerman opted to change his name to Bob Dylan because he felt that it suited him better, claiming it was his true name all along. With a new name, Dylan set his sights for New York City or the "capital of the world" as he called it.[8] He hitchhiked to New York and instantly embedded himself in the Greenwich Village folk music scene.[9] During this period Dylan mastered most of Woody Guthrie's repertoire. Guthrie, one of the original folk music heroes in America, had blazed the path for other singer song-writers to use folk ballads as a vehicle for social protest. Little by little Dylan began writing his own music, claiming "I could see that the type of songs that I was leaning towards didn't exist."[10] In Dylan's autobiography, written in 2004, he wrote about his first year in New York City: "destiny was about to manifest itself. I felt like it was looking right at me and nobody else."[11] It is clear he had a strange feeling that he was chosen to succeed as a musician, whether this destiny was embellished in the book written years later is harder to clear up. Trusting himself, he set out to prove his destiny had some truth.

From his meager beginnings in 1961 when he reached New York City, Dylan soon blossomed into the talk of the town. In 1963 he released *The Freewheelin' Bob Dylan*, an album containing his first major hit, "Blowin' in the Wind."[12] Thus begins the story of Dylan's

rise as the "voice of a generation." The song is full of stirring soul searching questions regarding the civil rights movement and the "war on poverty." The then twenty-two year old Dylan was looking into the eyes of the United States political establishment and abroad, and asking "Yes, 'n' how many years can some people exist, Before they're allowed to be free?"[13] The song caught people off guard and, indeed, forced them to ponder how deeply ingrained racism was in society.

Freewheelin' also contained two other strongly politically motivated songs, "Masters of War" and "A Hard Rain's A-Gonna Fall." "Masters" attacked world leaders saying, "You play with my world / Like it's your little toy," going on to finally conclude, "Even Jesus would never / Forgive what you do."[14] This song was highly topical in the age of the Cold War and the nuclear arms race. "Hard Rain" follows much the same tone, in somewhat less aggressive rhetoric. It describes the world after an Armageddon like fate. Surrounding the events of the early sixties it was impossible not to associate the so-called "hard rain going to fall" from Dylan's song with the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. Dylan's next album kept much the same pace with topical songs that captured the heart and mind of Americans looking for change.[15]

The album *The Times They Are A-Changin'* was released in 1964 by Columbia Records, and Dylan was selling out highly anticipated concerts across the country.[16] The song "The Times They Are A-Changin'" only solidified Dylan's dominance in the topical song category of folk music. Nineteen sixty-four marked a year in which the nation's youth was becoming strikingly alienated from their parents, and older generations in general. This was pivotal, because this group of young people would form the bulk of Dylan's audience. Overall, his audience was mostly white males aged fifteen to thirty-five, but it also included many high school and college age females; in addition, African Americans and in-tune adults formed a facet of Dylan's listeners.[17] These in-tune adults were very much a minority, however, as the bulk of adults did not understand him. According to Peter Yarrow, a member of the group Peter, Paul, and Mary, "Young people felt that older people did not understand, that they were insensitive to what was going on." With this growing sense of alienation from other generations, young people were looking for hope.[18]

Dylan's music became a lightning rod for alienated young people, because he sang songs that were full of the emotions that isolated youths brooded over, but had no one to relate to.

Suddenly they had a leader, and he was their age. Dylan's words quickly spread through college campuses, turning into anthems for disillusioned youths. A particularly popular verse from "The Times They Are A-Changin'" spoke directly to the older crowd, and actually gave them orders,

> Come mothers and fathers / Throughout the land
> And don't criticize / What you can't understand
> Your sons and your daughters / Are beyond your command
> Your old road is Rapidly agin'.
> Please get out of the new one / If you can't lend your hand
> For the times they are a-changin'.[19]

The reactions to Dylan's protest music from 1961 to 1964 were explosive, and helped the student movements across the country gain steam. In 1963, Dylan performed in Mississippi in order to draw attention to the Civil Rights movement at the invitation of student leftist groups SDS and SNCC.[20] According to Jim Miller, Dylan's records and protest performances helped get people involved in the student movements; moreover, people in the movements were elated by Dylan's powerful messages in his lyrics, and always looked forward to his next song.[21] A student at Southern Illinois University Carbondale told history professor Robbie Lieberman in an interview conducted in 1997 that, during his freshman year in 1965, he attended a student protest in front of Morris Library called the Rational Action Movement. Unfamiliar with the student movement, he was curious; so he decided to check it out. The man recalls seeing a big stage with a folk singer covering a song he had never heard before. The song ended up being "The Times They Are A-Changin'," and he was instantly fascinated with the atmosphere. He decided to get involved, and was elected to the student senate that spring.[22] This sense of electricity surrounding Dylan's influence may have been embellished in the above interview, which was conducted much later. Still, examples such as this were numerous across the country with college students "turning on" their friends to Dylan's music among various other things, including marijuana, a drug that was also spreading through the youth of America at exponential rates.[23]

By 1965, Bob Dylan had solidified himself as a premier songwriter and had, in many people's eyes, revolutionized music by recreating himself from the master of topical songwriting, into a rock and roll star whose lyrics seethed with animosity of a new brand. Prior to 1965, Dylan had been the folk music icon due to the

fact that he breathed new life into the art, and gave the civil rights movement and the student movement some of their best protest songs. However, Dylan was determined not to be pigeonholed by journalists and folk enthusiasts. He felt that the stigma of "protest song writer" cut off his creativity, because he could not explore human emotions on a personal level while writing protest music. Instead, he combined themes of protest with themes of depression and isolation that allowed for more expression in his writing. Dylan never quit writing songs that were full of powerful protest, he just started using different methods of songwriting. In a recent interview Dylan explained, "An artist has gotta be careful to never really arrive where he thinks he's at somewhere, you have to realize that you're constantly in the state of becoming."[24] This concept appears in Dylan's writing during the sixties in the song "It's Alright Ma, (I'm Only Bleeding)" where he warns, "he not busy being born/ Is busy dying," meaning that if one does not constantly recreate themselves or yearn for more, than they are taking a step closer to dying.[25] The next period of his career consisted of having a rock and roll band back him, while he skillfully breathed out his new, more complex and surreal songs. Dylan released three albums between 1965 and 1966, all three of which are arguably his best albums. Folk purists from Greenwich Village lambasted Dylan for "selling out," a term associated with mainstream music. They felt that Dylan was wasting his prodigious talent for writing topical songs about the times. After all, it was the mid 1960s, and the youth movement among others was at a fever pitch. They needed his unique protest songs more than ever.[26] Aside from folk purists, however, Dylan's new form of "folk rock" spoke to an even bigger section of society in profound ways.

What the folk purists, such as Pete Seeger of the Weavers, did not understand was that Dylan's records during the mid sixties were indeed overflowing with protest even if he used the mainstream rock and roll genre. Listeners just had to look more closely at what Dylan was saying in the songs. This is not to say that no one noticed. Universities full of students and even older crowds began to study Dylan's lyrics to the finest detail for inspiration.[27] This period represents the height of Dylan's image as "the voice." Proof of Dylan's significant influence on society is the sheer amount of attention he received from a wide range of groups. Before Dylan, rock and roll bands had influence over youths, but in a more shallow way.[28] The lyrics of the songs had very little to say, but with Dylan's emergence onto the popular culture stage, suddenly rock music

had substance. The effect of Dylan's crossover into mainstream music is visible in the writing of Todd Gitlin, president of the influential New Left group Students for a Democratic Society in the 1960s. Gitlin described Dylan's songs and lyrics as a bellwether for decisions of many students on campus. For example, according to Gitlin, when Dylan began playing rock and roll "students were teased by the idea of a popular movement, we admired Dylan's ability to smuggle the subversive into mass-circulated trappings. Whether he liked it or not, Dylan *sang for us*."[29] Dylan, indeed, did not like being labeled "the voice of a generation" but his songs were too powerful for young people to ignore.

Dylan's songs were powerful to young people, because they were in a very formative period of their lives. Adolescence represents a time in a young person's life where they are learning that they can make important decisions on their own. This new sense of freedom leads to rebellion from social norms youths deem unimportant or ignorant. With this stage of rebellion comes friction with adults and parent figures that, in turn, leads to isolation from adults who "just don't understand." In situations like these, youths many times became introverted and found that music was the only release from these growing pains.[30] Evidence supports the opinion that Bob Dylan was a leading force in shaping the actions of young people and the lost souls of other generations. For example, the song "It's Alright Ma (I'm Only Bleeding)" particularly caught people's attention with its grotesque critique of the decrepit underbelly of society. The following is an excerpt of the fifteen verse song in which Dylan spotlights the foes of authentic living with daring accuracy,

> Disillusioned words like bullets bark / As human gods aim for their mark
> Make everything from toy guns that spark / To flesh-colored Christs that glow in the dark
> It's easy to see without looking too far / That not much is really sacred . . .
>
> For them that must obey authority / That they do not respect in any degree
> Who despise their jobs, their destinies / Speak jealously of them who are free
> Do what they do just to be / Nothing more than something they invest in . . .
> Advertising signs that con you / Into thinking you're the one /

That can do what's never been done
That can win what's never been won / Meantime life outside goes on / All around you.[31]

The excerpt above is just a taste of the song's power, and the lyrics washed over like a tsunami those with their ears to the music. Groups of isolated youths and confused adults realized that they were not alone in their thoughts, and that a community of listeners could make a difference. Evidence of Dylan's lyrics forming friendships can be found in numerous interviews. For example, Danny Goldberg, the CEO of Artemis Records, used Dylan's lyrics as a key component for finding friends, writing "I could immediately bond with a stranger who quoted key Dylan lyrics intelligently."[32] Goldberg's confession is testament to Dylan's words being an important part of young people's dialects, which helped them relate to one another and spark friendships. According to Gitlin, "Stoned, my friends and I and many another movement circle would fish Dylan's torrent of images, confirming our own revolts and hungers. . . . Even his irony about his own failed flight from the straight world spoke for an anguish we shared about the ambiguities of privilege."[33] The communities formed through the common bond of Dylan's music forged lasting relationships, and gave these people an outlet they perhaps would have not found otherwise.

In college classrooms professors were subscribing students to the thoughts of Chaucer, Dante, Shakespeare, Eliot, Blake, and many others but, according to Tony Colaianne, "it was Dylan who was the most accessible and consequently the most important."[34] Instead of trying to understand poets of a different background, they could listen to Dylan, and immediately understand the context of his work. According to Ralph Gleason's article "The Greater Sound," Dylan's music had an explosive effect on high school students also. The students scribbled Dylan's lyrics on scraps of paper and duplicated them on "ditto machines" to pass around school.[35] In a similar situation, Danny Goldberg, who was in high school in the mid sixties, recalled being unexpectedly pulled aside by a high school classmate whose excitement about Dylan's "Ballad of a Thin Man" demanded that he share his personal experience with the lyrics with someone else right away. The musical power of such songs brought listeners together in a shared social and personal consciousness. To high school and college students alike, the song "Subterranean Homesick Blues" spoke volumes about the

monotonous routine of the education system in the sixties. With short bursts of truth spouting from "Homesick Blues" such as, "twenty years of schoolin' / and they put you on the day shift" or "look out kid, it's something you did / God knows when but you're doin' it again," it is easy to understand the connection students had with Dylan's musings. The song cut to the heart of the nation's youth, and people of different beliefs who were being blamed for the problems of the world. With the words of Dylan's songs ingrained into the young people's minds, some students began demanding Dylan's songs be incorporated into curriculum. In other instances teachers realized the importance of Dylan's work themselves, and voluntarily used the music in class.[36]

College kids were paying attention, college professors began implementing Dylan's music into lectures, and even literary scholars were forced to face the notion that Dylan was breaking old social norms.[37] However, not everyone agreed that Dylan's music was ground-breaking. An article by Thomas Meehan in the *New York Times* from 12 December 1965 does a fine job of capturing the essence of the argument. The article was titled "Public Writer No. 1?" and it examines the results of an informal survey of students majoring in English at three prominent Ivy League Colleges. The article may be biased in that only English majors were questioned, but the article nonetheless gives a clear representation of the results. Literary critics expecting authors such as Robert Lowell and Norman Mailer were bewildered when beatnik twenty-four year old Bob Dylan was revealed to be the college students' favorite contemporary American writer. The students felt that Dylan was writing about things they cared about. One student from Brown University took his comments a step further noting, "We don't give a damn about Moses Herzog's angst or Norman Mailer's private fantasies." The student explained his partiality to Dylan claiming, "We're concerned with … the threat of nuclear war, and the civil rights movement … and Bob Dylan is the only American writer dealing with these subjects that makes any sense to us."[38]

On the other hand, a Harvard undergrad asserted that it was "absurd" to take Dylan's writing seriously.[39] Another literary critic sided with his opinion by claiming that the only people who call Dylan poetry do not know anything about poetry, adding with exclamation, "Neither does Bob Dylan!"[40] Furthermore, Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm is quoted in 1964 as saying "it's clear from Dylan's fairly numerous bad verses—that he comes from that *Reader's Digest* mass civilization."[41] Hobsbawm felt that the culture

Dylan grew up in diluted his vocabulary and left him a "mixture of stammering cliché."[42] Still further, a teacher at Philips Academy accused Dylan of poorly imitating Jack Kerouac.

By far the most extreme anti-believer was an English professor from the University of Vermont who expressed the opinion, "Anyone who calls Dylan the greatest poet in the United States today has rocks in their head."[43] This brings up a number of conclusions. One, Dylan's work must have been highly influential during this period for this topic to be such a hot debate. Also it is important to note that the Dylan detractors, who are a minority in the articles researched, are predominantly of an older generation and, thus, are outside of Dylan's main demographic. The reaction of a Princeton teenager to the debate is fitting, "It's the words. Either you understand him or you don't. I can't explain why he's so great, but he knows what *it's about*."[44]

Aside from the debate of whether Dylan was a poet or not, his music was indeed a soundtrack to people's lives during the 1960s; moreover, it fueled their decision-making on a range of topics. The potency of Dylan's words and the striking images they created formed a backdrop for the events of young people's daily lives. Music critic and essayist Greil Marcus alluded to this concept in an essay he wrote after witnessing the police riot at the Chicago Democratic Convention in 1968. Marcus went home rattled from the day's activities and began listening to Dylan's record *Blonde on Blonde*. Soon he came upon the song "Stuck in Mobile With the Memphis Blues Again"; "I've heard that song hundreds of times before, but this time it was different. It became a journey, a rite of passage, a struggling effort to pass out of an inexplicable contradiction, only to find another, with no escape … intensifying the desire that it all be over."[45] Marcus's experience shows the powerful relationship Dylan's writing had with events of the sixties. In addition, this example illustrates the wide range of situations that Dylan's writing was able to effect in people's lives. For example, "Memphis Blues Again" never mentions anything about the Democratic Convention of 1968, but it is still able to conjure emotions from the listener attached to this topic through the use of highly expressive language and incredible wit.

Lyrics from "Memphis Blues Again" such as "But deep inside my heart / I know I can't escape / Oh, Mama, can this really be the end," are all related to strong emotions.[46] Dylan realized this relationship, and was able to fill his songs with lyrics that used the listener's everyday experience as a framework for his words

to grow. From this framework of experience in the listener's mind, Dylan's songs were able to take on personal relationships with the listener, which led to extremely powerful responses to the songs. For example, the relationship Dylan's lyrics formed with the listener, created the opportunity for a song that had nothing to do with the police riots of Chicago in 1968, to take on these meanings in people's lives. For instance, a group of people could listen to the same Bob Dylan song, and each person could be strongly affected by the song in his or her own way. This concept is important, because it allowed people from different backgrounds to be able to relate to Dylan's music; furthermore, this allowed a wide range of people to relate to other people through Dylan's songs. This phenomenon helps explain the deeply personal relationships that people develop with Dylan's lyrics and also the spirited debate over what his songs meant.

