THE FLAGLER COLLEGE HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. II

2021

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

VOLUME I EDITORIAL STAFF

Casey Niebuhr, Lead Editor

Reace Kaleko, Associate Editor

Elise Hoff

Nina Oeberg

Dr. John Young, Faculty Advisor

RESEARCH ARTICLES

I Want to Take You Lower:

Sly and The Family Stone's *There's A Riot Goin' On* and Social Tension in the 1970s

Zachariah Brown

Rarely does an album capture the struggles and changes of an era as perfectly as Sly and The Family Stones' *There's A Riot Goin 'On*. From a witty, charismatic band leader, Sly Stone's personal struggle with addiction turned him into a paranoid and disillusioned recluse. The multiracial Family Stone, the quintessential image of 1960s harmony, splintered. Created in the midst of this dark era of violence, racial tension, and substance abuse, *There's A Riot Goin' On* reads today as both a testament to the death of 1960s idealism and the beginning of the cynical 1970s. A landmark album both musically and historically, *There's A Riot Goin' On* records the unrest of 1971 in two parts: the growing social tensions on the streets, and the drug-fueled riot inside Sly Stone's mind.

"Blood is thicker than the mud/It's a family affair" – "Family Affair"

Sly Stone was born Sylvester Stewart on March 15th, 1943 to a musical family. His mother, Alpha Stewart, was the daughter of a pastor and founder of St. Andrew Church of God in Christ in Denton, Texas.[1] As children, Stewart and his four siblings, including younger brother Freddie and sister Rose Stewart, were immersed in gospel music. Stewart was said to have a preternatural gift for showmanship. His mother, Alpha, claimed he was

---

[1] Jeff Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher: The Life and Times of Sly and the Family Stone* (New York: Backbeat Books, 2009), 3.

"born with a big voice."[2] By the time Stewart was eleven years old, he had formed a family band with his siblings. The family moved to Vallejo, California, a small town with a large black population north of San Francisco. Occasionally Stewart and his siblings would travel to Texas and record gospel records to sell, at the suggestion of a local pastor. He recorded his first lead vocals at eleven years old.

As Stewart grew older, he became more involved in the Bay Area music scene. In high school, he joined a group known as The Cherrybusters, an orange-jacket clad gang that spent much of its time chasing girls in Stewart's green 1953 Chevy and singing doo wop. After getting kicked out of high school, Syl (as he became known) studied music theory in community college. Stewart began performing with a group known as The Viscaynes, notable in the area for being integrated; the singing group consisted of white musicians, a Filipino boy named Frank Arellano, and Stewart himself, the lone black performer.[3]

Stewart was inspired by both his success with The Viscaynes, which included recording sessions in Los Angeles and topping the local charts, excited for the possibilities of a popular multiracial band. During these times, the charismatic bandleader often got in trouble for having white friends and dating white girls, and the integrated future that lay in music appealed to him. The young Stewartvester was known as "Sly" by his fellow bandmates for his clever plans and know-how when it came to getting things accomplished, and by the summer of 1967 he had engineered his best plan yet.

---

[2] Joel Selvin, *Sly and the Family Stone: An Oral History* (New York: Avon Books, 1998), 1.
[3] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 9.

In the mid- to late-1960s, Sly Stewart worked for a black radio station named KSOL and headed his own popular and progressive radio show that mixed black R&B with white rock n' roll. He also produced and wrote songs for local acts, notably white rock musicians in the burgeoning hippie scene of San Francisco including The Beau Brummels, The Warlocks, and the Great Society.[4] On the side he headed his own band named Sly and the Stoners. An energetic man with eclectic taste, Stewart was disappointed in the lack of freedom that production and deejaying gave him. He quit working at the station and ditched his side projects to focus on his own musical career.

Stewart split with the Stoners, taking female trumpeter Cynthia Robinson with him. Robinson was a tall black woman with a large Afro, who had struggled to find work as a talented trumpet player due to her gender and look. Stewart immediately took to her and offered her a position in his new band. Practicing in the basement of his home in the hippie neighborhood of Haight-Ashbury, they joined with Stewart's younger brother Freddie, who, like Sly, had been playing guitar and singing in the Bay Area scene for years, as well as with his sister Rose Stewart. After this initial grouping, Sly began building his dream band in earnest.

Sly scouted the local bars and music clubs and found drummer Greg Errico working as a set player. Errico was a seventeen-year-old Catholic Italian-American playing soul covers in mostly Black clubs. Jerry Martini, a white saxophonist, was already friends with Sly Sylvester in the San Francisco scene, playing with a band named George and Teddy and the Condors. Together, the two finished the ensemble by enlisting the help of the locally

---

[4] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 26

famous bassist Larry Graham. Graham would later become famous for developing an entirely new and revolutionary style of bass playing that would come to be known as 'slap bass.'[5]

After a few rehearsals in his Haight-Ashbury basement, Sly knew he had struck gold with an orchestrated band filled with individuality, soul, and funkiness that represented the diverse sounds of inner-city America. He asked everyone in the band to change their last name to Stone, a sign that they would truly all be family. Jerry Martini later said, "He was so far ahead of his time (…) There was a shit pot full of black drummers that could kick Greg's ass (and) a lot of black saxophone players that could kick mine. He knew exactly what he was doing. Boys, girls, black, white."[6]

Sly had created his multiracial band; a band he believed would help break down racial stereotypes and promote his ideals of coexistence. He debuted the band at The Cathedral in San Francisco, and was quickly signed by David Kapralik, a manager who brought them to Epic Records.

Kapralik knew talent when he saw it and moved the band to New York City. Sly and The Family Stone were slow to start out; their debut record A Whole New Thing was a critical flop. Over the course of their next two albums, Sly and The Family Stone were "transformed from best-kept secret to an inflating commercial success."[7] With the release of Dance to the Music and Life, Sly and his Family were skyrocketed into fame. Stand!, released in 1969, gelled all the funk, soul, and high political commentary of the previous

---

[5] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 38.
[6] Selvin, *Sly and the Family Stone,* 37.
[7] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 64.

albums and became one of the most popular albums of the latent 1960s. A legendary performance at Woodstock Music and Art Fair boosted the band, and Sly, to superstardom. By all accounts, they were destined for greatness.

"Thank you for the party/I could never stay" – "Thank You For Talkin' to Me, Africa"

By 1969, America was changing; and with it, the conditions the band was used to playing in. First came the riots. On a road trip to Detroit, the band was pulled over in their touring bus by the National Guard. Race riots had consumed the city. "They look in the van, and it's black and white hippies, and that's challenging," remembered drummer Greg Errico, "We didn't have any weapons, but we're up against the wall, they have machine guns, there's a race riot going on and this is a very tense situation."[8] Sly reacted strongly. Never one for authority, he spoke back to the police and threatened them. Errico and the rest of the band feared for their lives, but soon enough they were hustled back onto the bus and allowed to leave the city.

In July, the band was scheduled to play the newly rock-centric Newport Jazz Festival. For the first few acts the crowd grew restless, finally breaking down the security fence around the stage. As tensions heightened, police arrived in full riot gear for the remainder of the weekend, and during Sly and The Family Stone's set list "hundreds of youth outside instigated rock throwing with the officers, eventually bum-rushing the ten-foot gates during 'You Can Make It If You Try.'"[9] The stage was trashed, as was The Family Stone's tour bus. A month later, restless teens threw bottles and rock at the side of famed

---

[8] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 65.
[9] Marshall Miles Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On: 33 1/3* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016), 64.

Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C., after the band arrived five hours late. The Daughters of the Revolution, who owned the Hall, banned rock concerts from the venue permanently. In Grant Park, Chicago, a free Sly and The Family Stone concert turned to a full-blown war zone after drunk, agitated crowds fought the police, who unleashed tear gas, shot three people, and arresting more than a hundred and fifty others.[10] Sly and The Family Stone were aghast. These crowds were clearly not the peace-loving hippies of Woodstock; the mood of rock concert attending audiences in the inner cities had invariably begun to shift.

These riots were nothing new. Since the early 20th century, stringent and racist Jim Crow laws had pushed blacks to riot in cities across the North and the Deep South. Before Sylvester Stewart was born, his hometown of Denton, Texas was reshaped by civil unrest as the white community pushed the relatively affluent black population to the outskirts of town in the late 1920s.[11] Similarly, economic depression throughout the latter half of the century caused riots from both blacks and whites alike. The multicultural, peace-loving hippie movement of the 1960s decried violence, the core of Sly and The Family Stone's initial audience.

As economic depression and racial tensions flared, marked by both the decline of the middle class and the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., America and its counterculture saw a rejection of these idealistic principles.[12] These crowds often turned to rock music to

---

[10] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On: 33 1/3*, 64
[11] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 3.
[12] Thomas Borstelmann, *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013), 97.

unleash their angst, whether in shows like The Rolling Stones' Altamonte or at The Family Stones.[13] Sly and The Family Stone, as pop counterculture icons, had front row tickets to the cynical abandonment of nonviolence. The riots experienced by the band left an impactful impression on Sly Stone, and on the creation of *There's A Riot Goin' On*.

Leading up to the recording of the album, another influence began to tug at the corners of the group. Members of the Black Panther Party, the black nationalist organization, began to pressure Sly Stone to fire and change the white members of the band, including saxophone player Jerry Martini and manager David Kapralik. The racial diversity of The Family Stone had always been a dual strength and weakness; while hip Bay Area crowds celebrated them, the band would often find themselves exiled from Southern clubs or racist Northeastern music halls. As the prominence of the Black Panthers grew and the death of Dr. King reverberated throughout the nation, Sly and his band found themselves drawing more heat for being multiracial. Manager David Kapralik notes, "Jerry is the one who told that in Boston some Panther members tried to get Stewart to drop me, get rid of whitey, get rid of the devil. He wouldn't hear it… The Panthers were after him."[14] The Black Panthers tried multiple times to get Sly to drop white members, pressuring him outside of music clubs on both coasts.

While the Panthers struggled to get Sly to change the racial outlook of his band, it was, at least in their eyes, for good reason. With the death of Dr. King brought a renewed sense of injustice and hopelessness in Black America. The political landscape of America

---

[13] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 23.
[14] Selvin, *Sly and the Family Stone,* 89.

was moving right, and the candidacy of Richard Nixon and his "Southern strategy" of courting segregationist voters proved to many that white America was attempting to reel back much of the progress made in the 1960s.[15] The Black Panthers brand of militarism was reactionary and protectionist. Sly was the perfect target – a visible black superstar who openly celebrated racial harmony. For his part, Sly never considered the idea that he would change the makeup of the band. Stone's goal "in assembling a racially and gender-integrated unit spoke louder than any of his rare public declarations on racism (…) the band expressed its collective consciousness on the subject in musical form, in "Everyday People", "Underdog", and most explicitly "Don't Call me Ni**er, Whitey"[16] Sly also dodged the question repeatedly when asked about his relationship with the Panthers, but that may have been due more to his ever more confused state of mind. At the end of 1969, Sly Stone was heavily addicted to hard drugs.

"Look at you fooling you! Another day/You're farther away" – "Runnin' Away"

The relationship that Sly Stone, and by association The Family Stone, had with drugs at the beginning of the 1970s is perhaps the single most recorded aspect of the band, and the easiest way to understand their subsequent musical output, *There's A Riot Goin' On*. "The effect of drugs on the musical legacy of Sly and The Family Stone is moralistically the biggest lesson there is to learn from the groups downslide."[17] The influence of hard drugs, in the story of both the band and the album, cannot be overstated. Neither can the social,

---

[15] Borstelmann, *The 1970s,* 283.
[16] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher,* 86.
[17] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 48.

political, and cultural landscape of early 1970s America which allowed this relationship to proliferate unabated.

The band had been smoking weed and drinking together since their inception in the Bay Area music scene. After-parties for *A Whole New Thing* and *Dance to the Music* were apparently riotous affairs, with all the band members taking part. But after Freddie Stone was introduced to cocaine in 1968, the relationship the band and Sly had with drugs began to change. "I remember the night that Freddy first did cocaine; it was at the Fillmore East backstage, and he changed from that day," saxophonist Jerry Martini later recalled. "It was real interesting to watch the personalities change."[18] Freddie introduced the drug to Sly, who quickly took a liking. Cocaine shaped the way the band leader functioned, and soon Sly was taking prescription psycho-sedatives from a doctor to sleep.

Sly Stone became less like the charismatic Sylvester Stewart and more like a mood-shifting junkie. He began to miss concerts, causing more riots from deflated fans. He showed up to interviews high and nonsensical. He became more irritable and violent, lashing out at his closest friends and disappearing for long depressive episodes. "His two personas – the shy, innocent poet Sylvester Stewart and the streetwise character he'd invented, Sly Stone, were torn apart," said manager David Kapralik about Sly, "He'd numbed himself with cocaine."[19] Stone's descent had begun.

In 1970, Stone moved to a multimillion-dollar, stately mansion in Coldwater Canyon, Los Angeles to record his upcoming album. It was here, in Los Angeles, that Stone dove

---

[18] Selvin, *Sly and the Family Stone,* 65.
[19] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher,* 90.

into his addiction head on. While the record company had planned his next album release to be in the spring of 1969, Sly Stone had fallen very behind, acting more and more irrational. He had purchased a large pit bull named Gun that he would sic on anyone who caused trouble, or momentarily irked him. His band members Martini, Errico, and even his sister Rose had initially moved in with him but left as his cocaine parties grew more intense. Stone hired gangsters to protect him and his drug stash, building an entourage that included the fresh-out-of-jail former pimp Hamp "Bubba" Banks and tough guy J.B. Brown. They followed Sly Stone everywhere, from concerts to management meetings, often picked on his band members.[20]

In his true outlandish fashion, Stone also took to carrying a violin case full of cocaine, taking it to concerts and walking down the Beverly Hills boulevards with it. He also began taking the drug PCP, known to him and his band as 'angel dust', and carrying a gun on him. Gangster and associate Bubba Banks said, "When Sly did the PCP (…) he was all the way out. There wasn't anything happening no more. It was over. (…) He was doing shit you would expect to see in some kind of institution for mentally retarded people."[21] Stone had officially gone down the rabbit hole and was quickly dragging the band down with him. It was during this downward spiral that *There's A Riot Goin' On* was recorded, in the autumn of 1970.

"My only weapon is my pen/And the frame of mind I'm in" – "Poet"

---

[20] Selvin, *Sly and the Family Stone,* 85.
[21] Selvin, *Sly and the Family Stone,* 95.

Originally titled *Africa Talks to You*, the album *There's A Riot Goin' On* is a complete musical denial of everything Sly had previously produced. Gone were the positive, uplifting funk tracks that asked its listeners to "dance to the music"; in their place were brooding, spaced-out jams that warped and mumbled through depressive themes. Even the album cover was a sharp departure from the previous covers that featured a smiling, glittering Family Stone. Instead, a stark red, white, and black American flag waves like a banner, with fifty stars replaced by twenty-eight suns.[22] On the inside cover are a montage of gritty images: a caution sign, a warped copy of the Gettysburg Address, and a picture of Stone's pit bull, Gun.

The recording quality of the album succeeds well past the cover's dark and moody promise of an album unlike any The Family Stone had released before. "Never before on a Sly and The Family Stone album were songs open to so much interpretation, and even more so, dripping with cynicism."[23] It's worth noting that, for most of the album, Sly is almost impossible to understand. His voice strains and murmurs throughout, tuning in and out of legibility like a fuzzy radio station. This is because Sly Stone overdubbed the album constantly, often overlaying tracks multiple times within the same day. He also recorded much of the album's vocals while laying down in bed or slung over the side of his couch, exhausted after long bouts of taking PCP and cocaine.

By this time, the fractures within The Family Stone meant that the album was recorded mainly by Sly Stone, with only partial participation from the rest of the band.

---

[22] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 70.
[23] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 72.

While much of the album was recorded in Stone's bedroom on a sixteen-track console and personal microphone at his Coldwater Canyon manse, Stone also took secretive trips out to The Record Plant, a recording studio in Sausalito, California. There, Stone recorded on a Flickinger mixing console built specifically for him by the Plant, sunk into the studio floor, so he could snort lines of cocaine off its top while mixing tracks.[24] The combination of tense interpersonal relationships between band members, unorthodox recording styles, and erratic mixing and lyricism made *There's A Riot Goin' On* a completely unique album, unlike anything heard before in the funk genre. From beginning to end, Riot was something new.

The album begins with the track "Luv n' Haight" a funky, slow-stepping groove built around a four-metronome beat laid down by an MRK-1 electric drum machine. Stone used the MRK-1 for much of the album, becoming one of the first major artists to introduce electric drum machines to rock n' roll. Due to Stone's deterioration relationship with drummer Greg Errico, this was out of necessity as well as style; however, the result is a poignantly impersonal but increasingly hypnotizing beat. Freddie Stone chimes in with wah-wah guitar, and Cynthia Robinson and Jerry Martini blast percussion horns.[25] "Feel so good inside myself/Don't want to move" Stone croaks faintly, "Feel so good inside myself/Don't need to move" The tone is lethargic and happy but with a note of sinking desperation. As the track chugs along, Stone's ad libs turn to pleas of "I wanna move/I wanna move." Like the title of the song, Stone's relationship with his body and the drugs

---

[24] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 77.
[25] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 87.

he takes is one of love and hate. Much like America's relationship with drugs, Sly is at odds with his newfound pleasure, enticed by its promises but exhausted by its requirements. "As I grow up/I'm growing down" Sly moans, too high to struggle with this acknowledgement. The track fades into a jam.

