THE
ALEXANDRIAN

Troy University Department of History

& Phi Alpha Theta-Iota Mu

In Remembrance of Professor Nathan Alexander

A*lexandrian* Submission Guidelines

The Alexandrian accepts manuscripts pertaining to the subjects of history and philosophy. Accepted forms include book reviews, historiographic essays, and full-length articles.

Format: All submissions should be in Microsoft Word. They should adhere to the *Chicago Manual of Style*. Please include footnotes instead of endnotes and refrain from using headers.

Abstract: Any article submission must include an abstract of no more than 200 words. This is not necessary for submissions of book reviews or essays.

Please send submissions to Dr. Karen Ross at kdross@troy.edu.

Cover: This year's cover features *Red Channels*, a booklet published in 1950 by Counterattack. Counterattack published this special report on alleged communist sympathizers among entertainers, journalists, and other media figures in their hunt for subversives during the Red Scare. For more on the Cold War and the media, see Alyssa Allen's article in this issue.

THE

ALEXANDRIAN

Introduction to the Eleventh Annual Volume

Hello there! It is my honor to welcome you to the Eleventh annual volume of *The Alexandrian*.

This year's volume features pieces focused mainly on the twentieth century: research surrounding World War II, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Cold War are examined by our students here in the department. In addition, we include an essay on the self-made men of the early Republic.

We are so excited to share with you the hard work all the students, staff, and editorial team have been working on this last year.

Enjoy,

Mykaila Baker,
Editor

The Change in U.S. Television News Throughout the Cold War

Alyssa Allen

During the Cold War, news media in the United States regularly covered and reported the unfolding conflict between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. along with the many "hot wars" during this time period that pitted Capitalism vs. Communism. During this time, Americans would see news of the American-Soviet conflict in many forms, from print and radio to eventually film and television. By the end of the Cold War, television would become the new medium to surpass written documents in America; it was more meaningful and more powerful than any other previous forms of media. The rise of television had a codependent relationship with the Cold War; as the war intensified, so too did the use of television and film to portray the incidents within it. After WWII, television grew as a form of media available to the masses. By 1959, the television had become the central home appliance, with nine out of ten households owning one.[1] Within the first five years of regular network reporting, Americans learned about the many events of the beginning of the Cold War through their television sets in between commercials for the many consumer goods pushed their way.

Even in the early days of television, when only a small number of networks even existed, the U.S. government showed great interest in television as a tool to create public support of military and foreign policies.

---

[1] Thomas Patrick Doherty, *Cold War, Cool Medium: Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 4-5.

The first project in television taken on by the Office of Public Affairs was producing the program *Your Foreign Policy* for ABC in 1948, which discussed topics such as the Truman Doctrine, "Greek-Turkish Aid," and "Is European Recovery Road to Peace?" The Office of Public Affairs' hand in using television to promote U.S. foreign affairs is further evidenced by the office making the signing of the Japanese Peace treaty in San Francisco on September 21, 1951, the first nationwide television broadcast. The Office of Public Affairs did not stop there though and went on to produce series such as *The Marshall Plan in Action*, *Diplomatic Pouch*, and during the Korean War, *The Facts We Face* and *Battle Report Washington*, with the intention of bringing U.S. foreign affairs to the public and to demonstrate support for U.S. Cold War policies.[2] American television news changed drastically from the end of World War II to the end of the Vietnam War, through the fear Communists in media brought to Americans, the government's control over networks mixed with the production of propaganda, the accessibility of news along with faster reporting, and finally via, the change in objectivity in news reporting coupled with the government's loss of control over networks.

Early on in the life of television news and entertainment in America, many were afraid of the damage a Communist behind the camera's lens could do in helping spread their Communist ideas and sympathies. To combat this, an attempt at controlling the entertainment industry was made in 1947 by anti-Communist organizers because of the potential danger of having the American people manipulated by Communists. The Mundt-Nixon Bill was passed that banned Communists from using broadcast frequencies for "treachery, propaganda, and sabotage."[3] However,

---

[2] Nancy E. Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda: 1947-1960* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 74-76.

