



THE FLAGLER COLLEGE
HISTORICAL REVIEW
VOL. I
2020

SPONSORED BY THE ALPHA OMEGA NOU CHAPTER
OF PHI ALPHA THETA
THE NATIONAL HISTORY HONOR SOCIETY

VOLUME I EDITORIAL STAFF

Zachariah Brown, Lead Editor

Casey Niebuhr, Assistant Editor

Lena Demers

Erin Hamm

Reace Kaleko

Cheyenne Koth

Kimberly McLester

Nina Oeberg

Dr. John Young, Faculty Advisor

RESEARCH ARTICLES

Erin Hamm

“Revolutionary Opportunism: Shifting Ideology for Political Expediency”

pp. 2-23

Caroline Martin

“One of Another Kind: How Wilhelm II Attempted to Emulate Frederick the Great”

pp. 24-33

Noah Chelednik

“Laws of the Heavens:

An Historical Analysis of International and United States Outer Space Law”

pp. 34-45

Emmaline Bruce

“The Development of the English Identity in Literature Through the Inspection of Cultural Practices in Jane Austen’s *Emma*”

pp.46-56

Zachariah Brown

“Joseph Goebbels and the Jewish American Film Industry:
Collaboration and Competition in Propaganda”

pp.57-66

BOOK REVIEWS

Casey Niebuhr

A Death in the Delta: The Story of Emmett Till by Stephen J. Whitfield

pp. 68-70

Anila Lahiri

D.W. Griffith’s The Birth of a Nation by Melvyn Stokes

pp.71-73

RESEARCH ARTICLES

REVOLUTIONARY OPPORTUNISM: SHIFTING IDEOLOGY FOR POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Erin Hamm

The Russian Revolution can be defined as one of the most explosive and complex events of the 20th century. It was a monumental period of change. Rising out of the ashes of the political chaos was Vladimir-Ilich Lenin. As the founder of the communist faction, the Bolsheviks, Lenin turned this group of activists into one of the most powerful political parties in the world. Lenin helped begin a new political order. He used the growing economic and political tensions to his advantage to bring about a proletarian revolution. Lenin exploited the theories of Marx and Engels to rapidly transform Russia into a socialist state. He laid down the foundation for the revolutionary period that brought swift change to the nation. With this rapid change came problems of gigantic magnitude, for Lenin underestimated the economic backwardness of the nation. Lenin was forced to bend Marxism around in order to create his desired revolution. As the revolutionary period developed in Russia, Lenin's ideological beliefs continually evolved to fit into the changing political and social situations.¹ His inconsistencies are reflected in his established policies, which contradicts his initial ideas for transforming Russia into a socialist state.

Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov, also popularly known as Lenin, began his political career in 1893 at the young age of 23.² Having spent his youth studying the works of socialist theorists Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Nikolay Chernyshevsky, Lenin formed an interest in radical politics. One of the most decisive landmarks in Lenin's spark of rebellion was the

¹ Scholars of the Russian Revolution often disagree on the revolutionary timeline. Robert Service claims the revolutionary period lasted from 1900 to 1927, while Sheila Fitzpatrick argues it lasted from 1917 to the Great Purges in 1937. Orlando Figes, on the other hand, offers a more extreme timeline of 1891 to 1991. The revolutionary timeline for this paper is from 1905 to Lenin's death in 1924. 1905 saw the first major movement for a revolution in Russia. It also marks the year in which Lenin began his political transformation. Prior to 1905, Lenin simply laid down the foundation for a proletarian revolution. Between 1905 and the October revolution of 1917, Leninism, as a particular Marxist ideological tendency, emerged. The revolutionary period ends in 1924 for two reasons. One, because that is when Lenin, the leader of the revolutionary movement died. Two, because the USSR was established by that point in time, completing the revolution's goal for transforming Russia into a Soviet State.

² In Russia, the Julian calendar was maintained until January 1918 when Lenin introduced the Gregorian version. The dates in this paper correspond to the particular calendar in official use at the time.

fate of his brother, Alexander Ulyanov.³ The oldest in the family, Alexander was involved in the People's Freedom organization that took part in the failed attempt to assassinate Tsar Alexander III. Alexander was caught and executed on May 8, 1887, spurring a powerful shift in Lenin's personality. Lenin set a high value on his potential contribution to the cause of radical change in Russia.⁴

Having fully embraced Marxism, Lenin left his home in Samara on August 20, 1893, to make a name for himself in the intellectual salons of St. Petersburg.⁵ For Lenin, the capital presented the new Russia, for it was in the prongs of industrial and educational progress.⁶ What also attracted him to St. Petersburg was the group of young Marxist authors who had published about Russia's economy and society. Passionate about his politics, Lenin joined this small group in their efforts to publish works in the legal press. Through these works, he aimed to promote a revolution. Lenin's confidence in his goal rose after he wrote his first piece of literature, "New Economic Trends in Peasant Life," which is a Marxist interpretation of the quantitative data collected in V.Y. Postniknov's *Peasant Farming in South Russia* on the southern peasantry. Although he was turned down for publication in the journal *Russian Thought*, Lenin kept up his determination to have a broad impact on public debates.⁷

A year later, in the summer of 1894, Lenin illegally published his first book *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*. In this work, Lenin called for a proletarian revolution. This work gained the attention of his fellow radicals with its anti-populist polemic.⁸ Following Marxist beliefs, Lenin claimed the formation of large-scale capitalism will allow the workers to sever their ties to the old society, ultimately uniting them and placing them in the condition to join the organized struggle. He wrote,

³ Dmitri Voljogonov, *Lenin: A New Biography*, trans. Harold Shukman (New York: The Free Press, 1994), 12.

⁴ Robert Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, vol. 1 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press), 25.

⁵ Service, *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 90.

⁶ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 92.

⁷ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 95.

⁸ Nina Tumarkin, *Lenin Lives! The Lenin Cult in Soviet Russia*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 36.

When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organisations are formed among the worker to transform the workers' present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle—then the Russian **WORKER** rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the **RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT** (side by side with the proletariat of **ALL COUNTRIES** along the straight road of open political struggle to **THE VICTORIOUS COMMUNIST REVOLUTION** [Emphasis original].⁹

Lenin printed and illegally circulated this work among Marxists and the Emancipation of Labor Group, spreading the call for a communist revolution. Copies were first handed out throughout St. Petersburg, and by the end of 1894, it had spread as far as Vilnius, in what is now Lithuania.¹⁰ The work had a strong influence on Marxist youth and Russian Social Democratic organizations abroad.

Having high hopes for a greater future in Russia, Lenin desired to travel and make direct contact with fellow Marxists across Europe. On April 24, 1895, Lenin set off from St. Petersburg to begin his journey abroad. One of his main purposes in going abroad was to meet his idol, Georgi Plekhanov, who was the founder of the social-democratic movement in Russia. Lenin met with Plekhanov in Geneva, where he impressed him with his intelligence and extreme dedication to the movement. In their visit, the men discussed the creation of *Robotnik*, a journal of socialist theory. Lenin also paid a visit to German social democrat Wilhelm Liebknecht, who was one of the principal founders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. In the fall of 1895, Lenin met with Iuly Martov, the future leader of the Mensheviks, and shortly after, they formed the organization the “Group of Social Democrats.”¹¹ These meetings abroad only strengthened Lenin’s unquenchable faith in Marx and the revolutionary movement. Ideology and its leading exponents were the sole

⁹ V. I. Lenin, “What the “Friends of the People” Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats.” *Lenin Internet Archive*, trans. D. Walters. Accessed November 13, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1894/friends/index.htm>

¹⁰ Marxist Internet Archive, *Marxist.org*, accessed November 13, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1894/friends/index.htm>

¹¹ Tumarkin, 36. Iuly Martov is also commonly spelled Yuli Martov.

focus of his life. He even confessed to being in love (*vlyublennost'*) with Karl Marx and Georgi Plekhanov, showing his complete passion for ideology and politics.¹²

After his journey in 1895, Lenin's status within the movement was greatly enhanced. The Marxists in St. Petersburg gained a large number of groups and adherents. Disagreements arose within these groups over the education of the working class. The labor workers, who the movement attracted, had the tendency to move out of their working-class status after being educated by the Marxist activists. Martov and his mentor Alexander Kremer, argued for Marxists to maintain study in their inner circles while only indoctrinating the workers on their immediate tasks. Other members, including Lenin, disagreed. Lenin insisted that Marxists have something to teach the working class and if the proletarian revolution was to be successful, there had to be widespread teaching of Marxist doctrines.¹³ Martov gained the upper hand in the negotiations, and a Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class was formed. The organization shifted from intellectual debate to economic and political agitation among industrial workers.¹⁴

Despite his early misgivings, Lenin moved with the times and supported the organization, abandoning his belief in a widespread indoctrination of Marx among the working class. This is an early example of Lenin's willingness to toss aside his views to fit the current situation. In November 1895, when textile workers went on strike, Lenin wrote a leaflet, "Russian Factory Legislation," that addressed the strikers at the Thornton Factory in St. Petersburg. This was the first time Lenin engaged in political activity outside of the confines of studious discussion circles.¹⁵ Shortly after, the organization wished to establish its own newspaper called *Rabochee Delo*, or "Workers Cause," with Lenin as the editor. Its purpose was to propose the formation of a worker's political party.¹⁶ In 1897, Lenin published his pamphlet, "The Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats" in the *Rabochee Delo*,

¹² Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 103.

¹³ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 105.

¹⁴ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 106.

¹⁵ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 106.

¹⁶ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 60.

where he discusses the “*practical* activities of the Social-Democrats”[emphasis original].¹⁷ On December 8, 1895, the newspaper was confiscated by police, and Lenin and his fellow members of the organization were taken into custody. Lenin was placed in the House of Preliminary Detention, where he spent time sketching out a program for the Marxist party¹⁸

On January 29, 1897, the authorities sentenced Lenin and members of the St. Petersburg Union of Struggle to three years of exile in eastern Siberia. While the members all agreed not to escape and fulfill their time, ideological differences divided the group. The growing outbursts of the working-class discontent posed nagging questions for the Marxists groups. Disagreements evolved over what role the anti-tsarist industrial workers would play in the revolution. Some members, such as Stepan Radchenko, argued that workers could not do better than well-read and committed intellectuals. These members became known as the Veterans and leaned more towards pro-terrorist actions. Other members, like Apollonaria Yakubova, argued working-class Marxists had enhanced abilities to run various organizations. Lenin leaned more toward the Veterans’ views but was not as hostile towards the working class. Neither he nor Radchenko believed that socialism was a doctrine that the working class could acquire without the ideological guidance of the intellectuals. On the other hand, Lenin knew the current affairs could not last and welcomed workers in the direction of the Union of Struggle, as long as they possessed a basic intellectual grounding.

In August 1898, while in exile in Shushenskoe, Lenin completed his book *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. He published the book under the pseudonym Vladimir Ilin since he was a well-known revolutionary and wanted to avoid problems with censorship. In Siberian exile, Lenin strengthened his skills, updating the scientific side of Marxism while also maintaining his uncompromising spirit that distinguished him from other Russian Marxists.¹⁹ The book’s erudite footnotes that refer to over six hundred books and articles support Lenin’s claim as a scholar. Although, the many derogatory remarks

¹⁷ V.I. Lenin, “The Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats,” *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 323-352, trans. George Hanna, accessed December 1, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1897/dec/31b.htm>

¹⁸ Service, *Lenin; A Biography*, 108.

¹⁹ Pomper, 52.

about *Narodnik* socialists Nikolay Mikhailovski and Vasily Vorontsov testify to the political aims of the work. He refutes the socialists' belief that Russia could avoid capitalism. He hammers out his detailed economic arguments on this point, suggesting Capitalism is sweeping through Russian agriculture.²⁰

The book offered a picture of steady and irreversible change in Russia. Lenin implied that social differentiation was a unilinear process and one that brings ever-increasing gains in agricultural efficiency through the application of machine-powered equipment.²¹ For capitalism to develop in Russia's industries, three main stages must take place. He claimed these stages are, "small commodity-production (small, mainly peasant industries); capitalist manufacture; and the factory (large-scale machine industry)."²² While Lenin offered a Marxist analysis of Russia's economic development, his definitions are problematic. He paid insufficient attention to the inner workings of the peasant community offering only an analysis of macro-economics. Lenin was also particularly vague about what he meant by capitalism and left no room for the occurrence of an economic crisis.²³ Instead of focusing on disproportionality, his main message was devoted to the ease in which Russia would develop into capitalism, showing how idealistic Lenin could be. This lack of preparation for economic crises later makes an appearance when Lenin was unable to form a solid solution for the economic struggles that were affecting the nation.

By the end of his three-year exile, Lenin was reaching new heights of achievement. He was quickly gaining popularity and transforming into a more orthodox Marxist. As his intellectual conviction grew stronger, Lenin gained a new respect for the Russian terrorist tradition.²⁴ His ability to overlook human suffering had developed by this point in his career. He had formed deep emotional attachments to the men who molded his ideological beliefs, as well as the Russian terrorists. As he gained confidence in himself, he began

²⁰ Robert H. McNeal, *The Bolshevik Tradition: Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), 8.

²¹ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 67.

²² Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia," *Lenin's Internet Archive*, Vol. 3, pp-21-608, trans. R. Cymbala. Accessed November 14, 2019. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/>, chapter VII, section XII.

²³ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 68.

²⁴ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 126.

presenting his beliefs as purely orthodox. Although he had yet to mature as a political leader, he was already beginning to take the leading role in the movement. By 1900, Lenin was determined not to waste any more time and further the cause of the revolution.²⁵ Since he was a marked man under tight surveillance, he went abroad to build his cause. His first task was to establish a newspaper that would publish the proletarian line and unite the local Democratic groups in Russia.²⁶ Together with Martov, Lenin laid the groundwork for the illegal newspaper, *Iskra*, or “The Spark” to be formed in December 1900. It targeted revolutionary activists and was designed to act in lieu of a party central committee.²⁷ For the next three years, Lenin, who had begun to publish under that pseudonym, and his colleagues were quite successful in propagandizing the Marxists in Russia on the behalf of the organization.²⁸ He was able to spread his revolutionary ideas across borders, building his cause to new levels.

The manner in which Lenin used language was like no Marxist before him. He was not a great stylist, but his angular grammar and abrasive rhetoric made his followers feel that he was akin to them.²⁹ His written works gave readers and supporters not only a sense of the importance of the revolutionary movement but also themselves. His audacious visions inspired a rallying around the name Lenin. A work that spurred a following was his article, “The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement,” published in December 1900. It states that “the fundamental task for the movement is to facilitate the political development and political organization of the working class.”³⁰ In this work, Lenin explored two ideas that were momentous for the future of Russia. The first was that the labor movement, left to itself without the guidance of socialist intellectuals, would become “petty and inevitably

²⁵ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 126.

²⁶ McNeal, 14.

²⁷ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 135.

²⁸ McNeal, 15.

²⁹ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 141.

³⁰ V.I. Lenin, “The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement,” *Lenin’s Internet Archive*, Vol. 4, pp-366-371, trans. R. Cymbala. Accessed November 14, 2019. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1900/nov/tasks.htm>

becomes bourgeois.”³¹ The second idea was that socialists, “must train people who will devote the whole of their lives, not only their spare evenings, to the revolution.”³²

This article was pivotal for Lenin’s political transformation, for it demonstrated how his ideologies had started to change. A few years earlier, Lenin was proving that the peasants were the petty-bourgeois, and that the *Narodnik* movement, which he criticized in *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, was inevitably bourgeois because they did not base themselves solely upon the proletariat.³³ Now, he was claiming that the proletariat, too, would become bourgeois if they did not accept the leadership and teachings of its socialist vanguard. This was a drastic departure from Marx, who in 1871 claimed that “the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves.”³⁴ Despite departing from Marx and Engels on this matter, Lenin still claimed to be an orthodox Marxist.

Lenin returned to the same theme in his article, “Where to Begin,” published in *Iskra* in May 1901. He continued the discussion for a need for a “real people’s political newspaper” that will reach the “urban petty bourgeoisie, rural handicraftsmen, and the peasants.”³⁵ In the article, Lenin also criticized the *Rabochego Dyelo*, the worker’s cause, for not having any set point of view. He claimed they misinterpreted Liebknecht’s words, “if the circumstances change within twenty-four hours, then tactics must be changed within twenty-four hours.”³⁶ Lenin stated, “only people devoid of all principles are capable of changing, in twenty-four hours, or for that matter, twenty-four months” and that “it is ridiculous to plead different circumstances and a change of periods.”³⁷ While Lenin, at this point in his career, had only made slight changes to his ideological views, he will later plead

³¹ Lenin, “The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement.”