The metaphor between Stone's personal struggle with the duality of pleasure and suffering under hard drugs and America's struggle within the 1970s continues throughout the album. After "Poet", a short track about Stone's songwriting prowess, the album slips into "Just Like a Baby" a twinkling keyboard honey-glazed jam that is both as catchy as it is overdubbed and lo-fi. "Sometimes I cry/I can feel it when you lie to me" Sly Stone murmurs, sounding exhausted, as if speaking directly to the lines of cocaine on his Flickenger. "Just like a baby" Sly and friend Bobby Womack harmonize, sounding a million miles away. The track lifts the listener up and sets him down, melancholy and relaxed, and already nostalgic for its own peak. The mood is intoxicating. "'Just Like a Baby' makes you want to get high – which is just how you would've felt as a hopeless brother living in an American ghetto circa 1971."[26] The song is almost a musical transliteration of that feeling of pain and hopelessness.

"Family Affair" is the most powerful track on the album, and Sly and The Family Stone's last number one hit single. Upbeat on its face but with brilliant, saddened lyrics, "Family Affair" is both a story and a feeling, a tribute to the social turmoil that inner-city families face. "One child grows up to be/Somebody that just loves to learn/And another child grows up to be/Somebody you'd just love to burn" Sly Stone rhapsodizes, claiming

---

[26] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 91.

the mother loves them equally, and she's stuck in the reality that "Blood is thicker than the mud" Later, he tells the story of a newlywed couple, insinuating their infidelity. "You can't cry/'cause you'll look broke down/But you're crying anyway/'cause you're all broke down" Sly eats at the heart of what it means to be a black family, and peering deeply into the structure of 1970s American family life. Rose Stone sings the title, a beautiful ghost in the background. The bass thumps along to the electric drum and, while the melody is joyful, the production effects are as sparse and haunting as the lyricism.

The rest of the album is as equally depressing and distant, insightful and impenetrable. Both "Time" and "Spaced Cowboy" reinterpret lyrics from previous hits, this time imagining them as gloomy callbacks to past success. "Thank you for the party/I could never stay/Thank you for lettin' me be myself again" Sly croons on "Thank You For Talkin' to Me Africa" reimagining his ode to individuality as an apology for his current state. Even the most energetic piece on the album, "Brave and Strong", sags at the end, with Jerry Martini's funky sax riffs and Larry Graham's slap bass competing with Sly's chants of "Ain't got a friend/You don't know who turned you in" The album grooves and swings, but is never quite triumphant or confident. "You Caught Me (Smilin')" is a sardonic, live-drum filled jam with the title serving as a fading and almost creepy refrain. The song sounds like the worst part of an inescapable high; inorganic pleasure is forced upon the listener as Sly screams his way out of the repetitive groove.

The album reads the most as a commentary for Stone's wariness of the coming decade and his own struggle with addiction on two tracks. The title track, "There's A Riot Goin' On" is simply four seconds of silence. Stone officially stated it was silent because he

"didn't want any more riots."[27] It is hard to imagine that the many riots the band had to endure did not go in to configuring this decision. Sly also used this track, as well as the title of the album, as a rebuttal to Marvin Gaye's *What's Going On*. Instead of political commentary, Stone's album served as a sort of score to the events of the changing decade, interpreting the musicians' own experiences. By titling his album, and the silent track, Stone may have been indicating his own placement within the rioting.

The second track, "Africa Talks To You (The Asphalt Jungle)" is a less straightforward but no less important commentary on the changing times. An over-eight-minute twisting jam with rhythmic electric beats and dark hypnotic bass, "Africa" is a spiraling odyssey in the true rock tradition of lengthy songs. The most telling lyrics come around when The Family Stone sings a chorus of "Timber/All falls down/Timber/Who's around" over the whining, and slightly off-beat guitar licks. Stone chimes in with "Must be a rush for you to see a lazy/In his backyard he grew/Copout/He's crazy." This song represents the duality of Stone's own descent into drug abuse, and inner-city America's own failures and decline – hence the imagery of the falling tree in the asphalt jungle. Sly Stone even goes so far as to criticize himself and lay his pain out for those to see. It must be a rush for the public to see him fail, a 'lazy' and a 'cop-out'. As distant as the copious amounts of PCP and cocaine made him, he was not unaware of his own failures and his failures to live up to his musical promises of racial unity and black positivity.

There's A Riot Goin' On embodied this metaphor between Sly Stone's own descent and the death of the 1960s. When Sly spoke about his own failures with drug addiction, it

---

[27] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher*, 118.

spoke deeply to America (and rock n' roll) about their new, unfamiliar, and dangerous relationship with mind altering substances. When Sly made space on his album for a silent track about rioting, it was hard not to read it as a cynical commentary on America's urban unrest. As Sly and The Family Stone shattered, their multiracial band dividing often among racial lines, it seemed that *Riot* was a product of a much less harmonious era.

"You know that time/Needs to be a little longer" – "Time"

The long awaited There's A Riot Goin' On was a critical and chart success. Critics, initially aghast at its inward-looking, paranoia-funk, realized its importance after only a few listens. Famed Rolling Stone music writer Vince Aletti wrote its most revealing review, and perhaps one of the most influential reviews of his career. "Maybe this is the new urban music. It's not about dancing to the music, in the streets. It's about disintegration, getting fucked up, nodding, maybe dying. There are flashes of euphoria (...) mostly it's just junkie death," Aletti writes. "Sly (is) laying himself out in all his fuck-ups. And at the same time holding a mirror up to all of us. (...) It's hard to take, but *There's A Riot Goin' On* is one of the most important fucking albums this year."[28] Aletti saw the album for what it was, the authentic portrayal of Sly and of the new American counterculture. It was brilliantly unique. American audiences saw the same thing and loved it. The album debuted at number one on the charts and stayed there for eight weeks.[29]

---

[28] Vince Aletti, "Sly and The Family Stone – 'There's a Riot Goin' On' (1971)," November 26, 2008, https://beatpatrol.wordpress.com/2008/08/29/sly-the-family-stone-theres-a-riot-goin-on-1971/.
[29] Kaliss, *I Want to Take You Higher,* 107.

In a true rock n' roll cultural exchange, the album influenced the 1970s as much as the 1970s influenced album. Nixon's War on Drugs began the same year as *Riot*'s release and was aimed squarely at Americans who looked like Sly Stone: the young, and the black.[30] Nixon's campaign claims, often directed towards Southern anti-integrationists, focused on the fact that drugs were "decimating a generation of Americans." The War on Drugs conflated the soft-drug craze of marijuana from the hippie counterculture and the hard-drug influence of heroin, PCP, and cocaine. Nixon was exceptionally explicit as to who was at fault for this conflation of ideologies: "The incendiary black militant, and the welfare mother, the hedonistic hippie, and the campus revolutionary."[31] Sly and his family fit well within nearly all of these groups, and *There's A Riot Goin' On* figured as cultural fodder and evidence that this corruption extended well into the realm of pop culture.

However, the album also served as evidence that drugs were leaving the confines of the ghetto. The Family Stone was wealthy, suburban, and multiracial. J. Edgar Hoover's COINTELPRO was already well in the midst of a rock n' roll fueled investigation and simultaneous takedown of the Black Panthers when it reportedly opened a file on Sly and The Family Stone.[32] Similarly, just days into Nixon's War, a memo from the administration leaked saying that racial issues, such as inner-city drug abuse, should be dealt with on a policy based on "benign neglect"[33] *There's A Riot Goin' On* was a mouthpiece into the

---

[30] Dan Baum, *Smoke and Mirrors: The War on Drugs and the Politics of Failure* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1997), 21.
[31] Baum, *Smoke and Mirror*s, 23.
[32] Lewis, *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 103.
[33] Baum, *Smoke and Mirror*s, 24.

bedrooms of white teenagers across America, a nightmare for politicians like Hoover and Nixon. Clearly, the potential for damage was high given the cultural mobility of rock n' roll.

Rioting after the release of *There's A Riot Goin' On* did little to abate. Stone's unwillingness to perform at shows, as well as his unpredictability, made his crowds ever more volatile.[34] While the Black Panthers eventually stopped courting Stone, it was simply because they did not need to anymore. Stone's multiracial musical movement had, like the rest of the 1960s idealisms, fallen by the wayside. Reporters stopped bothering Sly Stone for interviews; often he simply would not answer questions, or he was just too high to function.[35] By the end of 1975, the band had stopped performing together in public. Cynthia Robinson moved in with a new husband, Rose Stone abandoned her brother for the East Coast, and manager Kapralik deserted to Hawaii after a cocaine-induced nervous breakdown.

In terms of legacy, the album has gone on to influence a wide range of modern artists and sounds. Hip-hop breaks routinely feature samples from Riot, with Stone's sing-rapping style and dark themes cited as an essential part of the formation of early hip-hop.[36] Further, Stone's sound served as direct influence on his friend George Clinton, who continues to cite him as the true creator of funk music (and also as the man who, for better or worse, introduced him to cocaine). Stone's dark and moody themes would leave their marks on

---

[34] Mike Gormley, "Sly & the Family Stone: Cobo Hall, Detroit", *Detroit Free Press* (1970), Sly & The Family Stone, Rock's Backpages, Accessed November 10, 2020, 1.

[35] Timothy Crouse, "Now Sly Tells His Side of the Story, Sort Of." *Rolling Stone*, June 25, 2018, 1

[36] Lewis. *There's a Riot Goin' On,* 110.

jazz as well, with his peers Herbie Hancock and Miles Davis even attending the original recording sessions for *Riot* and tributing many of its melodies in later works.

The warmth with which the band describes Sly today is surprising. Rose Stone, his sister, manages this like Kapralik did, by characterizing him as two separate people. "We know the difference between Sly and Sylvester. (…) Sly is more or less something that has come about because of (…) struggles. And the image that you must continue to project the Sylvester, the part that I know, is the person that people need to know. Because he's the real genius."[37] The duality of Stewart as the good spirited genius and Sly as the drug-fueled maniac born from social pressure is how most of the Family Stone deals with their memories of him, and an excellent metaphor for the characterizations of the 1960s and the 1970s. Regardless, today neither Sly nor Sylvester are often seen in public. Rumored to be hiding in a trailer park in Beverly Hills, the genius behind the first essential album of the 1970s is reclusive, still dealing with the riot inside his mind.

"Come to find out/I'm a whole lot like you, too" – "Just Like a Baby"

There's A Riot Goin' On captured the transforming social ideals of the 1970s and in so doing broadened what a rock n' roll album could accomplish. Cynical, paranoid, drug-fueled, and incredibly dark, the album transposed Sly's own experiences with violence, racial tension, and drug addiction into a historical time capsule for the burgeoning decade. The album's causal relationship with the era further serves as evidence of rock's

---

[37] WGBH Openvault, Rock and Roll: Make it Funky, Interview with Rose Stone and Freddie Stone, 1995, http://openvault.wgbh.org/catalog/V_BD1E27341B54473B983A7E4398793E32.

greater ability to influence history just as much as it can interpret it. Sly Stone's decline is a window into the rapidly changing America of 1971, and the riot that lived both inside and outside of the artist's mind. This window has proved both musically and historically valuable, and an integral part of the cultural shifts of its period.

Agency, Misery, and Revolution in Latin America

Anila Lahiri

To accurately discern the characteristics which distinguish the Mexican Revolution from the Cuban Revolution, one must examine the conditions which created the environment for revolutionary upheaval. Before a revolution manifests physically, the appropriate quantities of human misery and human agency must reach a state of equilibrium.[1] Yet, this state of equilibrium should not be viewed as a structural-functionalist monolith. Rather, equilibrium is contingent upon a number of social, political, economic, and intellectual factors which may vary from one region to the next.[2] To accurately identify the factors which cultivated the appropriate quantities of human agency and misery, one must examine the environments in which the Cuban and Mexican Revolutions manifested. Therefore, it is necessary to identify and evaluate the significant events which occurred between Independence and Revolution. In this manner, proper historical context must

---

[1] Chalmers Johnson, *Revolutionary Change*, 2nd ed. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982), 182. The term, "equilibrium" is intentionally used to contradict Johnson's notion of a "disequilibrated society," later echoed by Jack A. Goldstone's notion of revolution manifesting at a state of "disequilibrium."

[2] The necessary quantities of misery and agency needed to produce a revolution should not be viewed as a monolith. In essence, one should not expect to produce a revolution in one region using the same exact methods used in a separate location, as modification will be required to ensure success. Even in the field of pathology, it is widely understood that a virus mutates. This is significant, as it provides an intriguing format for revolution. The virus still maintains its core components, yet, it evolves to adapt to its new host. To a degree, this may explain the failure of the Foco theory of Revolution. Successful transmission demands some degree of adaptation to ensure longevity. Concerning ideology, the successful transmission of an ideological contagion requires a degree of ambiguity. Ambiguity ensures that an ideology is able to adapt to its new host upon transmission. In a sense, this is why the enlightenment was so successful. There was no forced, uniform implementation of enlightenment ideals by an exclusive intelligentsia or Foco. Rather, it accommodated for free will. A successful revolutionary theory must incorporate a mechanism for adaptation. This is a pivotal component in cultivating the necessary ratio of human misery to human agency, and a necessity if one wishes to ensure permanent revolution.

accommodate for the role of foreign policy and its subsequent impact upon each nation's national identity. By examining the variables which contributed to the cultivation of agency and misery, it is possible to reveal the development of each nation's respective revolutionary physiognomy. Though not exhaustive, the conducted research seeks to identify the most prominent social, political, economic, and ideological variables which created the environment for Revolutionary equilibrium in Mexico and Cuba.

As asserted by Theda Skocpol, "Cases need to be carefully selected and the criteria for grouping them together made explicit," when approaching comparative historical analysis.[3] In essence, to accurately comprehend the components which contributed to Mexico and Cuba's Revolutions, it is necessary to understand the development of their individual national identities, or lack thereof. In 1810, Mexico declared independence from Spain, eventually achieving independence in 1821. Following independence, Mexico immediately experienced dire economic circumstances which could largely be attributed to a suffering textile industry, a lack of transportation, and disrepair in its mines, which functioned at one-third of their prewar production level. As the nation was enveloped in economic despair, few jobs were available for

"300,000 men, most of whom had fought in the wars, had no job or income when the battles came to an end. This represented 15 to 30 percent of the entire adult male population. They were eager, often angry, and usually armed."[4] In essence, independence led to an influx of

---

[3] Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 40.
[4] Peter H. Smith and James Naylor Green, *Modern Latin America*, 8th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 48-49.

agency, which was quickly followed by an increase in misery. Yet, the necessary quantities of agency and misery were not present to propel Mexico into a state of revolutionary equilibrium. Many of these same veterans went on to form the caudillos that would play a profound role in shaping the disequilibrium that characterized Mexico for much of the 19th century.

Similarly, in 1895, a revolt for Cuban independence began to gain traction. By 1898, the U.S. had more of a role in Cuba than did Spain. Because of its economic investments in Cuba, the United States was motivated to intervene: "In 1896 Congress declared that the U.S. government 'should be prepared to protect the legitimate interests of our citizens, by intervention if necessary."[5] To safeguard its economic interests, the U.S. entered the Spanish-American-Cuban-Philippine War.[6] While the U.S. claimed to aid the guerrillas, its actions can be viewed as a form of insubordination. In essence, the conduct of the U.S. was dismissive of the contributions of the guerilla fighters. This was exhibited on June 17, 1898, when U.S. forces chose to fly the U.S. flag rather than flying both the U.S. flag and the flag of the Cuban guerilla fighters. In so doing, the U.S. forces undermined the Cuban guerilla fighters and denied their contributions to the Spanish-American-Cuban-Philippine War, following the Battle of Santiago de Cuba. This action was received as an insult, which triggered an influx of human agency and human misery, "This action served effectively to turn Cuban nationalism—with all of the momentum gained during the prolonged struggle

---

[5] Peter H. Smith, *Talons of the Eagle: Latin America, the United States, and the World*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 35.
[6] Eric R. Wolf, *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 254.

for independence—against the United States."[7] In so doing, the U.S. inadvertently contributed to the development of a cohesive Cuban national identity, while cultivating the environment for Revolution.

When comparing the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions, the role of national identity should not be overlooked. Identity is a highly influential concept, which maintains the ability to unite the masses. Though national identity is central to the topic, it should be noted that religious, cultural, and racial identities can be equally influential in mass mobilization. Additionally, national identity should be viewed as a prominent source of human agency in creating the environment for the Mexican and Cuban Revolutions; however, the cohesiveness of each nation's post-independence national identity largely dictated the success of their Revolutionaries. In the decades following independence, Mexico went on to endure fifty years of political instability. During that period, at least fifty presidents came to power, while 35 of these regimes were led by army officers.[8] Many of these officers were veterans from Mexico's War of Independence.[9] From its establishment as an independent nation, Mexico exhibited a severe fragmenting of human agency, which in-turn led to a fragmented national identity. Conversely, Cuba's national identity was largely informed by its proximity to independence. Following U.S. intervention in 1898, the

---

[7] Wolf, 255.