"Anyone who didn't live through the Sixties simply cannot realize how important his (Dylan) albums seemed then; they defined a community."[47] The above quote from John Rockwell, a music and arts critic of the *New York Times*, may be somewhat nostalgic, but it captures the notion of just how much was riding on the words of Bob Dylan. Young people were entranced by the works of Dylan during the 1960s, each album representing a watershed moment in their lives. The records Dylan released in the sixties each contained a batch of wisdom in the eyes of the youth culture; it was only a matter of deciphering for themselves Dylan's true message. The American music landscape was altered substantially during the 1960s by a number of musicians and bands; however, it is Bob Dylan's revolutionary mixing of socially conscious lyrics with a dynamic musical backing that spurred this transformation in many ways. It was Dylan who created the most powerful anthems during the sixties that fueled isolated youths in many ways to form communities of dissent. Dylan delved into the darkest caverns of American society and shined a glaring light on the inequalities and distorted realities that most people never talked about; moreover, he wrote telling accounts that brought these issues to the forefront of the youth culture's conscious.

It is important to point out that Dylan himself was by no means perfect. He was known to be cruel to friends and often hurt the feelings of people for no other reason than to protect his image. Aspects of his songs at times carry hopelessly pessimistic undertones, such as "name me someone that's not a parasite and I'll go out and say a prayer for him."[48] It seems that Dylan himself was

often quite detached from those around him; and the isolation he felt prompted him to react negatively to others in social situations.[49] It is hard not to hypothesize that the feelings of isolation that plagued Dylan's mind fueled the extremely thought provoking and explosive songs he wrote in the sixties. He has often been discredited by critics for never offering answers to the critiques his songs make on society.[50] However, it is evident from the messages of many of his songs that he felt that there were no answers to the problems that plagued his life and society at large. Perhaps that is why the youth culture of the sixties was able to identify with Dylan's music so much. They watched politicians playing with their world "like it's their (the politicians) little toy," and felt helpless working in the movements to stop them.[51] For youths, one of the only outlets for these feelings was to form "circles" of friends in which they could discuss how Dylan's songs related to their own fears in life. Todd Gitlin elaborated on this, showing how a group of people could make their personal situations more positive. "It didn't matter that Dylan's lyrics, for example, were celebrations of strictly private experience, by playing the music together we transformed into a celebration of our own collective intimacy, love, hilarity."[52] Bob Dylan's music defined the truly personal feelings of an era. By writing about his own fears and joys he allowed a large section of the youth culture to find a voice they could believe in. Whether or not Dylan felt like the "voice of a generation" did not matter; his songs forged a community out of a lost group of people who needed answers.

Notes

1 Bob Dylan, "Visions of Johanna," *Blonde on Blonde* (Columbia Records, 1966).

2 In this paper "youth culture" will refer to the high school through post college age group, and the interests that united them, such as their rebellious tendencies, political drive, and overall thirst for genuine happiness without the trappings of extreme materialism.

3 Todd Gitlin, *Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books Inc., 1987), 198; Thomas Meehan, "Public Writer No. 1?" *New York Times*, 12 December 1965, SM44.

4 As quoted in Robert Shelton, *No Direction Home: The Life and Music of Bob Dylan* (New York: De Capo Press, 1986), 34.

5 Shelton, *No Direction Home*, 21-63; Meehan, "Public Writer No. 1?," 132.

6 *On The Road* was a famous book written by Jack Kerouac about road trips across the U.S. and Mexico written in a spontaneous prose style that influenced a number of great artists. Bob Dylan, *Chronicles: Volume On*e (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), 234-5.

7 Shelton, *No Direction Home*, 332-3.

8 Dylan, *Chronicles*, 130.

9 Greenwich Village was a neighborhood in New York City full of musicians and artists that was known for its bohemian ambiance.

10 Dylan, *Chronicles*, 276.

11 Ibid.

12 Andy Gill, *Don't Think Twice It's Alright: Bob Dylan, The Early Years* (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1998), 23.

13 Bob Dylan, "Blowin' In the Wind," *The Freewheelin' Bob Dylan* (Columbia Records, 1963).

14 Bob Dylan, "Masters of War," *The Freewheelin' Bob Dylan* (Columbia Records, 1963); Dylan, Chronicles, 33.

15 Topical songs were songs that dealt with pertinent social issues of the time, such as civil rights and the war in Vietnam.

16 Bob Dylan, "The Times They Are A-Changin'," *The Times They Are A-Changin'* (Columbia Records, 1964); *Younger Than That Now: The Collected Interviews with Bob Dylan* (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2004), 13-14.

17 It is important to note, some women felt Dylan's music was sexist, and there were feminist outcries against his lyrics.

18 *No Direction Home*, Produced By Martin Scorsese Pictures, Two Hours, Paramount DVD, 2005, DVD.

19 Bob Dylan, "The Times They Are A-Changin'," *The Times They Are A Changin'* (Columbia Records, 1964).

20 SDS stands for Students for a Democratic Society. SNCC stands for Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. These were groups involved in the various student movements, which were groups of students fighting for a number of causes including ending the Vietnam War, Civil Rights, and Women's Rights.

21 Jim Miller, "Bob Dylan," in *The Dylan Companion*, ed. Elizabeth Thomson et al. (New York: De Capo Press, 2001), 25.

22 Robbie Lieberman, *Prairie Power: Voices of the 1960s Midwestern Student Protest*, (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2004), 162.

23 Gitlin, *Sixties*, 205.

24 *No Direction Home*, Scorsese, DVD.

25 Bob Dylan, "It's Alright Ma (I'm Only Bleeding)," *Bringing It All Back Home* (Columbia Records, 1965).

26 *No Direction Home*, Scorsese, DVD; *Younger Than That Now*, 31-35; Gitlin, *Sixties*, 202.

27 *No Direction Home*, Scorsese, DVD; *Younger Than That Now*, 161-69

28 Ralph J. Gleason, "The Greater Sound," *The Drama Review: TDR, Vol. 13, No. 4, Politics and Performance*. (Summer, 1969), 160-66.

29 Gitlin, *Sixties*, 197.

30 Douglas H. Heath, "Student Alienation and School," *The School Review*, Vol. 78, No. 4 (Aug., 1970), 526-8.

31 Bob Dylan, "It's Alright Ma (I'm Only Bleeding)," *Bringing It All Back Home* (Columbia Records, 1965).

32 Danny Goldberg, *Dispatches From The Culture Wars: How the Left Lost Teen Spirit* (New York: Miramax Books, 2003), 126.

33 Gitlin. *Sixties*, 201; Gleason, "The Greater Sound," 163.

34 Tony Colaianne, "Defensive No Longer" in *Bob Dylan: American Poet and Singer*, ed. Richard David Wissolik. (Greensburg, PA: Eadmer Press, 1991), 2-4.

35 Gleason, "The Greater Sound," 162.

36 Gleason, "The Greater Sound," 163; Goldberg, *Dispatches From the Culture Wars*, 128.

37 Gleason, "The Greater Sound," 160-66; *Younger Than That Now*, 35-47.

38 Meehan, "Public Writer No. 1," 44.

39 Jerome B. Agel, Letter to the Editor 1- No Title. *New York Time*s, 26 December, 1965, SM4.

40 Ibid.

41 Colaianne, "Defensive No Longer," 2-3.

42 Ibid.

43 Gleason, "The Greater Sound,"45-6.

44 Agel, "Letter to the Editor 1-No Title," SM4.

45 Miller, "Bob Dylan," 25.

46 Bob Dylan, "Stuck Inside of Mobile With The Memphis Blues Again," *Blonde on Blonde* (Columbia Records, 1966).

47 Miller, "Bob Dylan," 20.

48 Bob Dylan, "Visions Of Johanna."

49 Shelton, No Direction Home, 84-5; *Younger Than That Now*, 135-9.

50 Meehan, "Public Writer No. 1?," 45.

51 Bob Dylan, "Masters of War," *The Freewheelin' Bob Dylan* (Columbia Records, 1963).

52 Gitlin, *Sixties*, 202-03.

William Cowan

The Problem of Identity: The Controversy over Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*

In early 1963 famed social philosopher Hannah Arendt published *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, an in-depth study of the trial in Israel of former Nazi Adolf Eichmann. Serialized in *The New Yorker* in the February-March issues and then released in proper book form in April, Arendt's work offered a radically original perspective that directly challenged some of the popularly held perceptions on specific aspects that were critical to the overall understanding of the Holocaust, such as how to view Eichmann as a man and as a criminal, the Jews as victims, the crime of genocide itself, and the nature of totalitarianism and the unique form it took under Nazi Germany.

The focus of this paper will be on the explosion of controversy caused by the work's publication, a controversy that was due in large part to Arendt's refusal to make her report fit neatly into those commonly held perceptions, and that itself revealed specifically what many of those perceptions were: that Eichmann was the consummate villain, a sadistic killer driven by rabid anti-Semitism who was the "mastermind" behind the Nazi genocide; that the Jews were hapless victims of the Nazis (the psychologist Bruno Bettelheim, in agreeing with Arendt, went so far as to assert that the term "martyr" did not apply to the Jews[1]); that Nazism as a totalitarian system and its adherents as human beings were both aberrations of humanity; and that the genocide itself was simply the latest chapter in anti-Semitism's four-thousand year old history. These perceptions had been fueled by, but did not originate from, Eichmann's trial itself.

Also, part of Arendt's thesis was to question the strict legality of the trial (not to be confused with the justice it was purported to serve, which she felt was achieved); its supposed purpose (she criticized the trial as more of "show" with the intent of reproaching the world for the horror inflicted upon the Jews); and its conduct in presenting almost the entirety of the "Final Solution" (the blame for which was placed squarely on Eichmann, which, according to Arendt, was to a large extent misapplied).

The majority of negative reactions to Arendt's thesis were visceral in nature, and as such resulted in the commonly expressed view that, by minimizing or mitigating his guilt, she sympathized with Eichmann as being a victim of the system, in which he was but a mere cog. In addition, she seemed to be accusing the Jews as victims of being complicit in their own destruction. The combination of these separate interpretations, which were misinterpreted themselves, resulted in the perception that Arendt was trying to shift the blame, partially or completely, from Eichmann and the Nazis onto the Jews themselves; or, in the case of Germans and other non-Jews, blame seemed to shift from the Nazis specifically onto all Germans or all humanity in general.

This was not, of course, what Arendt explicitly argued, but the fact that people were able to draw this conclusion illustrates the emotional nature of the controversy, as emotional involvement tends to inhibit full comprehension of an issue by distorting or misinterpreting facts critical to comprehending the issue at hand. But what made this controversy so emotional? What motivations or preoccupations were behind these outbursts of indignation and anger? The truth is that a particular perception of the Holocaust was critically linked to conceptions of particular collective identities. In other words, understanding the Holocaust is important to what it means to be a Jew, a German, a Christian, and a number of other cultural, religious, and political or national identities. Arendt's challenge to the common perceptions used to understand the Holocaust constituted a challenge to the general perception of the Holocaust itself, and since certain collective identities were tied to that general perception, people who were associated with those identities necessarily felt that they themselves were being attacked. To illustrate this truth, this paper will examine the two main points of contention from early 1963 to 1965, namely the differing perceptions of Eichmann and of the Jews as presented by Arendt and her opponents.

Adolf Eichmann was the head of the German *Schutzstaffel* (S.S.) department responsible for organizing the deportation of Jews from their home communities throughout Europe, beginning with forced emigration to countries outside the Reich, and eventually to concentration camps like Theresienstadt and death camps like Auschwitz and Chelmno. As the man behind the machinery of transporting Jews to their doom, Eichmann was guilty of a singularly monstrous crime, but he himself was not a monster. This is the paradox that Hannah Arendt attempts to explain in her portrait

of Eichmann. In this explanation, she asserts that he was "banal" rather than sadistic or sociopathic; that chief prosecutor Gideon Hausner inflated his importance from a mid-level bureaucrat to "the monster responsible for all [the suffering of the Jews];"[2] and that it was the nature of totalitarian society that shaped his personality and impaired his ability to tell right from wrong.

The "banality" of Eichmann, as characterized by Arendt, lay almost entirely in his incapacity for original thought. This was expressed by his inability to ever see anything from another person's point of view, his constant regurgitation of clichés when speaking, his marked propensity for bragging in order to exaggerate his own self-worth, and his complete and utter dependence on authority to essentially make important decisions for him. In addition, he was motivated not by an "insane hatred of Jews" or an "insatiable desire to kill," but rather by an extreme dedication to his own definition of Kant's categorical imperative: "the principle of my will must always be such that it can become the principle of general laws." The source of these "general laws" for Eichmann was the oral pronouncements of Adolf Hitler, and anything that ran contrary to these "general laws" was therefore, in Eichmann's mind, inherently unlawful.[3]

Arendt also showed that Eichmann's own position within the Nazi hierarchy was never as important as the prosecution in Jerusalem had, in trying to place upon him the burden of guilt for the entirety of Jewish suffering, attempted to establish. This, combined with a poor understanding of the Nazi bureaucratic system, led to the mistaken view that Eichmann had been instrumental in the planning, and not just the implementation, of the "Final Solution." This view was expressed in the Israeli Court of Appeal's final judgment:

> It was a fact that the appellant had received no "superior orders" at all. He was his own superior, and he gave all orders in matters that concerned Jewish affairs.[4]

This imparted to Eichmann a false authority over aspects of the "Final Solution" he had by no means possessed, aspects such as the *Einsatzgruppen* (the mobile killing units of the S.S. in the East), the administration of the ghettoes, and even the death camps themselves. This, according to Arendt, was "dangerous nonsense," because it had, in essence, made "Eichmann the superior of Himmler and the inspirer of Hitler," when it was obvious at all times that the direct opposite was the truth. [5]

Finally, Arendt argued that what truly enabled Eichmann and so many others like him to be accomplices in evil was the totalitarian nature of Nazism that had warped society and essentially legalized murder. In addressing the question of his conscience, she illustrates one of the key factors that prevented Eichmann from the realization that what he was doing was wrong:

> His conscience was indeed set at rest when he saw the zeal and eagerness with which "good society" everywhere reacted as he did. He did not need to "close his ears to the voice of conscience," as the judgment has it, not because he had none, but because his conscience spoke with a "respectable voice," with the voice of respectable society around him.

This was an indication of the complete moral collapse the Nazis caused in "respectable society" not only in Germany, but in the majority of Europe as well. This collapse created an environment in which voices from outside the system that might have aroused Eichmann's conscience were either non-existent or so ambiguous that they were completely ineffective. Totalitarianism had also made possible Eichmann's "thoughtlessness," described above: it demolished his concept of the individual (insofar as the individual is capable of independent thought and action in pursuit of personal interests) by placing the aims of the State above all other considerations, thus reducing the individual to nothing more than a means to an end. It was his abdication of personal judgment, combined with his "thoughtlessness," that "predisposed Eichmann to become one of the greatest criminals of the [Nazi era]."[6]

The portrait of Eichmann that came out in criticisms of Arendt was decidedly different. By and large critics simply rehashed the Israeli court's impression of Eichmann, which was characterized mainly by a wholesale rejection of the paradox that Arendt had presented.

According to Arendt's critics, Eichmann was a fanatical anti-Semite, a fact derived simply from his being a member of the Nazi party. Since the "hatred of Jews was an essential part of [Nazi] ideology,"[7] it was only logical to assume that "no person could have joined the Nazi party, let alone the S.S., who was not at the very least a *vicious* anti-Semite."[8] In addition, who but a sadistic anti-Semite would brag about going to his grave laughing that he had "the death of five million Jews" on his conscience?[9]

As to his conscience, many reviewers chose to ignore Arendt's thesis and even appropriated some of her evidence to support

their own. Arendt had pointed out the fact that Eichmann had visited Auschwitz and Treblinka, and seen the operations of the *Einsatzgruppen* in the East.[10] She had used this evidence to support her contention that Eichmann's conscience had been subverted by Nazi ideology, but her critics pointed to it as proof of Eichmann's sadism, that he had possessed no conscience at all. And in some particularly harsh reviews, it was implied that Arendt had actually ignored the fact that Eichmann had seen firsthand the results of the death camps and the *Einsatzgruppen*.[11] In addition, some disputed Arendt's contention that there were not enough voices speaking in opposition to the "Final Solution."[12] Lastly, the same "guilt by association" from which his fanatical anti-Semitism had been inferred was used to illustrate Eichmann's sadism and lack of conscience.