³² Lenin, “The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement.”

³³ Bertram D. Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution: A Biographical History* (New York: Time Reading Program, 1964) 186.

³⁴ Karl Marx, “General Rules of the International Workingmen’s Association,” *Marx & Engels Internet Archive*, Accessed November 14, 2019. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1864/10/27b.htm>

³⁵ *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, One-Volume Edition, “Where to Begin” pp. 37-43 (New York: International Publishers, 1971) 41.

³⁶ *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, “Where to Begin,” 37.

³⁷ *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, “Where to Begin,” 38.

different circumstances on numerous occasions, much like the *Rabochego Dyelo* he criticizes.

After the publication of “Where to Begin,” Lenin’s theorizing began to turn toward what is later referred to as Leninist. He poured his greatest effort into consideration of the party’s condition.³⁸ In February 1902, he published the book, *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, taking the title from his beloved Chernyshevsky’s novel. The purpose of the work was to devote a detailed development of the ideas expressed in “Where to Begin,” published a year earlier. Lenin presented the need for a centralized party of revolutionaries to help the workers develop revolutionary ideas. He also offered his plan for immediate and all-round preparation for an uprising. His immediate recommendations were addressed specifically to Russia and presented not as an eternal solution, but as solutions to “the questions of our movement.”³⁹ Instead of seeking authorization in spontaneous mass movements, Lenin located authority in the conscious element of social democracy, the organization of professional revolutionaries.⁴⁰ He argued, “The greater the spontaneous upsurge of the masses and the more widespread the movement, the more rapid, incomparably so, the demand for greater consciousness in the theoretical, political, and organizational work of Social-Democracy.”⁴¹ Lenin claimed capitalism needs to form in Russia, for it predisposes the working class to accept socialism, but it does not spontaneously make them conscious Socialists Democrats. For socialist consciousness to form, it has to be “brought to them from without,” meaning they need to be led by intellectuals.⁴²

The work thrust Lenin before the attention of Marxists, not for his innovative political theory, but for the controversy the book produced. For Lenin, the work was merely a statement of orthodox Marxism on the questions of party organization. Russian Marxists, on the other hand, saw it as reminiscent of the traditions of the Russian agrarian socialists

³⁸ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 88.

³⁹ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 88.

⁴⁰ Pomper, 74.

⁴¹ V.I. Lenin, *What is to be Done? The Questions of Our Movement* (New York: International Publishers, 1999), 53.

⁴² Lenin, *What is to be Done?*, 31.

of the 1860s-1870s.⁴³ They also saw Lenin's emphasis on the need for underground political activity as hinting to secret conspiracies. In response, Lenin argued that in the current political atmosphere it would be suicidal for the party to act in the open. For those not hostile towards him, the book served as a hymn to his leadership. It had a formative influence on the contours of Leninism, outlasting the peculiar environment of its writings.⁴⁴ It eventually led to the creation of a communist party and the October Revolution of 1917.

In 1903, Lenin began to stand outside the usual generational affiliation. What sparked this transformation was the divide between Lenin and his close colleague Martov. During the second RSDLP Congress on July 29, 1903, a discussion of the party program took place.⁴⁵ Martov expressed that he wanted a party with members who had the ability to express themselves independently of the central leadership, while Lenin desired strong leadership with absolute control.⁴⁶ This disagreement between the two revealed Lenin's own agenda and his authentically hard mentality. His hatred for compromise and alliance with any but the extremely faithful became apparent.⁴⁷ Lenin understood what was needed for victory and believed only a disciplined party that has a spirit of subordination to its leaders could be successful.⁴⁸ Following the disagreement, the organization split, and with it, two factions emerged. Lenin's followers were termed the "Majoritarians," and later became the Bolsheviks and Martov's followers were the "Minoritarians" and later named the Mensheviks.⁴⁹

The tension between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks continued long after the 1903 conference. Lenin left the editorial board for *Iskra* and proceeded to publish anti-Menshevik works, seen in "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back." Despite arguments, the Bolsheviks increased in strength, and by spring 1904, all eight members of the Central

⁴³ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 139.

⁴⁴ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 142.

⁴⁵ The 2nd Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party was held between July 30 and August 23, 1903. It first took place in Brussels, Belgium and concluded in London, England.

⁴⁶ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 155.

⁴⁷ Pomper, 72.

⁴⁸ Pomper, 75.

⁴⁹ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 156.

Committee were Bolsheviks.⁵⁰ In 1904, together with Alexander Bogdanov and Anatoli Lunacharski, Lenin arranged to publish a rival newspaper to *Iskra* called *Vperëd*, or “Forward.”⁵¹ It was first published on December 22, 1904, and following its release, a civil war in the party raged. This was the political mood in which the 1905 revolutionary movement was built on.

After the events of Bloody Sunday, mayhem and strikes ensued across the nation.⁵² Revolutionaries were caught unprepared for the political storms that raged in 1905. The situation in Russia changed so fast that no émigré leader, even the zealous Lenin, could provide detailed advice to committees on how to proceed.⁵³ Despite being unprepared, the parties tried to take advantage of the social unrest and begin their revolution. Lenin recognized the potential for a civil war in Russia and thought the moment had arrived for the autocracy to be brought down by a determined revolutionary assault.⁵⁴ He believed a series of major uprisings involving guerrilla warfare would be necessary to overthrow the autocracy, so he began encouraging Bolsheviks to engage in a violent insurrection. In specifying how to make a revolution, Lenin presented a set of slogans that electrified his audience. He would say things like, “armed insurrection,” “a provisional revolutionary government,” “mass terror,” “the expropriation of gentry land” and “never stop” to inspire his followers in joining the violent movement.⁵⁵ Some members of the party, such as Miron Konstantinovich Vladimirov, did not understand how Lenin’s slogans fit into the early understandings of Russian Marxism and declared Lenin a proven renegade.⁵⁶

To justify his radical slogans in the face of criticism from the Mensheviks, Lenin published another booklet, “Two Tactics of Russian Social-Democracy in the Democratic

⁵⁰ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 163.

⁵¹ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 163.

⁵² Bloody Sunday occurred on January 9, 1905 when a peaceful procession for universal civil rights and a degree of democratic political representation ended in a massacre. Soldiers stationed outside the Winter Palace began shooting at the crowd, killing several hundred innocent demonstrators. It increased the unrest against the Romanov Dynasty, opening the door for revolutionaries to gain support.

⁵³ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 123.

⁵⁴ James Ryan, *Lenin’s Terror: The Ideological Origins of Early Soviet State Violence*, (London and Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 31.

⁵⁵ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 170-171.

⁵⁶ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 171.

Revolution.” Published in *Vpered* in May 1905, this pamphlet not only explains the reasoning for Lenin’s slogans, but it also describes the tactics needed for the Social Democrats to win over the masses. He claimed the revolution showed the true nature of societal classes and the real aspirations of the peasantry. Lenin described the efforts needed to educate and organize the working class whose strength was needed for the “onslaught against the autocracy.”⁵⁷ He tried to drum some organizational sense into the Bolsheviks, who he noted were slow to found trade unions and other organizations of the working class.⁵⁸ Since 1902, Lenin had called for the preparation for a proletarian revolution, and Bloody Sunday, he believed, marked the final preparation stage. This was Lenin’s most important work since *What is to be Done?*, for he defined the principles of Marxism and explained the concrete tasks the proletariat needed to take to begin the revolution. For Lenin wrote:

*The proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. [Emphasis original] Such are the tasks of the proletariat which the new-Iskraists present so narrowly in all their arguments and resolutions about the sweep of the revolution.*⁵⁹

Despite the awakening of a broader mass of the population, the revolutionary organization was not yet in the position to conduct its propagandistic work on a large-scale.⁶⁰ They might have been able to succeed if Tsar Nicholas II had not issued the October Manifesto on October 17, 1905, which promised reforms that would “restore peace to the life of the state.”⁶¹ The autocracy’s concessions gave the public some of its aims, causing them to change their positions, if only to a limited degree. As a result, the violence of the

⁵⁷ *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, “Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution,” 51.

⁵⁸ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 171.

⁵⁹ *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, “Two Tactics,” 117.

⁶⁰ Robert H McNeal, ed. *Russia in Transition 1905-1914: Evolution or Revolution?* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970), 12.

⁶¹ “Manifesto of October 17th, 1905,” trans. Daniel Field. Accessed November 16, 2019.

https://academic.shu.edu/russianhistory/index.php/Manifesto_of_October_17th_1905

revolution receded. Although they failed in overthrowing the Tsar, the revolutionaries had no intention of allowing the spirit of the revolution to die. For them, the 1905 uprising had been the initial operation that will be followed by a future act proletarian revolution.⁶² Lenin saw the failed uprising as a dress rehearsal for the final revolution that would welcome a socialist state. He had his mind on the final goal, emphasizing the Marxist distinction between the minimum democratic program and the maximum socialist program that would lead to communism.⁶³ Seeing the working-class' spontaneous instinct, Lenin formed an even greater urgency to actively lead the emancipation of the people. The defeats of 1905-1907 did not depress Lenin, for victory could be delayed but not postponed forever.⁶⁴

Between the 1905 uprising and the 1917 revolution, Leninism, as a particular Marxist ideological tendency, emerged. When Lenin called himself a Marxist, it meant to him that he had accepted the principle of the moral and actual inevitability of a proletarian revolution.⁶⁵ During these intervening years before the outbreak of World War I, Lenin continued to reiterate his conviction for the need for a confrontation with the autocracy to secure a republic.⁶⁶ He wrote, "the task of the Russian proletariat is to carry the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia to its conclusion, in order to kindle the socialist revolution in Europe."⁶⁷ Lenin's faith in Marxism was a living faith that gave him the confidence to take bold and unpopular positions. In the years following the outbreak of the First World War, Lenin preached defeatism and class war during a time when it appeared all, including social democratic representatives, supported the war effort.⁶⁸ He saw the coming bourgeois revolution in Russia as a possible key to the transformation from international war to a world-wide civil war, which would then develop into a proletarian revolution.⁶⁹

⁶² Sydney Harcave, *The Russian Revolution of 1905*, (London: Collier Books, 1970), 261.

⁶³ Ryan, 44.

⁶⁴ Service, *Lenin: A Political Life*, 175.

⁶⁵ Meyer, 108.

⁶⁶ Ryan, 48.

⁶⁷ Meyer, 144.

⁶⁸ Pomper, 232.

⁶⁹ Meyer, 157.

Lenin understood that a proletarian revolution could never alone achieve socialism, for it needed to rise with an advanced industrial economy. While living in Switzerland, Lenin began studying *Imperialism*, a politico-economic work by British economist J.A. Hobson. Written in 1902, the work linked capitalism to the empire. In June 1916, Lenin produced his own economic essay, “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.” He brought together a vast array of data, such as economic, social, and political to produce an essay of great power and influence.⁷⁰ It is notable for its emphasis on the changing character of imperialism, from colonies to economic domination, and for its argument that states imperialism is the final stage of capitalism.⁷¹ The work distinguished Lenin’s departure from Marx and Engels, neither of whom allowed for such a phase in their development of capitalism. This essay was a prime example of how his beliefs continually changed, for earlier in his career, Lenin criticized any who did not fully follow the theories of Marx. Lenin argued that imperialism was not just the highest stage, but it was also the product of monopoly capitalism. He stated, “monopoly that grows out of the soil of free competition, and precisely out of free competition, is the transition from the capitalist system to a higher socio-economic order.”⁷² He claimed that as competition increases, a war between capitalist nations would continue until they are overthrown by a proletarian revolution, which opens the door for socialism. For, “imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat.”⁷³ He predicted that Russia would soon be transforming its imperialist war into a socialist revolution.

Through the rest of 1916, Lenin was trying to foment the European socialist revolution in order to bring about capitalism’s overthrow. He did not believe it would occur overnight, and continually stressed that there might be countries whose capitalists would fend off the revolutionary assault.⁷⁴ All the while he fervently believed that he was living through a revolutionary epoch. He repeated the song that revolution was “ripe,”

⁷⁰ Pomper, 233.

⁷¹ Jeffery Brooks and Georgiy Chernyavskiy, *Lenin and the Making of the Soviet State: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2007), 44.

⁷² *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,” 259.

⁷³ *V.I Lenin Selected Works*, “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,” 175.

⁷⁴ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 249.

“imminent,” and “growing.”⁷⁵ Lenin’s prediction came true the following year when in February 1917 a political eruption took place in Petrograd.⁷⁶ Grieved over the deteriorating conditions in factories and food shortages, women textile workers went on strike in the capital. All loyalty to the emperor had vanished. Lenin saw that the moment for his revolution had finally arrived. Fearing a violent overthrow, Nicholas II abdicated his throne to his brother, Mikhail, but the concession was inadequate for the rebels and power had already passed to the leaders of the dispersed State Duma.⁷⁷ On March 2, 1917, the Romanov Dynasty that had ruled since 1613 was officially over, making way for the Soviets to assume power. This was the “bourgeois revolution” of which Lenin had spoken.⁷⁸

After a decade of living abroad, Lenin made his return to Russia after hearing of the political earthquake that shook the nation. On route from Switzerland, he began sketching his proposed strategy for Soviet control of the state. In his notes for the defense of his *April Theses*, Lenin wrote, “we must skillfully, carefully, by clearing their minds, lead the proletariat and the poorest peasantry forward from the ‘dual power’ toward the *full power* of the Soviets.”⁷⁹ Published on April 7, 1917, “The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution,” also called the *April Theses*, laid the groundwork for a proletariat run government. Lenin provided ten points that call for the establishment of socialist policies and also denounces the war and the Provisional Government. The work laid the foundation for Leninism and became the “gospel” of the workers’ movement.⁸⁰

Although Russia had just entered its bourgeois phase, Lenin called for the renunciation of any cooperation with the bourgeois Provisional Government, insisting the power should be transferred to the Soviets.⁸¹ He wrote that the Soviets “are the only possible form of revolutionary government” and their task is to transform “the entire state power to

⁷⁵ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 249.

⁷⁶ Following the outbreak of World War I, on September 1, 1914, the city of St. Petersburg was renamed Petrograd to disassociate with Germany.

⁷⁷ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 253.

⁷⁸ Meyer, 186.

⁷⁹ Bertram D. Wolfe, *An Ideology in Power: Reflections on the Russian Revolution* (New York: Stein and Day, 1970), 139. “Soviets” is short for the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies.

⁸⁰ Tumarkin, 98.

⁸¹ Tumarkin, 48.

the Soviets of Workers' Deputies."⁸² Instead of allowing the bourgeois phase to last several decades that the Social Democrats previously envisioned, Lenin claimed that after six weeks, the bourgeois political hegemony in Russia was already coming to an end.⁸³ The bourgeoisie revolution had merged with a simultaneous anti-bourgeois revolution.⁸⁴ It accompanied several measures designed to lead the nation towards socialism.

Lenin's intellectual development following the October Revolution went through three principal phases. The first was a brief period of profuse optimism, which expressed itself in maximal demands. The second phase saw an emergence of utopian dreams in which a realistic appraisal of trends led to ruthless terror, seen in the purging of political opponents even within the movement. Lenin's ideological development during this phase was obscured by the fact that a decisive change in policy sharply divides it into two periods. This change can be seen in Lenin's complete abandonment of War Communism and the introduction of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921. In the third and final phase, Lenin focused on stocks, hinting at potential new policies. What these policies might have been will never be known, for Lenin became sick and died during this third phase.⁸⁵

During his second principle phase, Lenin published his famous work, *State and Revolution* in August 1917. He finished the book while hiding in safe houses to avoid arrest for the violence the Bolshevik party caused during the July Days.⁸⁶ In his book, Lenin described the role of the state. He illuminated his view of the state being a weapon of class struggle and a means to transform society. Lenin stressed the need for a lasting state and highlighted how the bureaucratic-military machine must be smashed. He used Marx and Engels's teaching to supplement his ideas on transforming the bourgeois economy into a "state power of the armed workers."⁸⁷ The work displayed Lenin's belief that a socialist state

⁸² Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution [a.k.a The April Theses]," *Marxist Internet Archive*, No. 26 (April 7, 1917), trans. Isaacs Bernard. Accessed November 16, 2019. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/apr/04.htm>, 3.