[8] It can be observed that humanity is constantly inflicted by varying degrees of human misery. Yet, revolutions rarely occur. This can be attributed to a lack of human agency. Certain demographics (usually middle or upper classes) perpetually harbor high quantities of human agency, but rarely initiates revolution. Without ideology and human misery, high concentrations of human agency alone will not initiate a sustainable revolution. This is exhibited within the Mexican Revolution. In the century preceding the Mexican Revolution, Mexico had declared independence from Spain in 1810, acquired independence in 1821, and had endured over five decades of political instability. Between 1821 and 1876, Mexico had at minimum 50 different presidents, which can be viewed as a series of unsustainable revolutions.

[9] Alan Knight, *The Mexican Revolution: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 8.

Cuban nationalism which had been cultivated during the struggle for independence was redirected at the United States. The anti-U.S. sentiment served as a potent ideological contagion which resulted in a far more cohesive national identity in the decades leading up to the Cuban Revolution.[10] This is historically significant, as the deviations in each nation's national identity foreshadowed their revolutionary movements.

While national identity functioned as a prominent source of human agency, the social, political, and economic structural conditions which preceded revolution were a substantial source of human misery. In his analysis of the limitations of Theda Skocpol's structuralist perspective, Michael Kimmel asserts:

> Because of her uncompromising stand against voluntarism, Skocpol forgets that human beings, thinking and acting (however haphazardly), are the mediating link between structural conditions and social outcomes. Structural conditions may define the possibilities for mass uprising or the options available for consolidating state power in a revolutionary situation, but they do not fully explain how particular groups act, what options they pursue, or what possibilities they realize.[11]

Kimmel's analysis offers valuable insight into variables which Skocpol minimizes. While structural conditions may limit channels of political dissent, they cannot absolutely predict the corresponding ideological response of the dissenter. In short, revolutions do not come; they are made.[12] Opposingly, in *States and Social Revolutions*, Skocpol offers her consent for the notion that "revolutions are not made, they come."[13] While this sentiment harbors truth, it overlooks the influence of ideology and identity in mobilizing the masses. As

---

[10] Cuba's national identity was far simpler, and far more cohesive when compared to Mexico's fragmented national identity.

[11] Michael S. Kimmel, *Revolution: A Sociological Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 183-184.

[12] Eric Selbin, *Revolution in the Real World: Bringing Agency Back In,* in *Theorizing Revolutions*, ed. John Foran (Routledge: Taylor and Francis, 2003), 128.

[13] Skocpol, 17.

asserted by Eric Selbin, "Ideas and actors, not structures and some broad sweep of history, are the primary forces in revolutionary processes."[14] Proper historical context must accommodate for various displays of agency from an array of actors, while evaluating the influence of the social, economic, political, and intellectual variables preceding the outbreak of revolution. In essence, before revolutionaries consciously decide to commit themselves to carry out a revolution, there must be an injustice which they seek to overturn. The gestation period between witnessing/enduring injustice and making the decision to eradicate that injustice should be viewed as a moment of revelation, which is essentially an ideological revolution. To endure/view injustice results in a degree of human misery. Similarly, harboring the ability to address that injustice can be categorized as human agency. Collectively, the process of enduring/witnessing injustice, having the ability to address it, and deciding to take action can be viewed as an ideological state of equilibrium, which parallels a revolution. In this manner, revelation is the breeding ground for revolution.

To accurately identify the variables which led to the cultivation of revolutionary fervor, it is necessary to examine the social, political, and economic factors which preceded the revolution. In February of 1877, Porfirio Díaz ascended to the presidency. Though his regime was sustained with significant political repression by way of the *guardias rurales*, his 35-year presidency is viewed as a period of political stability. Díaz immediately inherited a chaotic financial situation, which went on to shape his policies as president.[15] In the

---

[14] Selbin, 118.
[15] Knight, 8.

interest of securing economic progress, Díaz pursued several policies that resulted in an influx of human misery. This was displayed in the 1890s when Díaz proclaimed that unused lands were open for private acquisition while offering economic concessions to foreign investors.[16] This strategy was characteristic of the economic liberalism adhered to by the *Científicos*.[17]

Though Díaz prioritized progress, it came at a cost as Mexico imported the dietary staples of corn and beans; "Vital statistics were alarming. In 1900, 29 percent of all male babies died within their first year," which illustrates that Mexico's agricultural production barely kept up with population growth.[18] During this period, the U.S. became Mexico's primary commercial partner, as 80% of the railway capital was from U.S. investment. The United States also invested heavily in mineral exports. "With the advent of railroads, however, much of this land had come under control of the United States' firms," leading to restriction of land access.[19] In essence, increased commercialization led to the erosion of peasant land holdings. By the early 1900s, resentment was growing among the peasantry who had lost their land to commercial railway construction and agricultural production. Each of these economic developments occurred at the expense of building a sustainable

---

[16] Peter H. Smith and James Naylor Green, *Modern Latin America*, 8th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 54-55.

[17] Technocrats of Positivism were labeled by Diaz as Científicos. The Científicos were heavily informed by Positivist philosophy. Positivism promoted the idea of application of science (specifically social Darwinism) to all aspects of a community. Positivists believed there needed to be a basis and process for every action, including those in positions of power. Yet, there were elements of racism/racial hierarchy in positivism because of social darwinism. Within Positivism, there was a belief which promoted the idea of the innate inferiority of native people. Positivists believed that the nation must rely on creoles or peninsulares to lead Mexico out of its backwardness. It can be observed that a connection exists between positivism and connection exists between positivism and social Darwinism. social Darwinism.

[18] Smith, *Talons of the Eagle*, 34-35.

[19] Wolf, 38.

lower and middle class, eventually leading to a substantial increase in human misery. This is significant, as Mexico's increase in human misery parallels the influx of misery in Cuba following decades of U.S. investment.

Following independence, the United States exponentially increased its investment in Cuba. Between 1847-1914, U.S. investments in Cuba continued to rise from 50 million dollars to 336 million dollars. During that period, the U.S. would proceed to intervene and occupy Cuba on four separate occasions, with occupation lasting anywhere from one to five years at a time.[20]

Informed by Monroe Doctrine, U.S. economic interest in Cuba went on to shape U.S. foreign policy for much of the twentieth century. In the early 1900s, this was exhibited by the Teller Amendment, the Platt Amendment, and the Roosevelt Corollary.[21] Later, President William Taft's policy of Dollar Diplomacy would be equally influential. By this strategy, the U.S. would invest economically in undeveloped countries to prevent their economies from collapsing, which would then warrant U.S. intervention. In essence, investing was thought to be cheaper than intervention.[22]

Following the conclusion of the First World War, "agriculture, mining, and oil accounted for 60 percent of all U.S. investment" in Cuba, while modern corporations such

---

[20] Smith, *Talons of the Eagle*, 52.

[21] *The Platt Amendment of 1901,* in *Neighborly Adversaries*: *Readings in U.S.-Latin American Relations*, 3rd ed., ed. Michael J. LaRosa and Frank O. Mara, (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 77-78.
Article 3 of the Platt amendment enabled the U.S. to intervene in Cuba in the interest of "preserving Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the Treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba."

[22] Though Dollar Diplomacy was touted as an effort to bring stability to a nation, there were often so many strings attached; it was hard for Latin American countries to separate the U.S. giving money from political directives

as Hershey Chocolate were able to invest $600 million in Cuba's sugar industry, which comprised over half of Cuban sugar output by 1925.[23] This should not be taken lightly, as U.S. economic investment in Cuba was often perpetrated by political elites who benefitted from the business dealings. In essence, a few political elites thrived at the expense of the masses. After 1933, this was, in part, made possible by President Franklin Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy and President Harry Truman's "Truman Doctrine," which established a foundation for the containment of Communism in the latter part of the 20th century. Over six decades, the flames of anti-imperialist sentiment cultivated during Cuba's struggle for liberation erupted into a revolutionary conflagration of anti-U.S. sentiment, as the United States continued its trend of economic and political intervention. While Cuba experienced an influx of human misery over this period, it also saw a surge in human agency. Because the anti-U.S. sentiment provided a cohesive mechanism for Cuba's national identity, U.S. economic and political interference should be viewed as a variable that was influential in creating the environment for Revolution.

The varying degrees of U.S. political interference in Cuba can be observed in the Cuban Presidency of Fulgencio Batista. After joining the army in 1921, Batista's ambitions propelled him to attain the rank of Sergeant. In September 1934, Sergeant Batista assembled a military force, carrying out a successful revolt and helping to install Dr. Ramón Grau San Martín. From then on, Batista's influence would only increase. In the 30 years leading up to the Cuban Revolution, Batista played an integral role in installing and removing the

---

[23] Thomas F. O'Brien, *Making the Americas: The United States and Latin America from the Age of Revolutions to the Era of Globalization* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), 92.

Cuban leadership. When advantageous, Batista was not opposed to collaborating with the United States if it would help him carry out political aims. In August of 1934, the two nations decided to repeal tariffs on each other's goods, inevitably reducing the import tax on sugar. For the next 25 years, Cuba was guaranteed a fixed quota of the sugar market. Batista also implemented reforms such as providing a pension to workers limiting worker's hours, all of which satisfied the demands of the urban masses and alleviate human misery. In 1937, Batista took a radical step in supporting the nationalization of tobacco and sugar, thus bringing them under state control. Following 1937, the state had acquired a tremendous degree of control.

After observing his accession to power, and subsequent influence in the political arena, the U.S. government decided to back Batista's regime. Batista's first term as president in 1940 was characterized by stability and economic progress as he embraced elements of populism. When Batista ran for his second term in office in 1952, it became clear that he would not win the election. Batista promptly organized a coup and canceled the election. The U.S. almost immediately recognized Batista's regime. During his second term as president, Batista rejected many of the positivist ideals by canceling the 1940 constitution and pursuing legal means for eradicating many of the remaining civil liberties. Under Batista, Cuba witnessed an increase in corruption and what many would view as various forms of depravity, "Gambling and gangsterism became synonymous with the U.S. presence as Batista welcomed mobsters. . . .The gangsters in turn shared their earnings with the dictator and his henchmen. Prostitution spread to cater to North American sun-and-

sex tourists." [24] In essence, Batista prioritized the financial prosperity of himself and those in his circle over the general public; those who did not benefit were subject to the lure of anti-U.S. sentiment. Therefore, Batista consolidated agency among the upper classes while inflicting misery upon the masses. To a degree, the corruption of the Batista regime parallels that of Porfirio Díaz. In both revolutions, the subsequent impact of U.S. economic investment should be viewed as a variable that was instrumental in fostering an atmosphere for revolution.

In 1953, Fidel Castro had been a prospective candidate in the Cuban elections; however, the elections were called off by Fulgencio Batista, who sought to further consolidate power to himself. In response, Fidel Castro and his brother Raul organized the July 26th movement in an attempt to draw attention to the movement and incite insurrection. For Castro, this was a catalyzing event that resulted in an influx of human misery and agency. Castro prompted him to organize a response that would ideally draw attention to Batista's corruption and encourage a revolutionary coalition to form under Castro. The plan had been to storm the Moncada Army Barracks in an attempt to draw attention to the movement and incite insurrection. In essence, Castro's primary purpose was to infuse human agency into the atmosphere. Due to its lack of organization, the movement failed. Several of the 165 revolutionaries were killed, while the majority were captured, imprisoned, and later executed. Fidel and Raul were both sentenced to fifteen years in prison. As a lawyer, Castro prepared his defense, which he gave in the fall of 1953, just a few months into his sentence. In his defense, titled *History Will Absolve Me*, Castro

---

[24] Smith and Green, *Modern Latin America*, 121.

identified numerous factors that resulted in the oppression of the Cuban people.[25] He went on to detail the economic exploitation that was perpetuated by corruption. Additionally, he cited the work of Milton, Paine, Locke, Rousseau, The Declaration of Independence, and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. Castro stated, "The right of rebellion against tyranny, Honorable Judges, has been recognized from the most ancient times to the present day by men of all creeds, ideas, and doctrines."[26] In so doing, he attempted to historically legitimize the July 26th movement, while asserting himself as a liberator, and an inheritor of a long tradition of uprising. Ironically, even though the storming of the Moncada Army Barracks did not garner the immediate results that he desired, Castro's *History Will Absolve Me,* which came as a byproduct of failure, was successful in cultivating the desired quantities of human agency. Furthermore, the July 26th Movement and Castro's *History Will Absolve Me* speech was an instrumental variable in establishing an environment for Revolution.

Similar to the catalyzing effect *History Will Absolve Me* had on the Cuban population, in 1908, Porfirio Díaz was interviewed by James Creelman. During the interview, Díaz stated, "I welcome an opposition party in the Mexican Republic." Díaz went on to assert, "If it appears, I will regard it as a blessing, not as an evil. And if it can develop power, not to exploit but to govern, I will stand by it, support it, advise it and forget myself

---

[25] It can be observed that with revolution, Castro desired to replace one cycle with another. It should be noted that the root of the word revolution comes from the word revolve. Castro saw the cuban people trapped within a perpetually revolving cycle. As a result, he desired to cause the cycle to cease, and initiate a cycle which would ensure justice.

[26] Fidel Castro, *History Will Absolve Me* (La Habana: José Martí Publishing House, 1984).

in the successful inauguration of complete democratic government in the country."[27] Though many were skeptical of Díaz's sincerity in his assertion, the interview was profound in its impact. In encouraging the formation of political parties, Díaz initiated a substantial increase in human agency. This is notable, as the cultivation of revolutionary fervor which resulted following the circulation Castro's *History Will Absolve Me* speech parallels the influx of agency that occurred following the Creelman interview. In 1910, when Díaz retracted his former sentiment, the announcement led to an influx of human misery. The combination of human agency and human misery was enough to propel Mexico towards a state of revolutionary equilibrium. Moreover, the historical significance of the Creelman interview lies in its ability to function as a prominent variable that created the environment for Revolution.

By 1910, the Mexican Revolution was underway. "The issues of economic inequity and local autonomy fueled the revolution that erupted in 1910."[28] In response to Díaz's call for opposition parties, Francisco Madero submitted himself as a candidate, ran for office, and was imprisoned. As a result, the Maderista Rebellion began. It should be noted that as a member of the richest family in Mexico, Madero harbored a great deal of human agency. Once released from prison, Madero went to the U.S. and drafted the Plan of San Luis Potosí, which was published on October 5, 1910. Unified in their discontent toward Díaz, the call for effective suffrage served as a rallying cry for Madero. For the moment, this effective suffrage functioned as a uniting ideology, which temporarily synthesized the necessary

---

[27] Porfiro Díaz, interview by James Creelman, *President Diaz: Hero of the Americas* (Pearson's Magazine, 1908).
[28] Cheryl English Martin and Mark Wasserman, *Latin America and Its People* (Boston: Pearson, 2012), 4.

quantities of human agency and misery. What had begun as a call for fair election shifted to a call for revolution. Ascending to power in January 1911, Madero's campaign solidified into a campaign that imposed substantial pressure on the Díaz regime, leading to his resignation in May 1911.

After his ascension to power, Madero's presidency only lasted two years. In *The Anatomy of Revolution*, Crane Brinton asserts that opposition groups are rarely composed of a "united people." Instead, the opposition is frequently a conglomeration of people, "welded by the necessity of effectively opposing the government into a genuine political unit."[29] To a degree, this unity was exhibited in the Mexican Revolution up until the overthrow of Porfirio Díaz. Following his overthrow, fractures immediately manifested as the honeymoon period came to a close. Brinton defines the conclusion of the honeymoon period by asserting, "It has now become the government, and is facing a new set of problems. When it actually gets to work on the problems, the honeymoon is over as soon as possible."[30] It can be observed that the unity found within the dominant revolutionary part was impermanent by nature. Just as Brinton describes, the groups that had allied to overthrow Díaz quickly disagreed about how quickly and to what extent they would implement reforms. In this manner, the cross-class coalition began to erode. As soon as the honeymoon period ended, the revolutionary fervor/human agency dissipated from its former state and manifested in a fragmented form.[31]

---

[29] Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), 91.
[30] Brinton, 91.
[31] In part, the fragmenting of human agency in the Mexican Revolution should be attributed to the lack of a united Mexican national identity. Since its independence, Mexico's national identity frequently manifested in fragmented, regional form. Additionally, the inability of the Mexican Revolutions leader to produce an

The substantial lack of cohesion that lingered can be attributed to Madero's endorsement of regional, revolutionary leaders, which propelled the nation into what can be viewed as a civil war. From a macro perspective, one could assert that the appropriate quantities of human misery were present. Yet, the revolutionaries lacked the necessary quantities of human agency to develop an ideological contagion potent enough to envelop the nation in a revolutionary conflagration. In contrast, following Fidel Castro's ascension to power in 1959, Castro frequently promoted Trotsky's notion of permanent revolution. By mentally keeping the people in a revolutionary state, they were more willing to undergo discomfort and sacrifice for the good of the movement. By embracing the idea of permanent revolution, and adopting an ambiguous narrative, Castro was able to mitigate the build-up of human misery while establishing a constant flow of human agency. Thus, Castro succeeded in sustaining the cross-class coalition far longer than Madero had in the Mexican Revolution. In this manner, the social, economic, political, and intellectual variables which existed in Mexico and Cuba following Independence were instrumental in establishing an environment for Revolution. Unfortunately, this was just the beginning of a struggle with an ideology that would echo through world history and transcend generations in its impact. The effects continue to be felt today.

---

ambiguous ideology to unite the masses severely crippled the movement. Without ideology, the potency of human agency is diluted, making it difficult to sustain a cross class coalition.