Finally, most critics refused to accept Arendt's diminution of Eichmann's power and continued to tout his role as the "High Chief Executioner of the Jews."[13] He was characterized as a "first generation Nazi,"[14] who "invented the ghetto system [and the] plan to ship all the Jews to Madagascar."[15] He was at all times and in all places the one person most responsible for inspiring and implementing the "Final Solution."

Considerations of Eichmann aside, what had inflamed people most against Hannah Arendt were her comments on the role of Jewish leadership during the Holocaust. (It must be stressed here that her criticisms were directed solely at the Jewish leadership and not the masses of ordinary Jews). The topic had come up in Eichmann's trial, as one of the questions many in Israel and around the world had asked in reference to the Jewish victims was "Why did you not resist?" Arendt's answer to this question has very much to do with her contention of the "moral collapse" of society caused by totalitarianism. The Jews were subjected to "totalitarian terror" just as all other peoples had been in Nazi-dominated Europe, and as such they had behaved no differently than other peoples in similar circumstances.[16]

It also led her to ask a second question that was also on people's minds but that the court in Jerusalem avoided asking during testimony by a prominent member of a Jewish council: "Why did you cooperate in the destruction of your own people and, eventually, in your own ruin?" In addressing this second question, Arendt asserted that Jewish leaders were motivated by the mistaken belief that survival laid in cooperation, a belief that persisted even when they became aware of the full implications of the Nazis' "Final Solution." Even the Zionists, who had worked to rescue Jews, did so according to Nazi-inspired (but not dictated) categories, pleading on behalf

of "special cases" at the expense of the "non-special" masses. The cooperation of the Jews was very much the rule, and any resistance, whose existence in itself was a "miracle," was the exception. (Arendt later clarified her position on resistance, in response to accusations from critics that she had unfairly expected active resistance from the Jews, which was impossible under the circumstances. Arendt agreed that "there was no possibility of resistance, but there existed the possibility of *doing nothing*."[17]) Also, it was this cooperation that amounted to another example of the lack of voices that might have stirred Eichmann's conscience.[18]

The statistics that showed a Jew's chances of being killed through cooperation (roughly ninety-nine percent of cases) and of "trying to escape" (roughly fifty percent of cases), combined with the near totality of cooperation by Jewish leaders with their Nazi overlords, led Arendt to make a sweeping declaration:

> Wherever Jews lived, there were recognized Jewish leaders, and this leadership, almost without exception, cooperated in one way or another, for one reason or another, with the Nazis. The whole truth was that if the Jewish people had really been unorganized and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half and six million people.[19]

It was in order to avoid confronting this basic "truth" that the court in Jerusalem had deferred from asking the question of complicity of the Jewish leadership during the Holocaust.

This particular part of Arendt's book is what attracted the most vehement opposition, because it gave the impression "that the Jews themselves were responsible for their fate because … they neither availed themselves of opportunities to escape nor did they—with rare exceptions—offer resistance."[20] Against this impression, critics offered a variety of arguments defending the Jews and castigating Arendt as a textbook case of Jewish self-hatred.[21]

A common factor in nearly all the criticisms of Arendt's thesis on the Jews involved two mistaken assumptions. First, that Arendt had not mentioned that, in going to their deaths peaceably, the Jews had behaved no differently than other peoples under Nazi domination; secondly, that, by largely ignoring or dismissing resistance movements and uprisings, she had asserted the complete and total collaboration of Jews at all levels with their Nazi killers.

Thus, nearly all defenses of the Jews began with arguments against these mistaken assumptions. Most emphasized the fact that in Jewish communities there had existed pockets of resistance against the Nazis, just as in occupied France or Holland. The two examples most frequently cited were the uprising of the Warsaw ghetto in late 1943 and the efforts of Zionist organizations to rescue Jews from Europe, which some critics characterized as the "spearheads" of Jewish resistance, "selflessly" acting to ransom Jews from the Nazis.[22] Jewish victims themselves were called "martyrs" and "heroes," that they had been forced "at the point of a gun"[23] to cooperate, and that in any case they could not have known the full implication of Nazi brutality. Their sacrifice was "motivated not by cowardice but by faith,"[24] and as such Dr. Nahum Goldman, president of the World Zionist Organization, demanded that their "unparalleled suffering and tragedy" be treated with due respect.[25]

A second line of attack that many critics employed was to point out the actions of the *Einsatzgruppen* in Eastern Europe as a way to refute Arendt's claim that fewer Jews would have been killed had they been unorganized and leaderless. Essentially, the simple fact that the *Einsatzgruppen* had murdered approximately one million people, all of whom were more or less unorganized, was in itself argument enough against Arendt's claim. In addition to this, many critics pointed out that Arendt's declaration had, for all practical purposes, demanded "anarchy of the least anarchic of people,"[26] a demand so unreasonable that she might as well say that "if the Jews had not been Jews, the Nazis would not have been able to kill so many of them."[27]

Finally, Arendt herself was taken to task over her own possible prejudices and biases. She was accused of being a self-hating Jew, as was noted above, as well as being anti-Zionist or anti-Israeli, which was reflective of her assimilated Jewish-German outlook, which Israeli columnist Schlomo Grodensky called her "Jewish Prussian soul."[28] The perception of the self-hating Jew was combined with her apparently "sympathetic" characterization of Eichmann, and led some to declare that "Hannah Eichmann"[29] had written an "apologia for a notorious Nazi"[30] by "establishing to her satisfaction the guilt of the Jews and the minor role of Eichmann."[31]

It is interesting to note that while many critics of Arendt tried to discredit her in this manner, two in particular did not. Instead of accusing her of self-hatred, famed Jewish scholar Gershom Scholem and, to a lesser degree, sociologist Daniel Bell asked why she had written in such a cold and "heartless" tone when dealing

with such a sensitive topic. Scholem spoke of the Jewish concept of *Ahabath Israel*, or, "love of the Jewish people," a love that he can find "little trace of" in the flippant tone of Arendt's book.[32] Given the enormity of the tragedy, he found this a totally inappropriate way to approach an understanding of that tragedy.[33]

Bell took a similar tack, but he realized that Arendt's book had revealed a clash between points of view:

> One can see the world as a human community and man's quest as the difficult one of defining some permanently valid universal rules—either through some conception of natural law or some consensual international code. Or one can see the world as inevitably hostile and divided (from the orthodox point of view between Jews and *goyim*), in which survival is a precarious matter of toleration, bargaining, bribery or force.[34]

Bell understood that Arendt was trying to be as objective as possible by assuming "the unmoved quality of the Stoic, transcending tribe and nation, seeking only the standard of universal order," but judging from that standard alone was in his opinion "too strong a yardstick" to use in making moral judgments. [35]

Arendt had raised several difficult questions in her report on Eichmann's trial. If Eichmann is not a monster, what does that say about his crime? Can a crime be monstrous without a monster to blame for it? If the Jews and their leaders were complicit in their own demise, can they rightfully be considered "heroes" and "martyrs?" If Eichmann and other Nazis, or even ordinary Germans, were not primarily motivated by anti-Semitism, then why did they participate, actively or passively, in the murder of six million people? What does this mean to understanding morality, conscience, and the nature of good and evil?

Raising these questions was in direct opposition to the general contemporary understanding of the issues they dealt with. As Norman Podhoretz put it, Arendt's theory of totalitarianism and its application to Eichmann and the Jews

> violates everything we know about the Nature of Man, and therefore the Nature of Totalitarianism must go hang. … No person could have joined the Nazi party, let alone the S. S., who was not at the very least a *vicious* anti-Semite; to believe otherwise is to learn nothing about the nature of anti-Semitism

> ... no person of conscience could have participated knowingly in mass murder; to believe otherwise is to learn nothing about the nature of conscience … no banality of man could have done so hugely evil a job so well; to believe otherwise is to learn nothing about the nature of evil.[36]

These kinds of objections, as Bell pointed out in his illustration of the opposing viewpoints, were directly related to "the root of one's identity, and one's root conception of the world."[37]

To put it simply, the "root conception" that Arendt had challenged was that there is a specific line of demarcation between what is good and what is evil. This line is determined by Judeo-Christian moral precepts generally accepted as universal to Western Civilization; "evil" people who commit violent crimes like murder are seen in contrast to the "good" people upon whom those crimes are perpetrated, so that "evil" is viewed as an aberration of "good" society. Thus in viewing Eichmann's crime, no moral lesson could be drawn that was not immediately "obvious to a child of six:"[38] Eichmann and the Nazis were an aberration of humanity that killed millions of innocent people—what else was there to say? As one person put it, there was "an all-too-human need … to locate the source of the Nazi guilt in individual aberration,"[39] and it was Arendt's refusal to adhere to this "ethical simplicity,"[40] which resulted in a blurring of the line between the purely evil killer, the purely innocent victim, and "good" society, that upset so many people. Suddenly, it was not the individual aberration of Eichmann, Hitler, and other Nazis that had been responsible for genocide; instead, society itself had become the aberration, and Eichmann, the Jews, and nearly all of Europe during that time was operating "normally" under those aberrant conditions.

But what did the debate over Arendt's work reveal about certain collective identities most tied into perceptions of the Holocaust, namely Germans, Christians (both in Europe and America), and Jews (both in Israel and the Diaspora)? How did the debate affect them, as they were confronted with the uncomfortable task of having to account for their actions during the war?

Germans could no longer claim innocence by pretending they had been duped by the "madness of Hitler's ideology" that was wrapped in a "pretense of legality and redress of wrongs [as] a screen for criminal aims of conquest and destruction."[41] To be sure, beginning in the late 1950s West Germany was making great strides

in recognizing and dealing with its Nazi past: old Nazis were put on trial or censured (these trials accelerated with Eichmann's capture, a fact that was not lost on Arendt), history textbooks were rewritten to contain "detailed descriptions of the persecution of the Jews" and "drastic judgments on German national policy," and people who had resisted the Nazis were honored, particularly the conspirators who had attempted to assassinate Hitler on 20 July 1944.[42] This last aspect was particularly important, as Germans tried to identify themselves more closely with those who had resisted the Nazis in order to escape the image of the pliant, willing German acceding to Nazism that had come to be symbolized by Eichmann. Indeed, West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer asserted that "'only a relatively small percentage' of Germans had been Nazis, and that 'a great majority [had been] happy to help their Jewish fellow-citizens when they could.'"[43] It was important for Germans to shed this image because of Cold War politics: a West Germany that did not completely and visibly break with its Nazi roots put it at odds with other European members of NATO (many of which had been victims of Nazi occupation). In addition, it was critical to maintain the American perception of Germany as a *former* totalitarian enemy now allied with the U.S. against the *current* totalitarian enemy, the U.S.S.R.[44] International perceptions of Germans as unrepentant Nazis would result in a weakening of allied unity in the face of Soviet aggression. This was totally unacceptable given West Germany's position on the front line in the Cold War, but the irony of the situation was not lost on those who remembered that less than twenty years before, it was "Uncle Joe's" Soviet Union that had been the key ally of the West against Hitler's Germany. As one rabbi commented in ceremonies marking the twentieth anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising in New York City:

> How topsy-turvy a world this is, in which the first and foremost victims of Germany were abandoned behind a wall in Warsaw, and today the allied powers are prepared to risk the unimaginable horror of a third World War in order to guarantee the freedom of Germans in West Berlin.[45]

Clearly, in order for West Germans to continue to be seen as worthy of this protection, they needed to do three things: first, they needed to separate themselves from their Nazi past as much as possible; second, where they could not achieve adequate separation, they needed to be honest about it and, however practical, to make

amends; lastly, in both cases, they needed to be seen doing it. Arendt's work undermined these efforts not only by asserting that Eichmann was more a "typical German" than a "typical Nazi," but also by sharply criticizing Bonn's reluctance to prosecute known war criminals prior to 1958 and the "fantastically lenient" sentences given to those who were eventually tried and convicted.[46]

Germans were not the only ones trying to avoid being associated with Eichmann. During the trial, the Israeli characterization of the Nazi genocide as the latest chapter in 4000 years of anti-Semitism, drawing a direct line from Exodus's Pharaoh to the Crusades to Hitler, put Christianity on the defensive as well. The uncomfortable reminder of Christianity's historical anti-Semitism was exacerbated by Arendt and a young German playwright named Rolf Hochhuth. In her book, Arendt had criticized the testimony at Eichmann's trial of prominent Protestant minister Heinrich Grüber, who had tried to help Jews and had had several meetings with Eichmann during the war; Grüber was forced to admit that he had never once tried to convince Eichmann that what he was doing was immoral, and Arendt showed that his negotiations with Eichmann on behalf of Jews were for exceptions to the policy of extermination, as opposed to arguing against the policy itself.[47] Similarly, Hochhuth's *The Vicar*, released on Broadway in 1964, boldly accused the wartime Catholic Pope Pius XII of indifference to Jewish suffering by failing to publicly the denounce the "Final Solution."

Prior to Eichmann's trial, Jewish suffering in World War II was seen, by and large, as simply one part of the terrible whole of Nazi brutality.[48] The trial would recast the Nazi genocide in strictly Jewish terms: Jews were no longer simply among the victims of Nazi genocide, they were its primary victims. Jews in Israel and abroad benefited from the moral high ground their status as innocent victims had granted them.[49] What happened to the Jews in Europe was used during the trial as a sort of moral cudgel to beat the rest of humanity into shame. In the words of Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion and his Mapai party, Eichmann's trial held a special "lesson" for the rest of the world:

> Let world opinion know this, that not only Nazi Germany was responsible for the destruction of six million Jews of Europe … we want the nations of the world to know … and they should be ashamed.[50]

This sentiment was echoed in America as well. According to New York Rabbi Dr. Robert L. Lehman, "shame must be ascribed

to others, for it was their untenable silence … that permitted the wholesale destruction of our people."[51] This shame was turned into political capital for Israel, which received money, arms, and diplomatic support from West Germany and the Allied powers in its struggle for existence.

Jews also benefited from the decline in anti-Semitic feeling in Europe and America resulting from notions of guilt over the genocide, as Arendt observed:

> Anti-Semitism has been discredited, thanks to Hitler, perhaps not forever but certainly for the time being, and this not because Jews have become more popular all of a sudden but because, in Mr. Ben-Gurion's own words, most people have "realized that in our day the gas chamber and the soap factory are what anti-Semitism may lead to."[52]

But in showcasing Jewish "guilt" and criticizing the recasting of the Nazi genocide from the general definition "crimes against humanity" to the much more specific "crimes against the Jewish people," Arendt's work threatened to erase this moral advantage. An Anti-Defamation League memo feared that "anti-Semites will point to this Arendt document as evidence that Jews were no less guilty than others for what happened to six million of their co-religionists."[53] A committee of the National Community Relations Advisory Council examining Arendt's work believed that it would provide "a ready 'out' for those Christians who have never faced up to their full responsibilities in permitting the Nazi holocaust to go unchallenged until it was too late."[54]

Pride was also on the line for both Israelis and dispersed Jews, but in different ways. Much as the Germans and Christians did not wish to be identified with Nazi evil, both Israeli and Dispersed Jews did not wish to be identified as weak or helpless victims (much less active collaborators in their own doom), and so a "myth of widespread Jewish resistance … had been assiduously promoted since the end of the war" that emphasized Jewish "heroism" in resistance movements like the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto.[55] The key difference is that Zionists equated the "heroism" of Warsaw with their own fight in Palestine, contrasting it with the "submissive meekness" of those in the Diaspora who went to their deaths without a fight as a way to promote Israel as the only real protection for Jews in a hostile world.[56] The threat that Arendt posed was her suggestion that Zionists "were not interested in

rescue operations" but rather in selecting "suitable material" for a future Jewish state (she did specify that this was the attitude in efforts "prior to the extermination program," but most critics took her to mean all Zionist efforts throughout the war years to save European Jewry).[57]

Dispersed Jews, unhappy with the Zionist labels of helplessness and weakness but unwilling to give up the moral advantages of victim-hood, also highlighted the Warsaw uprising, and the vast multitudes that had not resisted were re-characterized as "martyrs" as a "rebuttal" to perceptions that they were "like sheep going to slaughter."[58] This was reflected during the controversy, as the majority of pieces written, both for and against Arendt, used the term "martyrs" or "heroes" when referring to Jews killed by the Nazis. As Gershom Scholem put it, "the heroism of the Jews was not always the heroism of the warrior; nor have we always been ashamed of that fact."[59] Arendt undermined this as well in showing the collaboration of Jewish leadership with the Nazis and the very minimal role of resistance efforts.