[3] Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda: 1947-1960*, 56.

following this, the public would take the responsibility of exposing Communists and Communist sympathizers into their own hands.

In June of 1950, "Counterattack," a privately owned and operated anti-Communist newsletter, issued a list of news personalities and entertainers believed to be a part of the Communist Party or have Communist sympathies in their publication entitled *Red Channels: The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television*. *Red Channels* explained the risk that pro-Communist peoples in the media could pose to the American people stating that these entertainers would bring "Communist ideology and pro-Soviet interpretation of current events" to the American people.[4] However, the fight against Communistic influence in the media did not stop here.

At a Lincoln Day dinner speech to a Republican Women's Club, Senator Joseph McCarthy stated that he had a list of 205 names of known Communists working in the State Department, giving him overnight fame. Though he first only mentioned members in the State Department, McCarthy would soon move onto members of the entertainment industry. Like the *Red Channels*, McCarthy accused people he believed to have ties to Communism or sympathies towards it. McCarthy felt the need to expose them to protect Americans from Communist influences in the media. All in all, McCarthy's so-called *Blacklist* of suspected Communists constricted people's freedom of speech and opinions in private as well as in the public eye, as entertainers had to be cautious of any and all things they said as not to appear to have any Communistic sympathies. Even renowned public figures, such as former President Harry Truman saw through the near censorship the *Blacklist* forced upon Americans. In a televised address on November 16, 1953, Truman stated that "McCarthyism is the corruption of truth, the abandonment of our historical

---

[4] *Red Channels: The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television* (New York: Counterattack, 1950), 2.

devotion to fair play. It is the abandonment of the due process of law. It is the use of the Big Lie and the unfounded accusation against any citizen in the name of Americanism and security… It is the spread of fear and the destruction of faith in every level of our society."[5] All in all, this fear of Communists among the American people was not the only thing frightening the public when it came to the Cold War; fear of instant nuclear annihilation also did wonders to instill an "us vs. them" mentality in Americans.

Between 1951 and 1953, three atomic bomb detonations would be broadcast to the American people in a public service program sponsored by the government, as no brands wanted to sponsor an atomic bomb detonation. *The Blacklist* and *Red Channels*, coupled with the fear of atomic demise displayed on television, made for a challenging time for advertisers. Advertisers wanted to reach as wide a demographic as possible, so using television was ideal, but the fear of supporting Communism in media or frightful shows hung heavy upon advertisers. Based upon ratings and letters, television executives were constantly worried about what might offend the public, and subsequently, sponsors often folded after any pressure from the public.[6] Walter Cronkite for CBS, Morgan Beatty for NBC, and Chet Huntley for ABC were all on the scene of the last of the three detonations in March of 1953, giving commentary to the public of the goings-on of the detonation. The detonation of such bombs brought fear to the public and helped foster the growing animosity and disdain Americans harbored for the Soviets.[7] Also produced and

---

[5] *Former President Truman's Remarks in Response to Criticism by Herbert Brownell in Regard to the Harry Dexter White Appointment* (Kansas City, MO: American Broadcasting Company, November 16, 1953).

[6] Doherty, *Cold War, Cool Medium Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*, 61-63.

[7] Doherty, *Cold War, Cool Medium Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*, 7.

brought to the public thanks to the U.S. government was *Operation Ivy*, a 28-minute telecast about the detonation of the H-Bomb that was created by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission.[8] Besides actual informational telecasts about bomb detonations, shows such as ABC's *Atomic Attack*, which followed a woman left to survive an atomic bomb detonation on the island of Manhattan, helped promote fear of an attack from the Soviets and overwhelmingly promoted support for more civil defense in America.[9]

At the start of the Cold War conflict, American media presented coverage of the fear-inducing "Red Scare" campaign to sway American opinion away from that of destructive Communism and instill American patriotism. Television really got on its feet at the height of the "Red Scare" and was heavily influenced by the ensuing anti-communist hysteria, whether this be creating fear of atomic annihilation or fear of Communistic influences in the media. Media significantly contributed to the continuance of the Cold War through its sensationalized propaganda and heavily politicized reporting, which created a prolonged state of fear of impending doom and paranoia.[10] Although the fear of Communists and impending doom could not have been spread so rapidly and efficiently had the U.S. Government not had as great a control over broadcasting networks.