Chivalry's Death Throes: England and the Wars of the Roses

Reace Kaleko

Throughout the medieval period in Europe, two things remained constant: Christianity and chivalry. As the Fifteenth Century drew to a close though, the code that so many men at arms, as well as rulers of the greatest European nations, had followed was seeming to slip from their fingers as sand from the hourglass of history. The Wars of the Roses were a key catalyst, at least for England, in this slow shift to a more modern form of warfare as well as to new conventions in the way people treated each other. This paper will show, through deep primary source analysis, that the Wars of the Roses marked the end of many of the most important facets of the code of chivalry. This was due in large part to a revolution in military weapons and tactics, as well as a change in the attitudes of rulers and the common man on the subject of moral good.

Before moving to analysis, it is important to make a note on the sources used here, as well as their biases. This article will employ a Fourteenth Century text, *Le Livre de chevalerie* or *The Book of Chivalry* by Geoffroi de Charny, as the main source for the actual tenets of chivalry. Most scholars agree Geoffroi furnishes the late medieval period's most accurate and in--depth list of rules and values of the chivalric man and thus proves valuable to the goals of this article. The sources from the Fifteenth Century that actually chronicle the Wars of the Roses, particularly the Crowland Chronicle, the Paston Letters, and the Chronicles of the White Rose of York, are very biased because of the time in which they were written. Since this was a period of civil war, all the sources' authors took

sides, upon which they cast a favorable light. This obviously causes issues in making value judgements —something very important when discussing chivalry —but as these are the sources available, one must do one's best to read between the lines to find the closest thing to the truth.

The first and most important aspect of these wars that signaled the death throes of chivalry was the widespread use of bows and arrows, then subsequently gunpowder and gunpowder weapons, as the main means of destroying enemies. Late medieval Europe produced a fairly interesting and rapid number of weapon innovations, beginning with the longbow. The longbow had its beginnings in the Hundred Years War, when the English longbowmen proved decisive in the battles of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt. This was far from the end of its career, however, as the longbow was used to great effect in many battles of the Wars of the Roses, most importantly the Battle of Towton, which is well known as the bloodiest battle of the war. While the main handheld arms used in these conflicts were bows, the actual weapon that decided battles in the Wars of the Roses was the cannon. While the Chinese had used gunpowder for a few centuries at this point, the invention of the cannon, and subsequently the first iterations of the blunderbuss later in the Fifteenth Century, brought warfare into a new age. This new age, however powerful, ran directly against the tenets of chivalry. Chivalry called for a noble form of warfare, built upon three forms of fighting, all of which were directly destroyed by these new weapons. The first tenet of a man at arms training was the joust. Jousting was one of the most important noble pastimes in medieval Europe. It trained future knights for one of the main forms of combat, horseback lance warfare, but it was also the first

kind of combat most nobles experienced. Geoffroi writes, "...the first exercise in the use of

arms which they can encounter is jousting, and they are eager to do it. And when God by

his grace grants them frequent success in jousting, they enjoy it, and their desire to bear

arms increases..."[1] According to Geoffoi, the second type of fighting is sparring in

tournaments, using the melee weapons of the era. He explains, "Then after jousting, they

learn about the practice of arms in tournaments, and it becomes apparent to them and

they recognize that tournaments bring greater honor than jousting for those who perform

well there. Then they set out to bear arms in tournaments as often as they can."[2] Finally,

Geoffoi explains that the prospective knight must use the skills learned in these mock

battles in actual warfare, combining horseback and melee combat. He concludes:

> Their knowledge increases until they see and recognize that the men-at-arms who are
> good in war are more highly prized and honored than any other men-at-arms. It therefore seems to them from their own observation that they should immediately take up the practice of arms in war in order to achieve the highest honor in prowess, for they cannot attain this by any other form of armed combat.[3]

As these passages point out, at no point does one study the art of archery in the chivalric

tradition and truly it is not a chivalric form of combat. An example from an Arthurian

romance, one of our only sources directly from the Middle Ages, might be one of the

three great sins committed by the title character in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*.

In Book III, Parzival kills Ither of Gaheviez with a "javelin" though this most likely refers

to a bow an arrow, as later he asks for his quiver. When he does so, his squire replies, "'I

---

[1] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of* Chivalry, trans. Elspeth Kennedy (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005) 56.
[2] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, 56.
[3] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, 56-7.

will not hand you any javelin – knighthood has forbidden you that,'"[4] For a man--at--arms

who prized the code of chivalry, the melee was the form of fighting he must pursue, and

battles for much of the medieval period reflected that. Some of the most substantial

French casualties during the Hundred Years War occurred when the French army sent

their heavy cavalry charging across the battlefield into wave after wave of arrows

launched from the longbows of the English. It follows then, that any war where much of

the fighting was done with archers would be one that was distinctly un-chivalric. As we

see in *Hall's Chronicle,* a source written in the 1500s and recompiled in the 1800s:

> The lord Fawconbridge, which led the forward of kyng Edwardes battaill (as
> before is rehersed) being a man of great polecie, and of much experience in
> marciall feates, caused euery archer vnder his standard, to shot one flyght (which
> before he caused them to prouide) and then made them to stad still. The northre
> me, feling the shoot, but by reason of jr snow, not wel vewing y distance betwene
> them and their enemies, like hardy men shot their schiefe arrowes as fast as they
> might, but al their shot was lost, & their labor vayn for they came not nere the
> Southerme, by. xl. taylors yerdes. When their shot was almost spent, the lord
> Fauconbridge marched forwarde with his archers, which not onely shot their awne
> whole sheues, but also gathered the arrowes of their enemies, and Jet a great parte
> of them flye agaynst their awne masters, and another part thei let stand on y groud
> which sore noyed the legges of the owners, when the battayle ioyned.[5]

The fact that arrows proved to be the most important and deciding factor of this battle,

and indeed the stage of the battle that Hall writes most about, shows us just how decisive

these weapons were becoming in the late Middle Ages. As a further note supporting this

assertion, a mass grave excavated in the area of the Battle of Towton reveals many corpses

with healed injuries to their skulls ; the men sustained these wounds long before their

---

[4] Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parzival, trans. Cyril Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 67
[5] Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle; Containing the History of England, During the Reign of Henry the Fourth,
and the Succeeding Monarchs, to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in Which are Particularly
Described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods* (London: G. Woodfall, 1809), 255-256.

deaths and seemingly multiple times over their lives. Other remains show head wounds but no bodily injuries. These men were most likely archers, who wore little armor as to best fire their bows.[6] Knights wore large, metal helmets that protected their entire face from weapons like arrows. The issue with these helmets is they did not allow for clear vision, meaning archers could not wear such armor and fire accurately. Thus, head injuries were more likely among archers. The discrepancy in the number of men with head injuries and those without points to knights being less common on the field of battle than archers at this time. Indeed, M.A. Hicks states that there were three archers for every man at arms in each force during the Wars of the Roses.[7] All that said, one would find it hard to argue that this form of fighting so far from the code of chivalry had become the norm.

Another weapon anathema to those who observed the code of chivalry dominated the sieges of the Wars of the Roses and arguably had an even greater impact on that conflict than the bow. While sieges were a common part of medieval warfare, they were carried out in a much different way than with the invention of cannons. Sieges were made up of a number of different phases, and Geoffroi lays them out in the section of his book entitled "How to Study the Art of War". He states:

> They take great pleasure in seeing how a siege is set up to surround the town or castle,
> how the battifol are made to block the way out for the besieged, and to exert more pressure on them, how mining is carried out under the cover of devices such as sows,

---

[6] Veronica Fiorato, Anthea Boylston, and Christopher Knüsel, eds., *Blood Red Roses : The Archeology of a Mass Grave from the Battle of Townton AD 1461* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2007), 152-153.
[7] M. A. Hicks, *The Wars of the Roses, 1455-1485* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2004), 58.

buyres, cats, and belfries, and other matters, such as how to mount an attack on the walls,
to climb up on ladders, and to pierce the walls and to enter and take by force.[8]

One might notice how none of the many modes of siege include gunpowder weapons, as these beastly creations were yet to exist in the time of chivalry, and just as they ruined the foundations and walls of the great castles of Europe, so too did they destroy the foundations of the code of chivalry. While the Chinese had used black powder, or gunpowder as it became called, for many years before the Europeans adapted it, this new technology shattered the most important principles of chivalry, and the medieval period in general, for a multitude of reasons. One of the most obvious is what cannons did to castles. The castle was arguably the most important piece of architecture in medieval Europe. Hugh M. Thomas in his book *The Norman Conquest: England After William the Conqueror* notes that castles served as an immediate level of extra fortification for the aristocratic people of society in addition to the town walls. They also served as powerful symbols of the new control the Normans exercised over the land.[9] Castles were thus a status symbol as well as a necessary defensive building. Robert E Liddiard furthers the point in his book *Anglo-Norman Castles* by stating that castles were not only important for defense, but economically and socially as well.[10] They mattered to peasants and craftsmen as they employed the stoneworkers, carpenters, and so many other professions. They drew a level of tourism because of their elegance. More than anything they were the

---

[8] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, 57.
[9] Hugh M. Thomas, The Norman Conquest: England After William the Conqueror (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008), 64.
[10] Robert E Liddiard *Anglo-Norman Castles* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK : Boydell Press, 2003), 4.

obvious way for such a proud warrior society to display it's power and simultaneously

protect its elites, both churchmen and lords.[11] Not only was it a powerful chivalric status

symbol, but it provided the best level of defense against the weapons of the age. Spears

and swords did nothing to the thick stone walls, and even the arrow could only hope to

reach the men upon the battlements. Siege weapons, such as the aforementioned belfries,

sows, cats, and buyres, among others, did exist, but these were comparatively ineffective,

or merely helped to allow for the more chivalric methods of siege, scaling walls and

fighting hand to hand or undermining to get inside. However, as we can see from

firsthand accounts, cannons made castle walls little more than an annoyance. As one

chronicler narrates:

> And then my Lord Lieutenant had ordained all the King's great-guns, that were charged,
> at once to shoot unto the said castle; New-castle, the King's great-gun, and London, the
> second gun of iron; the which betide the place, that stones of the walls flew into the sea;
> Dison, a brazen gun[12] of the King's, smote throughout Sir Ralph Grey's chamber oftentimes...[13]

The four separate cannons mentioned here seem to be all that was needed to win this
siege. Further weapons became unnecessary when the walls of the great castle could be so
easily ripped down by these great guns.

Both the longbow and the cannon played into a larger theme: the movement from

hand to hand combat toward ranged warfare. One might argue that the reason the code

---

[11] Liddiard, *Anglo-Norman Castles*, 5-7.
[12] Great-guns, guns of iron, and brazen guns were all words that were used for cannons in some medieval texts, and New-castle, Dison, and London were all names of cannons existing at this time. Much like ships or tanks are given names, so too were cannons.
[13] *The Chronicles of the White Rose of York: a series of historical fragments, proclamations, letters, and other contemporary documents relating to the reign of King Edward the Fourth ; with notes and illustrations, and a copious index*, ed. John Giles (London: James Bohn, 1845), lxxxviii.

of chivalry did not include gunpowder weapons or bows is because they simply did not

exist at the time. This, however, was not true. The bow and arrow have been used for

hunting since the paleolithic period, and they have been used in fighting for just as long.

However, ancient shortbows were nothing compared to the longbow, which sported

range beyond anything ever seen before, and the crossbow, which was unrivaled in the

damage it could do. Alfred H. Burne discusses both weapons in his work, *The Crecy*

War : A Military History of the Hundred Years War From 1337 to the Peace of Bretigny in

1360. Discussing the Battle of Crecy, he gives a short description of just how dangerous

these longbows were:

> As they [the Genoese crossbowmen] advanced occasional shafts were discharged,
> as was custom with these crossbowmen, but they all fell short. Not till they were
> within 150 yards of the motionless line in front of them did their enemy respond.
> Then a sharp word of command rang out and instantly the heavens were, as it
> appeared, black with the swarm of arrows discharged from the trusty English
> longbows. The result of this discharge… was devastating.[14]

At extreme range the longbows could have fired even farther, as Burne points out earlier

in that same paragraph, but the English command wanted to wait for the ideal range.

Shortbows, as a contrast, had a max range of 100 yards. Some chroniclers say that

longbows could be effective at up to 200 yards, though the range is much debated.[15]

While there were longbows going back to before even the Hundred Years War, the main

difference between the warfare of Geoffroi de Charny's period and the Wars of the Roses

is that, by the time of the latter, even the best man--at--arms was completely outclassed

---

[14] Alfred H. Burne, The Crecy War : A Military History of the Hundred Years War From 1337 to the Peace of
Bretigny in 1360 (Yorkshire, UK: Frontline Books, 2016), 178.
[15] J..F. Verbruggen, The Art of Warfare in Western Europe During the Middle Ages From the Eighth Century
(Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 1997), 119.

by a talented archer. One could not hack off the head of his opponent, or run him through, if he could not reach them. This sort of fighting was inherently un-chivalric, as a fight between knights was fair and tested the skills one had learned from tournament fighting and jousting. There was something almost sacred about the clash of metal on metal as two swords met each other, and a purely ranged form of war removed that. The greater issue was that of fairness however, and that is why some of the general public, people not fully acquainted with the tenants of chivalry but rather the broad idea, think it made a small resurgence in the era of gunlines standing still and firing. No matter how one might look at it though, Charny's chivalric form of war was gone, replaced by an unbalanced and dishonorable form of fighting.

One other form of social change seen in the Wars of the Roses had to do with the role of women on the battlefield. For Geoffroi and his chivalryic vision, a woman's place was as far away from war as possible. As he states when discussing what a good lady should wear, ". . . for the qualities and reputation of men are more quickly known and recognized and in more ways than the qualities and reputation of women can be known, for men go where they want among people and in different lands, but women cannot do this. Men can joust and tourney: women cannot do this. Men take up arms for war: women cannot do this."[16] While it should come as no surprise that the general view of women was far different from today's view, it is important to see just how limited what a woman "could do" was in chivalric thought. Women were brought honor by the deeds of their men, not by their own deeds. One might bring up Joan of Arc as an example of

---

[16] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, 103.

women being able to fight in wars, but it is important to consider that she came to the French king with a vision from God of her fighting for France. There were other noble women and queens who had operated as generals on the battlefield, such as Elanor of Aquitaine. Women such as this went against the general station chivalry laid out for them. In the manuals, *chanson de gestes*, and romances of the Middle Ages, women, while powerful and capable of making men into fools, were meant to merely serve as conduits or inspirations for their knights, not as knights themselves.[17] Thus, the scene of Queen Margaret leading a battle to save her husband flies in the face of the values held by those who held chivalry as sacred. As seen in the beginning of the Chronicle of Edward the Fourth: "Edward the Fourth, of that name, son and heir of Richard, late duke of York...that was slain at Wakefield the 30th day of December anno 1460," (and after) the battle done at St. Albans the Ash Wednesday, and won by the Queen Margaret, and her 'complices,"[18] One of the most interesting points of this specific quote is how Queen Margaret is noted as seemingly the only true general of the battle, even though she was accompanied by Henry Percy, Earl of Northampton, and Henry Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, among others. Other sources do note the contributions of these other leaders; the White Rose Chronicle, for example, fails to mention the queen's presence at all: "...on the 29th of December, a dreadful battle was fought at Wakefield between the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Northumberland and Lord Neville..."[19] These two sources show the

---

[17] For a discussion of this, see *Constance Brittain Bouchard, "Strong of Body, Brave and Noble": Chivalry and Society in Medieval France (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1998),*129-144.
[18] *The Chronicles of the White Rose of York*, 6.
[19] *The Chronicles of the White Rose of York*, lxxxiii.

continued change in attitudes during this era, as chivalry and its ideas were yet again being challenged by the female sex. One chronicler seems to have intentionally omitted Queen Margaret's inclusion in the fighting, as if to minimize her role. There are multiple possible reasons for this omission, but it seems one of two is most likely. Either this was for the good of Richard, as surely his honor would have been stained if he fell in a battle where the opposition was led by a woman, or possibly because the chronicler could not believe such a thing had even taken place. The other chronicler, one who seems more authoritative based on being charged with writing the Chronicle of Edward the Fourth himself, places Margaret firmly in control of the battle, rather than her lackeys.[20] While the Battle of Wakefield is the only campaign for which we have definitive evidence of Queen Margaret's involvement in the Wars of the Roses, it is of serious importance because the script seems to have been flipped. Here a powerful queen rescuing her half mad husband from a power hungry group of nobles, rather than what the romances of the time would have preferred. Though there is no actual evidence that the queen ever picked up a sword, it seems untrue even as far back as the fifteenth century when Geoffroi states "men take up arms for war: women cannot do this".