Finally, the controversy over differing perceptions of the Holocaust can be boiled down to the human need to understand things in simplistic terms. It is easier to understand Eichmann if he's seen simply as a monster and not the banal "everyman" shaped by the complexities of totalitarianism; it is easier to understand the Jews as innocent, heroic victims and not degraded non-entities obediently going to the gas chambers; it is easier to understand ourselves if the concepts that we have been raised to believe, upon which we base the identities we inhabit and the judgments of ourselves and others, are simple and not complex.

Complex ideas are, by default, hard to understand, and human beings generally react with fear and anger to that which they cannot understand. The degree of fear and anger increases with the importance of the idea as it relates to human endeavor.

For example, the "Black Sox" scandal of 1919, in which the Chicago White Sox threw the World Series, has a simple explanation, which says that it was simply the selfishness of eight greedy players, and a complex one that takes into account other factors such as the exploitation of players by owners and gambling bookies, who among the players actually tried to lose and who did not, and so on. At stake in this example is the reputation of the White Sox, both yesterday and today, and whether or not "Shoeless" Joe Jackson is allowed into the Hall of Fame—hardly something to get too worked up over (especially if you're a Cubs fan!). Perceptions of

the Holocaust, on the other hand, influence the policies of many different nations, affecting the lives of millions worldwide, and it is invoked by Jews and Gentiles alike in a variety of ways for a variety of purposes, most notably as a justification for continued support of Israel, something that was just starting in the 1960s but has since become ingrained in the consciousness of Western Civilization today. Because the Holocaust has such a profound influence on how people think of themselves and others—how they treat themselves and others—it is not difficult to see why any challenge to popular, simplistic perceptions of it are met with indignation and outrage. Indeed, it was the sheer magnitude of emotional feeling that contributed to the many instances of distortion and misrepresentation that are ubiquitous throughout the controversy. As Arendt herself said, there are certain groups with "down-to-earth interests … whose excitement is entirely concerned with factual matters and who therefore try to distort the facts."[60] Anger and fear can cause us to misunderstand what is really being said, to see malice where none exists. It is self-perpetuating, as accusations of ignorance, bad-faith, or outright hate are flung back and forth with little or no consideration of their authenticity, to the point that the issue that started the controversy is swallowed up by the fury of the controversy itself.

Hannah Arendt's greatest sin was to show the complexities and ambiguities of the Nazi genocide in order to achieve a better understanding of it and, by extension, ourselves. Such an understanding requires of us patience and an admission that Eichmann's aberration was not limited to just himself, or just Nazis, or just Germans, or just Christians, but was in fact *unlimited*—evil does not require malevolent intent, only indifference, something that is all too common in every human being. As Ernest van den Haag said in his review of her work:

> We all would like the world to be simple and safe; it is neither. Books can spuriously simplify our image of it, and reassure us, by helping us not to see it plain. Miss Arendt refuses to cooperate; which makes her book controversial. … Life would be simpler if only monsters committed monstrous acts; and much safer: there are, after all, a few monsters around—by definition. The trouble is that Eichmann was a rather ordinary man. There are lots of ordinary men around and, given the circumstances, they would have acted

> as Eichmann did. … We are not safe at all. Our only hope—feeble as it is—rests on understanding what happened, what can happen to ordinary men, what can be done by them, and under what circumstances it is likely to occur. Miss Arendt has made a major contribution to this understanding.[61]

Indeed she did make a major contribution to understanding the Holocaust, but this does not necessarily mean she was right in all her arguments, nor was she wholly objective in her conclusions. She went to Jerusalem looking for evidence to support her theory on totalitarianism, and Eichmann seemed to her to be the perfect embodiment of what she was seeking: the totalitarian "everyman." Also, while perceptions of Eichmann as merely sadistic are too simplistic, so too is her perception of him as merely banal.

Recent scholarship has shown that Eichmann was not nearly as banal as Arendt thought. David Cesarani, in a recent biography of Eichmann, shows that he was not a social outcast, and was far more intelligent and clever than Arendt had supposed him to be, and not merely the dutiful automaton blindly following orders.[62] But insofar as Eichmann began as a normal person and was "made" into a *génocidaire* (a French term coined from Rwanda to refer to a person implicated in genocide[63]) Cesarani agrees with Arendt, just not with her description of a totalitarian system that destroyed Eichmann's personality. Rather, according to him the chaos of political maneuvering and infighting between agencies and individual egos within the Nazi government led to the ever-increasing radicalization of policy that eventually culminated in the destruction of entire peoples. It was, essentially, a slippery slope that moved inexorably toward increasing brutality: when it is acceptable to curse a Jew, it is easier to spit on him; when it is acceptable to spit on him, it is easier to beat him; when it is acceptable to beat him, it is easier to murder him.

Ultimately, considerations of who has the right perceptions of the Holocaust and who has the wrong ones must be put aside in order to understand the real lesson of Hannah Arendt: that despite the supposed enlightenment of modernity in which we glorify ourselves for being so tolerant and rational, we are so consumed by the petty, parochial self-interests by which we define our distinctive identities that, whenever those interests appear threatened, we are capable of being neither tolerant nor rational. Instead, we delude ourselves in every way possible in order to maintain our illusions of

enlightened superiority and moral purity. The only way we can ever begin to understand ourselves and the complex issues that define our times is to admit and accept that the past is not sacrosanct, that those who came before were no less imperfect than we are today.

Notes

1 Bruno Bettelheim, "Eichmann; the System; the Victims," *The New Republic*, 15 June 1963, 24.

2 Quoted in Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (New York: Penguin Books, 1994), 8.

3 Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, (New York: Penguin Books, 1994), 25-7, 41-2, 46-9, 51-5, 135-8, 148-9, 276-7, 287-88.

4 Retrieved from the Nizkor Project, "The Trial of Adolf Eichmann," Appeal Session 7, Record of Proceedings in the Supreme Court of Israel, 1961. http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/people/e/eichmann-adolf/transcripts/Appeal/Appeal-Session-07-01.html

5 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 209-19.

6 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 125-31, 294-5.

7 Lionel Abel, "The Aesthetics of Evil," *Partisan Review* 30 (Summer 1963): 221.

8 Norman Podhoretz, "Hannah Arendt on Eichmann," *Commentary* 36 (September 1963): 206. Italics are his.

9 Marie Syrkin, "Miss Arendt Surveys the Holocaust," *Jewish Frontier* 30 (May 1963): 10.

10 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 86-90.

11 Michael A. Musmanno, "Man with an Unspotted Conscience," *The New York Times Book Review*, 19 May 1963.

12 Podhoretz, 207.

13 Abel, 222.

14 Podhoretz, 207.

15 Marie Syrkin, "Clothes of the Empress," *Dissent* 10 (Autumn 1963): 347.

16 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 11-12, 115-26, 283-4.

17 Hannah Arendt, "'Eichmann in Jerusalem:' An Exchange of Letters between Gershom Scholem and Hannah Arendt." *Encounter* (London) 22 (January 1964): 55. The letter itself is dated 24 July 1963. Italics are hers.

18 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 115-26, 131-3.

19 Ibid., 124-125.

20 Ernest S. Pisko, "Afterword on Eichmann," *Christian Science Monitor*, 23 May 1963.

21 Several critics, most notably Marie Syrkin and Norman Podhoretz, raised this issue, and Dwight MacDonald, defending Arendt in *Partisan Review* 31 (Spring, 1964): 262, cited the 12 April 1963 headline of the *Intermountain Jewish News* which read "Self-Hating Jewess Writes Pro-Eichmann Series." I was not able to find a copy of that article.

22 Syrkin, *Jewish Frontier*, 9.

23 John Gross, "Arendt on Eichmann," *Encounter* (London) 21 (November 1963): 68.

24 The Rev. Dr. William Berkowitz, quoted in "Rabbis Eulogize Warsaw Heroes," *New York Times*, 21 April 1963.

25 Dr. Nahum Goldman, quoted in "Hausner Criticizes Book on Eichmann," *New York Times*, 20 May 1963.

26 "'Eichmann in Jerusalem'—Can One Know the 'Whole' Truth?" *Newsweek*, 17 June 1963, 94-5.

27 Podhoretz, 205.

28 Quoted in *Newsweek*, 94 (original source not cited). See also: Syrkin, *Jewish Frontier*, 14.

29 Mary McCarthy, "The Hue and Cry," *Partisan Review* 31 (Winter 1964): 82. Quote attributed to the wife of an unnamed Israeli official.

30 Hugh Trevor-Roper, "How Innocent Was Eichmann?" *The Sunday Times* (London), 13 October 1963.

31 Syrkin, *Jewish Frontier*, 13.

32 Gershom Scholem, "'Eichmann in Jerusalem': An Exchange of Letters between Gershom Scholem and Hannah Arendt." *Encounter* (London) 22 (January 1964): 51. The letter itself is dated 23 June 1963.

33 Ibid., 52.

34 Daniel Bell, "The Alphabet of Justice," *Partisan Review* 30 (Fall 1963): 417-18.

35 Ibid., 418, 428.

36 Podhoretz, 206. Italics are his.

37 Bell, 417.

38 Gross, 74.

39 Robert Griffin, Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 23 June 1963.

40 *Newsweek*, 95.

41 Constantine Fitzgibbon, "Again the Issue of German Guilt," *New York Times*, 18 August 1963.

42 Fitzgibbon.

43 Quoted in Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 18.

44 Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life*, (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 88.

45 The Rev. Dr. Israel Margolies, quoted in "Rabbis Eulogize Warsaw Heroes," *New York Times*, 21 April 1963.

46 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 14-17.

47 Ibid., 129-31.

48 Novick, 65.

49 Ibid., 141.

50 Quoted in Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 9-10.

51 The Rev. Dr. Robert L. Lehman, quoted in "Rabbis Eulogize Warsaw Heroes," *New York Times*, 21 April 1963.

52 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 10.

53 Arnold Forster to ADL Regional Offices, 11 March 1963, *NCRAC Papers*, Box 67. Quoted in Novick, 141.

54 Minutes of NCRAC special committee meeting, 23 April 1963, ADL microfilms, "-1974," Eichmann. Quoted in Novick, 141.

55 Novick, 138.

56 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 10.

57 Ibid., 61.

58 Henry Kamm, "Jews' Resistance to Nazis Depicted," *New York Times*, 7 February 1965.

59 Scholem, 52.

60 Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 285.

61 Ernest van den Haag, "Crimes Against Humanity," *National Review*, 27 August 1963.

62 David Cesarani, *Becoming Eichmann* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Da Capo Press, 2006).

63 Ibid., 357.

Nathan J. Brouwer

Roots of Resentment: Segregation, Housing, And the Chicago Freedom Movement of 1966

> In the south they don't care how close you are just so long as you don't get too big; in the north they don't care how big you are so long as you don't come close.
>
> —Dick Gregory

In 1966 Martin Luther King, Jr. and others prominent in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) began another dimension of the civil rights movement. After a stream of successes in the South, including Birmingham, Selma and others, they had ambitions of obtaining similar victories in the North.[1] Forging an alliance with local civil rights groups in Chicago to form the Chicago Freedom Movement, they attempted to achieve a cooperative relationship with city officials to change rigid segregation in the housing of African Americans. This degree of segregation had resulted in the formation and maintenance of vast ghettos, which contributed to Chicago's designation as the country's most segregated city by a 1959 Civil Rights Commission.[2] Unfortunately, by the time King and the rest of SCLC left Chicago they had been defeated. Government complicity in maintaining segregation beginning in the post World War II period and continuing through 1966 was one of the main causes of the defeat of the Chicago Freedom Movement. During this time, the administration of urban renewal and public housing, government policies meant to help poor inner-city residents, further increased segregation. Moreover, the failure of these policies documents the limits of liberal reforms during the period and provides insight into the resentment felt by many African Americans.

Understanding the nature of the segregation in Chicago prevalent in 1966 requires addressing its origins. The period that is traditionally viewed as the first stage of the black ghetto in Chicago spans from 1890-1920.[3] It was during this time that the "Black Belt" was formed, the area on the South Side that became the city's first

black ghetto. At the time people were restricted from moving out of the ghetto by threats of violence. This was an important time period because it set the precedent of restricting the areas where African Americans could live. The second period in the formation of Chicago's ghetto began in the period directly after the end of World War I, which is characterized by the mass migration of African Americans to the north, often referred to as the "Great Migration." This period is influential in the history of housing in Chicago because the areas that these migrants came to were not large enough to hold the old and new residents. Therefore, the ghetto underwent a period of intense overcrowding. The residents were forced to inhabit these overcrowded areas because of restrictions placed on them by the widespread use of restrictive covenants. Restrictive covenants were privately held agreements among neighbors establishing judicial punishment for selling one's home to a black person.[4] Restrictive covenants began to lose support of the local judges by the mid-1940s. They were forever ended when a Supreme Court decision, *Shelley v. Kraemer*, ruled them unconstitutional in 1948.[5]

This ruling brought the city to a crossroads in race relations, and began the period of African American housing policy that is of direct relevance to the Civil Rights movement in 1966. The end of restrictions opened up the possibility of widespread integration in Chicago. African Americans were now free to leave the confines of the ghetto, and the overcrowding of the previous twenty-five years meant that there were large numbers of African Americans to fill the voids in all-white neighborhoods. Therefore, a mass integration could have taken place. Coupled with the legislation for slum clearance included in the Housing Act of 1949, Chicago could have made significant progress in eliminating segregation and, subsequently, improved race relations in the city. The Housing Act of 1949 provided federal funds for carrying out slum clearance, which was the destruction of blighted areas, and urban renewal, which was the rebuilding of these slum areas. These liberal policies not only meant to eliminate areas of extreme deterioration in many urban centers, they also provided the opportunity to institute change in the nation's cities for the benefit of the poor. According to the *Chicago Defender*, described by Arnold Hirsch as the "institutionalized voice of the city's African-American community," the promise of a "'decent home and suitable living environment for every American family' written into the Housing Act of 1949 as national policy should give every good American a sense of deep and abiding satisfaction."[6] Hirsch further asserts that

inhabitants of the ghetto "breathed a sigh of relief" upon hearing of the city's urban renewal campaign.[7] Residents were hopeful that the program would provide relief from the housing shortage and overcrowding in the black ghetto. However, their hope and excitement were misplaced, and their support for urban renewal enabled, in part, the implementation of the legislation without dissent on their part.[8]

Although many of the inhabitants of Chicago's ghetto supported the program, suspicion began when some officials on the federal level feared misuse of the policy. Controversy surrounding the bill began even before the bill's passage, when federal officials within the Racial Relations Service (RRS), a federal agency set up to address racial implications and "minority group problems … in the field of housing," realized that the bill was void of a racial policy.[9] Officials in the RRS realized that this absence offered local governments an ideal opportunity to implement further segregation under the supervision of the federal government and, furthermore, with federal funds. One RRS official, George Nesbitt, forecasted that the absence of a racial policy in the bill would lead to displaced citizens, increased segregation, and anger and resentment. Nesbitt and others in the RRS urged the inclusion of a racial policy in the bill. However, the bill was passed without regulation regarding the issue of race because liberal policymakers knew inclusion of racial regulations made passage less likely.[10]