America's television industry was different from that of the Soviet Union in that it was corporate-owned and commercially sponsored as opposed to the Soviet's state-controlled information television. However, America's television industry was not as free as one might think during

---

[8] *Operation Ivy*, March 17, 1952.

[9] *The Motorola Television Hour: Atomic Attack* (American Broadcasting Company, 1954).; Doherty, *Cold War, Cool Medium Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*, 12-13.

[10] Alexander Stafford, "The Role of the Media During the Cold War," E, October 27, 2013, http://www.e-ir.info/2013/10/26/the-role-of-the-media-during-the-cold-war/, 3.

the beginnings of the Cold War. Most news reported during the early Cold War was heavily scripted and often produced by the government or defense establishment itself. Television networks had a dire need to produce their news programs cheaply and efficiently, as, during their infancy, networks did not have the capital to produce many programs of their own. This, coupled with government agencies seeking out control over the news reaching the public, was the recipe for the give-and-take relationship enjoyed by the U.S. government and news outlets. The networks and the government were able to come to an agreement that the government would financially help produce programs for the networks, and in return, many shows and news programs would have heavy influences from the government, giving the government further control over what information the American people had access to.[11] The Korean War brought to the forefront of the American people the thought that perhaps the government's control over the media would soon get even tighter.

At the beginning of the Korean War, one major threat faced by television networks was the chance of nationalization by the government. Because of the financial crisis the Korean War brought about, U.S. television networks' stocks fell, and government seizure of the networks was a real fear. This financial crisis coupled with the thought that sponsors might disappear because of their goods being less produced due to the war, as well as many television workers being drafted to Korea leaving gaps in the workplace, really proved to many broadcasters that a significant halt in television's growth was going to happen.[12] However, after the fear of nationalization of networks subsided, the government still had an enormous amount of control over what the networks reported on during

---

[11] Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda: 1947-1960*, 1-6.
[12] Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda: 1947-1960*, 77-96.

the Korean War. General MacArthur got very upset about early negative coverage of the Korean War and eventually would order mandatory censorship of news coverage, starting in December 1950. MacArthur was able to successfully censor news reports of the conflict via the Army's control of the telephone systems journalists in Korea used to dictate their news coverage of Korea. This blatant censorship of the conflict would continue until the armistice in July of 1953.[13]

In the early stages of the Cold War, the media's effect was apparent as the U.S. government used anti-Soviet-American-propaganda to dissuade any domestic sympathies towards Communism. This form of propaganda was apparent in many forms from print, radio, film, and TV, such as the 1957 film *Red Nightmare*. Since the television networks needed cheap programming, state department agencies would produce films for use as propaganda in many countries receiving aid from the U.S. and distribute them for free to broadcasters, further exemplifying how the government was able to get their propaganda received by the public. Though following the Korean War, as governmental control in television started drop, networks were able to regain their capital and bring in their own income, which they were able to invest into news and television shows with less government influence, while also investing in new television technologies that they had previously been unable to afford or that had yet to exist.

Early on, many people did not think the fad of television would last, and in its infancy, television struggled to prove itself as a legitimate news outlet. Television's early technological stature limited its power to report the news. One of television's first coverages of the U.S. political party conventions was limited by the reach of coaxial cables, making the 1948

---

[13] Bruce Steele, "Korea: How the Korean War Changed the Way Military Conflicts Are Reported," *University of Pittsburgh: University Times*, June 22, 2000, 32 edition, sec. 21, https://www.utimes.pitt.edu/archives/?p=3014.

party convention's coverage only available to the northeastern states. Also, during the early 1950s, most television networks did not have their own camera crews and relied heavily on newsreel companies to provide them with film. This would all change by the time America's next great war, the Vietnam War, was fought.[14]