⁸³ Tumarkin, 48.

⁸⁴ Meyer, 186.

⁸⁵ Meyer, 186-187.

⁸⁶ July Days took place between July 3-7, 1917 in Petrograd where armed demonstrations against the Provisional Government took place. Following, the Provisional Government blamed the Bolsheviks and began mass arrests of party members. Lenin fled to Finland to avoid arrest.

⁸⁷ V. I. Lenin, *State and Revolution* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1970), 58.

would smoothly develop after a proletarian revolution, and then wither away, leaving a communist society in its wake. This piece of literature exhibited how much of a utopian dreamer Lenin was during this phase of his political career. The work was not only based on false expectations, but it also created them. Lenin's notion of a communist state was the utopian issue of both his faith in Marxism and his need to offer inspiration for the struggle of the historical moment.⁸⁸

Following the publishing of *State and Revolution*, Russia began its Civil War, which tore apart the country for three years.⁸⁹ In the summer of 1918, a major development forced Lenin to produce radical alterations to his socialist plans. These necessitated emergency measures are referred to as War Communism. At the beginning of the Civil War, Lenin toyed with the idea of state capitalism, but within a few weeks, he abandoned this scheme of a mixed system of state control and plunged recklessly into broad nationalization of industry and centralized control over production.⁹⁰ This caused production to flounder. Lenin believed only the party and its agencies had the will and expertise to organize production, for, as stated in *State and Revolution*, the proletariat was incapable of the roles assigned to them and needed to submit to the dictatorship of the party.⁹¹ The new policy profoundly affected all aspects of society. It virtually ruined the industry, significantly reduced agricultural production, and forced the party to rule increasingly by force.⁹² This policy of surplus appropriation was not consistent with the classical Marxist principle of distribution under socialism.⁹³ The Marxist theory states that every person would be rewarded according to the amount of work he or she performed, but under Lenin's War Communism, no matter how much a person worked, they would only receive a fixed amount. It was a departure from the socialism Lenin originally aimed to create.

⁸⁸ Pomper, 293.

⁸⁹ Civil War officially lasted from November 7, 1917 to October 25, 1922. It was fought against the anti-communist White Army by the Red Army, who were Bolsheviks. Lenin and his Red Army were victorious.

⁹⁰ Pomper 351.

⁹¹ Pomper 352.

⁹² Pomper, 353.

⁹³ Richard Fleming, "Lenin's Conception of Socialism: Learning from the Early Experiences of the World's First Socialist Revolution," *Forward*, Vol. 9, No.1, 1989. Accessed November 17, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-7/lenin-socialism.htm>, 7.

Lenin became more concerned with restoring the health of the crippled system of production than with following Marxist values. This demonstrates Lenin's change in view, for a few years earlier he claimed his every decision was aimed at following Marxism. In Marxist theory, production in a socialist system serves the needs of its citizens. While, in the new communist party-state created by Lenin, control over the production made the workers mere instruments to be used for the system of production. He established a policy known as the "militarization of labor," which treated the industrial worker essentially as soldiers.⁹⁴ In April 1919, Lenin ordered a general mobilization of workers, making labor in defense industries mandatory for every person able to work.⁹⁵ Wages were not paid in money, but food, clothes, and limited goods. Long hours were required, and in some cases, workers worked longer than before the revolution. This is far cry from the work conditions Lenin promised when he made his Decree on the Eight-Hour-Day in October 1917, which limited work for everyone to only eight hours per day.⁹⁶ Russian leftists criticized Lenin's War Communism as being too drastic, but Lenin disagreed. He published "A Great Beginning" on June 28, 1919, to counter his critics. In this work, Lenin wrote:

Those who try to solve the problems involved in the transition from capitalism to socialism on the basis of general talk about liberty, equality, democracy in general, equality of labour democracy, etc. (as Kautsky, Martov and other heroes of the Berne yellow International do), thereby only reveal their petty-bourgeois, philistine nature and ideologically slavishly follow in the wake of the bourgeoisie. The correct solution of this problem can be found only in a concrete study of the specific relations between the specific class which has conquered political power, namely, the proletariat, and the whole non-proletarian, and also semi-proletarian, mass of the working population—relations which do not take shape in fantastically harmonious, "ideal" conditions, but in the real conditions of the frantic resistance of the bourgeoisie which assumes many and diverse forms.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Fleming, 8.

⁹⁵ Fleming, 8.

⁹⁶ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 321.

⁹⁷ Vladimir Lenin, "A Great Beginning: Heroism of the Workers in the Rear 'Communist Subbotniks,'" in *Lenin's Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 408-434. Accessed November 16, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/jun/19.htm>

Ultimately, Lenin's style of leadership created the groundwork for disaster, and he showed no capacity for changing it.⁹⁸

The Bolshevik's victory in the Civil War brought them face to face with the country's internal problems of administrative chaos and economic devastation.⁹⁹ Production in 1921 was one-seventh the level it was at in 1917.¹⁰⁰ The peasantry had little to no incentive to increase output because any extra food was taken by the government. Unrest began to stir among the peasantry, industrial workers, and the Red Army. The military revolts at Kronstadt and Tambov, which were fueled by economic and political grievances, drove home the need for a new economic policy.¹⁰¹ In March 1921, Lenin formulated a set of measures, called the New Economic Policy (NEP), that brought sweeping changes to Russia. The first step was the replacement of requisitioning peasant produce, for the system, a tax in kind. In this new system, the state took only a fixed quota instead of everything they could. The second step was permitting the peasantry to engage in private trade to sell their surplus food. Lenin was strongly opposed to the private trade, feeling it was a repudiation of communist principles. Although he opposed the new measures of the NEP, Lenin was in desperate economic circumstances and had to make a strategic retreat. Due to the unsteady economic situation, Lenin was forced to take these measures to restore the shattered economy and to calm the fears of the non-proletarian population.¹⁰²

The establishment of NEP had fatal flaws. To modernize production, Lenin had to call for wider use of bourgeois experts in the industry. In "The Tax in Kind," Lenin stated, "We must not be afraid of Communists "learning" from bourgeois experts, including merchants, petty capitalist co-operators and capitalists, in the same way as we learned from the military experts, though in a different form."¹⁰³ Although Lenin made it clear the factories would not turn over to the bourgeoisie, allowing the bourgeoisie to make higher

⁹⁸ Pomper, 356.

⁹⁹ Sheila Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution*, fourth ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 94.

¹⁰⁰ Fleming, 9.

¹⁰¹ Fitzpatrick, 96.

¹⁰² Fitzpatrick, 97.

¹⁰³ V.I Lenin, "The Tax in Kind (The Significant of the New Policy and its Conditions)," in *Lenin's Collected Works*, Vol. 31, 329-365. Accessed November 16, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1921/apr/21.htm>

wages then the working class contradicted his earlier plans for the working-class system. The new economic policy generated substantial controversy. Never had opposition to Lenin been more vocal.¹⁰⁴ Leftists accused Lenin of retreating into capitalism for his allowance of individual production and trade. Other critics came from the right-wing, who claimed the economic crisis proved Russia was not yet ready for socialism. They wanted a prolonged period of capitalism to develop the production forces that will later allow socialism to prosper.¹⁰⁵

Lenin responded sharply to the criticism over NEP. He claimed that neither the left nor the right understood what was required to build a socialist state. Lenin pointed out that socialism could not exist without a qualitative modernization of the economy and that Russia's economy would modernize faster under a socialist government than a capitalist one.¹⁰⁶ In the face of the controversy, Lenin formed the opinion that experimentation is needed for building socialism. He wrote, "those who want to solve a more difficult problem, namely, to vanquish capitalism, must have the perseverance to try hundreds and thousands of new methods, means and weapons of struggle in order to elaborate the most suitable of them."¹⁰⁷ His new opinion only arose after Lenin accepted failure and created the NEP. Earlier in his career, Lenin was adamant that his ideological groundwork, laid out in the *April Theses* and *State and Revolution*, was the true path towards socialism, but as the situation changed, so did his plans. He had adjusted his thought and behavior to the opportunities on offer.¹⁰⁸ As seen in both War Communism and the NEP, Lenin tugged Marxism around to fit it into the kind of revolution he desired.

In 1922, Lenin's health began to seriously decline. In May, he suffered from his first stroke, which caused him to temporarily lose his ability to speak. Between December 1922 and January, Lenin began dictating his political testament. In what is called "Lenin's Testament," he outlines the program for the future of the Soviet government. He emphasized the need to make changes to the government and warns against the

¹⁰⁴ Tumarkin, 109.

¹⁰⁵ Fleming, 10.

¹⁰⁶ Fleming, 11.

¹⁰⁷ V.I. Lenin, "The Great Beginning."

¹⁰⁸ Service, *Lenin: A Biography*, 369.

consequences if such changes are not made. In the work, Lenin critiqued the members of the Soviet, including Stalin, who was in the position to take over. He believed no other leader was worthy of succeeding him. In his testament, Lenin wrote, “I think that Stalin’s haste and his infatuation with pure administration, together with his spite against the notorious ‘nationalist socialism played a fatal role here.’”¹⁰⁹ Despite his efforts to have Stalin removed, Stalin took control after Lenin suffered another stroke, which ended his political career. On January 21, 1924, he fell into a coma and died at the age of fifty-four.

When Lenin died, socialism was still very much in its infancy. His death appeared to precipitate the gravest political crisis of the regime since the Civil War.¹¹⁰ This was because Lenin was a source of its legitimacy, even during his illness. Lenin’s unfinished business left the party with unanswered questions as to where to take the Soviet state. Many problems still confronted the party. The NEP was in full swing and he left no plans on how to end it. National economic planning hardly existed, and Lenin’s collectivization of agriculture had barely started.¹¹¹ Although we can never know where Lenin may have taken the nation, we do know he laid the framework for the system of government that ruled Russia for seven decades. He created a model for communist governments to follow.

In a span of thirty-one years, Lenin transformed Russia from an absolute monarchy to a one-party state. Few Russians and even fewer foreigners predicted that Lenin’s Bolshevik party would have gained complete power. Lenin had been given a chance because of wartime economic disruption and administrative and political turmoil. He zealously handled his party with determination, ensuring that an extreme order of authoritarianism was formed. Although he claimed to be an orthodox follower of Marx, Lenin bent Marxism around to the kind of revolution he wanted. He continually altered his ideological views to ensure Russia transformed into his desired socialist state. Lenin’s ideological development throughout his career is marked by its contradictory and highly controversial ideas. Lenin’s ultimate aim was to hold power, which he did by making whatever doctrinal changes were

¹⁰⁹ V.I Lenin, “Last Testament’ Letters to Congress: The Question of Nationalities or ‘Autonomisation,” in *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol. 36, 593-611. Accessed November 16, 2019.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1922/dec/testamnt/autonomy.htm>

¹¹⁰ Tumarkin, 135.

¹¹¹ Fleming, 12.

needed at the time. The establishment of War Communism and the NEP, which depart entirely from Lenin's early ideological views, show the lengths he was willing to go to ensure Russia stayed socialist. Lenin's extreme flexibility as a policymaker made it possible for him to justify almost any abrupt abandonment of one course for another. Although Lenin made extraordinary mistakes throughout the revolutionary period, ones that caused him to abandon his beliefs, Lenin helped turn the world upside down. He was an unexpected figure that now is the embodiment of the Russian Revolution.

**ONE OF ANOTHER KIND:
HOW WILHELM II ATTEMPTED TO EMULATE FREDERICK THE GREAT**

Caroline Martin

At first glance, it may seem Wilhelm II and Frederick the Great have nothing in common aside from both holding the regal name Hohenzollern. Frederick brought Prussia to greatness and Wilhelm played a major role in the untimely demise of the German Empire. But they may not have been so dissimilar. Wilhelm II was an ardent admirer of Frederick the Great: so much so that he tried to emulate his ways and thought it was his destiny to bring glory to Germany just as Frederick the Great had brought glory to Prussia during the Silesian Wars. Wilhelm's own mother, Princess Victoria, wrote in a letter to her mother, Queen Victoria of England, that she wished her son would become a second Frederick the Great, but "one of another kind."¹ Though he tried to become the leader he felt he was destined to be, he focused his attention on all the wrong things. He attempted to act as Frederick without a complete understanding of Frederick's philosophy and as such much of what he did was disjointed and inevitably led to his downfall.

It is clear that from birth Wilhelm had high expectations set before him. Both his and Frederick's childhoods shaped the way they developed and both sovereigns suffered in their youth, though in different ways. Wilhelm was born on January 27, 1859, and endured major complications during birth, the result of which left him with irreparable injury to his left arm and shoulder. His mother was horrified, and the doctors tried all manner of torturous medical treatments to fix him, such as sticking his arm in freshly slaughtered animals (a treatment known as an "animal bath"), tying his good arm to his body to force use of the injured one, electrotherapy to the arm and neck, and placing him into a stretching machine for an hour a day. Wilhelm also suffered numerous other illnesses and injuries in childhood that left him bedridden for weeks at a time, many of which became

¹ Lamar Cecil, *Wilhelm II: Prince and Emperor, 1859-1900* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 15.

lifelong afflictions.² Victoria wrote to her mother that the young Wilhelm was “prone to violent passions” due to his frustration over his disabilities and how distressing it was as a mother to witness such things.³

Victoria became emotionally abusive to her son as she became increasingly disappointed by his lack of perfection. She insisted he receive proper schooling so he would grow up to think like the English, whom she believed to be of superior intellect. Wilhelm’s father, Frederick III, hired a tutor, George Hinzpeter, who he believed would satisfy Victoria’s ambitions while still teaching him the way of the Prussian military. Hinzpeter’s tutoring was harsh; the hours were long and the punishments for mistakes were strict. The end result was the opposite of what everyone had hoped.

Historian Lamar Cecil states that Wilhelm’s education managed to be at once “exacting and superficial” and he goes on to write that “as an adult [Wilhelm] would command an astounding number of facts but fail to possess a thorough understanding of even a single area of learning.”⁴ Wilhelm was praised for reciting memorized facts as people believed this to be a sign of intelligence. This became a large part of how he reigned. He memorized numbers and phrases and believed that he understood everything that was happening around him when, in reality, he was extremely out of touch with his own people and with other world leaders. Due to the constant criticism he received as a child, he would not tolerate any as an adult. Criticisms included any statements with which he did not agree. When Wilhelm attended university as a young man and one of his professors wrote, “[Wilhelm] refuses to have anything to do with contrary opinions.”⁵ Wilhelm’s refusal to listen to others only became more pronounced once he became emperor. His insecurity caused him to surround himself with people who would always do what he said, without question, which led to many mistakes.

Frederick the Great also suffered a tumultuous childhood, though he ended up with a much different outlook. He was born on January 24, 1712. Frederick’s father, Frederick

² John C. G. Rohl, *Kaiser Wilhelm II 1859-1941: A Concise Life*, trans. Sheila De Bellaigue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 7-9.

³ Rohl, *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, 11.

⁴ Cecil, *Wilhelm II*, 24.

⁵ Cecil, *Wilhelm II*, 39.

William, was believed to have suffered from porphyria, a hereditary disease, which, according to historian Nancy Mitford, “drives its victims mad with prolonged and terrible sufferings.”⁶ Wilhelm II was also believed to be afflicted with this disease later in life. It could cause random bouts of violent rage which could be inflicted on any individual that happened to be nearby. Frederick’s closest sister, Wilhelmina, describes what life in the Royal house was like stating, “The pains of purgatory could not equal those we endured.”⁷ Frederick learned to react to situations with cool indifference as a coping method for dealing with the violent outbursts of his father.

Frederick William prized the military above all else and surrounded Frederick with military men. He refused to let him be taught history, Latin, or anything concerned with the classic civilizations. Despite Frederick William’s efforts some of the soldiers whom he chose to guide young Frederick, unbeknownst to him, were also scholars. Jacques Duhan and Count Finck von Finckenstein made Frederick aware of the great learning that could be achieved and from then on he sought out intellectual pursuits to spite his father.⁸ Historian Gerhard Ritter states, “The mistreated boy learned more and more to think of himself as someone different and isolated, until he came to consciously oppose the traditions of his family.”⁹ In order to deal with the trauma he had endured, Frederick created an identity for himself that was as different from his own father as he could possibly manage.