Despite these warnings from the RRS, and a Public Affairs committee that further warned that "Chicago is getting ready to build 'ghettos' under the 1949 Housing Act," the city began its urban renewal campaign.[11] The first urban renewal project in the city was a project known as Lake Meadows, the brainchild of extremely powerful businessmen in Chicago, including the vice president of Marshall Field Company. The project's aim was to provide a buffer zone between the business sector of the city and the encroaching South Side ghetto, the "Black Belt."[12] The project had immediate effects on the African-American population in the area, resulting in the elimination of "100 acres of slums" that were replaced by "a middle-class complex of 2,000 units of housing."[13] However, the most shocking aspect of the project is that there were 3,416 units of housing before the slum clearance took place. Therefore, in the middle of a severe housing shortage, the city actually lost housing units. Furthermore, the rent being charged in the area was now three times what it had been prior to the project. Therefore, none of the previous residents of the area benefited from the renewal,

because they were unable to afford the rent increases.[14] Roger Biles, a scholar on the ties between race and housing in Chicago, concluded that "rather than aiding the poor, this urban renewal project merely moved them to other, less visible areas and increased congestion where they eventually settled."[15] Furthermore, according to Hirsch, of the 3,600 families that were displaced by the Lake Meadows project, 2,700 "had to find accommodations in the private market during a time of desperate shortage."[16] The remaining 900 were forced into Chicago's deplorable public housing system, discussed below. These effects of urban renewal attracted the attention of some officials in the federal government.[17]

As a result of the Lake Meadows project, Chicago found itself in the middle of a controversy that eventually determined the way urban renewal was implemented across the country. George Nesbitt, one of the RRS officials who initially advocated a racial policy to prevent misuse of the renewal program, went to the city in 1950 to see the progress, or lack thereof, of the Lake Meadows project. He left the city feeling that the city's renewal effort was "too heavily a slum clearance program" that generated "a near insurmountable relocation problem," according to Hirsch.[18] Furthermore, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) added that the renewal program was "improper and vicious in that they [Chicago officials] seek to maintain and impose a ghetto pattern of segregation."[19] As a result of his findings, Nesbitt decided to recommend revoking federal funding of urban renewal projects in Chicago until there was a more suitable plan to deal with the displaced. When several of Nesbitt's superiors in the RRS agreed with him, the federal government contacted the city, threatening to withhold the funding of the projects in question. The crucial outcome of this debate is described in an article by Hirsch:

> Despite the apparent momentum, however, implacable white resistance at the grassroots level united the local political establishment (joining together the "machine-dominated city council and the reform mayor, Martin H. Kennelly) and presented Foley [Nesbitt's boss] with the unpalatable choice of supporting a program acceptable to the local segregationists or having no program at all in the Democratic stronghold of Chicago.[20]

At considerable detriment to many African Americans in the future, the federal government promptly conceded defeat to the

local opposition's ultimatum and effectively granted Chicago officials the power to dictate how urban renewal was carried out, despite obvious segregation.[21]

The actions of the federal government in the wake of the Lake Meadows project "sealed a deal that spoke volumes on the federal government's inability (and ultimate unwillingness) to impose an unwanted racial policy on recalcitrant localities," according to Hirsch.[22] Basically, the inaction provided local authorities in Chicago and elsewhere with the power to carry out the liberal policy of urban renewal as an instrument of segregation. The city of Chicago, due in large part to the inaction of federal officials, continued its urban renewal program despite the warnings that it was resulting in deeper segregation.

Urban renewal in Hyde Park, a neighborhood bordering the South side ghetto, was another example of how the program, which promised to provide relief for the poor, resulted in increased segregation. The Hyde Park neighborhood was home to the University of Chicago. Prior to 1948, when restrictive covenants were ruled unconstitutional, the university was one of the chief proponents and enactors of restrictive covenants.[23] These covenants served to keep African Americans out of Hyde Park. However, it also led to the piling up of poor black people in the overcrowded ghetto north of Hyde Park, and when restrictive covenants were struck down many moved into the neighborhood. The movement of large numbers of African Americans into the Hyde Park neighborhood upset many white residents, including the president of the University of Chicago, Lawrence Kimpton, a powerful member of the community. Kimpton advocated, as documented in *American Pharaoh*, that implementing urban renewal in the area would serve as "an effective screening tool" in "cutting down [the] number of Negroes."[24] The urban renewal program in Hyde Park drew objections from groups such as the NAACP and the Catholic Archdiocese.[25] The NAACP expressed concerns that the city was using urban renewal to promote segregation. However, despite these objections the urban renewal of Hyde Park was carried out.[26] The result was that "the poor, black residents who had found their way to Hyde Park, one of the city's few integrated neighborhoods, were once again pushed back into the ghetto."[27] However, this was not the end of urban renewal in the area.

Chicago received more funding for urban renewal in 1959.[28] Subsequently, urban renewal continued well into the 1960s, despite objections. Hyde Park again received part of the funding for the

urban renewal despite persistent warnings. According to the *Chicago Defender*, the site of the renewal represented "the northern boundary between the Hyde Park-Kenwood urban renewal area and the Negro ghetto," and "will be an integration barrier."[29] However, in the end the project continued. In the same period, urban renewal was carried out in Englewood, another neighborhood on the South Side. Martin Luther King, in 1966, protested the urban renewal project in Englewood. The protest stemmed from the fact that the project replaced "600 Negro homes" with a shopping center.[30] It had become clear that urban renewal had, according to the *Defender*, resulted in "Negro removal."[31]

Urban renewal was not the only liberal program intended to help poor residents that perpetuated further segregation in Chicago in the period leading up to King's visit. Public housing also began with favorable promises for the poor African-American population of Chicago. The housing program, on a national level, was first instituted as part of the New Deal, under President Franklin Roosevelt. It was provided for in the United States Housing Act of 1938.[32] The initiation of the program in Chicago showed promise when the mayor at the time, Edward Kelly, appointed Elizabeth Wood to be the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) director. Wood was an advocate of integration, and she attempted to use her post as director to carry out the integration of the public housing system. However, the Neighborhood Composition Rule, instituted by the Interior Secretary Harold Ickes, made this impossible. The Rule stated that the racial makeup of public housing projects had to match the racial makeup of the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, in Chicago it proved difficult to implement integration because the high degree of segregation already in the city meant that the housing projects would have to be segregated along racial lines. When the Neighborhood Composition Rule was ended in Chicago in 1946, a more volatile, and lasting, means of preventing integration surfaced.[33]

When integration of existing CHA projects was attempted after the end of enforcement of the Neighborhood Composition Rule, it was met with widespread violence. In November of 1946 Wood and the CHA attempted to move a few black families into the public housing project at the Airport Homes, located in an all-white area. Opponents of the integration rioted outside the project, effectively derailing the planned integration.[34] The CHA's next attempt made national news because of the ferocity of the opposition. Trumbull Park was another public housing project in the heart of a white

community; however, the violence surrounding the integration of the Trumbull Park Homes was anything but typical. The CHA attempted to move in African-American families beginning in 1953. The lack of immediate unrest is testament to the ignorance of the opponents of integration. It was almost two weeks and after several encounters with Betty Howard, a light-skinned African American, that the opponents realized the Howards "might be Negroes" and began rioting.[35] The violence surrounding Trumbull Park lasted for years. It succeeded in concluding attempts to integrate public housing. [36]

The violence also profoundly affected the future of public housing. First of all, Elizabeth Wood, the most powerful advocate of integration in the city, was fired in response to her challenge of segregation. Secondly, grassroots community groups resistant to integration changed public housing policy in Chicago. Powerful groups such as the State Street Council, Chicago Real Estate Board, and the Civic Federation of Chicago pressured city officials to abandon ideas of integration.[37] The result was the passage of a bill requiring city council approval for all housing sites, taking the power away from the CHA. Subsequently, the city council, avoiding backlash that would have resulted in the loss of votes, began the precedent of placing virtually all public housing in African-American parts of the city. For instance, the first proposals requiring council approval resulted in the refusal of all sites in white areas and the passage of all sites in black areas.[38]

In 1955, Richard Daley was elected the mayor of Chicago. Daley was extremely powerful, presiding over the city for the next twenty-one years. After his election he "wasted no time in displaying his resolve to control the city council," according to Roger Biles, which he did by mandating that almost every political decision pass over his desk.[39] As evidence of this quest for control, Biles explains, "the mayor had his rostrum in the city council chambers fitted with a device that could silence the microphone of any alderman who spoke too long or who posited unacceptable ideas." The result of the transfer of power was that members of the city council "rubber-stamped everything that Daley approved."[40] As evidenced by his autocratic rule, Daley's power drastically influenced public housing after 1955.

Daley's first move regarding the issue, shortly after his election, was to approve the construction sites of housing projects in areas that were already extremely segregated. The location of these sites document the failures of the Chicago public housing system. Of

these projects the Henry Horner Homes were to be in an area of ninety-nine percent black occupancy; the Stateway Gardens were in an area of ninety-eight percent black occupancy; Brooks Homes were to be in an area of ninety-eight percent black occupancy. Shortly after these were approved Daley decided to add more housing projects in the middle of the Black Belt. These were the Washington Park Homes, and another 736 units were added to the Henry Horner Homes. A year later, the Robert Taylor Homes and the Clarence Darrow Homes were approved, again in the middle of the ghetto.[41]

The Robert Taylor Homes, completed in 1962, are a striking example of the failures of public housing in Chicago. The largest housing project in the world, they were lined along a two-mile stretch of State Street, bounded by the ghetto on one side, and the Dan Ryan Expressway on the other. The Dan Ryan had been built in 1957 resulting in a fourteen-lane barrier between white areas of the city and the Black Belt. Furthermore, the high-rise architecture in the Taylor Homes, similar to that of projects previously mentioned, ushered in a whole different set of problems. Concrete floors, the impersonal feel of the "cold sterile" projects, and the difficulty in policing, were all characteristic of the problems of high-rise public housing. As stated in *American Pharaoh*, "the CHA spent years on the engineering but gave little thought to the human problems that would come from concentrating thousands of impoverished families in such an unnatural environment."[42] According to the *Chicago Defender*, the high-rise architecture was carried out despite warnings from many people and organizations, including the city's own Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council.[43] Furthermore, the fact that 20,000 of the 28,000 people who lived in the Taylor Homes were under 21 should have raised concerns regarding the effects of high-rise public housing. In addition, the CHA cancelled the program of requiring background checks of applicants. The combination of all of these factors made it almost impossible to establish a sense of community in public housing projects. "Crime, juvenile delinquency, vandalism, and other problems," ensued almost immediately in the high-rises, according to Biles.[44]

There were several benefits for the city's Democratic machine in segregating public housing. The program brought huge amounts of federal funds into the city, which created jobs for labor, helping the city's economy. Furthermore, placing the projects in the ghetto ensured that there would be no white backlash, which resulted in quick approval. Public housing also "locked black voters into the

traditional black wards where the submachine could keep them voting the straight ticket," according to Biles.[45] Basically, Chicago officials were benefiting from the detriment of others. [46]

Urban renewal and public housing were not the only factors that led to segregation. Private factors also further exacerbated the segregation. After restrictive covenants were outlawed many black people sought escape from the ghetto by moving to white areas of the city. However, real estate offices refused to sell to black people in outlying white areas. Realtors sold homes on the ghetto boundaries, block by block. They further exacerbated things by carrying out block-busting. Block-busting was the realtor practice of striking fear into white homeowners by forecasting a large influx of black people into their neighborhoods, and then offering the homeowners a chance to get out of the neighborhood by selling their property. Realtors bought the property from these people at a fraction of what it was worth and then turned around and advertised the homes to African Americans at highly inflated prices. A 1963 study by the Urban League found that African Americans in Chicago were "paying 75 million dollars a year in excess rentals," according to the *Chicago Tribune*."[47] Block-busting also added to the intensity of "white flight" from the city. "White flight" was the mass movement of people, almost all white, to the suburbs. Many moved to escape the fears of integration, which were amplified by block-busting. Combined with urban renewal and public housing, real estate practices and the effects of "white flight" led to an inescapable ghetto for the majority of the city's black citizens by the mid-1960s.[48]

The inescapable ghetto prevalent in Chicago created the ideal opportunity for the modern Civil Rights movement to draw attention to the chronic inequalities in the North. The presence of the ghetto symbolized the underlying issue of the injustice faced by African Americans. Martin Luther King, Jr. and others in the SCLC chose Chicago because of the obvious segregation in the city, publicized in 1959 as the "most segregated city in the country," a designation reiterated in 1963 by the Civil Rights Commission.[49] At the same time, the autocratic rule of Mayor Daley represented a possibility of instituting change by persuading only one person. SCLC leaders were even more optimistic because of the victories in Birmingham and Selma. Furthermore, King had personal connections to Chicago. In 1964, he had given a speech at Soldier Field, which 75,000 "cheering admirers" had attended. He concluded that "very seldom, if ever, have I had a more inspiring afternoon."[50] He also

viewed the cooperation between the SCLC and the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations (CCCO) to form the Chicago Freedom Movement as an extremely important development. He viewed the CCCO as the strongest Civil Rights organization in the North. Finally, James Bevel, an adept organizer in the SCLC, had already moved to Chicago to begin campaigning. King, and the SCLC, hoped that all of these factors would contribute to another successful campaign.[51]

However, in 1966, there were also divisions within the Civil Rights movement. Militancy was becoming popular, surfacing in large part in the rallying cry of "Black Power." For instance, in July of 1966, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) had "unanimously adopted a resolution calling for an end to non-violence in the civil rights movement."[52] Similarly, Stokely Carmichael, the powerful chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), had also become an advocate of "Black Power." Martin Luther King, Jr., however, remained a staunch advocate of non-violence, as evidenced by his rhetoric:

> I do not see the answer to our problems in violence. Our movement's adherence to nonviolence has been a major factor in the creation of a moral climate that has made progress possible. The climate may well be dissipated not only by acts of violence but by the threats of it verbalized by those who equate it with militancy.[53]

These differences in ideology not only represented a threat to the success of King and the SCLC because of people converting to "Black Power," but also because CORE and SNCC had been key allies of the SCLC in previous years.[54]

The Chicago Freedom Movement began in January of 1966 when King made three visits to the city. In the first two King met with CCCO officials to "outline a cooperative assault on the city's entrenched residential segregation patterns."[55] On the third visit he decided to draw attention to living conditions by renting an apartment in the middle of the West Side ghetto, an area with especially deplorable conditions. However, by the time he returned from a trip to Georgia the apartment had been renovated. This sort of action characterized the undermining actions of the Chicago government in response to the movement. Aware of the fact that the movement was drawing national attention they tried to make token renovations to show that they were indeed trying to fix housing problems. However, in

reality these token improvements had no substance regarding any long-term solution to the problems.[56]

In March, at his first meeting with Daley, King attempted to negotiate with Daley. The mayor refused to promise any lasting change in segregation, housing policy, or the conditions of ghetto housing. Daley recited the token gains that the city had made to address demands made by the Chicago Freedom Movement. King left the meeting disappointed. The movement began focusing its energy on planning marches, and getting ready for a rally at Soldier Field.[57]

The rally at Soldier Field took place on 10 July 1966. Projected to draw 100,000 people, only 30,000 actually showed up. The Soldier Field rally had failed to live up to expectations, and signified the beginning of major problems for the Chicago Freedom Movement. Despite the disappointing attendance, King ridiculed the living conditions in Northern ghettos and used the opportunity to repudiate the growing militancy in the Civil Rights movement. After the rally King and his supporters marched to City Hall, where he taped a list of the demands onto the door; the "primary target" was housing discrimination.[58]

A tide of disappointment surrounded the movement after the rally. There were many reasons that may explain the lackluster attendance. First, African Americans in the Daley power structure, like Congressman William Dawson, who was powerful in Chicago's black neighborhoods, had denounced the Freedom Movement. Second, Reverend Joseph Jackson, an influential minister in Chicago, had also come out publicly against King and the Chicago Freedom Movement. Furthermore, the day of the rally was extremely hot, with temperatures reaching ninety-eight degrees. However, it is probable that the divide occurring between Civil Rights groups and the apathy of residents who had lived in segregated communities their whole lives played larger roles than the other influences.[59]