The Vietnam War was termed the first "TV war" because of the media's high coverage of the war through television. New filming process and advanced lenses helped portray Cold War events such as the Vietnam War in a way never seen before.[15] Because of these new film processes and the easy accessibility that television provided to the average American, broadcasting networks became the primary source of news for Americans by the end of the 1960s.[16] Early on in the life of television, complicated and cumbersome cameras and sound equipment made field reports challenging to film and took days to broadcast because of a lack of satellite communications. By the time the Vietnam War took place, advancement in both video and audio recordings made for easier news coverage; TV networks even competed for the very best equipment to make their news coverage stand out among the growing number of networks.[17]

The last significant change in American television news during the Cold War came through new objectivity gained by television news networks during the Vietnam War. In the years following the Korean War, television networks were able to gain more freedom from governmental

[14] Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda: 1947-1960*, 49.
[15] Steele, "Korea: How the Korean War Changed the Way Military Conflicts Are Reported."
[16] Kerry Mallett, "Bias and Technology Changes in Television Coverage of War," *Lehigh Review* 22 (2014): pp. 52-61, 52.
[17] Jessie Kratz, "Vietnam: The First Television War," National Archives and Records Administration (National Archives and Records Administration, January 25, 2018), https://prologue.blogs.archives.gov/2018/01/25/vietnam-the-first-television-war/.

influence because they were attaining capital themselves and no longer had to be dependent on the government to fund their programming. During the Korean War and WWII, the relationship between the U.S. Government and news media was one of cooperation and trust moving towards a common goal. Before the Vietnam War, during times of war, the media kept modern warfare hidden from the masses, kept military secrets, almost always supported the President, reported on the bravery and respectability of its soldiers, and demonized the adversaries the U.S. was fighting.[18] However, by the time the Vietnam War was at its height, the partnership between government and media morphed into a relationship of hostility and suspicion.[19]

Over time U.S. media would go from being an agent of the state to being more independent and owned by private companies, opening up avenues for less government-controlled propaganda and more critical of the government news pieces, none more apparent than those news stories covered during the Vietnam War. During the Vietnam War is when the media really began to stretch and show its independence from the government. At the beginning of the conflict, the coverage was often scripted and pro-western, like that of the Korean War, but by the time the Tet-Offensive came into play, this was no longer the case. During the war, the media was allowed free access to the conflict and took more independence when reporting than ever before. Television was no longer the mouthpiece of the government spitting out whatever the government pushed, and instead became more of a moderator of current events.[20] Journalists in Vietnam often obliged to restrictions concerning reporting

---

[18] Bruce Cumings, "Vietnam: A 'Television War?'," in *War and Television* (New York, NY: Verso, 1992), pp. 83-102, 83.
[19] Stafford, "The Role of the Media During the Cold War," 3.; Mallett, "Bias and Technology Changes in Television Coverage of War,", 52.
[20] Stafford, "The Role of the Media During the Cold War," 2.

on specific operations and their details, but when it came to combat conditions, troop morale, and overall conditions of the war, journalists resisted any attempts at censorship of their reporting.[21] Although Western media largely backed the U.S. consensus on the Cold War, the new independence in media meant policymakers were continually checking to make sure the media was telling the news and stories that went along with the government's narrative.[22] The Vietnam War's news coverage is vital to look at because of the enormous difference between it and WWII's and Korea's news coverage, as the networks were no longer working for government interests but against them.[23]

Through Americans' fear of secret Communistic influences, the government's dispersal of propaganda over networks it controlled, the technological advancements in television, and most importantly, the new objectivity gained by the media during the Vietnam War, American television news coverage changed drastically from 1945 to 1975. The many changes television news went through during the Cold War brought new importance to news coverage, one that was able to possibly change the outcomes of wars. Most notably, it was the change from pro-government reporting combined with the unrestricted graphic reporting of the Vietnam War that many historians have often listed as the culprit behind America's defeat in the war.[24] The television news coverage of the

---

[21] Steele, "Korea: How the Korean War Changed the Way Military Conflicts Are Reported."