As a young man this all became overwhelming for Frederick, and he, along with his friend Katte, attempted to run away to England, though they were captured. Frederick was imprisoned as a deserter of the Prussian military and was forced to watch Katte’s execution, believing himself to be the only person to blame. This event caused a psychological breakdown in Frederick. He did nearly everything his father asked of him after this and had an outlook that was drastically altered. He submitted to his father’s military and economic

⁶ Nancy Mitford, *Frederick the Great* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1970), 17.

⁷ Frederica Wilhelmina: Margravine of Baeruth. *Autobiography*, ed. W.D. Howells (Boston: Ticknor and Company, 1877), 142. Accessed 13 Nov 2019, HathiTrust.

⁸ Mitford, *Frederick the Great*, 22.

⁹ Gerhard Ritter, *Frederick the Great: A Historical Profile*, trans. Peter Paret (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968), 29.

training but continued to collect books and study in secret.¹⁰ It was during this time that Frederick began focusing on his political philosophies, looking forward to the day he became king so that he could rule Prussia as he saw fit. In a letter he wrote to his Chamberlain in 1731, less than a year after his imprisonment, he outlined many of his future goals, and wrote he wished for the Prussian state to “become the refuge of the oppressed, the shield of widows and orphans, the support of the poor, and the terror of the unjust.”¹¹ Though these statements are very idealized, many of his actions as ruler show he kept such ideas in the forefront of his mind, always doing what he believed was the best for all of Prussia.

When both Wilhelm II and Frederick the Great came to power, they inherited strong and growing states. By the time Frederick William I died in 1740, he had amassed a large sum of war treasures, made the military independent of foreign subsidies, and tripled the revenue of Prussia.¹² He left Prussia in a greater state than he had found it, leaving it poised to make its mark on Europe. Frederick was able to harness the military and economic skills his father had taught him along with his own ideals he had gathered from readings on philosophy and history and continued to expand the power of the Prussian state.

Wilhelm II rose to power in 1888 as King of Prussia and Emperor of a recently unified Germany. During this time, the German Empire was in a state of rapid industrialization. From 1873 to 1895, Germany shifted from an agricultural to an industrial based economy.¹³ This transition caused large migration to cities as people went to work in newly formed corporations. More people were becoming literate as education became more widely available. Germany was at the forefront of science and innovation, leading the world in advancements in engineering and chemistry.¹⁴ Wilhelm had even more material resources than Frederick the Great, not to mention the brilliant political minds with whom he was

¹⁰ Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, 31.

¹¹ Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, 33.

¹² Sidney Fay, *The Rise of Brandenburg-Prussia to 1786*, revised by Klaus Epstein (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), 90.

¹³ Volker R. Berghahn, *Imperial Germany 1871-1914: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1994), 16.

¹⁴ Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *The German Empire 1871-1918*, trans. Kim Traynor (Hamburg: Berg Publishers, 1985), 19.

surrounded at the beginning of his reign, such as Otto von Bismarck. Wilhelm had everything he needed to succeed, yet he set his ambitions unrealistically high and refused to settle for anything less than German-dominated Europe.

Wilhelm's desire for an all-powerful Germany resulted in a political philosophy that was highly unrealistic. While Frederick's philosophies were logical and based on years of dedicated research and contemplation, Wilhelm's were far-reaching and disjointed at best. Calling Wilhelm's ideas a philosophy at all is arguable, as that implies a depth of thought that simply was not there. Cecil wrote that Wilhelm suffered from "delusions of genius" and that he "tended to confuse the possession of facts with the mastery of a subject."¹⁵ This can be seen clearly in how he understood Frederick. Wilhelm often read stories about Frederick the Great that had been kept in his family histories. Wilhelm even commissioned a full length biography to be written of Frederick by Reinhold Koser, focusing primarily on Frederick's profound military victories and nothing on his domestic policies.¹⁶ Wilhelm believed that Frederick's greatness came entirely from his military accomplishment and his ability to gain territory, and because of this Wilhelm concluded that if he were also to be a great leader he needed to conquer as well. He picked the things he liked about Frederick, like his commanding nature on the battlefield, and ignored everything else. For instance, Frederick did not like religion and is commonly believed to be an atheist while Wilhelm was intensely religious because he believed God gave him the power to rule over Germany. He ignored anything and anyone that would say otherwise, even many of the writings of his own role model. Wilhelm believed he was the only person who understood what the empire needed. These two ideas of conquest and divine rule merged together to form the basis of Wilhelm's Weltpolitik, or world politics, which, in the most general terms, was the belief that Germany should be a powerful leader in international affairs and that Wilhelm, as Emperor, should be solely responsible for these proceedings.¹⁷

¹⁵ Lamar Cecil, *Wilhelm II vol. 2: Emperor and Exile, 1900-1941* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 50.

¹⁶ Cecil, *Wilhelm II vol. 2*, 51.

¹⁷ Thomas August Kohut, *Wilhelm II and the Germans: A Study in Leadership* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 177. Accessed 18 Nov 2019, EbscoHost.

Examples of this arrogant behavior are numerous. During the First and Second Moroccan Crises in 1905 and 1911 Wilhelm attempted to assert German dominance over France by supporting the independence of Morocco which was considered in France's sphere of influence, which only had the impact of causing increased animosity between France and Germany. In the name of Germany Wilhelm leased the Kiautschou Bay from China in an attempt to colonize even though they lacked the infrastructure necessary to make such an endeavor successful and only ended up annoying Great Britain who was also trying to colonize in the area. Wilhelm's pride and joy was the building of an Imperial Battlefleet to give Germany a navy rivaling that of Great Britain, which was seen as a deliberate provocation to other European countries. All of these events were completely unprecedented, unnecessary. They were done purely in an attempt to make himself seem like he had more power on the global stage than he actually did and all damaged Germany's relationships with other European powers.

Wilhelm did not pay much attention to anything other than foreign affairs. Cecil writes, "domestic issues rarely interested Wilhelm II whose taste ran to the more dramatic course of foreign policy."¹⁸ In his own memoir they are mentioned very little and when they are it seems to be only for the effect of making him seem like a benevolent ruler. It is worth noting his memoirs are not very trustworthy, as he frequently exaggerate in his own favor and used ghost writers for sections he did not want to complete.¹⁹ However, it can still be used to glean how Wilhelm thought of himself and the events transpiring around him. He wrote about a coal strike and how the lower class had greatly justified grievances over their treatment. Wilhelm then went on to say how much he cares about them and quoted Frederick the Great by stating, "I wish to be King of the Rabble."²⁰ This became his excuse for pushing programs and laws that did nothing but anger other government officials and leaders of industry. This was a common theme in the life of Wilhelm II. He would be inspired by some form of philosophical thinking, generally that of Frederick the Great, be

¹⁸ Cecil, *Wilhelm II Vol.2*, 191.

¹⁹ Cecil, *Wilhelm II Vol.2*, 25.

²⁰ Wilhelm II, *The Kaiser's Memoirs*, trans. Thomas R. Ybarra (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922), 38. Accessed 18 Nov 2019. Gutenberg.org.

moved to action, and then accomplish very little at best and causing a crisis at worst. Wilhelm attempted to act as an “Enlightened Despot”, a term often used to describe Frederick the Great, but seems to have never realized that the German Empire he ruled was very different from the Kingdom of Prussia that Frederick ruled and the same sort of policies would never work in the new international landscape.

Though Wilhelm wrote a little, Frederick the Great wrote extensively, which provided historians broad insight into his life and the way he thought about the world. One of Frederick’s most concise writings that reveals his political outlook is his response to Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, known as the *Anti-Machiavel*. He outlined all the points in which he disagreed with Machiavelli, of which there are numerous in every chapter. Frederick was especially against the notion that leaders should be cruel and operate through fear. He wrote, “It should be wished for the happiness of the world, that the Prince know good, without being too indulgent; so that kindness was always to them a virtue and never a weakness.”²¹ The leader that Frederick described here is one who supports justice and honor, always acting in the best interest of his people and never in the interest of personal gain. He also went into great detail explaining the kind of wars rulers should allow themselves to be engaged in. He broke them into three categories: wars of defense (the most just), wars of interest (which are “to uphold rights that are being questioned”), and wars of precaution. On wars of precaution he wrote, “When excessive size of power seems close to overflowing, and threatens to absorb the universe, it is prudent to throw sandbags at it.”²² This is important because he later claimed that the Silesian War was a war of precaution, writing of how Austria was throwing off the balance of power in the region and how Prussia needed to fight to prove its power on the continent.²³ This point outlines his way of thinking and the logical progression of ideas he followed to accomplish what he did, something which Wilhelm II greatly lacked.

²¹ Frederick the Great, *Anti-Machiavel*, 39. Accessed 18 Nov 2019, Archive.org,

²² Frederick the Great, *Anti-Machiavel*, 67.

²³ Christopher Clark, *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia 1600-1947* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press, 2006), 193.

Soon after becoming King, Frederick decided to invade Silesia. The action was extremely quick and decisive. From his days as Crown Prince, Frederick already possessed a great understanding of the European political landscape, economics, and capabilities of the Prussian military. When Maria Theresa became Queen of Austria in the wake of her father's death, Frederick saw an opportunity to invade when his chances of success were the highest.²⁴ His true motivations for invading have been debated by historians for centuries. The common reasons being a desire for personal glory, revenge against Austria, acquisition of Silesia's mineral deposits for economic gain, to increase the power of Prussia in Europe, or all of the above. Whatever his true reason was, he still took many factors into account both before and during the war. Frederick was brilliant but was by no means infallible. Throughout the Silesian wars he made many mistakes, but historian Christopher Clark points out he had "a readiness to recognize where mistakes had been made (including by himself)."²⁵ This ability to get outside of one's own head and see the situation for what it really is, in order to be better prepared in the future, is an exceptional talent and one few rulers seem to possess. Historian Gerhard Ritter wrote, "stronger by far than his skepticism were his will and readiness to act; and these were not weakened but purified and hardened in the flames of rational analysis,"²⁶ emphasizing Frederick's acute understanding of logical thought.

It was not only Frederick's willingness to act but his understanding of when not to act that made him brilliant in both foreign and domestic policy. After the Silesian Wars Frederick became a keeper of the peace, returning at once to the people of Prussia to help them recover after the many years of fighting. He promoted agriculture and industry to fix the damage done by invading armies.²⁷ When provoked by Empress Catherine the Great of Russia, instead of going to war, he did everything he could to gain an alliance with her. This resulted in the first partition of Poland, giving Frederick East Prussia, which had until that point belonged to Poland.²⁸ Though his accomplishments look great from an outside

²⁴ Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, 76.

²⁵ Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, 205.

²⁶ Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, 74.

²⁷ Mitford, *Frederick the Great*, 248.

²⁸ Fay, *The Rise of Prussia*, 120.

perspective, Frederick himself was never satisfied with his actions. As he grew older, he became increasingly depressed and misanthropic as he saw the suffering of Prussian citizens and believed it to be his own fault for not doing a good enough job. By the time of his death in 1786, Frederick was withdrawn from the public, spending most of his time closed off in his study.²⁹ Wilhelm similarly suffered from depression and had a misanthropic personality; however, a key difference is Wilhelm did not take responsibility for the things he did and instead believed any of his subjects who did not agree with him were simply not intelligent enough to understand the workings of the state.

From his youth Wilhelm had yearned to be like the heroic figure of Frederick the Great during the Silesian Wars, yet idealized him so much that he lost all the aspects that made him a successful ruler in the first place, such as rational thought, decisive action, self-awareness, and an understanding of his people.³⁰ Concerning warfare, Wilhelm completely fell short of his expectations because he was extremely indecisive and thought only of himself. In the years preceding World War I, he gave and withdrew and gave again unconditional support for Austria against Serbia, continually went back and forth on how to handle Great Britain, and at some points could not decide who it was in his best interest to attack and when. Even after most German officials decided it would be beneficial to go to war in 1914, the Kaiser still could not make up his mind. A few times Wilhelm gave contradictory speeches within the same day wherein he said they should not go to war in the morning and had changed his mind by the evening.

Due to this kind of behavior many of the elite government officials worked behind Wilhelm's back and attempted to manipulate him to their way of thinking which led to a dramatic decrease in the Kaiser's power that he did not even realize was happening.³¹ As the war neared its end in 1918, Wilhelm rapidly lost control of the government and became mostly an ineffective figurehead. They sent him out to placate the masses by spreading propaganda, but his tendency to go off script and his lack of understanding of the working-class led most of these speeches to be taken very poorly. This created a greater surge in

²⁹ Mitford, *Frederick the Great*, 252-254.

³⁰ Cecil, *Wilhelm II*, 36.

³¹ Rohl, *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, 135-162.

power for the Social Democrats and the Progressive People's party as they believed it was Wilhelm who stood between them and peace, leading to the Kaiser's ultimate downfall and abdication on November 9, 1918.³²

The great tragedy of Wilhelm is that in the end all he ever wanted was to be loved by the German people. He referred to Frederick the Great again and again because he saw in him a man that was looked up to by citizens and rulers alike, a man who no one would argue against. Just like Frederick, Wilhelm wanted Germany to be a world power and he had the tools he needed to make that happen. But at every step his own insecurity and ill temper got in the way, leading to Germany's role in the disastrous World War I, and the enmity of the German population. Had Wilhelm been a bit more rational and paid more attention to the writings of the man he admired so much, the fate of Germany in the 20th century could have gone very differently. As it was, Wilhelm brought nothing but destruction to the Empire he claimed to love and lived the rest of his days in exile.

³² John C. G. Röhl, *Wilhelm II: Into the Abyss of War and Exile, 1900–1941*, trans. F. R. Bridge and Sheila De Bellaigue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1170–1186. Accessed 19 Nov 2019, EbscoHost.

Laws of the Heavens:

An Historical Analysis of International and United States Outer Space Law

Noah Chelednik

A historical reality of human civilization is that a society with strong and good laws can grow and prosper. One of the earliest written laws was the Code of Hammurabi. This code established legal recourse to the Ancient Babylonian people, this established stability in the society which King Hammurabi used to conquer all of Mesopotamia. In this historical episode, stabilizing laws create societal improvements. This principle applies just as much to the Modern world as to the Ancient. For this reason, laws are sacred. It is the language in law books that permit fair economic practice and establish peace in a nation and potentially for the world. Thus, today's technologically advancing globalized world needs fair laws to provide peace and plenty. The most critically underdeveloped legal field today is Space Law. Space Law is made up of the international and national regulations that dictate and govern human activity outside of Earth's atmosphere. The body of International Space Law is comprised of the five major treaties and legal principals established by the United Nations (UN). These monumental treaties are a strong foundation for the field. However, because of innovative technological advancements and the current world geopolitical climate, they are insufficient for effective governance of modern and future human space activities. The body of law must be updated by the United Nations and nation-states to regulate themselves, corporations, and non-governmental organizations. The continually evolving nature of space travel technology requires an efficient process of legal revision to international and national levels. Further, enforceable policies both on international and national levels that compel space travel actors to follow legal regulations are a necessity.

Historical Background of Space Law from 1910-1957

Humanity has been on an insatiable and unstoppable march toward space travel since the creation of the first human-made tools during pre-history. From there, the Agricultural Revolution produced civilizations and laws which after thousands of years prompted the

Industrial Revolution. Wilbur and Orville Wright's invention of the first successful plane in 1903 was a late product of the industrialized world that arose in the later 18th century. The invention of the airplane provoked new and important legal questions about a country's sovereignty over its airspace. A Belgian lawyer named Emile Laude wrote the first paper responding to questions about airspace ownership in 1910. Laude argued for the need for a new "Law of Space" in extremely generic and broad terms. Before further international discussion about airspace sovereignty could ensue, the First World War broke out in 1914.¹ The use of airplanes during the War established the usefulness of flight as a military necessity, whether it be for bombing, dogfighting, or reconnaissance. In the years following the First World War, airplane production grew exponentially. In 1926 another paper discussing airspace law concerning planes was published. The author was V.A. Zarzar a senior official in the Soviet Union's (USSR) Soviet Aviation Ministry. Zarzar's thesis was more comprehensive and specific than Laude's. Zarzar argued for the "complete sovereignty of nations over their airspace".² However, Zarzar stated that there is an altitude at which sovereignty ends, and an international zone begins. He did not specify at which altitude the international zone should start, but his paper was the first to define inner atmosphere airspace and Outer Space in a legal discussion. Laude and Zarzar were the pioneers of legal regulations for the spaces above the ground, and their theses underprop all of Space Law.