The Soldier Field rally represented a turning point in the movement. The movement was clearly unraveling when two days after the rally a riot broke out on the West Side of the city. The riot began when city officials turned off fire hydrants in which African-American children were playing. This was enough to set off people who had "lived in this desperate climate for so long" they could not take it anymore, according to Ralph Abernathy.[60] The riot became increasingly large and violent. King tried calming the rioters in an effort to stop the situation; however, according to Abernathy, "he had encountered for the first time a crowd of blacks that he

could neither reason with nor overpower with his rhetoric."[61] On 15 July, Mayor Daley requested the deployment of the National Guard. Shockingly, Mayor Daley blamed the "outsiders," hinting at King, for the riot.[62] King countered that "ghetto misery" caused the riot.[63]

After the riots were finally quelled the Chicago Freedom Movement set out to change tactics. It was decided to plan several marches through white areas of the city, a tactic that had succeeded in the South, in part, by drawing national press coverage and, in turn, putting pressure on the federal government to take action. The marches led to more violence. Whites lined the streets pelting marchers with rocks, bottles, and insults. According to Ralph Abernathy, the violence exhibited during these marches was worse than anywhere in the South. [64] After a number of these marches, it was decided to have a summit meeting with Mayor Daley again to attempt to come up with a solution to the racial problems plaguing the city.[65]

Officials in the Chicago Freedom Movement and the city of Chicago met on 26 August 1966. Daley wanted an assurance that the marches would stop. King, in response, outlined nine demands the movement had, which included an open-housing policy in the city, a demand "that the Chicago Housing Authority stop building all public housing projects in slums," and "those responsible for urban renewal in Chicago stop discriminating against black neighborhoods."[66] In the end leaders at the summit agreed to the conditions; however, it quickly became obvious that there would be no enforcement. Token changes carried out by government officials continued, feigning real progress and masking the reality of the sordid, segregated, and deplorable housing conditions in the ghetto. That fall, after achieving few meaningful concessions, King and his staff left the city dejected and defeated.[67] The profound disappointment deeply affected King because he felt "for the first time that the majority of America's whites rejected his message of integration and brotherly love."[68]

The Chicago Freedom Movement failed for many reasons. Mayor Daley was an extremely powerful mayor, and his refusal to lend his sincere effort to change conditions was a significant factor. Furthermore, the divide between the growing militancy and non-violence created a rift between factions of the Civil Rights groups. Moreover, the fact that some influential African Americans in the city denounced the Freedom Movement added to the failure. However, the underlying theme of the defeat was the insurmountable factors

of segregation and housing conditions found in the city. The deep-rooted processes of segregation in the city resulted in apathy among many in the community, perpetuated a cycle of racism, and, most importantly, represented huge challenges that to remedy would have taken the whole-hearted efforts of everyone involved.[69]

Government programs such as urban renewal and public housing, coupled with the role of realtors and "white flight" from the city, led to the formidable segregation encountered by the Chicago Freedom Movement in 1966. Moreover, these programs showed the unwillingness of many liberal politicians to push for more radical change. They were intended to help poor inner-city residents; however, they proved to further separate the races in the city of Chicago. For instance, the Housing Act of 1949 could have proved extremely useful in ending segregation in the city, but the absence of racial regulations enabled local officials in Chicago to propagate further segregation. Another example of a failure in liberal policy was when John F. Kennedy promised to issue an executive order to wipe out housing discrimination with the "stroke of a pen."[70] When that order finally was issued, after several years, it only provided for future public housing projects, and did little, if anything, to change discriminatory policies of realtors. Furthermore, when an open-housing policy was finally passed in Chicago in 1963, it was never enforced.[71] Basically, most liberal policies meant to combat discrimination were missing something vital for the successful institution of the measure. All of these efforts passed up the opportunity to make wide-ranging, honorable changes in the country in regards to racial equality.

The housing of African Americans beginning after the end of WWII further exacerbated an already harmful and vicious cycle of segregation. Chicago officials carried out these programs in spite of the glaring segregation that resulted. In 1968, the Kerner Report, the result of a federal study, detailed the consequences of segregation, stating that "our nation is moving towards two societies, one black and one white, separate and unequal."[72] Viewed through the segregation found in Chicago, this conclusion is easy to understand. Equally discouraging was a ruling in 1969 by federal judge Richard Austin in which he stated that "99 percent of the residents of CHA family housing were black, and that 99.5 percent of such units were confined to black or racially changing areas."[73]

As civil rights movement leaders warned, segregation is detrimental not just to African Americans, but to society as a whole. Despite several warnings of the implications of segregation,

Chicago officials continued to carry out programs that had this result. The equality that was supposed to have come with living in a democratic society was eroded through the use of these programs. Furthermore, this time period had lasting effects on the lives of African Americans in Chicago. Generations of citizens were forced to endure deplorable conditions that created genuine impediments to their welfare because of the segregation that resulted from urban renewal, public housing, realtor practices, and the migration of white people to the suburbs.

Notes

1 Ralph Abernathy, *And the Walls Came Tumbling Down* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1989), 363.

2 Roger Biles, *Richard Daley: Politics, Race, and the Governing of Chicago* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1995), 88.

3 Arnold Hirsch, "Making of a Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago 1940-1960" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, 1979), 9-13.

4 Wendy Plotkin, "Deeds of Mistrust," (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago, 1999), 1.

5 United States Supreme Court, *Shelley vs. Kraemer*, Supreme Court Ruling, 3 May 1948, www.fedworld.gov/supcourt/index.html (accessed November 22, 2005), Hirsch, "Second Ghetto," 9.

6 "Lauds Public Housing Job, But Declares Big Task Lies Ahead," *Chicago Defender*, 13 August 1949, 6.

7 Arnold Hirsch, "Searching for a Sound Negro Policy: A Racial Agenda for the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954," *Housing Policy Debate* 11, no. 2 (2000): 393.

8 Ibid., 393-401.

9 "National Housing Race Relations Staff Expected," *Chicago Defender*, 20 July 1946, 5.

10 Ibid., 393-400.

11 "North, As Well As South, Guilty of Housing Bias, Survey Reveals," *Chicago Defender*, 28 April 1951, 3.

12 Adam Cohen and Elizabeth Taylor, *American Pharaoh* (New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 2000), 176; Hirsch," Second Ghetto," 218-19.

13 Cohen and Taylor, 176.

14 Biles, 12.

15 Ibid., 12.

16 Hirsch, "Searching for a 'Sound Negro Policy,'" 404.

17 Ibid., 404-05.

18 Ibid., 405.

19 Quoted in Ibid.

20 Ibid.

21 "U.S Official Criticizes Chicago's Housing, Slum Clearance Program," *Chicago Defender*, 28 October 1950, 5.

22 Hirsch, Searching for a 'Sound Negro Policy,'" 404.

23 Cohen and Taylor, 208.

24 Ibid., 209.

25 "NAACP Seeks Changes In Hyde Park Renewal Plans," *Chicago Defender*, 19 June 1958, 1; Cohen and Taylor, 211.

26 Ibid., 210-11.

27 Ibid., 212.

28 "Earmark More Urban Renewal Aid," *Chicago Defender*, 14 November 1959, 20.

29 Janet Minx, "City to O.K. Land Sale Despite Area Opposition," *Chicago Tribune*, 5 July 1964, S1.

30 "King Heads Englewood Urban Renewal Protest," *Chicago Defender*, 5 December 1966, 5.

31 Patrick J. Sloyan, "HUD Chief Raps Urban 'Removal'," *Chicago Defender*, 17 August 1966, 4.

32 Cohen and Taylor, 68.

33 Biles, 14.

34 "Airport Homes," *Chicago Defender*, 30 November 1946, 5.

35 Hirsch, "Making of the Second Ghetto," 106-07.

36 Ibid., 155; Cohen and Taylor, 78.

37 Biles, 14-15.

38 "CHA Cites Role Of City Council In Housing Sites," *Chicago Sun Times*, 29 March 1966; Arnold Hirsch, "Massive Resistance in the Urban North: Trumbull Park, Chicago, 1953-1966," *The Journal of American History* (1995): 539; Cohen and Taylor, 85; Biles, 14-15.

39 Biles, 57.

40 Ibid.

41 Cohen and Taylor, 183-85.

42 Ibid.

43 "Protest High-Rise at Cermak, State," *Chicago Defender*, 29 October 1964, IND3; "CHA Approves Marina Type Twin Towers," *Chicago Defender*, 14 February 1963, E4; "Delay is Asked in Skyscraper Public Housing," *Chicago Defender*, 12 June 1964, B21.

44 "Where Have All The Police Gone? Make Taylor Homes A Safe Place," *Chicago Defender*, 14 December 1963; 9, Biles, 89.

45 Biles, 89.

46 Ibid.

47 "Housing Plight of Negro Cited," *Chicago Tribune*, 4 March 1963, 4.

48 "Suburbia Dooms Negro", *Chicago Defender Weekly Edition*, 14-20 May 1966, 6; Hirsch, "Second Ghetto," 30; Alan B. Anderson and George W. Pickering, *Confronting the Color Line* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1986),

67.

49 "Chicago's Black Belt Expands, But Never Cracks," *Chicago Defender*, 20 May 1963, 9; Biles, 12.

50 James R. Ralph, Jr., *Northern Protest* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993), 39

51 Ralph, 37-9; Abernathy, 362-7; Biles, 362.

52 "CORE Adopts New Resolution; End Non-Violence," *Chicago Defender*, 5 July 1966, 4.

53 Quoted in David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1986), 492.

54 "Leaders Advised Fight Civil Rights Bill," *Chicago Defender*, 6 July 1966, 3; Van Gosse, *Rethinking the New Left* (New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2005), 31-52.

55 Biles, 120.

56 Ibid., 120-121.

57 Ibid.

58 "30,000 Hear Dr. King at Soldier Field Rally," *Chicago Defender*, 11 July 1966, 3.

59 Ibid.; Abernathy, 372-3.

60 Abernathy, 376.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid., 366.

63 Ralph, 112.

64 Abernathy, 379-80.

65 Biles, 120-3.

66 Ibid., 386.

67 Biles, 130-5.

68 Ibid., 135.

69 "30,000 Hear Dr. King At Soldier Field Rally,"2; Ralph, 104-6.

70 "Some Defend," *Chicago Defender*, 21 July 1962, 8.

71 Ralph, 209.

72 "Report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders (excerpt)." Retrieved from Facts on File—African Americans History and Culture. Accessed 11 March 2006 at www.fofweb.com.

73 "Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program," *Encyclopedia of Chicago*, www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org (accessed April 22, 2006).

Tara Denny

A Trial Within a Trial: Bobby Seale and Judge Julius Hoffman

"A black man chained and gagged because the court refused him the lawyer of his choice, then refused to let him defend himself, needs no interpreter. Nothing in our trial or in all the political trials of our time could match the power and truth of that moment."[1] With those words, the moment becomes etched in history: a black defendant being bound to a chair and gagged from the order of a white judge in a 1969 American court of law. The black man that Abbie Hoffman is referring to is Bobby Seale, one of seven co-defendants in the Chicago Conspiracy trial presided over by Judge Julius Hoffman.

The eight defendants in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial were David Dellinger, Richard (Rennie) Davis, Thomas (Tom) Hayden, Abbott (Abbie) Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, Lee Weiner, John Froines, and Bobby Seale. They were indicted on charges of conspiracy, of inciting riots during the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, and of crossing state lines and making speeches to incite riots. However, the term conspiracy should be explained in this situation because these eight defendants did not act together in a conspiracy, rather they became a conspiracy simply because they were indicted together.[2] The government knew that its case was circumstantial and decided to indict the defendants for conspiracy in order to be able to try the eight together. Had there not been a conspiracy charge, the defendants would have been tried separately and the dynamics and the outcome would have been very different. The conspiracy charges were ultimately brought about because it would be the easiest way to achieve guilty verdicts.

Although they might not have known each other when they were arraigned, the defendants got to know each other well during the five months of the trial, from September 1969 until its conclusion in February 1970. The manner in which the defendants were treated by Judge Julius Hoffman was truly disheartening. It was the Nixon administration who pushed the indictments of the Chicago Eight in order to preserve "law and order." However, it is evident that

Hoffman was unwilling to let the defendants get a fair trial in his courtroom and had more than likely decided their fate from day one. The dynamics between Judge Julius Hoffman and defendant Bobby Seale make clear that there was not only blatant racism but also a perverse disregard for the basic rules of the courtroom on the part of Hoffman.

To fully understand the dynamics of the Chicago Eight trial, a general knowledge of the Black Panther Party is needed. The Black Panther Party (BPP) was established by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale in Oakland, California, in October of 1966.[3] Newton and Seale wrote up a ten-point platform that would be the manifesto of the party. These points were concerned with the needs of the black community and were especially dedicated to improving living conditions. Newton and Seale were trying to establish that this new political party would advance the Black community.[4] As Charles E. Jones explains, the party was committed to "armed self-defense and revolutionary politics."[5] However, the image of the BPP as an uncontrollable, gun-crazed group is rather inaccurate. To make a conclusion about the BPP in this manner is incorrect, for Newton argued that implementing armed patrol in Oakland was a recruiting tool aimed at ordinary people.[6]

Until May of 1967, the BPP was still relatively unknown outside of Oakland. It was not until the Panthers appeared at the State capitol in Sacramento on 2 May 1967, that they garnered national attention.[7] The Party reached its peak membership in December 1968, with supporters across the country.[8] By 1969, a change was beginning to be seen in the ideology of the BPP. Instead of being a group to show the path for black liberation, they were beginning to think of themselves as "the organizers and leaders of that black revolutionary movement."[9] With this shift in ideology came a gradual breaking down within the group. However, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) COINTELPRO, a counterintelligence program, would also play a very important role in the breakdown of the BPP. The government and J. Edgar Hoover's FBI considered the BPP as the number one threat to national security and therefore used, as Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall describe, "the most vicious and unrestrained application of COINTELPRO techniques during the late 1960s and early 1970s" on the BPP.[10] In 1971, the BPP would finally split up due to internal differences.[11]

Although only one of the Chicago Eight, Bobby Seale, was a member of the BPP, all defendants were involved in some manner with the 1968 Democratic National Convention in

Chicago. The events that arose in the streets of Chicago during the convention would be what linked the defendants to the indictments in 1969. When it was announced on 8 October 1967 that Chicago would host the Democratic National Convention, the news was not met with positive outlooks, as many did not view Chicago as a good place to host the convention.[12] Regardless of initial opinions, Mayor Richard Daley was determined to have his city of Chicago host the convention, promising that he could keep peace in the streets.[13]

Planning for demonstrations got under way almost immediately after the official site was announced. When the planning was just starting, there were hopes and estimates for attracting some 100,000 demonstrators to the streets of Chicago. However, by March of 1968 those numbers were quickly waning as interest began to fall by the wayside.[14] The reason that the demonstrators wanted to come to Chicago in the first place was to protest the nomination of Lyndon Johnson. However, when Johnson announced on 31 March 1968 that he would not be seeking nor accepting the nomination, "the dream of a broad front of radical groups to meet in Chicago seemed no longer practical."[15] By this time, most of the planning was left up to the National Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam. Despite the falling numbers of expected demonstrators, the planners were still busy at work, but were being hampered by the fact that Mayor Daley and the city of Chicago were refusing to give them permits to parade and march.[16] Although the planners knew it was unlikely that they were going to receive the permits, they went on with the show and the demonstrators began to pour into Chicago the weekend before the convention actually began, with around 2,000 demonstrators in Grant Park.[17]

Mayor Daley wanted to avoid having riots cloud the convention. Urban riots were sweeping the country in larger cities during the 1960s. In 1967 alone, as Dennis E. Gale cites, "seventy-one cities experienced at least one—sometimes two or three—outbreaks of mob unrest. Moreover, the length of these confrontations increased ... more and more became 2–or 3-day cavalcades of looting, arson, assaults, and the like."[18] Chicago had already seen riots in the wake of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. Daley wanted to prove to the world that he was in control of his city, and he took measures to ensure order. During the April 1968 riots in Chicago, as Peter Yessne describes, Daley told the Superintendent of Police to issue an order directed

> immediately and under his signature to shoot to kill any arsonist or anyone with a Molotov cocktail in his hand in Chicago because they're potential murderers, and to issue a police order to shoot to maim or cripple anyone looting any stores in our city.[19]

After experiencing the riots following the King assassination, Daley did not want to have a repeat occurrence during the convention and, therefore, decided to refuse the permits for which the demonstrators had applied.