[22] James Chisem, "U.S. Propaganda and the Cultural Cold War," *E-International Relations*, August 20, 2012, http://www.e-ir.info/2012/08/16/u-s-propaganda-and-the-cultural-cold-war/, 4.

[23] Mallett, "Bias and Technology Changes in Television Coverage of War,", 52.

[24] James Chisem, "U.S. Propaganda and the Cultural Cold War," *E-International Relations*, August 20, 2012, http://www.e-ir.info/2012/08/16/u-s-propaganda-and-the-cultural-cold-war/, 3.; Greg McLaughlin, "From Luckless Tribe to Wireless Tribe: The Impact of Media Technologies on War Reporting," in *The War Correspondent* (London: Pluto, 2016), pp. 63-90, 78.

Vietnam War showed first-hand the cruelties of war, drastically changing the public's opinion of the war. After the Tet Offensive, reports of the war turned dramatically unfavorable. Full coverage of the war, the lives of the soldiers, and the combat conditions significantly changed public opinion of the war. Because the Vietnam War was so accessible to the public, news coverage created a huge public opinion against the war. The My Lai Massacre coverage sparked massive riots in cities and on colleges throughout the U.S., fueling strong public anti-war opinions.[25]

Many key American figures within the Vietnam War blame the U.S. coverage of the war for the demoralization of the American people and, ultimately, the defeat in Vietnam. General Westmoreland is quoted as saying that "television's unique requirements contributed to a distorted view of the war… The news had to be compressed and visually dramatic," and that because of this, "the war Americans saw was almost exclusively violent, miserable, or controversial."[26] President Richard Nixon also went on to say that "In each night's TV news and each morning's paper the war was reported battle by battle, but little or no sense of the underlying purpose of the fighting was conveyed… More than ever before, television showed the terrible human suffering and sacrifice of war… the result was a serious demoralization of the home front, raising the question whether America would ever again be able to fight an enemy abroad with unity and strength of purpose at home." Furthermore, President Lyndon Johnson believed that Walter Cronkite's editorial of the war after his trip to Vietnam played a crucial role in destroying Americans' support of the war.[27]

---

[25] Jessie Kratz, "Vietnam: the First Television War."
[26] Greg McLaughlin, "From Luckless Tribe to Wireless Tribe: The Impact of Media Technologies on War Reporting," 78.
[27] Cumings, "Vietnam: A 'Television War?'," 84-88.

All-in-all, as the Cold War came to an end, the media Americans saw varied drastically from what they had seen thirty years ago. Gone was the heavy government-controlled media and propaganda, and in came the faster and more accessible news coverage. Gone were the heavily biased news networks, and in came the objective news reporters, not trying to go completely against the government, but willing to print the truth and, if that did not garner ratings, willing to print the sensationalized stories. However, as the '70s came to an end and the '80s began the new influx of cable television and a rise in the number of network television news stations, the field of journalism became increasingly more competitive. This competition between journalists and networks that ensued within the 1980s led to increased journalists' attention to stories encompassing scandal and drama. The competitive journalistic market, coupled with President Reagan's loosening of government regulations on media, did no favors for ensuring the accountability of network television news. It was indeed during this last decade of the Cold War that a significant decline in the quality of American journalism began to take effect.[28]

The ending of the Cold War, the transfer of power from Mikhail Gorbachev to Boris Yeltsin, was an event unlike any in history. Never before had the images of such a large change in power been broadcast to so many nations at the time of its occurrence. Within hours almost all major nation's leaders had responded to the transfer of power on their own country's networks. The new innovations in technology and the many other changes in American television news that took place during the Cold War all led up to the moment Americans would be able to see within their own living rooms the leader of the Soviet Union stepping down from his position. The Cold War was over, and unlike ever before, every American

---

[28] Rick Musser, "The 1980s," History of American Journalism, December 2007, https://history-journalism.ku.edu/1980/1980.shtml.

was able to watch the war they had grown up in, been born in, and fought in, come to a whimpering end.