In the early 1930s, technological developments in rocketry prompted a Czechoslovakian lawyer Vladamir Mandl to write a monograph discussing the implications of rockets in the field of airspace law. Mandel's paper combined with Laude's and Zazar's established a basic international agreement of total sovereignty of a nation over its airspace to an altitude in which the physics of flight change. Thus, at the altitude where a human cannot breathe air no nation can claim control over. The earliest Space Law theorists called this altitude the ether, but there were dissenting opinions about this consensus. Another USSR legal scholar named Y.A. Korovin believed that the physical nature of the ether did

¹ Nandasiri Jasentuliyana, "A Concise History of Space Law," 2.
<https://www.iislweb.org/website/docs/2010keynote.pdf>

² Jasentuliyana, "A Concise History of Space Law," 2.

not change the legal status of sovereignty. Meaning, if the space of the ether was above a certain country, that space was still under said country's control *ad infinitum*. Korovin presented his paper in 1933 at a legal conference in Leningrad. He based his argument for the *ad infinitum* sovereignty of the ether on military security. For example, Country A could militarily threaten Country B from bombing at the ether altitude. Due to this potential security threat, Korovin thought a country had a right to protect itself from such threats by claiming permeant sovereignty over all of the airspace and outer space above its borders. Korvin's paper complicated international airspace law during the mid-1930s.

As World War One catalyzed the development of airplanes the Second World War impelled the growth of military rocketry. The USSR used rockets to barrage enemy positions from ground artillery and airplanes, and Nazi Germany created the V-2 Rockets which could travel vast distances and decimate cities. After the Allies victory in World War Two, English language papers discussing state sovereignty at high altitudes appeared. The first was by British theorist Arthur C. Clark in 1946. He sided with Laude and Zazar that there was a altitude limit to national sovereignty. He based his argument on a beautiful combination of science and sound legal logic. He argued that if there was no limit on sovereignty, the rotation of the globe would permit countries to claim different and vast swaths of the Universe throughout a given day. This observation made Korvin's theory untenable, further establishing an international consensus of a high atmospheric limit on national sovereignty. Following Clarke's paper was a United States (US) Department of State memo espousing a solution to conflicting territorial claim on the continent of Antarctica. It argued that Antarctica is a place solely for "investigation and research" where no nation could claim sovereignty.³ This idea was eventually accepted internationally and is a critical concept for later developments in Space Law.

In 1949, the British Ralph Smith Andrew wrote a hallmark paper concerning the ownership of outer space. He stated that the moon in particular, and by extension, the whole of outer space is "the common heritage of Man".⁴ Similar language was used by

³ Jasentuliyana, "A Concise History of Space Law," 3.

⁴ Jasentuliyana, "A Concise History of Space Law," 13.

Frenchman Lionel Laming the same year. By 1950, the concepts of Space Law were disseminating within the international community and maturing into legal precepts. Such precepts and ideas originated in multiple countries like the USSR, United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Czechoslovakia. A principal of non-ownership of a territory was developed in the United States and accepted internationally. These concepts took on new importance at the dawn of the Space Race in 1957.

United Nations Space Law

The geopolitical world that bore the first ever Space Race was distinctly bipolar. The USSR's and United States' battle for influence and technological supremacy defined the early goals of space exploration. These two space-faring nations aimed to demonstrate their countries' technological superiority by exploring faster, safer, and farther than the other. After 1962 the US primarily focused on landing men on the moon to prove their superiority, while the USSR had already placed satellites, men, and animals into orbit. The USSR's launching of Sputnik 1 in 1957 terrified the West, and the idea that the 'enemy' could put a humanmade object in space shattered the myth that the 1st World nations are innately superior to the 2nd World powers. This prompted President Dwight Eisenhower to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in 1958 to counter the Soviet space program. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, the international community considered the threat of military conflict in outer space as an existential threat to the species. The need for regulation of spacefaring nation's activities outside the atmosphere became increasingly apparent.

The UN's first resolution dealing with space related issues came in 1963. This was the *Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space*. This declaration exemplified International Law's primary purpose of promoting peace and cooperation between countries. The first article states "the exploration and use of Outer Space shall be carried on for the benefit and in the interests of all mankind".⁵ This principle is the main legal precept to guide all Space Law

⁵ Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, *United Nations General Assembly* (1963), 1.

developments following the declaration. The intention that space is a place for exploration and not warfare guides International and National Space Laws to this day. Article 2 dictates that all of outer space be open for peaceful exploration to all nations. This is significant because it means the US and USSR do not have a monopoly on space activities. It is this article that in recent times permitted Japan, China, and European governments to develop space capabilities. Article 3 of the declaration states “Outer Space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty.”⁶ The goal of this article was to decrease the chances of armed conflict in space because a common cause of war is territorial disputes. The US memo calling Antarctic an international zone, served as precedent for the UN declaring space a international zone. The rest of the declaration elaborates on how spacefaring nations should cooperate to secure peace and that member-states are responsible for their non-governmental organizations' activities in space. The requirement that a state is liable for its citizens' space activities in all respects is unique to International law. In the modern day, it is this principle that requires the US government to regulate the activities of space companies such as SpaceX ensuring the company adheres to International Space Law.

The 1963 declaration laid the groundwork for a UN treaty which would elaborate on the aforementioned principals and make them more enforceable. This treaty came to being in 1966, in the form of the *Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies*. Often referred to as the Outer Space Treaty (OST), this document is effectively the ‘constitution’ of space law because of its domineering influence on all space regulation after it.

Article One of the OST reiterates the first few stipulations of the declaration of 1963. It dictates that space and all celestial bodies be open for exploration on equitable, scientific focused, and peaceful ways. The language here echoes Arthur C. Clarks 1949 essay that outer space is the “common heritage of all mankind.”⁷ Article Two declares that outer space

⁶ Declaration of Legal Principals Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, *United Nations General Assembly* (1963), 1.

⁷ Stephen Doyle, “A Concise History of Space Law: 1910-2009,” in *New Perspectives on Space Law: The Proceedings of the 53rd IISL Colloquium on the Law of Outer Space*, ed. Mark J. Sundahl and V. Gopalakrishnan (Paris: International Institute of Space Law), 4.

is not subject to any national sovereignty, in any case. This further proves the drafters' keen interest in securing peace throughout the Solar System and beyond. The third article is a practical one that also promotes peace. It bans the use of all nuclear weapons in outer space. This article also illustrates the drafters focus on denuclearization and cooperation during the Cold War. These first three articles relate to the issues that were the most important in the minds of the drafters in 1963.

The rest of the OST deals with particular issues related to early space exploration circumstances and technology. Article V declares that state parties to the treaty must help any astronaut in distress, the foundation for this clause is the principle of cooperation. Articles VI-VIII make state parties liable for all space-related activities of its citizens and government programs. Any damage to a third party caused by a nation's citizens or government programs related to space is required to be mitigated and remedied by the 'launch state,' meaning the state in which the space vehicle which caused the damage originated from is liable for said damage. For example, if NASA launched a rocket and part of the rocket reentered Earth falling on a residential house in Cuba. The Cuban Government could seek monetary restitution from the United States Government. The means of attaining this restitution is purely diplomatic. The parties involved would meet and discuss the issue eventually agreeing on the amount of restitution the US would provide. If the parties involved could not come to a mutually agreed upon agreement, the UN would then become involved and attempt to negotiate a settlement.

The next article, number IX involves possible contamination of celestial bodies and Earth caused by exploration. It dictates that state parties ought to make allowances and take reasonable precautions ensuring that their activities do not environmentally contaminate the Earth and or celestial bodies. OST articles X-XIII focus on improving international cooperation by encouraging state parties to have a free flow of scientific information, transparent consultations, and allow observations of their space activities by other states.

The Outer Space Treaty is a landmark document. Its language is at times vague and as is the nature of international treaties non-binding. A reading of the treaty in its historical

context of the Cold War is crucial to understanding the intentions of the drafters and the state parties to it. A summary of their intentions is for there to be peace and cooperation in space. The negotiations of this treaty and its following counterparts is a noticeable area of cooperation between enemies during the most dangerous moments of the Cold War. The treaty also has proved extremely effective at keeping the peace in outer space, even if its terminology has some definitional shortcomings. A detailed discussion of the problems related to the OST will come later in this paper.

The second major treaty of international space Law entered into force in 1968, it was the *Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, The Return of Astronauts, and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space*. This agreement's basis resides in the vital principle of cooperation. It dictates that states when the need arises, should assist in the rescue of astronauts in danger and promptly return them to their launching state (i.e., their place of origin). Further, states ought to do likewise with space technology/objects and assist the launching state in recovering said objects and returning them to the launching state. This agreement was an elaboration on in articles V and VIII of the OST. Thus, the Rescue Agreement is an example of the importance of the OST in international space Law.

The third international space law treaty was the *Convention on the International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects* which entered into force in 1972. Similarly, to the relationship between the Rescue Agreement and articles V and VIII of the OST, the Liability Convention elaborated on Article VII of the OST. The Liability Convention reiterated the absolute liability a launching State has for damage caused by its citizen's or government programs' space activities.

The fourth UN treaty related to space activities was the *Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space*. This treaty became effective in 1976 and was created to assist in the effectiveness of the three previous treaties. As space exploration occurred more often in the late 1960s and early 1970s the international community recognized the need for a registry of space objects. The registry established by this treaty aimed to make it easier for state parties to identify the origin country of spacecraft and technology. This was necessary to streamline future liability and recovery operations of said

technology. The UN concluded an international registry of launched space objects was a useful way to do this. The principal of cooperation is evident in the language of the convention, as the UN Secretary-General is responsible for keeping the registry functional and transparent.

The final major UN space law treaty is the problematic *Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies* which entered to force in 1984. As opposed to the previous treaties, the Moon Agreement has only 11 signatories and 18 state parties. Further, no major spacefaring nation has ratified or signed the document. Thus, the Moon Agreement is ineffective or dead law. This begs the question, why did the Moon Agreement fail? The answer lies in article XI of the treaty itself. This article strengthens the no sovereignty claim of the OST to the point where resource exploitation (ex. space mining) is severely curtailed. Although the agreement does not ban resources exploitation, it emphasizes the scientific aspects of space exploration over the economic possibilities. In doing so, the agreement is also restricting many spacefaring nations abilities to place permanent settlements on celestial bodies. Article XII also curbs national interests by allowing for the creation of scientific preserves in celestial bodies, potentially stopping profitable resource exploitation and settlements. The Moon Agreement was heavily lobbied for by developing member states of the UN in an attempt to prevent the significant spacefaring powers from obtaining a monopoly on economic exploitation of outer space, which would only benefit spacefaring nations. It is important to note that though the Moon Agreement is ineffectual, it remains a part of international space law. That means it could become more influential should spacefaring nations choose to ratify it.

Space Laws of the United States of America

In the field of space law and any field of law, the interplay between international and national legislation is crucial to how effective those regulations become. International law's primary goal is to establish regulations and norms to achieve peaceful and cooperative interactions between countries. National law's focus is to promote and preserve peace and prosperity for a populace of a given country. International and national laws are often at odds. For example, international law may dictate that no nation can drill for oil at an area

because of environmental concerns, but national legislation could permit its citizens to drill for oil anywhere they find it no matter the environmental concerns. The same conflicting dynamic exists in the field of space law.

The United States Government has agreed to adhere to the first four UN space law treaties. However, the US has not signed the Moon Agreement. The US has not signed that document because the policies dictated in the Moon Agreement play directly against the goals of the US space industry. Specifically, the anti-resource exploitation clauses of the Moon Agreement are the United States' primary concern. The US has a long history in space exploration, NASA was the first and only organization to send humans to the Moon and remains a leading space administration. After the end of the Space Shuttle Program in 2011 NASA and the United States' space goals have fundamentally changed. The private space industry is now proving to be financially sustainable and effective. Thus, the United States' space laws have evolved to facilitate the trend toward privatization in today's space exploration climate.

The Administration of Barack Obama updated US Space Policy in 2010 to account for the shift in focus from NASA to private space enterprise. *The National Space Policy of the United States of America* is a compilation of US space policies, which focuses on transparency and partnership between US commercial, civil, and military agencies along with partnerships internationally to create cost-effective and reliable space programs and missions. US laws that attempt to achieve the space policy's goals exist in *Title 51 of the US Code*. All US space laws are obliged to adhere to the first four UN Treaties. However, the UN treaties do allow for commercial space industry so long as the state party in this case the US agrees to be liable for those commercial space industries practices'. Chapter 501 of Title 51 deals exclusively with the legislation involving space commerce. This national legislation changed the way the US Government interacts with commercial space industry players. Title 51 gave commercial players the ability to explore Outer Space provided they are incorporated under the laws of the US and agree to follow US space regulations, which include international space laws. Thus, space companies such as Blue Origin and SpaceX have the right to bid on contracts with the US Government to shuttle supplies to the

International Space Station. Also, NASA permits these commercial companies to use their launch facilities for a price. The incorporation of private industry under Title 51 allows NASA and the US Air Force to have more cost-effective space transportation vehicles to shuttle satellites, supplies, and eventually astronauts to outer space.

In 2015, President Obama signed the *U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act* into law. This act, sometimes referred to as the SPACE Act of 2015, added a revolutionary regulation into the US space policy. It is chapter 513 section 51303 of the act and it states that any US citizen “is entitled to any asteroid resource or space resource obtained, including to possess own, transport, use, and sell.”⁸ This clause permits space mining and other types of resource exploitation. The passage of this law thrilled space companies such as Planetary Resources who plan to mine various celestial bodies for profit. The potential profit for a successful asteroid mining venture is in the millions of dollars since asteroids can possess precious minerals such as gold. On the surface, this law violates the OST’s anti-sovereignty articles, but the US Government also states in this act, “it is the sense of Congress, that...the United States does not thereby assert sovereignty ... of, any celestial body.”⁹ Thus, this act gives the company ownership of any mineral it obtains without claiming US sovereignty over the land where the company obtains it. A legal analogy to this SPACE Act is fishing rights in international waters, where a fisherman has the right to keep any fish he has caught in said waters.

The Trump Administration slightly altered US space policy with Space Policy Directives 1-3. In SPD-1 President Trump altered the national space policy by changing the goals of the US Space programs to the “return of humans to the Moon for long-term exploration and utilization, followed by human missions to Mars and other destinations.”¹⁰ This directive was signed in December of 2017 and was followed by SPD-2 in May 2018. SPD-2 is entitled *Streamlining Regulations on Commercial Use of Space*, the primary aim of this directive is to make commercial space companies less encumbered by federal licensing requirements among other regulations. In keeping with the President Trump’s ‘America

⁸ SPACE Act, U.S.C. 51303 (2015).

⁹ SPACE Act, U.S.C. 31301 (2015).

¹⁰ Space Policy Directive – 1. Trump Administration (2017), 1.

First' ideology, the directive wants to use market competition to compel American commercial actors to develop innovative and cost-effective space technologies which are superior to the international competition. The most recent SPD-3 was issued in June of 2018 and is entitled *National Space Traffic Management Policy*. This directive aims to increase the US's space situational awareness and improve space traffic management. Meaning President Trump wants US space programs to more effectively monitor orbital debris and satellites to create a safe and sustainable space just outside Earth's atmosphere which is rapidly filling with defunct humanmade space objects threatening working satellites and spacecraft.

Along with his three SPACE Policy Directives, President Trump has established a sixth military branch dedicated to outer space operations. Legal evaluation of the Space Force yields interesting conclusions. On the surface, the creation of a military branch devoted outer space does not violate any of the UN's treaties, and this is because the OST and corresponding treaties only ban the use or placement of nuclear weapons in space. The UN treaties do not ban conventional weapons in outer space. Only if the Space Force places a military installation in outer space or on any celestial body would it violate international space law. More than potentially violating the treaties, the Space Force runs against the intentions and spirit of international space law. Those intentions and spirit of there only being peaceful activities in space with a focus on international cooperation. Also, a US Space Force could potentially contribute to the growing space militarization among the spacefaring nations which could eventually lead to warfare.