Urban riots were not the only perceived threat to law and order that was going on in the country during the 1960s. Demonstrations against the Vietnam War, especially on college campuses, were also sweeping the nation during this time. According to Adam Garfinkle, "in the first half of 1968, there were over 200 major demonstrations on campuses; most accompanied by preplanned violence."[20] The American sentiment was continually rising against the war in Vietnam, especially in 1967 and 1968. By early 1968, the effects of the war really began to hit home. As Howard Zinn explains, "the problem was that the United States was unable to win the war, while 40,000 American soldiers were dead at this time, 250,000 wounded, with no end in sight."[21] Even with all of the events going on in the nation during the turbulent year of 1968, the Democratic National Convention was going to go on.

The convention was scheduled to run from 25-29 August 1968, at the Amphitheatre. A month prior to the convention, Mayor Richard Daley would proclaim "this will be the greatest convention ever held."[22] Unfortunately, due to the lack of permits to march and heightened security things got out of hand rather quickly. Had the police simply let the demonstrators stay in the parks rather than enforce the ludicrous eleven p.m. curfew, events might have stayed relatively calm. Instead, the police were forcing the people into the streets against their will, causing a great outrage within the crowd, actually prompting a lot of the rioting that occurred.[23]

There were to be problems inside and outside the convention hall. Inside, the delegates were arguing. Half of the delegates supported the war whereas the other half felt that ending the war was imperative. Regardless, national television networks were broadcasting from inside the convention hall and the American people saw on their televisions the chaos, implying that, as Terry H. Anderson described, "the Democrats were out of control."[24] Outside the convention hall, the activists were gathering force,

camping, marching, and gathering illegally without permits. When the police riots finally broke out, the world would be watching. An estimated ninety million Americans watched the events unfold on the television, and the rest would see the recaps in the daily newspapers.[25]

By the end of the week, there would be 192 police officers reported as injured. The number of injuries to demonstrators cannot be positively determined, but there were a reported 101 demonstrators hospitalized in Chicago.[26]

Although the convention was finally over, the city of Chicago and the federal government wanted answers to the events that occurred during that week in August 1968. On 20 March 1969, the defendants were indicted by a federal grand jury.[27] The seven months that separated the convention from the indictment were a result of the Attorney General under Lyndon B. Johnson, Ramsey Clark, refusing to issue the indictments.[28] It was not until Richard Nixon's administration came into office that the indictments were issued.

The defendants were charged with conspiracy and crossing state lines and making speeches to incite riots at the 1968 Democratic National Convention, violating Title 18, United States Code, Sections 371, 231(a), and 2101.[29] According to Section 371, the conspiracy requires merely two people to "conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States" with a punishment of a fine, a maximum of five years imprisonment, or both.[30] Section 231(a) of Title 18 is the code regarding the defendants' speeches during the convention week, which states that any person who interferes with a police official in doing his job during a "civil disorder" can be fined or imprisoned for no more than five years, or both.[31] And finally, Section 2101 deals with the crossing of state lines to incite a riot and carries the punishment of a fine, imprisonment of no more than five years, or both.[32]

The defendants were not brought to trial for another six months, when opening statements were made by the prosecution, on 26 September 1969. It became obvious very quickly that the defendants the government wanted to "get" the most were Hoffman, Rubin, Hayden, Davis, Seale, and Dellinger.[33] There was very little evidence against Froines and Weiner. But the big question when the indictment came down was why Seale was even involved in the first place. It was common knowledge that Seale had spent less than twenty-four hours in Chicago during the convention and had made only two brief speeches.[34] It was also well known that the Nixon administration had pushed this trial forward because

it was bent on preserving "law and order." The government had also had a growing concern regarding the Black Panther Party, and perhaps saw using this indictment as a way to get at the heart of the Party.[35]

During his 1968 campaign for President, Richard Nixon indicated that he was a firm believer in law and order and wanted to protect the integrity of the country. When the administration took office it became very clear that the Black Panther Party was a target in its quest for law and order. Surveillance and wire taps are just two examples of the types of measures the administration took in order to bring the Party down.[36] The murders of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark in Chicago on 4 December 1969 are an example of the way in which the government wanted the Panthers to deteriorate. During an early morning raid of the apartment at Panther headquarters, police opened fire, killing Hampton and Clark. Hampton was still in his bed when the smoke had cleared, and had presumably been either drugged or asleep when he was killed. Deborah Johnson, Hampton's girlfriend, feared that he had been drugged because he fell asleep while still on the telephone. "I tried to wake him, but I couldn't," Johnson claimed.[37] The official version of events by the police was that they had knocked and announced possession of a search warrant. When the Panthers had refused them entrance they began to open fire, and the police had to return fire.[38] However, what was found was that the agents had shot somewhere between eighty-three and one hundred shots, whereas the Panthers had only fired one shot in the raid.[39] Although this is only one example of the type of tension between the Panthers and police, the administration and its tactics had a lasting effect, for, as James W. Button explains, "by 1972, most militant black leaders were either in jail, had left the country, or had gone 'underground'."[40]

So it becomes clear that the government was out to shut down the Black Panther Party, perhaps adding to the reasons why Seale was indicted with the Chicago Eight. Regardless of the reason that Seale was included in the indictment, he was the one defendant who was the most outspoken, and the first six weeks of the trial revolved mostly around him and his demands for his constitutional rights. Seale was adamant about having Charles Garry as his lawyer. Garry was a Panther lawyer and Seale had great trust in him as an attorney. However, Garry was facing emergency gallbladder surgery and Hoffman refused to issue a continuance so that Garry could have the surgery and then serve as Seale's counsel.[41] Hoffman

kept referring back to the fact that Seale had a perfectly capable lawyer in William Kunstler.

To fully understand the tension between Seale and Hoffman, the latter's judicial reputation has to be addressed. First, as John Schultz points out, Hoffman was known throughout the legal community for "seldom granting appeal bond, for no delay between a finding of guilty and sentencing, and for giving the maximum sentence."[42] It was also well known that Hoffman was not very favorable toward the defense in that he granted very few motions or objections for them.[43] Ultimately, Seale called Hoffman numerous derogatory names, racist being among the most profound. However, Hoffman always appeared to be overly quick to tell his proud story of how he had made the ruling about integrating the South Holland school to show that he was by no means a racist. Yet he was not as willing to share the fact that he often accompanied that story with his expressing that he had simply said that Black and white girls and boys could go to school together, not get married.[44]

It became clear to the defendants early in the trial that the government had very little evidence and might resort to doing something illegal in order to win its case. Fuel was added to this idea when two letters came to the attention of the court on 30 September 1969. These threatening letters were supposedly sent to two of the jurors, Kristi King and Ruth Peterson, from the Black Panther Party as a warning that they were being watched. However, the defendants, especially Seale, knew that these letters did not come from the BPP but had to have originated somewhere within the federal government because it was not normal practice for the BPP to send letters like that.[45] The government had in fact used this tactic of fabricating evidence before. As Jim Messerschmidt states, "The FBI will fabricate and suppress evidence in order to tie [radical political] leaders up in the courts and in prison. The FBI also encourages agents to lie. ..."[46] The Chicago Eight trial is only one trial in which the government fabricated evidence in order to win a conviction; another example in which the tactic was used was in the conspiracy trial of Benjamin Spock, *et al*.[47] However, that is not the most interesting part about the letters in question. Rather, it seems that perhaps the prosecution and Hoffman wanted to make sure that Kristi King was removed from the jury because she was young and perhaps sympathetic to the defendants. This is because Hoffman made King read the letter in court when she had previously indicated that she was not aware of the letter because her family had intercepted it and sent it to the FBI immediately.

> THE COURT: Will you please look at Government's Exhibit A for identification ... and let me know whether you have seen the original of that document at any time.
> MISS KING: No, sir, I haven't.
> THE COURT: You have never seen it?
> MISS KING: No, sir.
> THE COURT: Do you know whether any member of your family brought it to your attention or not?
> MISS KING: It wasn't brought to my attention, no, sir.
> THE COURT: All right. Read it, Miss King. Read it, please.
> MISS KING: It says, "You are being watched. The Black Panthers."
> THE COURT: Having now seen it, will you please tell me whether ... you can continue to be a fair and impartial juror in this case... Do you still think you can do that?
> MISS KING: No, sir. [48]

Hoffman should never have instructed King to read that letter. Rather, he should have left it at the fact that she had never seen it and that she could still be impartial. Instead, he decided to take a step forward, forcing King to read it, thereby tainting her as an impartial juror and essentially forcing her from the jury.

Although Seale managed to keep his cool during most of the early days of the trial, when a witness referred to him by name in his or her testimony, Seale often jumped up and argued that he did not have any counsel and wished to cross-examine the witness. Hoffman always reminded Seale that Kunstler was his attorney and could handle the cross-examination. But this was not sufficient in Seale's opinion and this kind of outburst began to occur quite frequently throughout the prosecution's case. Here is one common example, from 12 October 1969:

> MR. SEALE: I would like to cross-examine the witness.
> THE COURT: Your appearance is here on file.
> MR. SEALE: What about my lawyer? He is not here your Honor.

> MR. WEINGLASS: His lawyer is Charles R. Garry of San Francisco.
> THE COURT: I have heard that before.
> MR. WEINGLASS: He is his attorney.
> MR. SEALE: I still want to cross-examine the witness.
> THE COURT: Call your next witness, please.[49]

This is just one example of the kind of interactions that Seale and Hoffman had during the first six weeks of the trial. Hoffman continuously explained to Seale that his lawyer was Kunstler and then proceed to move on and expect Seale to drop the issue. But, as the trial went on, Seale became more and more insistent on his rights to be able to represent himself. "I was determined to defend myself. I had that right and I knew it."[50]

As these exchanges continued, Hoffman began to show signs of losing his calm with Seale. Eventually, Hoffman came to the point where he was fed up with Seale and warned him that under the law he could be bound to a chair and gagged to silence him if he continued to disrupt the trial.

> THE COURT: Do you want to listen to me for a moment?
> MR. SEALE: Why should I continue listening to you unless you are going to give me my constitutional rights? Let me defend myself.
> THE COURT: I am warning you, sir, that the law –
> MR. SEALE: Instead of warning, why don't you warn me I have got a right to defend myself, huh?
> THE COURT: I am warning you that the Court has the right to gag you. I don't want to do that. Under the law you may be gagged and chained to your chair.
> MR. SEALE: Gagged? I am being railroaded already. I am being railroaded already.
> THE COURT: The Court has that right and I—
> MR. SEALE: The Court has no right whatsoever. The Court has no right to stop me from speaking out in behalf of my constitutional rights.
> THE COURT: The Court will be in recess until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.[51]

It was the case of *Illinois v. Allen* which gave Hoffman the precedent to bind Seale to a chair and gag him. In the course of that case, the defendant, William Allen, was on trial for armed robbery. During his actual trial he indicated that he wished to defend himself and was granted that right with the help of a court-appointed lawyer to assist him. However, as time went on, the defendant began to become quite unruly and used foul language and even threw items at the judge and jury. The judge initially banished Allen from the courtroom, but because of the Sixth Amendment's right for a defendant to be present at his own trial, he was let back in. The judge subsequently banished him from the courtroom time and again until the trial finally concluded. However, when the case went on appeal, the Court of Appeals stated that the judge had no right to expel the defendant and subsequently deprive him of his Sixth Amendment right. Therefore, the court determined that in order to be sure that a fair trial would be held, the judge had the discretion to bind the defendant to a chair and gag him to keep the defendant in order.[52]

The day that Hoffman had explained that Seale could be bound and gagged under the law, Seale was absolutely ecstatic. "He'd said it! He'd said what I had been waiting for. But would he actually do it?"[53] The answer to that question would come rather quickly for Seale: yes. Hoffman would indeed bind and gag Seale. On 29 October 1969, there were numerous Black Panther members in the courtroom as observers, and Seale was asked to address them so that they would keep calm throughout the proceedings, telling them to "keep cool!"[54] However, when Hoffman came in, prosecutor Richard Schultz addressed him, telling him emphatically that Seale had told the audience members to attack during the proceedings. Bobby Seale was finally fed up and called Schultz a "dirty liar."

> MR. SCHULTZ: And he told those people in the audience ... that if he's attacked, they know what to do. He was talking to these people about an attack by them.
> MR. SEALE: You're lying. Dirty liar. I told them to defend themselves. ... I said they had a right to defend themselves if they are attacked.
> MR. SCHULTZ: If the Court pleases, that is what he said, just as he related it. In terms of a physical attack by the people in this—

> MR. SEALE: A physical attack by those damned marshals, that's what I said.
> THE COURT: Let—
> MR. SEALE: And if they attack any people, they have a right to defend themselves, you lying pig.
> THE COURT: Let the record show the tone of Mr. Seale's voice was one shrieking and pounding on the table and shouting. That will be dealt with appropriately at some time in the future.
> MR. KUNSTLER: Your Honor, the record should indicate that Mr. Schultz shouted. ...
> THE COURT: Yes, he raised his voice and I think he raised his voice—if what he said was the truth, I can't blame him for raising his voice.
> MR. SEALE: Will you please tell the Court I told them to keep their cool because I didn't want a spontaneous response to any kind of activity that might go on. Would you please tell the Court I said to keep cool.
> THE COURT: Will you remain silent, you defendants, please. You have a lawyer.[55]

These were the proceedings that occurred before Seale was gagged and bound to the chair. Seale had previously called Hoffman a liar and a racist numerous times, but by this time Hoffman had reached the end of his rope. Regardless of the reason, after a few more heated exchanges in the courtroom, Hoffman directed his marshals to "take that defendant into the room in there and deal with him as he should be dealt with in this circumstance."[56]

As Seale explained later,

> They got some tape and put it across my mouth. They handcuffed my hands down close to the legs of a metal folding chair and put the irons on my legs. They looped the chain through one of the rods running across the front of the folding part of the chair and brought it out and clasped it to my right leg.[57]

As soon as Seale was situated back into the courtroom, the jury was brought back in to face this spectacle of a man being strapped to a chair and gagged. Hoffman then gave Seale an opportunity to be released from his situation if he promised to behave appropriately,

but Seale was adamant about his constitutional rights, so he remained bound and gagged.[58] When the jury came back into the courtroom, Hoffman addressed them explaining,

> THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I must tell you that in a trial by jury in a Federal court in the United States, the judge is not a mere moderator under the law but is the governor of the trial for the purpose of assuring its proper conduct, and fairness, and for the purpose of determining questions of law. The law requires that the judge maintain order and to take such steps as in the discretion of the judge are warranted, and, accordingly, the marshals have endeavored to maintain order in the manner that you see here in the courtroom. ... I direct you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, not to hold it against any of the seven other defendants when these measures are taken with respect to the defendant Mr. Seale. These measures indicate no evidence of his guilt or lack of guilt of the charges contained in the indictment. These measures have been taken only, as I say, to ensure the proper conduct of this trial which I am obligated to do under the law.[59]

It would be very difficult for any person to see a man chained to a chair and gagged in a court of law and be able to look past the situation. However, that is precisely what Hoffman was asking the jurors to do.

Dave Dellinger writes, "everyone endured six more painful days of such treatment, with Bobby not only bound, gagged and chained but frequently brutalized by the marshals."[60] However, these six days would eventually come to a screeching halt when, on 5 November 1969, the trial within a trial of Bobby Seale came to an end with a mistrial.

> THE COURT: I adjudge the defendant Bobby Seale guilty of the several criminal contempts. In citing specific acts and statements of the defendant Seale as contemptuous, the Court has selected only the most flagrant acts, ... There will be an order declaring a mistrial as to the defendant Bobby G. Seale and not as to any other defendants.