While the discussion of war and its movement away from chivalric methods is a worthwhile pursuit, how the rulers who were major players in the Wars of the Roses fared when measured against chivalry also bears looking into. These wars were, at their heart, fought over petty issues between powerful claimants to a great throne, a pursuit which, at least according to Geoffroi, is hardly becoming of a good ruler. Geoffroi was a bit too

---

[20] *The Chronicles of the White Rose of York*, 6.

moralistic in discussing the function of rulers, but still, he does speak of his perfect king, stating:

> At that time were chosen those who were seen to have good physique, strong, and well equipped to endure hardship of all kinds and to strive for the good government of their people, whether in time of war or of peace. These personages and these lords were not raised up to have great periods of rest nor great pleasures nor great delights, but to endure more and to strive harder than any of the others.[21]

Understandably, Geoffroi sees the most important qualities of a king to be those related to knighthood, such as strength and the ability to endure hardships. If the kings of the medieval era had all acted as chivalry commanded, historians may have been less inclined to use the term "Dark Ages". The places of errancy from Charny's ideals for the rulers of the Wars of the Roses is more easily found in his discussion of economics. He writes:

> They were, therefore, chosen so that they might place the people's profit before their own. They were, therefore, chosen that they might protect their people without taking anything from them apart from those dues the people owed to their lord, and it was not for the lords to enrich themselves at the cost of impoverishing the people without reasonable cause. They were, therefore, chosen to spend their wealth on all kinds of good works so that they were not reproached for making ill use of it.[22]

Again, the chivalric king is held to very high standards, but we see in both of these two aspects the kings of the Wars of the Roses failed to such levels that it is hard to find anything in them worthy of calling chivalric. Henry VI, the king who inherited the throne and started the wars with his ineptitude as a ruler is perhaps the best example of a king who did not fit the mold Charny made for his rulers. His father, Henry V may have, in stark contrast, been the best example of a chivalric king, showing great prowess on the

---

[21] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, 76-7.
[22] Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, 77.

battlefield as well as in court. His son, on the other hand, was half mad most of the time

and ruled both neglectfully and selfishly. As one English chronicle narrates:

> In this same tyme, the reame of Englonde was oute of alle good gouernaunce, as it
> had be meny dayes before, for the kyng was simple and lad by couetous counseylle,
> and owed more then he was worthe. His dettes encreased dayly, but payment was
> there none; alle the possessyons and lordeshyppes that perteyned to the croune
> the kyng had yeue awey, some to lordes and some to other simple persones, so
> that he had almoste noughte to lefe onne. And suche ymposiciones as were put to
> the peple, as taxes, tallages, and quyn3ymes, alle that came from theym was
> spended on vayne, for he helde no householde ne meyntened no warres.[23]

While this source may hold some bias against Henry, if what it states is to be believed, his

spending and taxes were far from what Charny expressed a chivalric king should impose.

It should also not be forgotten that Henry was so weak and inept that his wife had to

rescue him from capture, as mentioned in *The Chronicle of the White Rose of York*, among

others. Henry VI was hardly a king worthy of Arthurian legend, when it came to both

fighting and policy. That said, the chronicle goes on to denounce Queen Margaret as well

for her frivolous spending, saying "The quene with such as were of her affynyte rewled the

reame as her lyked, gaderyng ryches innumerable."[24] One might argue however, that

these rulers were of course unfit to be called chivalric, as their failure to rule had caused

the conflict that is the basis of this discussion. They were just bad eggs that had to be

removed to make way for more chivalrous kings, one might continue. That statement,

however, is simply untrue.

---

[23] *An English chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI written before the year
1471; with an appendix, containing the 18th and 19th years of Richard II and the Parliament at Bury St.
Edmund's, 25th Henry VI and supplementary additions from the Cotton. ms. chronicle called "Eulogium,"* ed.
John Silvester Davies (London: Camden Society, 1856), 79.
[24] *An English Chronicle*, 79.

When discussing the rulers of the Wars of the Roses, one must look at one of the most controversial figures of the wars, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, or as he is sometimes known, Warwick the Kingmaker. We find that even this man, one who ruled in shadow during Edward IV's first reign, who fought for both sides, who was instrumental in many of the battles of the war; was a coward. Warwick failed in one of the most important battles he took part in, the Battle of Barnet, to even fight. As Hall recalls:

> At the breakyng of the daie, the erle of Warwicke sette his men in a raie, in this maner: In the right wyng he set the Marques Montacute, and the erle of Oxenford, with certain horsemen, and he with the Duke of Exceter, toke the left wyng, and in the middes betwene bothe, he set archers and to them he appointed the Duke of Somerset to be capitain. And when he had set his men in an order, he encoraged his men to fight, with many comfortable wordes[25]

While it might be true that according to modern military stratagem, Warwick made a good choice by protecting himself and staying behind, by simply placing himself in reserve and giving his men a great speech; a ruler following the code of chivalry laid about by Charny would not have done so. In the Battle of Agincourt, after his great speech, Henry V charged into battle with his men, leading them at their side, not from some tent on top of a hill, as Warwick did (and as commanders of the modern period do). A chivalric and honorable leader would fight with his men, and die with his men. Warwick, be it out of fear or something else, stayed out of the battle until almost all was lost. In the end he died on the field, allowing men to write of him as a warrior, but if things had not gone as badly as they did, it is unlikely Warwick would have joined the fray. What is particularly important about this specific instance is that the sources do not seem to

---

[25] Hall, *Hall's Chronicle*, 295.

decry him, which again signals a shift in ideas. It is possible the sources simply did not see this as worthy of ridicule, just that if he had been more active his actions would have been worthy of praise. Still, based on how critical medieval sources tend to be of their subjects, it seems unlikely that they would have still written something so flattering.

All of this said, there is a clear sense in the sources that the code of chivalry as it was known seemed to be disappearing in the Fifteenth Century. While some places kept vestiges of it, such as Henry the Navigator and his drive to be an Arthurian Knight, in England it seemed that especially in the areas of military technology and the standards by which a ruler can be judged there was a distinct shift taking place.[26] While much more could be discussed about social order and other things less talked about by Geoffroi de Charny in his code, that lies outside of the scope of this work. The issue of source bias is always prevalent and it is possible some things said may fall victim to it; however, it is hard to argue against the failings of these rulers and the obvious changes in war. Though change does not happen overnight and this should be in no way seen as an article advocating an idea of some sort of swerve or moment where everything changed, the attitudes of the era were certainly not the same as they were in Geoffroi's time. The code of chivalry may have been undergoing a long, laborious end that started in the Hundred Years War with the introduction of the longbow, or possibly even earlier. Nevertheless, the Wars of the Roses were a distinctly different beast from the war leading into them, and the changes felt there seem to dwarf any that came before. Truly the Wars of the

---

[26] For a discussion of Henry the Navigator as a chivalric zealot, look to Peter Russell, *Prince Henry 'The Navigator': A Life* (London: Yale University Press, 2000). Of particular interest are chs 1-3.

Roses were the death throes of chivalry in England and its colonies, and by the time the next great conflict arose in the country, nothing was the same as Geoffroi de Charny had seen it.

The Nuremburg Laws and American Influences

Luc Fraga

On September 15, 1935, the Nazi Party gathered for their annual rally in Nuremburg, Germany, where they passed three laws that came to be known as the Nuremburg Laws. These three laws were the first official attacks on the Jewish people. In the creation of the Nuremburg Laws, there was clear and obvious inspiration taken by Nazi lawmakers from existing racial laws in the United States at the time. They were inspired by American racial laws, based on the affinity Nazis had for the American racial system, immigration structure, and Hitler's belief the United States could become an essential ally to the Third Reich.

The city of Nuremburg in Bavaria, Germany, became the official home to the Reichstag rallies after the rise of the Nazi Party and Adolf Hitler in 1933. During their third annual rally three laws were passed: the Reich Flag Law, the Reich Citizenship Law, and the Law on the Protection of German Blood and German Honor, better known as the German Blood Law. While this legislation marked the beginning of the legal persecution of Jews, it was not the first aggression against them.[1] Beginning in 1933, immediately after the Nazis gained control and Hitler became Chancellor of Germany, they removed Jewish citizens' right to elected positions, forced Jewish people out of the media industry, imposed a national boycott of privately-owned Jewish businesses, and stripped Jewish

---

[1] Greg Bradsher, "The Nuremberg Laws; Archives Receives Original Nazi Documents That 'Legalized' Persecution of Jews," *Prologue Magazine* 42, no. 4 (Winter 2010), https://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2010/winter/nuremberg.html.

immigrants of their citizenship. Later, in 1934, the Nazis banned Jews from financial institutions and the farming industry. Compared to later policies, these first steps were relatively mundane as the Nazis still feared public backlash and competition from other political parties in Germany. It was only a couple of years into their control that the Nazi-controlled Reichstag felt it was possible to enact such directly targeted legislation against the Jews. Even though the Nuremberg Laws were passed in the fall of 1935, the legal persecution of Jews did not go into full effect until after the 1936 Berlin Olympic games, because Hitler and other Nazi leaders feared the visiting international press would draw negative attention and backlash against the Nazi Party.[2]

The laws that followed the September 15, 1935 rally were three fundamental acts that aimed to further remove Jews from everyday life and accelerate the Jewish people's impoverishment. The first of the Nuremburg Laws was the Reich Flag Law. This law meant that the nation of Germany legally adopted the Nazi Party swastika symbol as its own and then effectively banned all Jews from flying its colors. This law stemmed from an "insult" Hitler endured when a German vessel, the *SS Bremen*, was stormed by angry protestors while docked in New York City and had all of its Nazi swastika banners torn down. The implementation of this law symbolized the transition from the Weimar Republic to the Nazi Third Reich.[3]

The second law was the Reich Citizenship Law, which established a legal distinction between a German "citizen" and a "national" under the Third Reich. The

---

[2] Bradsher, "The Nuremberg Laws."

[3] James Q. Whitman, *Hitler's American Model: the United States and the Making of Nazi Race Law* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018), 19-25.

legislation read, "A Reich citizen is exclusively a national of German blood, or racially related blood." Whereas a national was merely "any person who belongs to the mutual protection association of the German Reich, and who owes special duties in return."[4] The Reich Citizenship Law created a clear distinction between Aryan German "citizens" and their privileges versus the newly created second-class "nationals" who were made up of racially inferior peoples, a group that included Jewish people. Read aloud by Herman Göring, the Minister President of Prussia, at the Nuremberg rally, both the Reich Citizenship Law and the Law of German Blood were perceived by the world press and foreign governments as an effort to "cater to radical sentiment within the party," as described by William E. Dodd, the American ambassador to Germany, following the announcement of the policy changes in late 1935.[5] However, despite the distinctions between "National" and "Citizen" that Reich Citizenship Law made, no clear definition of what constituted a "Jew" was provided. In fact, the definition of Jew was exempt from the Nuremburg Laws, despite the policies that were created specifically for the segregation and oppression of the Jewish people.

The third and final of the Nuremburg Laws was the Law on the Protection of German Blood and German Honor. This act outlawed any relations between Jewish nationals and citizens of Aryan German blood. This included marriages and intercourse between the groups. The law also restricts German citizens from hiring non-German female domestic workers younger than the age of forty-five. The Blood Law was also the

---

[4] Bradsher, "The Nuremberg Laws."
[5] Bradsher, "The Nuremberg Laws."

first to establish punishments for violating any of the Nuremburg Laws, which penalties included standard imprisonment or hard labor imprisonment.[6]

Similar to the Nazis' Nuremburg Laws were the American Jim Crow laws, race laws common throughout the United States, particularly in the former Confederate South. Jim Crow laws were racial discrimination laws adopted after the Reconstruction Era ended in 1877. The laws were explicitly designed to segregate and oppress racial minorities, primarily black and native peoples. The laws faced early backlash, but, following the United States Supreme Court ruling in Plessy vs. Ferguson in 1896, the ideology of "separate but equal" was expanded into all aspects of American society. Initially, Jim Crow laws intended to prevent the assimilation of the newly freed and 3.5 million strong former African slave population into the historically white American society by introducing the segregation of public places and legal restraints to deter voting. The Jim Crow laws quickly developed into eugenic practices.[7] Eugenics is the controlled reproduction of an ethnicity with the intent of creating a more desirable demographic mixture.[8] In the case of the United States and Jim Crow Laws, eugenics meant the criminalization of interracial marriages. If an individual had at least one-sixteenth Black African heritage or Native American heritage, then an interracial marriage to a white person of European descent

---

[6] Whitman, 29-32.

[7] Gloria J. Browne-Marshall, *Race, Law, and American Society: 1607 to Present* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 142-46.

[8] Mary L. Dudziak, "The Outcome of Influence: Hitler's American Model and Transnational Legal History," *Michigan Law Review* 117, no. 6 (April 2019): 1179–94. http://search.ebscohost.com.research.flagler.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=136694574&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

was illegal. In some states, such as North Carolina, even interracial marriages between Natives and Blacks was criminalized.[9]

Institutions and practices that turned certain individuals and groups into second-class citizens existed alongside Jim Crow laws in the early twentieth century. This oppression was carried out in different ways depending on which group was being targeted. For example, after the United States' acquisition of Puerto Rico and the Philippines in the Spanish-American War added millions of new American citizens of non-European descent to the United States, office-holders were faced with a dilemma. In response, the government decided that rather than award these people complete status of citizenship and the rights protected by the Constitution, they would instead become non-citizen nationals like the existing Native Americans.[10] This was an example of the United States creating legally defined de jure second-class citizens. The case of Black African Americans differed from these other groups, however, and lawmakers, judges, and law-enforcement officials took a more extended de facto approach to their oppression. Despite the addition of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution in the late nineteenth century, the United States was able to get around their own policies through judicial interpretations of the law like Plessy vs. Ferguson. The aforementioned case ruled that segregation was legal according to the Constitution as long as the separate facilities

---

[9] Browne-Marshall, 106-112.
[10] Sarah Richardson, "Innovation and Inspiration," *American History* 54, no.3 (August 2019): 14–15. http://search.ebscohost.com.research.flagler.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=136399232&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

were made equal. However, the facilities across the nation were not equal, nor were they ever intended to be as it was only a way to manipulate the law.[11]

Analyzing the Nazi policies of the early 1930s, like the Nuremburg Laws, alongside Jim Crow and second-class citizenship practices in the United States, leads one to see a clear correlation between the two. It is understandable why the Nazi lawmakers were attracted to the United States as a racial law model. The Reich Citizenship Law of 1935, with its distinctions between citizens and nationals, imitated laws put into place over three decades earlier in the United States. Similar to the United States, Nazi lawmakers successfully demoted a large percentage of the national population to a sub citizen tier where they had only limited rights. In an interview, the historian James Whitman explains that the Nazis valued the American legal system because it demonstrated that discrimination law could function without the explicit definitions to which Nazi lawmakers were accustomed.[12] American practices even suggested that, when attempting to remain subtle and avoid backlash for extreme policies, vague laws and missing definitions could be very effective. The Nazi adoption of this approach is apparent in the third Nuremburg Law of German Blood. Despite all the restrictions placed against the Jew, the law lacked a clear definition of what makes someone Jewish.

Evaluating these laws' development side by side, it becomes evident that there are shared racial ideologies between the two countries. Furthering the evidence of the Nazi affinity for the American racial system, Stefan Kühl demonstrates that there was a line of

---

[11] Browne-Marshall, 22-25.
[12] Richardson, 14–15.

correspondence between American eugenicist Lothrop Stoddard and Nazi eugenicists throughout the 1930s.[13] Like the Jim Crow prohibition of interracial marriages throughout the Southern United States, Nazi lawmakers created their Law of German Blood to preserve the "Aryan" eugenics from going extinct. The third Nuremburg law contains the greatest similarities to American Southern race law. Americans demonstrated the ability to keep whites and blacks segregated in all aspects of life. Following the third law, non-Aryan nationals were prohibited from public relations with German citizens; however, this did not extend to private lives beyond the act of marriage. Contrastingly, in some regions of the Southern United States at the time, like Mississippi and North Carolina, interracial relations in general were banned and punishable by imprisonment.[14] This exclusion of personal segregation legislation by the Nazis in 1935 suggests either the aforementioned attempt at discrimination law without explicit definitions or an effort of restraint due to concerns over international backlash at the upcoming 1936 Berlin Olympic Games.

Hitler himself valued many American policies of the early twentieth century, in particular the policies of selective immigration and manifest destiny. In Hitler's 1925 autobiographical book *Mein Kampf,* he praised the United States for "barring certain races from naturalization."[15] Hitler's praise was derived from a perceived failure and correction by the United States. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, America served as a

---

[13] Stefan Kühl, *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 37. Also Whitman, 8-10.
[14] Dudziak, 1183-85.
[15] Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (New York: Stackpole Sons, 1939), 425.

refuge for all immigrants from all over the world and maintained few if any immigration restrictions. However, by the 1870s, the United States began adopting legislation that set quotas and other limitations on immigrants from certain countries and, most of all, offered preferential treatment to the migrants from northern and central Europe.[16] This change of course proved to Hitler that the United States had learned from its mistakes and was, as a result, the only modern nation of the era with real immigration restrictions.[17] In addition to his praise of American immigration laws, Hitler also shared the ideology behind the American philosophy of manifest destiny, except in Nazi Germany it was known as *Lebensraum*. Hitler expressed his fondness for what he referred to as the American Aryan conquest of western North America. He praised how Americans, "gunned down the millions of redskins to a few hundred thousand."[18] Hitler believed that in order for the Aryan race to reach its full potential it needed "room to grow." He saw the United States' nineteenth century territorial gains as inspiration for what he could accomplish in the Third Reich.

Hitler's admiration for some American policies, as well as the countries' shared racial ideologies, produced hope among Nazi officials that the neutral United States of the early 1930s could eventually become a strong ally of the Third Reich. The American president Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal were praised in Nazi newspapers.

---

[16] Richardson, 14–15.
[17] Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 425.
[18] Quoted in Whitman, 47.