Conclusion

Human Space Flight is the most complicated and dangerous activity the species has ever attempted. It requires the sum of human knowledge to be successful, from physics to engineering, and politics to market forces. The central human drive to explore and grow compels thousands of people to invest and take risks to explore the final frontier that is outer space. As humanity continues to improve space flight technology, the need for effective and fair laws governing the practice remains critically important. International organizations such as the UN have laid a strong foundation for the field of space law, and

US national legislation has also made great strides in improving regulations. These developments must be expanded on to promote even more exciting and dynamic adventures in outer space.

The Development of the English Identity in Literature Through the Inspection of Cultural Practices in Jane Austen's *Emma*

Emmaline Bruce

The purpose of cultural normatives is to offer a sense of predictability, familiarity, and also to facilitate customs that create opportunities for individuals to bond over mutually shared experiences. In Jane Austen's *Emma* (1815), the overarching ideological influence of "English-ness" created a cultural and social backdrop for Austen's characters. During the nineteenth century, the economic and social structure of England was shifting with the introduction of liberal economics, and citizens had to learn how to adjust. In the fictional village of Highbury, the people relied on the normatives of English culture to maintain social order, and they were a society heavily reliant on public appearances and social interactions. Social interactions were highly theatrical due to the village's emphasis on keeping an accepted public appearance and reputation, and events such as dances were designed to create an appropriate space of interaction. A person's performance and maintenance of their public image were important, and a person was accepted into society if they were able to maneuver through the public sphere appropriately. In Highbury, civility and social etiquette were exemplified through social gatherings and the ritual of structured dance, and membership is reliant on a member's ability to abide by the guidelines designed for their class and gender. Thus, one must understand that Highbury was a highly performative society with a formal, semi-mobile socio-economic hierarchy that utilized symbolic rituals and social gatherings to police daily interactions for the sake of conformity to rationalize the characters and their behaviors in Jane Austen's *Emma*.

According to Elsie B. Michie, endogamous marriages were far more common than exogamous ones, and they were used to ensure wealth "would remain in the social group of which [a daughter] belonged to preserve the property for the group." By marrying within the limits of the local community, money would not circulate far away from the source,

¹ Elsie B. Michie, "Rich Woman, Poor Woman: Toward an Anthropology of the Nineteenth-Century Marriage Plot," *PMLA* 124, no. 2 (2009): 427. Accessed February 23, 2020, www.jstor.org/stable/25614284.

and while women were able to now claim the family inheritance, it was still monitored and not fully exchanged between fathers and daughters. Marriage in England in the nineteenth-century was “never about personal choice, [and] it always... reflecte[d] and reiterate[d] larger social and economic structures,” designed by the dominant culture.² Marriage was a hierarchical decision, and Austen’s characters struggled with the expectations of matrimony because they were not interested in marrying only for financial reasons. Emma is adamant about making proper matches and curating couples, but she also convinces herself that she will never have to marry because “a single woman, with a very narrow income, must be a ridiculous, disagreeable old maid! The proper sport of boys and girls, but a single woman, of good fortune, is always respectable, and may be as sensible and pleasant as anybody else.”³ Emma’s notion that she will “never marry...of course, means just nothing at all,” because as a woman of good fortune she is expected to marry into an economically advantageous marriage.⁴ Emma does not want to marry just for economic reasons, but as a young heiress who is viable for courtship, she is expected to fulfill her role and advantageously marry to accumulate a larger sum of wealth. Marriage was about ownership of property and wealth, and heiresses were a valuable asset in the market, or the dancehall.

The dances in Highbury functioned as both an opportunity for members of society to interact with one another, and as an opportunity of courtship. According to Joan Scanlon and Richard Kerridge’s article, “Spontaneity and Control: The Uses of Dance in Late Romantic Literature,” dances offered “moments of intimacy, even under the censoring gaze of others, and [they also offered] the occasion for men and women to be on display in the marriage market”⁵ in a socially approved setting. In a society that demands conformity, dances offered a space for members of society to conform within social standards with the excuse of a fun activity. This regulation of sexuality deterred individuals from the potential danger of tarnishing their reputations, and it created a standard for how the marriage

² Michie, 433.

³ Jane Austen, *Emma*, ed. George Justice (New York: Norton Critical Editions), 62.

⁴ Austen, 62.

⁵ Joan Scanlon and Richard Kerridge, “Spontaneity and Control: The Uses of Dance in Late Romantic Literature,” *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research* 6, no. 1 (1988): 30.

process was to be conducted.⁶ Dances asserted influence over the order of relationships, and when courtship practices stepped outside of this approved public sphere they occurred outside of the expected behavior of social members.⁷ Courtship practices of the time were semi-fluid with regard to choice, but the established ritual of dances solidified the stringent requirements of proper courtship. If one was to make a proper match, the proper steps had to be taken for the relationship to be legitimate. It was also important for a man to choose a woman with status and who held membership in society to not disrupt the order set into place, and dances were a way to publicly announce romantic intentions to peers and elders. The “licensed freedom”⁸ offered by a dance was an appropriate way for men and women to meet, and it kept order to society by ensuring that proper matches were made without deriving from custom. Highbury is a society that requires conformity and fulfillment of decided gender roles, making dances a semi-creative outlet for young people to meet and uphold the practices of formality and approved rituals of courtship.

Social membership in Highbury is heavily dictated by one’s ability to correctly partake in courtship rituals that satisfy the gendered roles of men and women. Based on Jan S. Fergus’ critique, “Sex and Social Life in Jane Austen’s Novels,” Jane Austen is known for her portrayal of the stringent English social codes of behavior for relations between men and women with regard to appropriate forms of courtship and other interactions.⁹ The civility and morality that is embedded in this code of behavior in *Emma* occurs during the dance scenes and other social gatherings due to Highbury’s emphasis on keeping an approved public image. Dances in this novel display how men and women ought to behave in order to regulate social standards and cultural norms. In Highbury, there is an emphasis on publicity and performance that spans across all socio-economic classes, and dances were a public endeavor with an approved setting bound to structure and the constant awareness of potential gossip.¹⁰ Men and women were strategically corralled by polite conversation and chaperoned by their peers and elders, and with this pressure,

⁶ Scanlon and Kerridge, 30.

⁷ Scanlon and Kerridge, 31.

⁸ Scanlon and Kerridge, 30.

⁹ Jan S. Fergus, “Sex and Social Life in Jane Austen’s Novels,” in *Emma*, ed. Justice, 396.

¹⁰ Fergus, 398.

dances were a way to maintain order and physically display the socially correct way to behave if one wished to maintain an untarnished membership in Highbury.¹¹ The public eye was readily offended by any deviation from the various courtship conventions, and in Highbury, social organization was maintained by the ideological concept of “proper” and “improper,” and they relied on public support and opinion to regulate order in Highbury.¹²

An example of the power of public opinion and the societal expectation of performing courtship rituals at social functions can be seen with the private relationship between Frank Churchill and Jane Fairfax. Their decision to mask their relationship, and for Frank to openly flirt with Emma at the expense of Jane is deemed a “very abominable sort of proceeding.”¹³ The secret engagement of Frank and Jane is “something of a very unpleasant nature,”¹⁴ and it stuns Emma to discover this level of secrecy has been occurring under her nose. Mrs. Weston reports that their engagement has been going on since October and that they have fooled everyone for a long amount of time. Their relationship disrupts the order and institutions established in Highbury society because they never publicly expressed their affections for one another. Emma is appalled that Jane could “bear such behavior [and] composure...to look on, while repeated attentions were offered to another woman, before her face...that is a degree of placidity, which [she could] neither comprehend nor respect.”¹⁵ Frank embarrassed Emma and Jane with his flirtatious behavior, and he fooled the entire town into believing he was an available man interested in Emma. This behavior disillusioned the entire town, and it makes a mockery of courtship rituals. Public support was necessary for a match to be legitimized, and secrecy was frowned upon because it created a false precedent, embarrassing all who have the misfortune to fall for the charade. It lacked the etiquette that was required for courtship and marriage, and it delegitimized the union in the eyes of society because it did not operate under the socially accepted system of courtship and marriage.

¹¹ Fergus, 397.

¹² Fergus, 398.

¹³ Austen, 275.

¹⁴ Austen, 272.

¹⁵ Austen, 274.

Based on the research of Daniel A. Segal and Richard Handler, the rigidity and formalities of Highbury produced a neatly ordered life, and dances were used to facilitate this order.¹⁶ Dances were a way for “unmarried persons to communicate their interest or lack of interest in a potential partner,¹⁷ and men were expected to take a leading role in the choosing. Women were able to decline advances in courtship, but they were not able to choose their matches as directly as men were expected to do.¹⁸ The dance itself signified three related social distinctions: the distinction between women who were out and those who were not, the distinction between the married and unmarried, and the distinction between eligible women and widows or spinsters.¹⁹ While dances were predominantly designed for courtship, married men were also expected to dance with unmarried women who were not “engaged for any particular dance,²⁰ and married women would often provide the music for the unmarried dancers. Married men danced with unmarried women like Harriet to make them feel included and like members of society. It was a way to ensure women who were not actively courting were entertained by married members of society, but also to not lead women into thinking that they were displaying their affection. Dances were used for general enjoyment and social opportunities for members of society, and while married men and women did attend and partook in dances, the ultimate goal of a dance in Highbury was to lead a couple to eventual marriage.

Dances gave the opportunity for men and women to become introduced to members of society, and they promoted a constricted but not finite opportunity to find a match within the behavioral codes set by the code of English morals. Men and women were expected to behave respectfully amongst one another, and it gave young members of society an opportunity to become better acquainted and make their intentions known in an approved ritual of dance. The etiquette of dancing was a “social convention [that could]

¹⁶ Daniel A. Segal and Richard Handler, “Serious Play: Creative Dances and Dramatic Sensibility in Jane Austen, Ethnographer,” *Man*, New Series 24, no. 2 (1989): 321. Accessed February 23, 2020, doi: 10.2307/2803309.

¹⁷ Segal and Handler, 324.

¹⁸ Segal and Handler, 326.

¹⁹ Segal and Handler, 326.

²⁰ Segal and Handler, 326.

generate a context for creativity as well as unimaginative uniformity”²¹ and it required that participants remain civil with one another to maintain the mood of formality and predictability. The culture of England and the society of Highbury abided by these rules to maintain order and predictability, and the disruption of this structured expressive space was not acceptable. While complete disregard for dances and courtship rituals, as in the case of Jane and Frank, was seen as offensive and a threat to social rituals and practices, there was a way to tactfully evade one’s role at a dance. If one abides by the rules of civility, there are less repercussions towards one’s actions. Civility; however, does not equate absolute nor genuine kindness between individuals. When Mr. Elton is asked by Mrs. Weston whether he would like to dance with Harriet, who has been the only woman without a dancing partner, he hurriedly states that “[he] had not observed [Harriet] - ... [and] that [his] dancing days are over,”²² despite the fact that he had been dancing all evening. His uncourteous behavior towards Harriet, while it may seem awkwardly evasive, is tactfully done. Mr. Elton emulates the guidelines of civility to appear polite to ensure that his membership within society is not questioned due to his behavior, and he also takes a personal jab at Harriet to remind her of her place and that he is above her. Harriet had been the only young woman who had not danced and was sitting alone, and his refusal to dance with her was to ensure that he had the upper hand in the situation. His refusal reinstates that, as a man, he has the power of choice, and he refuses Harriet to humiliate her. He ensures that he insults Harriet publicly to scorn her for assuming a man of his status would be seen with someone economically beneath him, and he simultaneously insults Emma for her meddling with his right as a man to initiate, control, and choose his own relationships.

When Emma refused his proposal, Mr. Elton had been “rejected and mortified... [and] he had gone away deeply offended,”²³ and his refusal to dance with Harriet was to get his revenge for his embarrassment. He re-establishes that as a man, he makes the decisions in courtship, leaving him as the superior both as a man and as a man with a higher status

²¹ Segal and Handler, 329.

²² Austen, 225.

²³ Austen, 126.

than Harriet. He could not publicly insult Emma, because she is of a higher status economically, so he does so by insulting Harriet because he sees her as beneath him as a person and monetarily. He supports the institution of a static hierarchy regarding wealth and gender, and he abides by the rules of civility to maintain the order he believes in. He acts under the guise of civility because, in Highbury, there is a code of behavior that must be adhered to if a person wants to maintain their membership with the elite. The code of behavior institutes that in Highbury, kindness and civility are different behaviors from one another, causing there to be an emphasis on the importance of courtesy rather than benevolence.

With a prioritization for courtesy over kindness, social interactions in Highbury often seem like they are manufactured and inauthentic charades. Identities and membership are defined by a person's ability to abide by the behavioral codes designed for their social class and gender. However, during the event at Box Hill, a buffer between authenticity and inauthenticity is challenged by Emma and Mr. Churchill with a disruption of etiquette as a game. As claimed by Jonathan H. Grossman, the "hollowly ceremonious request for all to reveal their thoughts is a demand for speeches unregulated by the strictures of politeness, and it points to the mental work being done by etiquette."²⁴ Having every interaction scrutinized and controlled by the policies of politeness is exhausting and requires lots of mental work to balance a public and private personality. Civility is lacking in comparison to openly caring relationships, and having to police interactions with it can be isolating. This demand for proper social interactions creates a society that prefers strict order and independence over emotions and dependence, and it creates a tense situation where it is difficult to be genuine. So when Emma mocks Miss Bates for her inability to limit herself to three words, she is engaging in this parody of the oppressive force of civility, and the situation goes from civil to unnecessarily rude at the expense of another person. The members of Highbury are supposed to be "engaged in the continuous process of perpetuating itself and socializing its participants through the work of etiquette."²⁵ The

²⁴ Jonathan H. Grossman, "The Labor of the Leisured in Emma: Class, Manners, and Austen," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 54, no. 2 (1999): 154. Accessed February 23, 2020. doi:10.2307/2903098.

²⁵ Grossman, 162.

removal of the buffer of civility allowed a person to make the code of behavior into a joke directed towards the ironic complexities of a social membership dictated by inauthenticity. When Emma made a joke at Miss Bates' expense, she simply "could not resist,"²⁶ because she could not resist the fun of flipping the code of politeness upside down. While her mocking of Miss Bates is disguised as a playful joke, it is an overstep. Emma embarrasses herself by partaking in a game to insult a woman who is admired by the group because civility is not to be parodied in polite company. Miss Bates is a liked member of Highbury who has fallen on misfortune, and to make fun of her taken seriously, and there is an acculturated desire to create two forms of the self in this situation, one of performance and one of privacy, placing a cultural emphasis on the policing of social interactions to maintain conformity and order.

The institutions in Highbury are designed to be followed and untampered with, and they rely on compliance to correctly function. To be an elite in Highbury, one's performance of civility and wealth heavily dictated which company you were in, but civility was a larger determinant of status because even fools can have money. This was because, during the time Jane Austen wrote *Emma*, the upper, middle, and lower classes had just begun to emerge during the nineteenth-century, which changed the social order from one of either extreme wealth or poverty, to an economic structure with less finite classes.²⁷ The development of the middle class changed the distribution of wealth, changed the social hierarchy of England, and ultimately Austen's Highbury. Economic status was no longer bound to a static framework, and a family could raise their station with the development of a three-tiered social hierarchy. The shifting of gendered economic statuses changed attitudes towards class because, until then, wealth had been dependent upon the inheritance of property. Now, men could become self-made and collect a sum of money they would not have been able to work for prior to the development of the middle class. The development of self-made wealth was a new part of society, and its effect on *Emma* and the demographics of Highbury are exemplified by the Coles and their ability to raise

²⁶ Austen, 256.

²⁷ Grossman, 144.

their economic status from poverty to middle-class members of Highbury. The Coles were “of low origin, in trade, and only moderately genteel...[and] the last year or two had brought them a considerable increase of means...and fortune in general had smiled on them.”²⁸ Emma believed that “the Coles were very respectable in their way, but they ought to be taught that it was not for them to arrange the terms on which the superior families would visit them,”²⁹ because they were not naturally wealthy like the Woodhouse or Knightley family were. Wealth was no longer dependent on natural inheritance, and Emma’s elitist and non-inclusive attitude towards self-made families like the Coles shows how economic fluidity was a new and threatening territory for the established elites who gained their wealth from inheritance.