Bibliography

Bernhard, Nancy E. *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda, 1947-1960*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Chisem, James. "U.S. Propaganda and the Cultural Cold War." *E-International Relations*, 20 Aug. 2012, www.e-ir.info/2012/08/16/u-s-propaganda-and-the-cultural-cold-war/.

Cumings, Bruce. "Vietnam: A 'Television War?'." Essay. In *War and Television*, 83–102. New York, NY: Verso, 1992.

Davidson, David, and Judith Merril. *The Motorola Television Hour: Atomic Attack*1, no. 1-15. American Broadcasting Company, 1954.

Department of Defense, and Atomic Energy Commission. Broadcast. *Operation Ivy*, March 17, 1952.

Doherty, Thomas. *Cold War, Cool Medium: Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Mallett, Kerry. "Bias and Technology Changes in Television Coverage of War." *Lehigh Review* 22 (2014): 52–61. https://preserve.lehigh.edu/cas-lehighreview-vol-22/2.

McLaughlin, Greg. "From Luckless Tribe to Wireless Tribe: The Impact of Media Technologies on War Reporting." Essay. In *The War Correspondent*, 63–90. London: Pluto, 2016.

Musser, Rick. "The 1980s." History of American Journalism, December 2007. https://history-journalism.ku.edu/1980/1980.shtml.

Kratz, Jessie. "Vietnam: The First Television War." National Archives and Records Administration. National Archives and Records Administration, January 25, 2018. https://prologue.blogs.archives.gov/2018/01/25/vietnam-the-first-television-war/.

Red Channels: The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television. New York: Counterattack, 1950.

Stafford, Alexander. "The Role of the Media During the Cold War." *E-International Relations*, 27 Oct. 2013, www.e-ir.info/2013/10/26/the-role-of-the-media-during-the-cold-war/.

Steele, Bruce. "Korea: How the Korean War Changed the Way Military Conflicts Are Reported." *University of Pittsburgh: University Times*. June 22, 2000, 32 edition, sec. 21. https://www.utimes.pitt.edu/archives/?p=3014.

Truman, Harry S. Broadcast. *Former President Truman's Remarks in Response to Criticism by Herbert Brownnell in Regard to the Harry Dexter White Appointment*. Kansas City, MO: American Broadcasting Company, November 16, 1953.

Deemed Satisfactory: Government Perceptions of Nisei Soldiers after World War II

Adam Smedley

President Franklin D. Roosevelt endorsed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, which sanctioned the removal of 110,000 Japanese Americans from their homes throughout the west coast and subsequently interred them in concentration camps during World War II.[1] In Hawaii, where roughly one-third of the population was comprised of citizens of Japanese ancestry, Japanese Americans did not experience internment on the same scale as on the mainland. Roughly 1,200-1,800 Japanese Americans were interred in Hawaii, a mere fraction of the roughly 157,000 Japanese citizens that resided on the island chain. The war effort in Hawaii relied too heavily on laborers of Japanese ancestry to do without them.[2]

Due to the lack of enforcement of Executive Order 9066 in Hawaii, Hawaiian defense units were formed, including the Hawaii Territorial Guard (HTG) and the Victory Varsity Volunteers (VVV). Nearly one-half of the HTG and the entirety of the VVV were comprised of Nisei—second-generation Japanese Americans who were born on American soil.[3] These defense units served as precursors for the creation of the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, combat units composed entirely of Nisei soldiers with white officers. In addition to the combat units formed from Hawaiian Nisei, the United States Military

---

[1.] Greg Robinson, "War Relocation Authority," Densho Encyclopedia.

[2.] Franklin Odo, *No Sword to Bury: Japanese Americans in Hawaii* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003), 149.

[3.] Brian Niiya, "Japanese Americans in Military during World War II," Densho Encyclopedia.