Before his public criticism against the Third Reich in the latter part of the decade, Roosevelt was respected by many Germans.[19]

Sourcing original points of inspiration for the Nuremburg Laws of 1935 leads one to question whether the Nazis drew inspiration or guidance from other models of racial oppression beyond that of the United States. This question is vital to address, especially there existed several other models of racial segregation and oppression in the early twentieth century. However, the Nazis do not seem to have drawn inspiration from, for example, the Union of South Africa or Australia, whose systems of racial segregation were well known internationally. In the 1930s South Africa had just been granted independence from Great Britain after the Statute of Westminster. What would have intrigued the Nazi lawmakers the most about the South African system of segregation was the 1913 Natives Land Act that attempted to force more than 80% of the population onto less than 10% of the country's land.[20] The elite's ability to marginalize such large numbers of people was quite the feat of fostering second-class citizenship. However, the Union of South Africa's laws were not as applicable to the Nazis as the United States' laws were. The native Africans were not as tied into the existing framework of the government as German Jews were, nor were the natives in any position of power to oppose such tyranny. Similar examples can be found with the White Australia policy of the early twentieth century. The 1901 Immigration Restriction Act, passed by the first Australian parliament, was very similar to the policies the United States adopted in the latter half of the nineteenth

---

[19] Whitman, 45-52.
[20] Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa,* 3rd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 163.

century. Like those policies, the Immigration Restriction Act gave preferred treatment to European immigrants and attempted to prevent non-white immigrants from permanently entering Australia.[21] However, similar to South Africa, the conditions of the White Australia Policy were not as similar to those of Germany as were those of the United States. Not only did the United States address immigration on a larger scale, but it also had a history that according to the Nazis reflected the flaws of mass immigration and, therefore, produced and enforced superior legislation as a result of their history.

When Adolf Hitler and his Reichstag passed the Nuremburg laws in 1935, they based their legislation on existing American practices. The United States' ability to segregate mass numbers of people, as well as their ability to create second-class citizenship status, proved influential to Nazi lawmakers. They valued the vague racial laws that Americans crafted without explicit definitions. Hitler himself found inspiration in America's immigration history and their ability to expand their borders. When contrasted with similar racial policies imposed by other nations in the 1930s, the Nazi lawmakers clearly demonstrated favoritism towards the United States, as their laws demonstrated the flaws of and offered corrections to unrestricted immigration. For these reasons, Nazi lawmakers took clear and obvious inspiration from the American racial system and immigration structure.

---

[21] James Jupp, *From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 8-18.

The Scottish Highlands:

How Victorians Influenced a Cultural Resurgence

Mackenly Davis

Scotland, a country in northern Europe that remains isolated from the large metropolitan cities in exchange for the dancing aurora borealis, ancient mountain-scapes, and moors of heather, moss, and cotton grass. Once avoided by outsiders, it continues to become more and more popular in mainstream media and as an international travel destination. Kilts, bagpipes, hunting, and the burn of whiskey are some of the most picturesque ideals of Scotland, the forefront of a culture that once teetered on the brink of existence. Scotland and its natives are perceived as strong, mystical, and all the while far, far away; a fairytale that originated from unthinkable struggle, deception, and slaughter. Scottish culture suffered at the hands of the English and the despair of Scotts themselves, barely surviving through the end of the eighteenth century and the crushing repercussions of the second wave of Jacobite uprisings led by Prince Charles Edward Stuart from 1745-1746. Highland culture saw its resurgence of value, participation, and recognition during the Victorian Era through literature and Queen Victoria's popular culture but not without limiting the tradition in *traditional* Scotland. First-hand accounts of the changing values, men disguising as Stuarts, forbidding laws, and advertisement for tourist's tartan are primary sources from this time that radically showcase the changes that the Scottish Highlands were facing and accounts for what traditional aspects survived the idea of "saving tradition". Highland life was widely manipulated by the English, romantics, and

those looking to capitalize on the new Scottish obsession, to play into the idea of Scotland that outsiders were so enthusiastic about from the books they read and the trendy Queen Victoria. Queen Victoria's notable love affair with Scotland coined the term Balmorality which is the romanticized Scotland, instated by the nobility and aristocracy of Britain. It is the idea outsiders had that Scotland was the peak of beauty, charm, and comfort. The country was the pinnacle of ancient, untouched beauty and tradition, the very tradition the British Crown and Englishmen ridiculed and sought to destroy. The overexaggerated and rosy idea of Scotland, accompanied by the ignorance of its history and once decaying culture is Balmorality. The foundation of the culture survives, and after years of previous scholars discrediting Highland culture as their own, today's scholars are returning the identity and creation to the Scottish people

Scottish culture as seen today is highly representative of specifically Highland (and island) culture. Scotland is separated between the Highlands and the Lowlands, distinguishable by geography and culture alike. The Lowlands are comprised of the southern, central and eastern coast of Scotland, and the Highlands encompass the north, north west, and islands of the country. The Scottish Lowlands were always distinct from the Highlands, even having an entirely different language. The Lowland language called "Scots", also referred to as Northern English and once Inglis, was not the same as Highland Gaelic but a variant form of English that was established by Germanic settlers around the sixth century C.E. [1] Scots in literature can be found from the 1300s - 1700s

---

[1] Hamish W. Fraser and R. J. Morris, eds., *People and Society in Scotland: A Social History of Modern Scotland in Three Volumes,* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1988) 3.

after losing traction after Scotland and England became unified in 1707, English now being the official language.[2] Scottish Gaelic is far more comparable to Irish Gaelic than to Scots, an exceptional distinguishment between the Lowlands and the Highlands.

The Lowlands of Scotland also differed because they were densely populated, compared to the Highlands, and industrialization and capitalism were heavy influencers in the division of the country.[3] In the first half of the 18th century, roughly 59% of Scotland's population lived in the lowlands and were centered around the cities of Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Edinburgh.[4] This development of the Lowlands is realistically because of the harsh and unforgiving terrain of the Highlands, and it created different lives and normality for the respective Scots. Lowlanders were perceived by themselves, and the English, to be more hard working, quiet, and like industrialized England, whereas the Highlanders were stereotyped to be wild and free from societal restraints.[5] The Highlands of Scotland were radically different from the Lowlands, sparse and widespread population, poor agriculture, and feudal like systems heavily reliant on clan leadership. They thought of themselves as true Scots, as opposed to the Lowlanders who were favored, and compared to the English.[6] The severance of Highland and Lowland Scotland contributes to Scotland culture as it is seen today because when the Highland cultural resurgence begun in the early 19th century, the Lowlands had already disconnected from

---

[2] Hamish W. Fraser and R. J. Morris, eds., *People and Society in Scotland,* 3.
[3] Christopher MacLachlan, *Crossing the Highland Line: Cross-Currents in Eighteenth-Century Scottish Writing,* (Glasgow: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 2009).
[4] T. M Devine, "Highland Migration to Lowland Scotland, 1760-1860," *The Scottish Historical Review* 62, no. 174 (1983): 137-49, Accessed December 2, 2020, http://www.jstor.org/stable/25529535.
[5] MacLachlan, *Crossing the Highland Line,* 87.
[6] MacLachlan, *Crossing the Highland Line,* 89.

Highland Scotland and did not hold the exotic and rebellious appeal outsiders had for the Highlands.

The resurgence and survival of Highland culture comes, of course, after its potential demise in the mid 1700s. Highland culture was set to be completely eradicated after the tragedy and massacre of the Battle of Culloden, April 16th, 1746. Charles Edward Stuart rallied and organized the second wave of Jacobite uprisings to put his father James Stuart on the throne and restore Stuart and Scottish rule.[7] The first of the Jacobite uprisings was in 1689 led by Viscount Dundee, who, with minimal popularity, fought to put James VII of Scotland or James II of England back on the British throne. Roman Catholic James VII was removed and forced into exile after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 that saw Protestant William of Orange and Mary take the throne. James attempted claim to the throne in the uprisings of 1708 and 1715. This uprising had more support and loyalty across the Highlands. The son of James VII, James Francis Edward, called the people together because of the unjustly removal of the Scottish king. In August of 1714 James Edward posted a handbill:

> "Every body knows that the Revolution in the Year 1688. ruin'd the English Monarchy, & lay'd the foundation of a Republican [rule without a King] Government, by devolving [passing] the Soveringn [royal] power on the People, who assembl'd themselves without any Authority, voted themselves a Parliament, & assum'd themselves without any Authority, voted themselves a Parliament, & assum'd a Right of deposeing & electing Kings contrary to the fundamentall [original] Laws of the Land, and the most express & solemn Oaths that Christians are capable of taking. And no body can be ignorant how unjustly the late King our Father [James II], of blessed memory, suffer'd by this unjustifiable Revolution

---

[7] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, London: Allen Lane, 1999, 154.

[called the Glorious Revolution, 1688 William invaded and ruled with his wife Mary II until 1694.]"[8]

He claimed there would not be peace but unrest until the rightful king was back on the throne. This claim is important to the understanding of what led to the last Jacobite battle and the desolation of Highlandism. By the uprising of 1719, Spain was a Jacobite ally, but the effort was not enough, and the Jacobite army fell back.[9] The next uprisings took place between 1745-1746 where the Jacobite cause was largely successful until 1746. James Edward, or the Old Pretender, did hold truth in his words. Highlanders did continue to feel unrest under the monarchy and did continue efforts to restore the Stuart throne until they used the very last of their men and resources.

The Battle of Culloden is the most important of the uprisings when discussing the fall of Highlandism. The son of James Edward, Prince Charles Edward Stuart, often referred as Bonnie Prince Charlie by his followers or the Young Pretender, brought clans together once again to fight for the heart and soul of Scotland. He planned on keeping the promise to put a Catholic Scotsman back on the throne and end the English pressures and their misfortune.[10] The Battle of Culloden, outside of Inverness in the Highlands, diminished the uprisings and all efforts. Thousands of Highlanders were slaughtered by the English and it forced the Crown to target and silence the people of the Highlands, ridding any chance of another uprising against them. Highland culture became illegal

---

[8] Handbill from James Francis Edward calling for the rightful heir, August 1714, Jacobite Propaganda (i), The British National Archives, Kew, Richmond, United Kingdom.

[9] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000,* 154.

[10] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000,* 176.

with the Dress Act 1746 under the Act of Proscription 1746 and reinstating, with more alarm than ever, the Disarming Act 1716.

These Acts targeted and made illegal every part of Highland culture. The Dress Act forbid anyone outside the royal army from wearing highland dress, including the kilt, bonnet, and any tartan, eliminating clan pride, loyalty, and kinship. The kilt and bonnet were important in their originality, function, and tradition to the Highlanders. The kilt and bonnet, made of wool, protected those who wore it from the cold, wind, and rain that covered the Highlands majority of the year. The tartan, or pattern of plaid, was crucial to Highlandism, as it was representative of which clan they were a member of, which also held social standing. Those found wearing highland garb were jailed for six months on the first offence and then outcast to oversees British territory for any following offense.[11] This allowed for the Crown to control the spirit of the Highlands and terminate the unity of the clans. By eliminating Highland dress and tartan, the Crown took the representation of clan unity and loyalty, in turn taking social authority away from clan leaders and large clans over the Highlands. The Dress Act 1746 fell under the Act of Proscription 1746, also outlawing bagpipe music, the teaching of Gaelic, and abolishing the clan system that had been set since the 12th century; the purpose being to assimilate the Scottish Highlands.[12] The crown wanted the Highlands to resemble the Lowlands and their proximity to English culture. The Crown took care in their efforts to crush any realm of possibility that the Highlanders would unite and fight again. By reinstating the Disarming Act 1716, in

---

[11] Laws to Control Scotland. Extracts from a sketch of regulations proposed to be made in Scotland, 1746. The. National Archives. Kew, United Kingdom.
[12] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000,* 184.

1746, the Crown did not allow any highlander to be in possession of a blade or gun unless authorized – a consequence of the 1715 Jacobite uprising – limiting the Highlanders ability to hunt.[13] Which with incredibly poor agriculture, meat supply and the hunt were crucial to the Highlanders survival and their culture. These Acts were ultimately lifted in 1782, but this effort came after the Highlanders grew weak and tired and standing up for their culture which was no longer a priority. During the time that the Acts were lifted, the highlands were faced with disease, famine, and the Clearances, leaving very few, if any to return to Highland wear and certainly not on an everyday level like once before.[14]

Scottish culture after the Battle of Culloden, the last effort for Scotland to claim victory over England, wavered in a way it never had before. Leading to the Jacobite uprisings of 1745, the Lowlands made significant effort to retain their reputation as a quite commerce and a cultural extension of England. The Lowlands disassociated themselves with the typical image of Scottish national identity, like tartan and kilts, and they themselves distinguished Highlandism.[15] Highlandism became the identity of Scotland, Lowlanders having the idea that if they are not seen as a "Scot" they would not be held to the same scrutiny as Highlanders. This Highlandism also saw a new identity, one of specific militarism. Previously, Highlanders were seen as barbaric fighters, not advanced military men. Since the Dress Act 1746 included all but the members of the Royal Army, the only men in Highland garb were active British soldiers. The highland soldiers were

---

[13] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, 184.
[14] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, 189.
[15] Matthew P. Dziennik, "Whig Tartan: Material Culture and Its Use in The Scottish Highlands, 1746—1815," *Past & Present*, no. 217 (2012): 118.

easily recognizable as they were adorned in their own pattern of Black Watch tartan.[16] Highland culture was also being manipulated during this time to tell their side of the Jacobite story. Many historians such as Richard Finlay and Murray Pittock argue how Scottish culture had always been influenced by outsiders and their perceptions, but Matthew Dziennik brings in the new argument that it was changed from the inside by clan leaders in an attempt to show support and cooperation with the Crown to remain relevant.[17] After the acts were lifted and Highland garb was associated militarily, clan leaders kept that ideal image to hold the respect and interest of the Highland solider to outsiders, including the Crown itself. These clan leaders should be given a portion of the credit in keeping Highland culture just viable enough for it to explode during the Victorian Era, even if their intentions were not to restore tradition in fear of backlash from the Crown.

The elites of the Scottish Highlands did what was necessary to remain in positions of authority and power, which was to pledge ultimate alliance to the Crown; they would not jeopardize their power in Scotland to reestablish the traditions that once held themselves above all else.[18] The militaristic connotation of Highland dress allowed for the elites to use it as a recruit tactic for the Royal Army; Parliament connected strong soldiers to the garb and effectively continued to recruit men from the Scottish elites, keeping clan leaders in a respected position in the British government. It also supported the large

---

[16] Matthew P. Dziennik, "Whig Tartan: Material Culture and Its Use in The Scottish Highlands, 1746—1815," 119.

[17] Matthew P. Dziennik, "Whig Tartan: Material Culture and Its Use in The Scottish Highlands, 1746—1815," 121.

[18] Matthew P. Dziennik, "Whig Tartan: Material Culture and Its Use in The Scottish Highlands, 1746—1815," 121.

debts that clan leaders faced after losing patronage, tenants, and government powers. The clans had begun to hemorrhage money to support their communities and most importantly their comfortable lifestyles.

Highland culture saw the height of its resurgence during the Victorian Era, defined by Queen Victoria of England's reign 1837 – 1901. The Highland cultural resurgence begun slowly when it became a literary focal point for Scottish novelists and gained rapid growth when Queen Victoria took a liking to the country after visiting in 1842. Initially, the "Scotch novels" that were published during the first three decades of the nineteenth century, most popular at the time, were *Waverley* and *Rob Roy* written by Sir Walter Scott. They were not well received by some who accused the novelists of romanticizing Highlands, who they thought, were in fact poor and uncivilized and little to write about[19] Others were immersed in the story of Scotland and only used the novels as a reference to the country, both sides not being fair to the state of the Highlands. The Scotch novels reached their English audience during a crucial time in the Highlands as the people were going through the Clearances. The Highland Clearances refers to the time period of the 1770s – as late as the 1870s, which saw people being evicted because of the struggles after the Battle of Culloden that left clan chiefs desperate for money and land for agriculture and livestock. This emigration from the Highlands coincided with the Scotch novels that are thought to have been produced during this time to create a foundation of empathy

---

[19] Juliet Shields, "From Family Roots to the Routes of Empire: National Tales and the Domestication of the Scottish Highlands," *ELH* 72, no. 4 (2005): 919.

from the rest of Britain.[20] With an increase in sympathy for the Scots, there was hope that

the Clearances would end and people could return to the Highlands and stabilized the

economy. Juliet Shields argues that there is a noticeable change of tone in the Scotch

novels after 1815, predominately because they feared that traditional Highland culture

would soon be extinct.[21] In writing to preserve Highland culture, the surrounding British

readers, largely English, saw a side of Highlanders that did not include tales of

uncivilized, wild men and uncontrolled women. The novels made English readers see

Highlanders, unfortunately for the first time, as people with the same values of family,

society, and culture as themselves instead of a faraway simple people.

Walter Scott's *Waverley* was an incredibly popular novel published in 1814 which

was one of the Scotch novels that Shields refers to. It was set during the 1745 Jacobite

rebellion and worked as a representation of preservation of the traditional Highlands.

Scott's intention was to reach a far larger audience than just that of Scotland which is why

so much detail within the text and through footnotes was included in his work.[22] This

British and international reach of readership is not fully because of the monetary value

but, as Silke Stroh argues, Scott patriotically wanted to create an understanding and level

of respect across British society, which the Highlands were a part of but hardly seen.[23]

---

[20] Juliet Shields, "From Family Roots to the Routes of Empire: National Tales and the Domestication of the Scottish Highlands," 920.
[21] Juliet Shields, "From Family Roots to the Routes of Empire: National Tales and the Domestication of the Scottish Highlands," 921.
[22] Silke Stroh, "From Flirtations with Romantic Otherness to a More Integrated National Synthesis: "Gentleman Savages" in Walter Scott's Novel Waverley," *Gaelic Scotland in the Colonial Imagination: Anglophone Writing from 1600 to 1900*, 141.
[23] Silke Stroh, "From Flirtations with Romantic Otherness to a More Integrated National Synthesis: "Gentleman Savages" in Walter Scott's Novel Waverley," 141.