In nineteenth-century England, materialism, wealth, and social-prestige determined whether a person would gain membership into proper society or not. There was a growing allure as the English empire expanded under the ideology of Adam Smith’s book *The Wealth of Nations*, and his liberal economic theories dominated the English political and social behavior of the time. The nineteenth-century was a time of economic shifting from a mercantilist system to a capitalist system, and economic decisions shifted from ones that serviced a country to ones that serviced an individual. The shifting of socio-economic classes, as in the case with the Coles, created a new grouping of people who did not fit into the classical form of wealth. The Coles are now able to host dinner parties and partake in higher society, but they were not bred into this life of wealth and hosting, and for someone like Emma who sees class as static, this is improper. Emma does not see the Coles to be of the same status as her, despite their manners and behavior, and she sees associating herself with them to be a blemish on her character. She grapples with this change in social status amongst the families of Highbury, and she does not view wealth as something you earn, rather something you are born with. Emma believes in the “permanence of patriline associated with the land [or inheritance],”³⁰ and does not see self-

²⁸ Austen, 143.

²⁹ Austen, 144.

³⁰ Richard Handler and Daniel A. Segal, “Hierarchies of Choice: The Social Construction of Rank in Jane Austen,” *American Ethnologist* 12, no. 4 (1985): 695. Accessed February 23, 2020, www.jstor.org/stable/644177.

made wealth as inheritance's equal. Before Smith's *Wealth of Nations* gained popularity, wealth was patriarchally inherited, and the idea of an open market that created an opportunity to change fate and create wealth did not concretely exist. The free market changed the way wealth was exchanged and it changed the inescapability of social ranking if a person was lucky enough to succeed in making a name for themselves. This shift in economic policy changed the definition of what it meant to be a part of the wealthy class, and it redefined the socio-economic structure of England and Highbury.

According to Richard Handler and Daniel A. Segal, the nineteenth-century was a period where the traditional idea of wealth as an inherited sum of property shifted to one where someone could work for their money and elevate themselves as self-made members of the upper class. Social status was dictated not only by one's inherited sum of money but the mobility and independence that wealth created. In Highbury, it is "better to be independent than dependent," because a person who was dependent was "not fully a person in his or her own right."³¹ Maintaining membership meant that one needed to attain independence that relied on making relationships that could be dominated or overridden to ensure one was not completely isolated. By making social stratification a strategic game, a person was always alert and forced to perfect their outward appearance for the sake of raising or maintaining their status. The act of networking and strategically maneuvering through social interactions was vital for a person's membership and status in Highbury, and it benefitted both parties with regard to access and the appearance of being a benefactor. Having connections and friendships with the families of Highbury fueled opportunities to interact with people of the town and become an accepted member of society through personal connections. Social hierarchy was limited with regard to upward mobility, but the overlapping of social relationships was more important than impermeable boundaries constructed by class in this instance.³² If a person was able to maintain relationships with others in society they were far more likely to be successful than they would with only money. Highbury regards a sum of wealth to be a qualifier of an elite

³¹ Handler and Segal, 693.

³² Handler and Segal, 698.

membership, but how one uses this money, generosity, and civil behavior is the major determinant of whether or not a person's presence is welcomed into society or not.

Highbury was a society that relied on order facilitated by a code of etiquette, and membership was dependent on one's economic status and social performance. Social stratification was loosely formed around the requirements of birth and wealth, but with the introduction of a liberal market, upward economic mobility was an option within the socio-economic hierarchy with the development of the middle class. There was a bias between self-made and inherent members of the leisure class, but one's emulation of social etiquette was the most important. Dances offered a marketplace for courtship practices and an opportunity to gather with other members of society, and these events were formal rituals conducted under a proper code of civility. There was an emphasis on maintaining a public and personal self, and one's ability to keep both of these lives separate was highly regarded. Marriage was a construct designed to facilitate the accumulation of wealth, and it was seen as a public affair in Highbury. The society of Highbury was one of formalities based on a superimposed code of behavior, and membership was dependent on one's ability to perform his or her role depending on his or her gender and socio-economic status. While Highbury is that of a fictional setting, one can see the paralleling practices that would have been present at the time of this novel's creation, and how outward influences developed themselves in Austen's creative writing process. Understanding *Emma* from a cultural perception teaches the reader about the social, economic, cultural practices, and ideologies of the time at the micro-level, and their influence is important over the development of the novel as a vessel for the understanding of national identity.

**JOSEPH GOEBBELS AND THE JEWISH AMERICAN FILM INDUSTRY:
COLLABORATION AND COMPETITION IN PROPAGANDA**

Zachariah Brown

In the early 1940's, as World War II unleashed an ideological storm across Europe and America, film developed into a dynamic arbiter of propaganda. Cultural identity, patriotism, racial superiority and romantic nationalism played out on the silver screens from Germany to America, uniting audiences in their country's war efforts through vivid propaganda and artistic endeavor. At the eye of this storm was the German Joseph Goebbels and his Reich Ministry of Propaganda, and swept up in its force was the Jewish American film moguls of early Hollywood. As both vied for cultural dominance in the world of film, their collaborative and competitive relationship defined war propaganda and film as a whole.

The American film industry at the cusp of World War II was a titan in the making. International cinema had a breakthrough in popularity with the advent of speaking films, known as 'talkies'. Produced mainly in America, talkies translated well to the European markets. Subtitled and artistically dense, American cinema was influential and appealing, particularly in Germany. German audiences loved American cinema— it was romantic and funny, with wide-angle shots that swept audiences into the story with gravitas and passion.

¹ Production companies like Warner Bros. and Universal studios led the charge, with films like *Gone with the Wind* and *Casablanca* proving to be box office sweeps. These American production companies were predominantly led by Jewish men, many of whom rose stoically from humble beginnings: "Jesse Lasky, the son of an immigrant shoe salesman, rose to be president of Paramount Pictures. Carl Laemmle founded Universal Pictures after immigrating from Eastern Europe and becoming a clothing salesman. Louis B. Mayer, the head of MGM, was the son of a Talmudic scholar and first worked in the junk business. The Warner Brothers founded their company after working as cobblers and bicycle salesmen."

¹ Thomas Doherty, *Hollywood and Hitler 1933-1939* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2015), 12.

² Many Jews found their way into the film industry following widespread immigration from Eastern Europe in the early 20th century. Film was a booming industry and a promising investment for young Jewish entrepreneurs, offering both power and prestige, as well as independence in artistic license. The success of these Jewish-run studios made American cinema an international household name, and by time the Nazis came to power, these studios films were an iconic symbol of American power.

However, German audiences had their own arthouse to contend with— Ufa, located in Berlin, was the popular leader of German cinema. It was led by visionaries such as Ernst Lubitsch, mediators who saw film as artform first and entertainment second. Ufa was created after World War I primarily to promote German culture and history, and made lengthy, dramatic works that celebrated Germany and its people. Internationally, Ufa was the sole competitor to the large production companies across the Atlantic. In terms of artistic experimentation, Ufa pushed boundaries and created dynamic films that packed European cinemas. Ufa was an icon of German cultural influence, filling theatre seats in even 1933, as the Nazis seized power on the streets of Berlin.

Joseph Goebbels, the newly appointed Minister of the newly created Reich Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, recognized the significance that Ufa and German film played on the world stage. Committed to beating the inferior Jewish Americans out of European cinemas, he commandeered Ufa eagerly and effectively. Goebbels wasn't a particularly imposing man. But Goebbels was ruthless, intelligent, and impressively creative. "If Hitler was the godhead of the Third Reich", then "Goebbels was his most identifiable minion. Clubfooted, scrawny, a man of the arts not action, Goebbels was the physical antithesis of a sculpted Nazi *ubermensch* but he made up in fanatical intensity what he lacked in body mass."³ Born in 1897 in Rheydt, Germany, Goebbels was a young man of ill health and poor means. The young Joseph Goebbels grew up wanting to be an author. He studied literature at the University of Wurzburg and published his thesis under the tutelage of Jewish professors at the University of Heidelberg. In the years after his

² Lary L. May and Elaine Tyler May, *Why Jewish Movie Moguls: An Exploration in American Culture* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press), 3.

³ Doherty, 19.

graduation, he attempted to make a living off publishing books, usually literary critiques or social commentaries. A professed dissident of modern culture, Goebbels hated the “mainstream”, considering many of his peers bereft of moral values. He also was virulently antisemitic, believing Jews to be cultural saps and power-hungry villains directly in contest with the German state. His writings reflected his growing radicalism and by the time Adolf Hitler was jailed for the Beer Hall Putsch in his attempted coup d’état of the German chancellery, Goebbels was convinced that Marxism and Jewish culture were inherently linked and a direct threat to the German people.

The Minister immediately recognized the power that film had in swaying the minds of the common people. Film, like literature and speech, was in Joseph Goebbels mind a tool with which propaganda could be disseminated and on which nations could be built: “‘We are convinced that the film is one of the most modern and far-reaching means for influencing the masses’, he declared, ‘A government can therefore not possibly leave the film world to itself.’”⁴ Particularly, Goebbels believed the future of German cinema was in movies that represented the Aryan wholesomeness of Nazi Germany. In tandem, he also was convinced that it was his duty to create films that disavowed the purportedly Marxist and culturally deteriorating Jewish influence. Goebbels himself said “‘Film subjects should be imbued with national-socialist ideas and problems and should acknowledge and represent the principle of the highest responsibility, but also the highest authority.’”⁵ To exemplify these principles at all times was the central tenet of Goebbels ideology. Throughout World War II, Goebbels refined this idea, using the German film industry as the Nazis central doctrinal machine.

Ufa, once a rich cultural bastion that pollinated German films across Europe, became an arm of the Reich. Under the Ministry of Propaganda and Goebbels’ direct control, Ufa began disavowing its partners in Jewish Hollywood. The production company also started the long process of removing native German Jews and Jewish American affiliates from its offices across Germany. As far as Goebbels and his Ministry was

⁴ Doherty, 19.

⁵ Peter Longerich, *Goebbels: a Biography* (London: Vintage, 2016), 286.

concerned, “The elimination of the Jews from the work of cultural production in Germany was the prime directive.”⁶ This meant that Ufa’s film productions were, for a period, all but halted. Jewish actors, production associates, scriptwriters and even janitors were fired—in some cases kicked onto the streets and beaten. This tension, and outward hostility towards Jews marked a new era for both the German and American film industries.

In the early 1930’s, American media was still hopeful for generosity from the Reich. As Warner Bros. and Universal Studios shuffled their Jewish employees out of Europe, they still maintained hope that they would be able to access the lucrative German film market, with American companies making hopeful assessments of the Nazi government: “‘New Hitler government is liable to present some strange anomalies for the film industry,’ Variety admitted in its first analysis of the new regime, but ‘Hitler’s policy definitely calls for friendliness to America.’”⁷ Unfortunately, Goebbels and his Ministry enacted absurd laws almost immediately in an effort to block Hollywood’s influence. Films were required to prove themselves to be in admiration or recognition of the superiority of the German state. American war dramas, romances, and especially Jew-ridden comedies were blocked from German cinemas. Additionally, imports had to be “culturally pure”, meaning Jews, especially those cast in heroic or even positive roles, were strictly forbidden: “The new censorship regime forbade the importation of ‘any film in which Jewish characters appear or that presents a cheerful aspect of Jewish life.’”⁸ This made it nearly impossible to clear American films for viewing through the Ministry. Even if a film had no Jewish actors or scriptwriters, it was undoubtedly produced by a Jew. And even if the entirety of the production was satisfactorily relieved of Jewish influence, the film still needed to qualify as “morally sound”, something often raunchy American films rarely did.

After 1933, Hollywood was essentially shut out of the German market, at the time the largest consumer market for films in Europe. Not only did the embargo anger executives on the American side, but also pointed to a sea change that was happening in German foreign relations. As official Nazi policy became more radical, so did the responses.

⁶ Doherty, 21.

⁷ Doherty, 18.

⁸ Doherty, 26.

Goebbels, for his part, showed no sign of relinquishing his stranglehold on the German film market. The dichotomy between his original thesis, to create film which was both artistically rich yet potently infused with the ideals of the Nazi empire, became clearer every day: “For Goebbels’ propaganda, it was an easy matter to represent as broad support for the regime two conditions it had itself created: on one hand the control of the public and widespread adjustment to Nazi norms of behavior, and on the other the silence of oppositional tendencies”⁹ In the period after 1933, Goebbels divided his mandate into two parts. Goebbels began to slyly copy American films, drawing from them inspiration for staggeringly effective propaganda he created during the war. Next, Goebbels closed the doors of German theaters firmly shut, creating a seemingly German-only pool of artistic creation that was actually as in debt to American cinema as it was previous German arthouse styles. However, neither of these actions, bold as they were, could have been done without a Nazi film prodigy by the name of Leni Riefenstahl.

Leni Riefenstahl was a godsend for the Ministry of Propaganda. Young, beautiful, singularly brilliant and undoubtedly unique, Riefenstahl was the Aryan model for filmmaking that Goebbels so desperately needed. “Dancer, athlete, actress, filmmaker, Leni Reifenstahl was the Valkyrie goddess of Third Reich cinema,” acclaimed by European media as “the lone shimmering star in a constellation of dim hacks.”¹⁰ Born in Berlin in 1902, Riefenstahl was drawn to the arts from a young age. A dancing prodigy and avid adventurer, she moved into acting after injuring her foot. Her first foray into film directing, *Das Blaue Licht*, was well-received but not critically appraised. *Licht* won the silver medal at the Venice Film Festival, but the critics (mainly Jewish) gave it unfavorable reviews. Riefenstahl was a renowned anti-Semite and by the time she met Hitler in 1932, her unfavorable opinions on Jews were known throughout the German film industry. Hitler and Riefenstahl got along swimmingly— she was clever, and in Hitler’s eyes the ideal of Aryan womanhood. He was a powerful public speaker and to Reifentstahl, was a political genius the world was not prepared for. Goebbels and Riefenstahl got along decidedly poor.

⁹ Longerich, 278.

¹⁰ Doherty, 11.

Annoyed by her closeness with the Fuhrer, Goebbels considered the attention she received a usurpation of his position, and made it clear he did not find film directing to be a respectable pursuit for a German woman. This changed completely when Leni Riefenstahl released her magnum opus, *Triumph of the Will*.

Triumph of the Will was the perfection of Goebbels thesis on propaganda. A sweeping take on the 1934 Nazi Party Congress, complete with speeches from Hitler and bombastic shots of his zealous crowds, *Triumph* was a perfect coalescing of artistic vision and dynamic propaganda: “More than any other film produced under Nazism, *Triumph of the Will* reflects the ability of Nazi propaganda to manipulate the emotions and desires of the German masses through the film medium.”¹¹ Thematically, the film is centered on pride and unity. During the opening marches, as the Nazis descend on Nuremburg, cheerful screaming and jubilation weave in and out of the musical accompaniment. Hitler, front and center, is portrayed as the iconic equivalent of modern Germany; without Hitler and the endless devotion of the people, Germany would be nothing. The cinematography used in *Triumph of the Will* is dramatic and often breathtaking. Wide-angle shots show the sheer size of the Nazi party. Aerial views give dramatic length to the crowds and scaled close ups on Hitler and the Nazi elite effectively pedestalize the Nazi leadership. Riefenstahl’s use of music and cinema in tandem was also revolutionary. The blaring drums and German nationalist anthems that play over shots of marching Nazi soldiers only serve to build on the ecstatic tension. In Riefenstahl’s epic, grandiosity was key. By showing the Nazi Party Congress as a unified whole, monumental and patriotic, Riefenstahl elevated the Nazi leadership to an almost religious grandeur. In the German media, her work was recognized as a resounding success.

In Germany, Riefenstahl was celebrated as a genius, and quite literally paraded around the country. Goebbels acquiesced in his disdain for her (for the most part), acknowledging her to be one of the greatest filmmakers he had ever seen. In America, however, Riefenstahl was blacklisted. The Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, a collaboration of

¹¹ David Weinberg, “Approaches to the Study of Film in the Third Reich: A Critical Appraisal,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 19, no. 1 (1984): 13.