> MR. SEALE: Wait a minute, I got a right—what's the cat trying to pull now? I'm leaving the—I can't stay?
> THE COURT: The court will be continued until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock for signing the certificate of contempt and to continue with the trial in respect to the other seven defendants.[61]

With that ruling, the Chicago Eight became the Chicago Seven and the trial's dynamics would change greatly. It appeared that Hoffman had finally had enough of Seale's antics. He had tried to control him by binding and gagging him. When the world began to learn of Hoffman's actions, the restraints came off of Seale. However, Hoffman was not quite ready to let bygones be bygones. Instead, he wanted Seale to be removed from the trial and to be able to continue the trial with the remaining seven defendants. Ultimately, Hoffman made the choice to sever Seale from the case based on Seale's repeated outbursts in the courtroom. While there would be three more months of trial after Seale's severance, the mental images of Seale's ordeal would be forever etched in the memories of everyone who was in that courtroom during those six grueling days.

Although Bobby Seale had been severed from the case, Hoffman did not stop his repressive rule in the courtroom once Seale was gone. On the contrary, he continued his repeated denial of defense motions and arguments. There were also numerous instances in which he would not allow certain witnesses for the defense to testify because he felt that there was no basis for their testimony. This continual denial of the defense attorneys to be able to make their case eventually got the better of them. When William Kunstler asked the court for a brief recess on 2 February 1970, to allow the witness Dr. Ralph Abernathy to arrive at the courtroom from the airport in order to testify, Hoffman once again denied his request, explaining that the trial must go on without delay. However, Kunstler had finally tolerated more of Hoffman's abuse than he could handle. Part of his outburst is as follows:

> MR. KUNSTLER: I am outraged to be in this court before you. ... I have sat here for four and a half months and watched the objections denied and sustained by your Honor, and I know that this is not a fair trial. I know it in my heart. ... I can't think of a better cause to go to jail for and to lose my license

> for ... than to tell your Honor that you are doing a disservice to the law in saying that we can't have Ralph Abernathy on the stand.[62]

Hoffman had very little to say to Kunstler's outburst other than to declare that the defense was resting its case. Naturally, this outburst would cause one of Kunstler's contempt citations at the end of the trial, but Kunstler did not seem to care anymore. He knew that he was witnessing a railroading attempt by the government and Hoffman, and was finally tired of not being able to present his case to the jury in the manner that he wanted.

The case went to the jury on 14 February 1970. However, there was a lot of trouble in the jury room. When an original vote was taken, there were eight jurors for conviction on all counts and four holdouts for acquittal. Two notes were sent to Hoffman explaining that they were hung, but Hoffman instructed the jury to continue deliberations both times. The marshal who brought back the message even added that the Judge could hold them there as long as he wanted to. Eventually, there was a "compromise" verdict because the four holdout jurors could simply hold out no longer.[63] Unfortunately, the jurors did not seem to know the law in that they did not realize that Hoffman would eventually have had to accept their position as a hung jury.

The jury was out until 20 February 1970, when they returned with the verdict. They had ultimately decided that all seven defendants were not guilty of conspiracy, while Dellinger, Davis, Hayden, Hoffman, and Rubin were found guilty of the charge of coming to Chicago with the intent to incite riots. Weiner and Froines were found not guilty of all charges.[64] Although this was the jury's decision, Hoffman also imparted his own decision in regards to the contempt citations of which he found each defendant guilty. These citations stemmed from the outbursts that he recorded during the course of the trial. He even sentenced the defense attorneys Kunstler and Weinglass to jail time for contempt.[65]

Although the trial went on for three more months after Seale's severance, and in the end the jury returned a compromised verdict, the events surrounding Bobby Seale did not simply disappear. Countless books, journal articles, and newspaper articles appeared during and after the trial. Since television cameras were not allowed into the courtroom, there was a heavy reliance upon newspaper journalists. Those who were fortunate enough to obtain a seat in the courtroom returned to their newsrooms to write the

daily proceedings for the following day's edition. However, it is quite interesting to see how differently the journalists and editors portrayed the trial proceedings. By simply looking at two local newspapers, the *Chicago Defender* and the *Chicago Tribune*, it becomes clear that they were polar opposites in their opinions regarding the trial. For example, the following passage was printed in an editorial in the 11 November 1969 edition of the *Defender*:

> After shackling and gagging Seale in a manner more consistent with contemptible medievalism than with modern court rituals, Judge Hoffman allowed his emotion to sway him into rendering a judgment wholly at variance with judicial precedents and far in excess of the breach committed by the defendant.[66]

It becomes quite clear that the *Defender* was obviously in favor of the defense through the manner in which it portrayed the trial.

However, this was only one way in which the trial was shown. The *Tribune* appears to have been consistently pro-prosecution in its editorials. For example, this was printed in its 31 October 1969 edition:

> The spectacle of a gagged and shackled defendant in a criminal trial is lamentable, but what else could Judge Hoffman do? The rule of law must be upheld. There is a New York precedent for gagging and shackling an unruly defendant. The action was upheld by the United States Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court refused to review it.[67]

Through the use of articles and editorials, the ways in which the two newspapers presented the trial likely contributed to further polarizing society. The trial was controversial to begin with, and everyone had his or her own opinion. However, opinions are often swayed by the media, and these differing views would have certainly affected society's opinion regarding the case.

Although reactions to the trial might continue to differ greatly, it can be argued that this was a railroading attempt by the government. As stated earlier, the Attorney General under Lyndon B. Johnson, Ramsey Clark, refused to issue the indictments of the Chicago Eight. However, once the Nixon administration came into office the indictments were handed down because of Nixon's determination to restore "law and order" in the country. Although this might seem unimportant, it is significant to note that there are

even questions regarding the manner in which the trial was handled from the beginning, between the time that the indictments were handed down and the arraignment of the defendants. The common method used by federal judges in assigning court cases is by lot; however, there are indications that Hoffman was selected because of his past record of being harsh toward defendants. Perhaps the entire trial was set up from the very beginning because of the Nixon administration and Hoffman.[68]

The 1960s was a turbulent time in America. What occurred during the 1968 Democratic National Convention was simple protest. Had the city of Chicago not intervened in the manner that it did, the riots probably would never have happened. If this had occurred, the events after the Convention could have been completely different, including the proceedings that surrounded the Chicago Eight trial.

Unfortunately, the city of Chicago did intervene during the Convention. And the rest is history. However, the Chicago Eight trial let the country see what the justice system was really like. It allowed a window into seeing just how far the government was willing to go just to get an indictment, trial, and conviction in the case of eight defendants who were never a conspiracy to begin with. This was not simply a criminal trial, but rather a political trial. The fact that a white judge bound a black defendant to a chair and gagged him says a lot about the way in which society still was during 1969. Although Judge Julius Hoffman was probably not the best choice for a trial judge in this particular case, his presence in the courtroom speaks volumes to the dynamics of the case. It is important to understand the actions that Hoffman took during the proceedings because it would be what gave the eight defendants their grounds for appeal. The defendants' convictions were ultimately overturned based on the actions that Hoffman took during the course of the trial. The mere fact that Hoffman's actions were the grounds for the rescinding of the convictions speaks volumes to Hoffman's disregard for the rule of law in the courtroom.

All the events that surrounded the 1968 Democratic National Convention and the Chicago Eight trial really bring into perspective just what little progress the country was making during the 1960s. The events that happened to Bobby Seale were not only shocking, but appalling as well. Regardless of his skin color, there was absolutely no reason for a person to be bound to a chair and gagged in a court of law. Seale was merely trying to defend his right to his preferred attorney and his right to defend himself. He was guaranteed those

rights under the Constitution, and Judge Julius Hoffman denied him those constitutional rights. The Chicago Eight trial should be a case that goes down in history as one of the most profound and important in the history of the American justice system.

Notes

1 Abbie Hoffman, *Soon to be a Major Motion Picture* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1980), 194.

2 David Dellinger, *From Yale to Jail: The Life Story of a Moral Dissenter* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1993), 340-341; Tom Hayden, *Trial* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), 30.

3 G. Louis Heath, ed., *Off the Pigs! The History and Literature of the Black Panther Party* (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976), 13; Michael Newton, *Bitter Grain: Huey Newton and the Black Panther Party* (Los Angeles: Holloway House Publishing Company, 1991), 14; Bobby Seale, *Seize the Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton* (New York: Random House, 1970), 59; Jennifer B. Smith, *An International History of the Black Panther Party* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999), 31.

4 Smith, *International History*, 32.

5 Charles E. Jones, "Reconsidering Panther History: The Untold Story," in *The Black Panther Party [Reconsidered]*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 1.

6 Floyd W. Hayes, III, and Francis A. Kiene, III, "All Power to the People: The Political Thought of Huey P. Newton and the Black Panther Party," in *The Black Panther Party [Reconsidered]*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 159, 161.

7 Heath, *Off the Pigs!*, 42.

8 Ibid., 59.

9 Ibid., 151.

10 Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall, *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement* (Boston: South End Press, 1990), 61.

11 Heath, *Off the Pigs!*, 211; Jones, "Reconsidering Panther History," 9; Charles E. Jones and Judson E. Jeffries, "Don't Believe the Hype: Debunking the Panther Mythology," in Charles E. Jones, ed., *The Black Panther Party [Reconsidered]* (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998), 40; Newton, *Bitter Grain*, 207-208; Smith, *International History*, 57.

12 Daniel Walker, *Rights in Conflict: A Report Submitted by Daniel Walker Director of the Chicago Study Team, to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1968), 16.

13 David Farber, *Chicago '68* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 122; Frank Kusch, *Battleground Chicago: The Police and the 1968 Democratic National Convention* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1994), 10, 137; Norman Mailer, *Miami and the Siege of Chicago: An Informal History of the Republican and Democratic Conventions in 1968* (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1968), 103.

14 Walker, *Rights in Conflict*, 21, 28.

15 Mailer, *Siege of Chicago*, 133.

16 Kusch, *Battleground Chicago*, 51; Walker, *Rights in Conflict*, 53.

17 Walker, *Rights in Conflict*, 3.

18 Dennis E. Gale, *Understanding Urban Unrest: From Reverend King to Rodney King* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1996), 71.

19 Quoted in Peter Yessne, ed., *Quotations from Mayor Daley* (New York: Pocket Books, 1969), 19.

20 Adam Garfinkle, *Telltale Hearts: The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 162.

21 Howard Zinn, "The Impossible Victory: Vietnam," in *Against the Vietnam War: Writings by Activists*, ed. Mary Susannah Robbins (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999), 19.

22 Yessne, *Quotations*, 29.

23 Kusch, *Battleground Chicago*, 68; Walker, *Rights in Conflict*, 4.

24 Terry H. Anderson, *The Sixties* (New York: Longman, 1999), 122.

25 Ibid., 123.

26 Walker, *Rights in Conflict*, 351, 353.

27 Dellinger, *From Yale to Jail*, 338; Jason Epstein, *The Great Conspiracy Trial: An Essay on Law, Liberty and the Constitution* (New York: Random House, 1970), 52; Tom Hayden, *Reunion: A Memoir* (New York: Random House, 1988), 327; John Wiener, *Conspiracy in the Streets: The Extraordinary Trial of the Chicago Eight* (New York: The New Press, 2006), 14.

28 Dellinger, *From Yale to Jail*, 338; Wiener, *Conspiracy in the Streets*, 23-24.

29 John Schultz, The Chicago Conspiracy Trial (New York: Da Capo Press, 1993), 9.

30 Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, FindLaw. http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/casecode/uscodes/18/parts/i/chapters/19/sections/section_371.html.

31 Title 18, United States Code, Section 231(a), FindLaw. http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/casecode/uscodes/18/parts/i/chapters/12/sections/section%5F231.html.

32 Title 18, United States Code, Section 2101, FindLaw. http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/casecode/uscodes/18/parts/i/chapters/102/sections/section%5F2101.

33 Dellinger, *From Yale to Jail*, 342.

34 David Dellinger, *More Power than We Know: The People's Movement Toward Democracy* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975), 235; Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 38; Seale, *Seize the Time*, 353.

35 Hayden, *Reunion*, 327; Wiener, *Conspiracy in the Streets*, 6.

36 James W. Button, *Black Violence: Political Impact of the 1960s Riots* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978), 135-136.

37 Newton, *Bitter Grain*, 148.

38 Ibid., 149.

39 Newton, *Bitter Grain*, 147-151; Smith, *International History*, 45-46.

40 Button, *Black Violence*, 138.

41 Hayden, *Trial*, 65-66; Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 40.

42 Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 5.

43 Dellinger, *More Power Than We Know*, 227; Hayden, *Reunion*, 363; Hoffman, *Major Motion Picture*, 190; Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 7.

44 Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 43.

45 Seale, *Seize the Time*, 329; Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 47-49.

46 Jim Messerschmidt, *The Trial of Leonard Peltier* (Boston: South End Press, 1983), quoted in Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall, *Agents of Repression*, 287.

47 Churchill and Wall, *Agents of Repression*, 51.

48 Judy Clavir and John Spitzer, eds., *The Conspiracy Trial* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1970), 38.

49 Ibid., 84.

50 Bobby Seale, *A Lonely Rage: The Autobiography of Bobby Seale* (New York: Times Books, 1978), 180.

51 Clavir and Spitzer, *Conspiracy Trial*, 153.

52 Illinois v. Allen, 397 U.S. 337, 90 S.Ct. 1057, 25 L.Ed.2d 353 (1970), in *Leading Constitutional Cases on Criminal Justice*, ed. Lloyd L. Weinreb (New York: Foundation Press, 2005), 960-965.

53 Seale, *A Lonely Rage*, 182.

54 Ibid., 191.

55 Clavir and Spitzer, *Conspiracy Trial*, 154-155.

56 Ibid., 162.

57 Seale, *Seize the Time*, 337.

58 Ibid., 338.

59 Clavir and Spitzer, *Conspiracy Trial*, 164.

60 Dellinger, *From Yale to Jail*, 353.

61 Clavir and Spitzer, *Conspiracy Trial*, 188-189.

62 Ibid., 518-519.

63 Schultz, *Conspiracy Trial*, 318-322.

64 Clavir and Spitzer, *Conspiracy Trial*, 594.

65 Ibid., 579-592.

66 "A Threat to Society," *Chicago Defender*, 11 November 1969.

67 "Guerrilla Theater in the Courtroom," *Chicago Tribune*, 31 October 1969.

68 Epstein, *Great Conspiracy Trial*, 95.

Contributors

NATHAN J. BROUWER received his B.A. in history from SIUC in December 2006, and began graduate school at the university in January 2007. He is a Teaching Assistant in the History Department and has worked as book review editor for *Peace and Change: A Journal of Peace Research*. His paper, written for HIST 499 as his senior paper, won the Edward J. O'Day award for 2007. He continues to research race and housing in Chicago, as well as social movements in twentieth-century America and social implications of governmental policies.

DYLAN BURNS wrote his paper for HIST 392, Historical Research and Writing. He is currently a junior in the History at SIUC. He visted New Harmony in the summer of 2005 and has been interested in Utopian societies ever since.

WILLIAM COWAN graduated from SIUC with a B.A. in history in 2007. His article was written for HIST 499 as his senior paper. In addition to history, he maintains interests in philosophy, sociology, and anthropology, as well as many of the physical sciences. He currently resides in the Chicago suburbs, where he is preparing for graduate school. He plans to pursue a career in history or journalism and currently contributes to several weblogs covering contemporary political, cultural, and social issues.

TARA DENNY wrote her article for HIST 499 as her senior paper. After graduating in August 2007 with a B.A. in History and a minor in Political Science, she plans to take a year off before returning to academics to pursue graduate studies.

LATISHA D. EMERY is a May 2007 graduate of Southern Illinois University Carbondale with a B. A. in History. Her article was written for HIST 499 as her senior paper. The study of history has been her passion for years. In the fall of 2007 she will be attending Northeastern University where she plans to pursue a master's degree in Inner City Studies at the Jacob Carruthers Center for Inner City Studies. She enjoys research and writing and hopes that one day she will be able to open a youth center for children in the inner city of Chicago where she will teach them the value and importance of history.

JACK REID has been deeply interested in Bob Dylan's lyrics and music since he was fifteen years old. His father is also a big fan of Dylan and introduced him to the music. He wanted to write a paper that would express the intense bond that song lyrics can have with an individual and how, in turn, these lyrics can shape that person's life. He chose Bob Dylan because his music has always had the most personal impact. His paper was written for HIST 392, Historical Research and Writing.

Southern
Illinois University
Carbondale