What Scott did that those before him failed, or did not try, was attempt to make a homogeneous Britain in the novel. There were a number of Scottish novelists during this time, one of the most popularly recognized is Sir James Matthew Barrie and his *Peter Pan* 1904. Barrie lived and studied in London, the setting of *Peter Pan*, choosing to appeal to the English reader rather than tackle the difficulties of Scotland. Scott had also already set up the literary scene that likely would have welcomed *Peter Pan* to Scotland. Perhaps Barrie avoided this because Scotland itself was viewed as a 'Neverland' and London brought familiarity. Scott did not only focus on Highland culture and how it was proudly the Highlands, but incorporated the Lowlands, English, and even French to showcase the similarities and mutualism in the people, bridging a gap of differences. *Waverley* is greatly referred to when studying Highland culture because of the span of cultures and how traditional Highlandism was woven in between. [24] This is important to consider because Scott, as a Scottish man and novelist, was using his platform to bring Highland culture to mainstream literature. Scott was tuned into what readers wanted and knew how to use Scotland to capture their attentions. Victorians, creators and consumers alike were dedicated to the romantic thoughts and wonders they found in the world choosing to view it with boundless optimism.

Once celebrated for his works and materializing Highland culture, Scott received criticism during the twentieth century. The popular notion was that Scott presented a

---

[24] Silke Stroh, "From Flirtations with Romantic Otherness to a More Integrated National Synthesis: "Gentleman Savages" in Walter Scott's Novel Waverley," 142.

cheapened and touristic version of Scotland and was ridiculed for it.[25] What scholars,

such as Stroh and Mary Nestor, are concluding is that Scott's literature is far more

complex than the simple fairytale or ghost story. Nestor argues his novels and poetry offer

"far more complex and multilaminated constructions of national and cultural identities"

comparable to the argument Stroh holds on how Scott contributed to the resurgence of

Highland culture. Examining Scott through his *The Lady of the Lake* (1810). Nestor

emphasizes the fact that Scott never made claims that this work was the representation of

the real Scotland, that is what his audience chose to receive it as. *The Lady of the Lake,*

with its fantastical and supernatural elements undoubtably coincided with an uptick in

Highlands tourism to Loch Katrine and the Trossachs, rumored to be the inspiration of

the literature setting.[26] Scott did a great deal in mainstreaming Highland culture, making

efforts to do so. This created the beginning of the Highland culture resurgence, bringing

awareness and traction for Queen Victoria in establishing it as popular culture.

Outside of the efforts of literature to maintain Highland culture, Queen Victoria is

largely the reason for its resurgence. Queen Victoria was admired by the people and was

most often the trendsetter of the time, from fashion, art, literature, and all things society.

What saved Highland culture was the attraction felt to it by Queen Victoria. This begun

when the Queen took a private trip to Scotland, which was merely for pleasure, but it was

also only the second visit from a reigning monarch since the seventeenth century.[27]

---

[25] Mary C. Nestor, "Revisiting The Lady of the Lake: Walter Scott and the Representation of Scotland," *Scottish Literary Review* 12, no. 1 (2020) 61-80, 61.
[26] Mary C. Nestor, "Revisiting The Lady of the Lake: Walter Scott and the Representation of Scotland," 61.

[27] Alex Tyrrell, "The Queen's 'Little Trip': The Royal Visit to Scotland in 1842," *The Scottish Historical Review* 82, no. 213 (2003): 48.

Memories of the slaughter at the Battle of Culloden and violent eviction and clearances of

the Highlands previously left a legacy of ill will towards the English from the Highlanders

and the message that the Crown or its representatives were not warmly welcomed.[28]

Victoria intended to keep the Scottish people at a distance, for this was not a royal tour,

but the people were waiting to see the young queen and London media outlets followed

close behind. The Queen's trip to Scotland, and her stay at Blair Castle, quickly had

lasting effects, during a time of aristocratic paternalism, it all "played a part in re-defining

the Scottish sense of national identity with results that lasted far beyond Victoria's

reign."[29] This trip is what started the trend of the luxury of Scotland, universally

blanketed by the term, Balmorality, which is the romanticization of Scotland. The term

steams from Balmoral Castle, which was introduced to the queen in 1847; Queen Victoria

and Prince Albert leased and later bought the castle inspired by Blair Castle.

Undoubtedly, this was because the Queen would only see the carefully constructed

absolute best parts of Scotland. Prime Minister Peel took the advice of the Duke of

Buccleuch and Lord Aberdeen on where the Queen must go to visit, as well as going as far

to arrange hospitality with Scottish aristocrats and organize a deer-shooting for Prince

Albert, the very best of what Scotland had to offer in the short time they were visiting.[30]

This Balmorality is what put Highland culture at the front of Scottish identity and the

tolerable Lowlands' attractable shine was now lackluster. Queen Victoria and the

monarchy were infatuated with and proud of the beauty of the Highlands and Islands,

---

[28] Michael J Stead, "Queen Victoria's Highlands," *British Heritage* 19, no. 7 (1998), 32.
[29] Alex Tyrrell, "The Queen's 'Little Trip': The Royal Visit to Scotland in 1842," 49.
[30] Alex Tyrrell, "The Queen's 'Little Trip': The Royal Visit to Scotland in 1842," 51.

still seeing them as romantic and backward with clan-based loyalties and rituals, taken now with interest as opposed to treason, likely because the Highlands were nothing close to a threat.[31] The infatuation steaming from the breath-taking landscapes, ancient traditions, novelty, and ownership.

Queen Victoria declared "'Scotch air, Scotch people, Scotch hills, Scotch rivers, Scotch woods, are all preferable to those of any other nation in or out of this world'" praising the pristine and untouched landscape.[32] The Queen and Prince Albert found escape in the Scottish Highlands. Hidden in the Highlands away from the stress, structure, and responsibility of London and the monarchy, the royals cherished the quiet countryside allowing them to enjoy their time together. The Queen even credited Scotland in making Prince Albert more attentive towards her than ever in England.[33] This distance between Queen Victoria in the Highlands and regal responsibility is likely the reason behind her lifelong love of the country and why it was such a romantic getaway. The Queen's diaries, analyzed by Michael Stead, describe the royals as being a part of the Highland community by joining in the traditional activities of salmon chasing on the Dee and even sheep shearing and visiting her tenants.[34] The queen would even occasionally have tea and talk to the "unsophisticated Highlanders" who made her feel at ease, compared to the scrutiny faced by those who surround her in court.[35] The benefits and

---

[31] Alex Tyrrell, "The Queen's 'Little Trip': The Royal Visit to Scotland in 1842," 65.
[32] Michael J Stead, "Queen Victoria's Highlands," 34.
[33] Michael J Stead, "Queen Victoria's Highlands," 34.
[34] Michael J Stead, "Queen Victoria's Highlands," 35.
[35] Michael J Stead, "Queen Victoria's Highlands," 35.

experiences that the Queen took from Scotland is what altered her original opinion of the country and compelled her to surround her life with the culture she was introduced to .

Queen Victoria returned to London with the motivation to include and showcase Scotland as a part of the court and united country. She brought the Highlands into style, bringing the upper-class to Scotland and increasing the demand of Scottish goods like wool and tartan. More and more people during this time also began to claim Scottish lineage to connect with the beautiful and wild idea that was so different than the structured "civilized" lives that they lived. Queen Victoria also went as far as to get an official piper that would play for her each morning in full highland dress, an event that still happens today. The music of Scottish Gael was once heard with great distaste, particularly from the mid seventeenth century to 1746, as it was a focal point of the hostile culture, but after the elimination of their threat, it came to symbolize the Scottish interest of the Crown.[36] The English before Victoria did not appreciate Scottish culture, but from the mid seventeenth century to 1746, bagpipe music was used during the Jacobite uprisings, including that of Culloden in 1746, as it always had been throughout Scottish history. This gave the music a negative connotation to England, never hearing it at weddings, celebrations, or funerals, only rebellious battles. The royal family and those around them welcomed the music, dress, and colors of Scotland, as they found them dream like in the sense that they had only experienced best of it and on vacations from their everyday lives. Scotland became a popular dreamscape for these families, never truly

---

[36] Neville T. McKay, "A History of the Office of Piper to the Sovereign," *Folk Music Journal* 7, no. 2 (1996): 188.

appreciating the underlying and threatened culture, as well as doing little to preserve

what was truly traditional from social impacts that degraded it.[37] It was the shows of

tartan and bagpipes shown to Victoria during her 1842 visit that delighted her enough to

bring the materials back to the court with her. Neville McKay notes that the Queen's

"love affair" with the highlands started during this trip and how she often wrote about her

love of pipes but never a specific tune or class of the music but referring to them as

merry.[38] This returns to the idea that indeed Highland culture was now welcomed by the

monarchy, but with minimal regard for what it meant to the people of the Highlands.

Balmorality did not only center around the highest classes of Britain, that is just

where it began. Once Queen Victoria brought Highland culture to England, it of course

spread to her court, nobility, aristocrats, and trickled down the social hierarchy, as does

every trend. Scott's literature still being popular during Victoria's reign, was put into book

sharing and often a part of student curriculum, women and students being the most

popular readers.[39] The Scottish Highlands became a popular interest of people across

social classes.

This new resurgence of Highland culture was so romantic to the English, in fact,

that there was a fabrication of grandsons belonging to the Bonnie Prince Charlie. The two

men, John Sobieski Stolberg Stuart and Charles Edward Stuart claimed that their father

was the son of the Bonnie Price who was raised by another family for his safety from the

---

[37] Neville T. McKay, "A History of the Office of Piper to the Sovereign," 189.
[38] Neville T. McKay, "A History of the Office of Piper to the Sovereign," 190.
[39] Silke Stroh, "From Flirtations with Romantic Otherness to a More Integrated National Synthesis:
"Gentleman Savages" in Walter Scott's Novel Waverley," 146.

Crown. The men were met with little doubt during this time likely because of the overwhelming legacy of the Highlands. The brothers wrote, *The Costumes of the Clans,* a detailed book explaining the history, workings, and art of Highland dress, predominately through elite wear. An interesting take for brothers who grew up in England and did not come into their "position" until their adult lives, calling, in the introduction, for the support of Highlanders to bring back their roots and be a proud and distinctive people once again. The brothers were always seen in full Highland garb, which had not been in practice for around fifty years and never carried themselves as anything besides the grandsons of the Bonnie Prince.[40] The brothers never attracted the attention of officials because they found little legitimacy to their claim. Prince Charles late in life legitimized a daughter who he titled and left his inherence to, something that may never have happened if he had a son or grandsons.[41] What these brothers did do is "awaken the enthusiasm of the Highlanders;"[42] the spirit of the Highlanders longed for the legacy of how they fought and what they fought for with pride. The resurgence of Highland culture – and supposed Stuart line – now in full swing, attracted British and international attention bringing outside visitors into Scotland like never before. This culture bomb had monetary consequences like many things do, and it was an opportunity for a few to capitalize on the new romance and demand of Highland culture, brought by the words of writers and the admiration of Queen Victoria.

---

[40] John Sobieski Stolberg Stuart, and Charles Edward Stuart. *The Costumes of the Clans,* (Edinburgh: John Menzies, 1845), xii.
[41] John Sobieski Stolberg Stuart, and Charles Edward Stuart. *The Costumes of the Clans*, xii.
[42] John Sobieski Stolberg Stuart, and Charles Edward Stuart. *The Costumes of the Clans*, xiii.

Romanticized Scotland produced in the Victorian Era was visualized by tartan and

the kilt, and the kilted Highlander now overshadowed the disdain of the Jacobite rebel.

This noble remembrance of the Highlander was incredibly romanticized and marketed,

making the kilts and especially tartan incredibly fashionable.[43] Tartan and kilts were once

subject to which clan a Highlander belonged to. A clan would have their own distinct

pattern of tartan and the style of dress varied, and these practices often centered around

the largest and most distinguished clans. Once tartan became popular there were a

number of new patterns assigned to small clans, claiming to be traditional, and the

production or purely fashionable patterns.[44] Tartan became something produced for the

masses and tourists that came to visit Scotland and the Highlands, now lacking the

kinship meaning of loyalty to the clan. This is seen plainly in the advertisement in

newspapers during the Victorian Era, one alerting that tourist season was near and to

order tartan for the shops.[45] A mass producer of tartan and plaid is seen urging shop

owners to buy exclusively for the tourist season, no doubt needing a larger quantity of

stock. The new market of tartan was not only targeted to tourists because this time also

saw Highlanders participating more in the new appreciation for Highland culture and

tradition. Highland culture was almost entirely dismantled, meaning Highlanders

themselves have lost touch with traditions. Most importantly the cultural resurgence gave

a new life to the Highlanders and they re-embraced their past. Another advertisement

---

[43] Victoria Kelley, "From the Highlands to Clydebank: 'The Inventors of Tradition'", *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry,* no. 34 (2013): 54.

[44] Victoria Kelley, "From the Highlands to Clydebank: 'The Inventors of Tradition'", 56.

[45] Esslemont & Macintosh - Tourist Season, Clan Tartan. Tartan advertisement. *Aberdeen Press and Journal,* July 30, 1907.

from the *Inverness Courier,* Inverness being the capital of the Highlands, is for children's

tartan school clothing such as skirts, ties, and socks.[46] A potential advertisement for

tourist who wanted to dress their children, but because it specifically advertises school

clothing, it is likely that it was meant for local children or for families who travel from

elsewhere in the Highlands to the hub of Inverness for necessities. Ultimately, tartan was

now mostly woven for ascetics rather than clan membership. A large percentage of

Highlanders are likely to favor the tartan that represented their heritage and family line,

but it no longer had the engrained loyalty to a kinship or leader, it was rather prideful

remembrance.

This resurgence of Highland culture which was accompanied by alterations

influenced by the interests of outsiders still strengthened Scottish, specifically Highland,

nationalism despite the wavering true traditions behind what people were producing and

purchasing. Older generations did take note of how the culture and the respect for it

changed quickly after the Highlands received the attention of Queen Victoria. Elizabeth

Grant Smith wrote an autobiography initially intended for the private viewing of her

family, but it proved to be a valuable insight on how people of the Highlands took to

these changes. Within Smith's stories there were slight acknowledgements of the

Highlands around her and how they evolved, The oldest generations could distinguish

the change more than others but ultimately the Highlanders were attracted to the

attention and the new economy they desperately needed.[47] The Highland culture that

---

[46] Tartan for Girls and Boys. Tartan advertisement. *Inverness Courier,* July 10, 1844.
[47] Elizabeth Grant Smith, *Memoirs of a Highland Lady: The Autobiography of Elizabeth Grant of Rothiemurchus afterwards Mrs. Smith of Baltiboys 1797-1830,* (London: 1911).

resurged during the Victorian Era was welcomed by Highlanders and the additions to it, largely the new economies around tartan, manufacturing, and tourism. Because Highland culture before the Battle of Culloden was mostly forgotten by the Scots themselves, there was little digression on how the culture was portrayed or used. It is today that Highland culture before its resurgence is being studied and discovered.

Highland culture saw its resurgence in the early 1800s, its peak being in the Victorian Era. The culture was altered in a variety of ways, suiting the interests of predominately Queen Victoria and the English elites who were invested in it. Clan leaders strayed from tradition to retain the little reputation they held within the British government. They found safety in show casing themselves and men as militaristic idols, changing the connotation of the Highlander and backpedaling on tradition when soldiers dressed in Highland garb for the British army. Queen Victoria and her associates neglected the meaning and history behind the cultural figures they played with. The largest disillusion, when they wore, decorated, and admired tartan patterns lacking the nexus of the lives Scottish lived and fought so desperately for. In 1746, the Crown launched a personal and direct attack on Highlandism and Highland culture being productive in dismantling the traditions. Queen Victoria did not appreciate this in the way she should. She claimed love and upmost respect for Scotland but chose not to acknowledge the haunting memory of slaughtered Highlanders, destroyed communities, and the end to clans as old as 500 years.[48] The masses were encouraged to appropriate

---

[48] Victoria Kelley, "From the Highlands to Clydebank: 'The Inventors of Tradition'", 58.

tartan and garb. These deviations away from what was traditional Highlandism is because of the Balmorality discussed earlier, the revitalized idea of Scotland. It neglected the pain, hardship, and struggle for survival that endured a short time before to celebrate intricate patterns, pipe music, and the rolling hills of heather. Previous scholarship on Highland culture stripped the Highlanders of credit of their own culture, claiming that it was created in its entirety by the English and its romantics. This claim is challenged today, firstly because the English were once disgusted by Scotland and its people deeming them barbaric and uncivilized, discouraging the argument that Highlanders took towards English influence in their own country. It was also the English making these origin claims during the times Scotland was being celebrated for their past and culture. Current scholarship is giving claim back to the Highlanders while deciphering fact from fiction from what has already been studied.

BOOK AND FILM REVIEWS

Lipstadt, Deborah. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. New York: Free Press, 1993.