Intelligence Service (MIS) opened a language school in San Francisco with the intent of training Japanese-English translators. Many of the school's candidates were Nisei, many of whom already spoke Japanese. This process initially began in the months before Pearl Harbor, but the MIS redoubled the effort after the United States declared war on Japan.[4] These Nisei soldiers serving in the MIS deployed to frontlines in the Pacific while the 100th and 442nd combat units served in the European Theatre. On both fronts of the war and in various capacities, Nisei soldiers served with distinction while fighting. With the United States' victory over Japan in 1945, the internment camps were closed, and citizens were released to return home. While white soldiers returned to jubilation and celebration, the Nisei soldiers encountered a skeptical, and oftentimes violent, homecoming reception from their communities.[5] In the months and years that followed, social stigmas and prejudice existed toward Japanese Americans, perpetuated by xenophobia, racism, and fear.

However, the Nisei's service played a direct role in acquiring civil liberties for Japanese Americans. The US government respected the Nisei for their military service in World War II superficially, but their actions ultimately betray this façade of acceptance and appreciation. This article acknowledges the current literature on the subject and then examines the pros and cons of the Nisei's combat roles, the government response to their service, the formation of the Nisei soldier stereotype, and how each of these aspects drastically influenced the US government's perception of Japanese Americans. Through this examination, one comes to understand that the Nisei's military service, both on the frontlines and in intelligence

---

[4.] Niiya, "Japanese Americans in Military."
[5.] Ellen D. Wu, "GI Joe Nisei: The Invention of World War II's Iconic Japanese American Soldier," in *Warring Over Valor: How Race and Gender Shaped American Military Heroism in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries*, ed. Simon Wendt (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2019), 44, https://muse-jhu-edu.libproxy.troy.edu/book/63183/.

capacities, proved crucial in obtaining more rights for the Japanese American community.

Scholars recognize the role the Nisei played in the acquisition of civil liberties. Franklin Odo stresses the importance of Nisei soldiers in World War II, saying, "More important, deploying nisei as combat troops had considerable significance in realigning official U.S. government practice with the constitutional values of racial equality."[6] In another work, Odo explains that the Nisei narrative, something he coins as "military heroism narrative," is one-sided. This concept about the Nisei soldiers focuses only on the positive aspects of service, while simultaneously ignoring the nuance of events and how that factored into their perception by the government.[7] Ellen Wu's analysis of events corroborates this view. Her research shows how the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) utilized this narrative extensively in their campaign for civil liberties, though it ultimately aided in establishing harmful stereotypes about Japanese Americans.[8] Wu's interpretation views the Nisei's service as a defense mechanism the United States government employed to deflect the idea that they were fighting a "race war" with Japan.[9]

Brenda Moore, in her findings, concludes military service helped individuals attain citizenship and employment, both facets inextricably tied to the government.[10] Much of the older literature in the field reflects

---

[6.] Odo, *No Sword to Bury*, 221.

[7.] Franklin Odo, "The Good War and Japanese America," *American Studies Journal*, no.59 (2015), https://DOI 10.18422/59-07.

[8.] Ellen D. Wu, *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 73, ProQuest Ebook Central.

[9.] Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 42.

[10.] Brenda L. Moore, *Serving Our Country: Japanese American Women in the Military During World War II* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 159-160.

the "military heroism" narrative previously mentioned. C. Douglas Sterner's text, while recently published, falls neatly into this category. His analysis focuses on the heroism and the emotional appeal of patriotism.[11] While much of the information he presents is valuable as a compilation of facts, his analysis and critiques are blatantly colored with hues of the "military heroism narrative" that Odo and Wu fiercely critique. Newer literature properly analyzes information in order to give a more complete, nuanced view of the Nisei soldier and his role in gaining Japanese American civil liberties. James C. McNaughton accurately depicts the immediate and some lasting effects the Nisei serving in the Pacific had on the U.S. His analysis provides context on how the government viewed these Nisei and their contributions.[12] Nisei servicemembers changed the view of the US government by fighting a war on two fronts: the battlefield and the home front. Understanding both is necessary to grasp the effects the Nisei servicemembers had on the perception of the United States government.