Jewish film moguls and powerful entertainment icons, made clear that Riefenstahl and her art were not welcome in Hollywood. Moreover, *Triumph of the Will* represented a new period of artistic interrelationship between Goebbels and Riefenstahl's propaganda and American cinema. Though uniquely experimental in its cinematography, *Triumph of the Will* itself borrowed heavily from American themes of propaganda. D.W. Griffiths' *Birth of a Nation*, the Reconstruction-era epic that inspired the rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan, was a major influence for the film. The themes of cultural superiority and racial pride that permeate and underline *Triumph* were arguably perfected first by American filmmakers such as D.W. Griffith. However, this influential relationship was mutually inspired. *Triumph of the Will* influenced most directly and obviously *Why We Fight*, a seven-part documentary series produced and published from 1942 to 1945 by acclaimed Italian filmmaker Frank Capra. Capra was captivated by *Triumph*, feeling challenged to create an Americanized equivalent that both convinced unsure Americans to support the war effort and reclaim American propaganda in a patriotic bid. As tensions and then war with Germany escalated, the pressure to create effective film propaganda heightened. Joseph Goebbels and Jewish Hollywood were each intensely aware of what was at stake, and the relationship between each other's artistic output during the wartime years is a glimpse into the climax of a complex artistic competition.

It was no secret that Joseph Goebbels' hated Americans and American culture. Goebbels considered America a baseless and morally abject country, that was racially impure and far too kind to its Jewish filmmakers. Goebbels' hatred of American film was just an extension of this disgust, directed at a Jewish medium he believed to be intrinsically tainted. Moreover, the themes of American films to Goebbels seemed dull. American films were raunchy and slapstick, romantic and fantastical, and evidence of a culture that was roundly influenced by Jewish and Marxist ideology. When comparing the heroes of German films to the morally dearth American movies, Goebbels once quoted "Nothing is more characteristic of the Jewish-plutocratic view of the world, life and history, than it's tendency to gradually but inevitably transform all values in a negative direction" claiming that by the time Germany had shown its prowess in filmmaking, "the momentary fame of American

film heroes will have melted along with the wax in Madame Tussaud's wax museum.”¹² Outwardly, Goebbels and his Ministry of Propaganda declared America to be useless to the world of film, with Hollywood representing nothing more than the toxicity of Jewish ideology.

However, Goebbels true feelings were far more complicated. In practice, Goebbels admired the staunch patriotism found in American films. The ability to craft a bold cultural identity with what Goebbels saw as a limited history was impressive and worthy of note. Jewish or not, Goebbels saw American films as largely attempting to depict their cultural identity as utopian and idealistic, something Goebbels wanted to mimic for German audiences. After watching the wildly popular American wartime film *Mrs. Miniver*, Goebbels was inspired. *Mrs. Miniver* was a romantic war drama, plotted around the titular British housewife discovering a wounded German pilot in her garden in the London suburbs. After feeding him and disarming him, Mrs. Miniver calls her husband back from the evacuations at Dunkirk to deal with the evil Nazi at home. The film's use of propaganda was obvious; by juxtaposing the evil German pilot against the young and wholesome British wife, American audiences were left to consider the immediacy and threat of the war in Europe. Fear, pride, and patriotism played throughout the film brilliantly, and Goebbels was eager to mimic the feat. “After he saw Hollywood's first major home front melodrama of World War II, *Mrs. Miniver*, Goebbels ordered German filmmakers and screenwriters to study the film and adapt its exemplary propaganda devices to Nazi use.”¹³ Goebbels was sure that the secret formula lay in America's refined use of masculine and feminine roles, and domesticity in the face of the brutality of war. “American propaganda and advertising defined the war as an essential struggle for an ordered domesticity, and the defense of the patriarchal family was also a key concept for addressing male viewers.”¹⁴ Goebbels, through many of his endeavors in Ufa and the Ministry, recreated this dynamic for a German audience. Frau Muller, a Goebbels creation and essential rip-off of Mrs. Miniver, never

¹² Randall Bytwerk, *Heroes and Film Heroes*. Accessed November 22, 2019. <https://research.calvin.edu/german-propaganda-archive/goeb35.htm>.

¹³ Laura Heins, *Nazi Film Melodrama* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press), 4.

¹⁴ Heins, 6.

managed to garner similar national affection. However, as student of American film propaganda, Goebbels did manage ultimate success in the creation of a new German cultural identity, one linked directly to Nazi film.

As the war drew to a close, unifying German audiences behind the Nazi's faltering war effort became essential. Goebbels grew less preoccupied with filmmaking and more focused on speeches designed to rally Germany behind the Fuhrer and the Nazi state. Leni Riefenstahl backed into the shadows, disavowing the Nazi leadership and claiming ignorance of the Nazi's genocidal intentions. Hitler's attentions were focused elsewhere, and as defeat loomed, the Ministry of Propaganda developed into a cheap print shop that distributed posters and copies of speeches throughout the crumbling Reich. Across the Atlantic, Hollywood was jubilant. Jewish Americans in the film industry recognized the fall of Ufa and the Ministry as partial successes on their part and celebrated by hosting lavish dinners and funding expensive war dramas. Nazis became a hallmark of post-war American cinema, an essential villain in the vocabulary of Jewish American Hollywood. Nazi's graced posters in cinemas country-wide, often mimicking ironically the propaganda styles so deftly traded between the two countries during the war. Though the war was over, the images of concentration camps and ghettos invigorated and infuriated the Jewish moguls of the American film industry. Left feeling victorious but only by a margin, Jewish Hollywood vowed to exploit Nazis in memoriam, painting them as caricatured villains in movies for decades to come.

The relationship between Nazi Germany and Jewish Hollywood is one of complex exchange. By expanding on American innovations in patriotic propaganda, Joseph Goebbels and Leni Riefenstahl were able to create a German cultural identity and film propaganda unique to the Nazis during wartime. Thematically diverse, American and German films of the war era were often conceptually linked. Pride, unity, domesticity, military dominance, and a litany of other subjects worked in tandem across the Atlantic to build a modern vocabulary for film propaganda in both Germany and America. The relationship between the two countries, initially through collaborative business, and eventually in wartime competition, cannot be understated. By examining the artistic

dissemination that came from this relationship, we can understand the interconnected significance that filmmaking had on the war. Most importantly, we can begin to appreciate the similarity in ideals that both Germany and America had in the creation of propaganda.

BOOK REVIEWS

Whitfield, Stephen J. *A Death in the Delta: The Story of Emmet Till*. New York: The Free Press, 1988.

In the summer of 1955, Emmett Till, an African American youth, visited a Mississippi general store to buy candy. The twenty-one-year-old white shopkeeper Carolyn Bryant soon-after accused Till of offending and harassing her, claiming that Till grabbed her and uttered obscenities. Bryant's husband and his half-brother abducted Till, and days later the youth's naked, mutilated remains were found in the Tallahatchie River of the Mississippi Delta. The two men were tried, acquitted by an all-white jury, and later sold their confessions for fame. Till's death, which received international attention, is credited as being one of the catalysts to the American Civil Rights Movement.

In his 1988 book, *A Death in the Delta: The Story of Emmet Till*, Stephen J. Whitfield, Max Richter Professor of American Civilization at Brandeis University, examined the ideological roots of the 1955 murder. Whitfield analyzed lynching, the acquittal, the national outcry and government involvement, and the role of sexuality and race-based violence; the latter of which, Whitfield asserts, is the reason Till's legacy has lived on and has impacted the African-American community so greatly.

Whitfield called to attention the lack of modern scholarly analysis of lynching. At the time of the publication, his book was first to do so. Whitfield's in-depth history of lynching is where he is most effective as a scholar, presenting the ideology in a clear and well-written manner, supporting all information with appropriate dates and statistics. Whitfield noted a decline of mob violence and the increase of terror in black communities, believably due to the idea of "legal" lynching of the South in the 1950s, but seemingly failed to acknowledge the possibility of Southern whites being instigators of racial violence.

Whitfield's scholarly inquiry of Till's brief life and the events leading up to the murder, as well as the act of killing itself, is both the strength and weakness of the book. Whitfield, through powerful descriptions, created a story that leaves a haunting image in the reader's mind. However, Whitfield does not clearly explain what racial taboo Till violated, and the reader is left confused as to whether Till was murdered for his whistling

at a white woman or for his carrying of a picture of a white woman in his wallet. Due to incomplete accounts of the events and the information provided in the acquittal testimonies and sold confessions, Whitfield's information is presented with a personal interpretation rather than a holistic account, and was greatly distracting to his overall analysis.

The trial of the white defendants is captured well by Whitfield, and the flawed Mississippian justice system is revealed. Whitfield creates an intricate image of the court proceedings, most notably in the testimony of Till's great-uncle. While his portrayal of the court system is effective, due to missing trial records, Whitfield brought forth weak accounts and relied on newspapers for his sources for his overall analysis of the courtroom proceedings, and ultimately was ineffective.

The turning point for racial injustice is presented evenly as Whitfield covered the blame and praise of the acquittal of the white defendants. Whitfield explained public opinions and political consequences in local, regional, and national views, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (NAACP) interest and push for a government-led investigation and the recorded variety of comments after the trial. There is, however, confusion as to whether Till's killers acted alone or with others, as Whitfield didn't explain the speculation clearly. Moreover, Whitfield's assertion that the failure to punish Till's killers was due to the indifference of federal authorities, including the Eisenhower administration and FBI, was ineffective. Whitfield relied more on emotional appeals than rationality, and although a tentative investigation was conducted by the FBI, there was no use of the investigation reports.

The ramifications of Till's murder and the acquittal of his killers were not fully developed. Whitfield cautiously assessed the murder and its impact, and failed to assimilate the brutality of the killing to the future protests in Montgomery. Whitfield claimed that the murder of Till stimulated the American conscience into the civil rights movement and that the acceptance of the lynching by Mississippian courts was the beginning of the transition of traditional attitudes toward basic civil rights for blacks. His lack of explanation of the importance of the murder occurring between *Brown v. Board* and the Montgomery

bus boycott decreased the power and persuasiveness of his previous claims. Whitfield's emphasis on the widespread impact of the case in Mississippi, the South, and the nation, was ineffective and the ultimate asset in the impacts he presented was the development of literature dedicated to civil rights and the national policies of the 1950s.

Whitfield did not present a clear interpretation when he suggested the murder of Till was a metaphor for psycho-social barriers, and that the metaphor was explored through the radical transformations of the American view of sex and race. His challenge that terror was sourced in lower-class resentments was ineffective, and Whitfield was unconvincing when he denied Till as a martyr for the civil rights movement. The assertion that Till's death is a reminder of the lengths white Southerners were willing to go was presented subjectively. The listed individuals that were impacted by the murder who later became prominent cultural figures and activists of the civil rights movement was presented ineffectively.

Ultimately, Whitfield had used too many secondary sources, failed to conduct interviews with those who were directly affected or took part in the case. His work fell somewhere between an introduction to the Till case and the full, objective picture of the events. Whitfield was captivating in his passionate and moving portrayal of Emmett Till's murder, but ultimately left general readers unsure of an underdeveloped thesis in which Whitfield was meant to explore in-depth.

Casey Niebuhr

Stokes, Melvyn. *D.W. Griffith's The Birth of a Nation*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

In his history of D.W. Griffith's *The Birth of A Nation*, Melvyn Stokes provides a compelling argument for the film's impact upon U.S. cultural history. Stokes' uniquely vivid depictions allow the reader to stay engaged throughout the text. Using this pattern, the author describes the film's revolutionary nature, while detailing its catalyzing traits and the resulting sociopolitical implications. Through his thorough examination of journals, reviews, newspaper articles, etc. Stokes provides an array of evidence and a variety of primary sources to substantiate his claims. Within his analysis, the author highlights the reaction of viewers to the film, while detailing its residual impacts upon each sector of society. In his history of *The Birth of A Nation*, Stokes constructs a comprehensive analysis of the film, allowing the reader to comprehend why it has been labeled as "The most controversial motion picture of all time" (8).

Within the introduction, Stokes alleges that the film "would bring about a revolution in American movie-going." The author proceeds to provide historical context to educate the reader on early 20th-century film industry standards. Such a description aids the reader in understanding how the film surpassed those standards. To further validate the films' revolutionary nature, Stokes cites numerous critics before delving into its more controversial aspects. While *Birth* received praise for its technical accomplishments and created a new standard in the arts and entertainment industry, its reception varied dramatically among its viewers. Had Griffith posed the film as fiction, there may have been slightly less controversy. Instead, Stokes points out that the film was advertised to have recreated historical events. This made its contents far more controversial. The author explains that the plotline of the film had several instances of paternalism and assumptions of African inferiority and incompetency woven into it.

Additionally, several scenes depicted stereotypical savagery, fueled by the retrogression thesis. These scenes brought to life a fear that had been ingrained into the minds of many Southerners. There is no refuting that the film is inherently racist. However, because the

film was viewed as a historical piece, it brought validity to some of the most feared scenarios, while romanticizing others. In essence, Stokes makes a case for the film as a rather distorted historical narrative.

Stokes clearly demonstrates that *Birth* was responsible for disseminating Lost Cause ideology. He explains that the film “apotheosized the Ku Klux Klan of the reconstruction period,” meaning that Griffiths depiction of the Klan portrayed them as heroes (9). The author explains Dixon’s positive view of the Klan by examining his family tree and listing the members of his family. The reader is left to assume that Dixon’s support of the Klan was due to his family’s ancestral involvement. In contrast, Stokes explores Griffiths view through a biographical approach. Stokes explains that Griffith did not have direct contact with the Klan, as Dixon had. Still, like many readers of Dixon’s book, Griffith had been fascinated with Dixon’s depiction of the Klan in *The Klansman*. Through the use of direct quotes from Griffith, the author leads the reader to believe that Griffith’s fondness and romanticization of the Klan can (partially) be attributed to their use of horses. This appealed to Griffith because his father had been a cavalry officer during the Civil War. These factors turned out to be highly influential in Griffith’s portrayal of Dixon’s book. Stokes makes a clear correlation between this heroic narrative and the resurgence of the Klan by citing quotes from various historians, authors, and film critics who echoed Stokes’ analysis. While the author sees the film as responsible for the revival of the Ku Klux Klan in the early 20th-century, he also attributes the film to mobilizing the NAACP. *Birth* elevates a caricature of African American men commonly known as “Black Beast Rapist,” which vilified black men while depicting the Ku Klux Klan as America’s white redeemers. In essence, Stokes explains that because the film validated long-standing hypothetical scenarios such as the mass raping of white women by black men, the plotline of *Birth* was not just racist, it was dangerous. The NAACP recognized the film as a breeding ground for violence and even justification for murder. As a result, the NAACP gradually began to grow in its membership as they advocated for the banning of the movie, and eventually organized protests against its showing. Stokes accredits the film with mobilizing and equipping the NAACP with skills and tactics that would be later employed during the Civil Rights

Movement. The author concludes by emphasizing the success of such tactics and citing how unprofitable showings of the film became due to protests and picketing organized by the NAACP.

Stokes effectively makes a case for the film's groundbreaking technological advances and its artistic accomplishments. The historical context provided by the author allows the reader to comprehend why the film seemed to be unparalleled at the time of its release. Throughout the text, Stokes' emphasis upon the respective lives of Dixon and Griffith was a vital part of his argument. Not only is the author's use of biographical analysis free of indecipherable jargon, but it is told in an engaging manner that enables the reader to become acquainted with the figures and many of the most formative events in their lives. Stokes' use of the biographical method proves highly efficient as he continued to refer to events, facts, or family members throughout the text. Frequently, the author reveals elements of symbolism within the plotline that can often be tied back to a person or event within their respective lives.

In his history of D.W. Griffith's *The Birth of A Nation*, Stokes explores the film's innovative and artistic merit while analyzing its residual impacts. The value of the text lies in its ability to take a series of perplexing or outlandish scenes (or scenarios) and distill them into a clear and concise explanation; all while emphasizing the historical significance. Ultimately, the author makes a formidable case for why the film was labeled as "The most controversial motion picture of all time."

Anila Lahiri



The Flagler College Phi Alpha Theta chapter is a proud sponsor and supporter of the *Flagler College Historical Review*. The idea for the journal was presented by Dr. John Young on October 21, 2019, in a Phi Alpha Theta meeting. After that, the members and Dr. Young worked on making the journal possible starting in the spring semester of 2020. Phi Alpha Theta at Flagler College is dedicated to making history accessible to the public and educating in a way that is both beneficial and interesting. The *Flagler College Historical Review* is to allow undergraduate students to have successfully peer-reviewed articles and reviews published. This initiative aligns with the purpose of Phi Alpha Theta.



The 2019-20 Executive Board

President: Megan Brown
Vice President: Jessie Bowers
Secretary: Erin Hamm
Treasurer: Noah Chelednik
Historian: Kimberly McLester