Deborah Lipstadt's 1993 work, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*, serves as an in-depth examination of the history of Holocaust denial, emphasizing the burden of proof on those who wish to debunk Holocaust refutations. The book also serves as a guide of refutation against Holocaust denial claims of recent debates in academia.

Lipstadt begins by providing a brief understanding of how Holocaust denial has prospered since the liberation of Europe at the end of World War II: misguided arguments and misused freedoms of speech. Lipstadt asserts that Holocaust denial is a dire issue that focuses simply on the denial of facts in an effort to delegitimize events pertaining to the Holocaust and its consequences. Holocaust denial, clearly put, is not a question of opinion. There is a forthcoming generation of history in which scholars believe that the debate of facts is freedom of expression, and she compares the role of a historian to that of a canary in a mine, which, once dead, warns miners of toxic fumes. The toxic fume to scholars is the Holocaust denial debate, of which there should be none. Holocaust deniers, as Lipstadt dominantly asserts, are anti-Semites disguised under the term "Revisionists," and that they function on the same ideologies as Nazis, only under a misconception of rationality.

Lipstadt addresses prewar antecedents and covers postwar literature concerning the denial of the Holocaust. She examines well-known deniers such as Austin J. App, Arthur Butz, Robert Faurisson, David Hoggan, Paul Raussinier, Harry Elmer Barnes, and Richard Hardwood, not only concisely summarizing their arguments but also breaks down Holocaust denial methodology. Lipstadt asserts that denier methodology relies on the false

and incomplete quoting of official reports, as well as the dependence of other denier arguments. There are also significant issues regarding the rearrangement of historical chronological events of World War II, and claims that deniers' conclusions are based on gross absences of factual evidence.

The most effective chapter in Lipstadt's work is "The Battle for the Campus." Lipstadt focuses on the problems associated with political correctness within academic institutions, such as the relevance of the issues and how positions aid in the favor of Holocaust deniers. In asserting her argument once more, Lipstadt emphasizes that the Holocaust is not for debate and that the utilization of "political correctness" can be dangerously used to acknowledge an alternative history. Her analysis of the free-speech debate is dramatically significant as the First Amendment issues are of national consequence in today's political climate, twenty-six years after her publication. Lipstadt argues that the First Amendment's purpose was to serve as a shield for individuals against government interference in publication affairs (which does not protect private publications). Further, she argues that the First Amendment is not a weapon to be wielded in defense of Constitutional rights, especially within the boundaries of outlandish statements that are at heart hate-speech. The pessimistic tone utilized by Lipstadt enhances this argument, as the urgency of rationality is increasingly imperative. Lipstadt criticizes students and scholars in their belief of there being two sides to the Holocaust debate. In which there is an acknowledgement of the side that is Holocaust denial, deniers have already won based on this conclusion.

The Appendix chapter, "Twisting the Truth," is the second-most effective part of Lipstadt's work, in which she thoroughly examines major issues used by deniers to falsify the Holocaust: the potency and power of Zyklon-B, the existence of gas chambers within concentration camps and their inability to be proven, as well as the criticism of the *Diary of Anne Frank* and its validity. Lipstadt refutes each argument in remarkable simplicity so as not to give Holocaust denial ample satisfaction.

After reading Lipstadt's work, there is dissonance concerning the desire for understanding and the power that is given to those within such a desire. To acknowledge a contradictory belief of which there can only be one answer, a true or false, is not necessarily to redefine one's attitude toward beliefs, which is chiefly based on morality. Suppose the hypothetical that Holocaust deniers would be correct, the millions who would have to be wrong is astonishingly deafening. Victims and survivors would be reduced to nothing, which only favors Lipstadt's claims of anti-Semitism ideologies of Revisionists. Bystanders and the thousands of Poles who watched the slaughter of Jews, who took part in the underground of protecting Jews, who became vigilantes and hunted Jews themselves, would all have to be wrong. Moreover, the perhaps most impactful individuals who would have to be wrong are the perpetrators. In the last words of the condemned, and as investigated in psychological experiences such as Milgram and Zimbardo, those who acknowledged their doings in an attempted annihilation would have to be entirely false. What conspiracy would constitute the false confession of thousands is incomprehensible.

To engage with Holocaust deniers is not to understand their arguments – in which there are none with reliable evidence – than it is to understand the psychology behind their

reasoning. There is a want of understanding behind anti-Semitic, racist, homophobic ideologies. If Holocaust deniers are, in fact, Nazis in sheep's clothing, then the continued want to understand the roots of these ideologies, which, essentially, is the core fundamental groundwork that was constructed. Such ideologies are not innate; they are predisposed onto youth and experienced throughout many lives. It is daring to suggest a feeling of pity towards them, for no one asks to hate another and conspire against them.

To analyze a Holocaust denier's argumentation is to expose their patterns, brought under the responsibility to follow the paper trail that is footnotes and textual evidence. The burden of proof that is libel against Holocaust deniers is bewildering, as instead of proving how one is not a denier, one must make the claims that they are spurting nonsense in a judicial sense. For there even being the occasion to testify against clear anti-Semitism and racism is left without words. It is indescribable.

In agreeance with Lipstadt, there is no denying that historical truths and facts are under assault. Expanding on her political correctness debates within scholarly institutions, the modernization of social media has connected millions and created a platform that has flattened the boundaries of argumentation in which "political correctness" is used as argumentation on both sides of political and historical debates. Moreover, the increase of extremism in recent years has created an abhorrent tolerance and acceptance to ideologies interconnected with Nazism, clear in political rallies and nationalism growth. The only alternative to these toxic fumes is to understand that truth is not relative—its meaning should not be based on interpretation rather than intention. To analyze effectively, one must look under all appearances and constantly be on the offensive side, questioning the

reliability and validity of sources. To be defensive in debates is to welcome to possibility of an alternative reality.

Lipstadt's work is ultimately one of the best analyses of critical Holocaust deniers' argument. It is not merely subjective to the Holocaust but provides a holistic and suggested point of view when it comes to the analysis of all historical debates.

Casey Niebuhr

Assisi Society in the Films *Brother Sun, Sister Moon* and *Francesco*

Lily Russell

The films *Brother Son, Sister Moon* and *Franscesco* are personal and introspective movies based on the life of St. Francis of Assisi. These films include themes of internal growth, coming of age, family, and poverty. However, one significant theme of these films is society. St. Francis spent the majority of his life being judged by the people around him. Today, St. Francis is a revered historic figure. However, during his life in the thirteenth century, St. Francis was seen as a mad man all because he rejected societal norms such as wealth, reputation, and status. Even others who followed the religious life he cherished did not understand the extreme lifestyle choices he'd made in the name of the Lord. The films *Brother Son, Sister Moon* and *Francesco* show this change in personality from his past self to his older, outcasted self. While each film has a different way of showing his progression into becoming a saint, the undeniable fact is that he was disowned by his family and the town in which he grew up. Many scenes in the films regarding his exile from society correlate and contrast with readings from primary sources including "The Rediscovered Life of Saint Francis of Assisi" by Thomas of Celano[164].

In the film *Brother Son, Sister Moon*, the audience follows along with Francis as he makes his journey to becoming a saint. This film begins immediately with his return from war, as he was sent home due to sickness and ransom. While he is in his fever state,

---

[164] Thomas of Celano and Jacques Dalarun, *The Rediscovered Life of St. Francis of Assisi*, trans. Timothy J. Johnson (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2016).

Francis reminisces about his life so far. During his childhood, Francis was a reckless youth, who drank and spent money without much thought. This part of the film *Brother Son, Sister Moon* correlates with Thomas of Celano's "Rediscovered Life" which declares, "He [Francis], who insolently followed the early teachings of his parents right up to the twenty fifth year of his life, squandered his time so vainly that among those who followed the miserable favors of the world, he was considered the most vain and insolent of the land."[165]. In the opening scenes of the film, Francis is shown as a young lad going to war with his friends. As he is being dressed in armor by his family, he makes the joke, "What shall we do with all the money we will make out of this war?" As shown, Francis was a normal young man in Assisian society's standards, meaning he was dedicated to his civil service of going to war. He made his family proud, as many young men who went to war. There is even a celebration to see them off, because the act of going to battle showed that the men were brave and honorable. By societal standards, Francis was adored. However,in the film, this image of him changes once he returns home. The way he was sent back brought shame onto the family, because he returned before his fellow soldiers. Responding to accusations of cowardice, his father shouts, "He has come back from the war because he is ill! He's not a coward!"[166]. This is the first event depicted the film that gives the audience a glimpse at what a reputation meant to someone in that era.

After his journey home, Francis changes his personality. Instead of being vain, selfish, and impulsive, he becomes gentle, nurturing, and unworldly. This causes a

---

[165] Celano and Dalarun, *The Rediscovered Life*, 2.
[166] *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, directed by Franco Zeffirelli (1972; Paramount Pictures), DVD.

mixture of reactions from the people around him. In the film, a woman named Clare is the only one who is not against his changes. She proclaims, "When you went off to war, they said you were fine and intelligent, but now you're mad because you sing like the birds, you chase after butterflies, and you look at flowers. I think you were mad before, not now."[167] No one in this film understood St. Francis but Clare, even when he did not understand her. Clare fed people who had fallen victim to leprosy. These people were called "lepers" and were shunned from society. When Clare is first introduced, she feeds the lepers, much to Francis' surprise. Like many others in the society of Assisi, Francis's father did not understand him at all, and scorns him as a result. In "The Rediscovered Life," Thomas of Celano states: "One day, when entering the city dressed in ragged clothing, his [St. Francis'] Father, who was not restrained in the least, laid hands on him and shamefully dragged him to his own house." [168] This situation is shown in *Brother Son, Sister Moon*, when his father reaches his breaking point with Francis. In one pivotal scene, Francis walks into the dining room wearing bloody rags, and this sends his father into a raging tantrum. Francis's mother can not hold the unhinged man back from grabbing their son and throwing him onto the ground, berating him the entire time. The father shows no mercy in this scene, as he did not in real life. Francis's father disowns him for the shame he has brought on his family, shouting things like "No son of mine is going to behave like this!" The people of Assisi do nothing to help St, Francis, even as his father drags him by the neck through the city. Even the bishop calls him "a menace to society"

---

[167] *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, directed by Franco Zeffirelli (1972; Paramount Pictures), DVD.
[168]Celano and Dalarun, *The Rediscovered Life*, 4.

because he cannot understand his ways. One of the central scenes in *Brother Moon, Sister Sun* is when Francis is dragged to the bishop's feet. There, he defends his actions and speaks his truth, and he takes off his clothes to give them back to his father in a symbolic gesture. The crowd that surrounds Francis, once mocking, watches him do this in a silent, stunned manner. It is clear they do not understand him, but his words affect them nevertheless.

The film *Francesco* begins with a young woman named Chiara, who later becomes St. Clare. The introductory parts of the film display her first impressions and admiration of St. Francis. The first scene shows her lying down next to an unconscious Francis, not minding the dirty and distinctive alley way that serves as their resting place. Chiara then comes across a group of men, who in a tent are writing down the life of St. Francis. At first, they discuss how vain and excitable St. Francis used to act. The writer even asks, "Should I write those things?"[169] He says this because St. Francis is a figure of purity and religious ideals, and his sinful past may taint the holy image others have of him. However, the group recognizes the importance of these details, because a big part of the Christian religion is being saved through the changing of one's ways. Like *Brother Son, Sister Moon*, this film showed how popular St. Francis was before he was discharged from the war. Before his radical change of lifestyle, Francis is the pride and joy of his family and friends. Chiara states, "The sight of him filled my existence from the time I was a little girl. He was always elegant and kind,"[170] A man replies, "And lots of money. His father was crazy about

---

[169] *Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.
[170] *Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.

him. He wanted his son to be a gentleman, and I can guarantee he was serious about it."[171]

Those two statements parallels dialogue in the *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*. Clare of Assisi is

portrayed both in *Brother Sun, Sister Moon* and *Francesco* as a devout follower of St.

Francis. She had known him before and after his change of lifestyle, and She admired him

in each phase of his life. She became dedicated followers. The second similarity is the

portrayal of the Father's expectations. Overall, his Father's disapproval is a stark point in

all adaptations of St. Francis' life.

As in *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, the father depicted in *Francesco* expects him to

keep the family fortune secure. When Francis begins to break away from what is expected

of him, someone asks what his father will think. "I don't understand. Didn't you want to

become a count or a duke? And now? What will your father say?"[172] As in *Brother Sun,*

Sister Moon, the St. Francis of *Francesco* must deal with his father's disappointment.

While the general outline of the story of his life is the same in both films, each

approaches key moments in its own way. In *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, St. Francis throws

his clothes from the window. In *Francesco*, he instead sells the clothes for money to give

to the poor. In *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, his father blames his mother for spoiling St.

Francis as a child. A huge difference between the films is the scene when St. Francis is put

on trial. *Brother Sun, Sister Moon* shows St. Francis being dragged through the city

towards the church while in Francesco they have an organized trial. Francis actually has a

lawyer on his side and attempts to justify his choice to take his Father's clothes and

---

[171] *Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.
[172] *Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.

textiles. Instead of screaming and yelling, Francis' father in *Francesco* tries to reason with him and even forgives him during the trial. "After all, you wanted to give alms. That's only right. You thought the household things were also yours to dispose of. And so you did. Right. That, too, must be done. Otherwise what sort of Christians would we be?" [173] This portrayal is starkly different from the one in *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*. According to Thomas of Celano, Francis's father had a violent reaction to his son's rejection of worldly goods. Thus, while the scene in Francesco is moving and well-articulated, the reaction of the father in *Brother Sun, Sister Moon* seems to be more in line with the medieval sources.

Both films make an effort to show the pervasive influence of Christianity on St. Francis's life and on the medieval world more generally. *Brother Sun, Sister Moon* places emphasis on the extraordinarily different and unique way Francis practiced religion, especially his choice to discard all material items, including the clothes on his back. This is the very thing his friends and followers find attractive. In one scene, his friend Bernadro states: "I feel stifled by my past, by my upbringing. None of it means anything to me anymore. And you Francesco, you know better than anyone else that I cannot live without an ideal, without something to believe in."[174] This coming of age sense of reflection upon one's life holds particular appeal in modern society. Like many young people today both characters are breaking away from ideals given to them by their parents and society. St. Francis and Bernardo inspire each other, despite the mockery they receive from people around them, who do not take them seriously.

---

[173]*Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.
[174]*Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, directed by Franco Zeffirelli (1972; Paramount Pictures), DVD.

Francesco explores this same theme through the character Chiara. Because of the stigmas and expectations placed on medieval women, Chiara faces special challenges in her efforts to break away from societal standards. Even Francis's male followers, who want to save others, do not want her joining because they fear scandal. "They'll insult us more than ever. They'll imagine who knows what…You know very well what they imagine when they see a girl with some men."[175] Despite intense opposition, Chiara manages to turn away from the singular path women had during the time, which was to be married and traded as property.

A final point of contrast between the two films can be found in their respective tones, atmospheres, and pacing. *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, the film has a soundtrack of melodic, light hymns. Even as St. Francis is reminiscing during his fever dream state, the horrors of war are rarely shown. The film deals more with his inward, personal change than with the trauma of war. However in *Francesco*, much emphasis is placed on the vulgarity of war. One early scene depicts soldiers burying the dead, and puts the horror and grime of battle on display. The film does not shy away from showing corpses, such as a hanging man. It portrays Francis' time as a prisoner of war, an episode not really discussed in *Brother Sun, Sister Moon,* and makes that experience a key catalyst in Francis's change of behavior. The narrator remarks, "It was the beginning of those…oddities, that so annoyed his father, who blamed everything on the year his son spent in prison." [176] The film does a good job at showing one of the reasons why St.

---

[175] *Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.
[176] *Francesco*, directed by Liliana Cavani (1989; Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico), DVD.

Francis became as devoted as he was to Christianity, because it was all he had during the terrifying ordeals of being a prisoner at war. Francis's personality undergoes a slower evolution in Francesc than it does in *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, wherein he wakes up one day completely changed. Franceso tries to show that his transformation was driven at first by small acts like giving the man at the shop money. Ultimately, these simple gestures lead to his remarkable change in demeanor.

Despite their differences, Both *Brother Sun, Sister Moon*, and *Francesco* provide realistic depictions of St. Francis's journey to becoming a Saint. Moreover, both films align to one extent or another with the stories of his life included in"The Rediscovered". Both films show that he was heavily influenced by the society he grew up in. The film *Francesco* gives a more realistic view of the horrors of his time period, such as religious wars and torture. Francis's internal change in *Francesco* is also much more detailed, especially of his imprisonment, and his reliance on scripture for sanctuary in those horrible circumstances. However, the film *Brother Sun, Sister Moon* provides an account that is more true to source like "*The Rediscovered*". Each film accurately shows poverty, sickness, war, and society during the thirteenth century when St. Francis was alive. The films place significant emphasis on the values of medieval society. Without the film's explorations of reputation, religion, and poverty, it may be hard for the audience to understand the obstacles stood in front of St. Francis during his lifetime. Taken together, the films allow us to grasp just how much St. Francis was willing to give up during his life to pursue his beliefs. While depictions of the personality of St. Francis differ across various sources and traditions, all portrayals emphasize his gentle, caring nature; the two

films are no exception to this. Neither film fails to demonstrate how St. Francis inspired others and acquired his following. Through his lessons and selfless nature, he was able to turn others away from society's standards, with messages that may still appeal to people of the modern day.

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.