The first side of the Nisei soldier's contributions to changing the perceptions of the US government was their role in battlefield combat. FDR and government leaders formulated the creation of an all-Japanese American fighting unit (officers excluded) to utilize as a manner of combatting Japanese propaganda that accused the United States of racism.[13] Japan carried out a propaganda campaign citing America's ongoing racism as a cause of much of their expansion. Japan painted itself as a "racial liberator," and the Japanese American concentration camps

---

[11.] C. Douglas Sterner, *Go for Broke: The Nisei Warriors of World War II Who Conquered Germany, Japan, and American Bigotry* (Clearfield: American Legacy Historical Press, 2008), v-4.

[12.] James C. McNaughton, *Nisei Linguists: Japanese Americans in the Military Intelligence Service in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 2006), 457-461, WorldCat.

[13.] Niiya, "Japanese Americans in Military."

gave ample ammunition for their printing presses.[14] The US military formed the 100th Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team as their Nisei combat units. Both units were deployed to fight in the European front, starting in Africa, then Italy.[15] In response to their military achievements during the war, the US government awarded Nisei soldiers with military citations and medals for valor in combat. These achievements of the 100th and 442nd in Europe were widely publicized back home, an attempt by the US government to overshadow the atrocities of the Japanese internment camps.

Immediately after the war, the United States government wasted no time in exploiting the Nisei war heroes' combat records. Government officials and newspapers widely spread the stories of brave Nisei soldiers who fought for a brighter, better democracy despite the unfortunate events of the internment camps.[16] Harry S. Truman, the nation's president, perpetuated this propaganda campaign introduced by his predecessor. In his address during the citation ceremony for the 442nd, Harry S. Truman proclaimed, "You fought not only the enemy, but you fought prejudice— and you have won."[17] Undoubtedly, the public image of the nation needed to be maintained, at all costs. Parading the Nisei soldiers around as champions of democracy was a political move used to sidestep the issues of institutional racism and forced internment of thousands of innocents.

[14.] Odo, *No Sword to Bury*, 221-222.
[15.] Niiya, "Japanese Americans in Military."
[16.] Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 42-43.
[17.] Harry S. Truman, "Remarks Upon Presenting a Citation to a Nisei Regiment," Presentation, Presidential Awards Ceremony, Washington D.C., July 15th, 1946, Harry S. Truman Library and Museum, NARA. Accessed on June 20, 2021, https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/public-papers/170/remarks-upon-presenting-citation-nisei-regiment.

It is important to note that Nisei soldiers received thousands of decorations for their frontline combat in Europe. The 442nd and 100th "received some 4,000 Purple Hearts, 8 Presidential Unit Citations, 559 Silver Stars, and 52 Distinguished Service Crosses among many other decorations. In the immediate aftermath of the war, only one member of 442nd received the Medal of Honor, America's highest military honor."[18] In 2000, Bill Clinton awarded twenty-one Medals of Honor to Nisei soldiers.[19] The Medals of Honor, though awarded fifty-five years later, reinforce the US government's perception of the Nisei in the late '40s and early '50s. Medals of Honor are the pinnacle of military combat achievement. While the Nisei soldiers were awarded Purple Hearts, Presidential Unit Citations, and Silver Stars, they were not honored with the highest achievement, despite having met the qualifications for exemplary valor. The government under FDR and Truman saw the Nisei as good soldiers, but not white soldiers, and therefore undeserving of the highest display of gratitude the country can bestow. In a 2005 interview, veteran George Kiyomoto spoke about the difference in the government administrations and perceptions of Japanese Americans at the time. When asked about the 1988 Civil Liberties Act and the nation's reparations efforts and apology, he simply said, "Well, I think it was a good thing they did you know. The people that put them there weren't the one that was apologizing."[20] The government of the late 40s and early 50s did not apologize for the internment camps, nor the drafting of imprisoned men out of those camps. Indeed, they used the Nisei soldiers and their heroism

---

[18.] Niiya, "Japanese Americans in Military."

[19.] Odo, "The Good War."

[20.] George Kiyomoto, interview by Ralph Kumano, June 10, 2005, transcript, JACL-CCDC Japanese American Oral History Collection, California State University, Fresno, CA. http://digitalcollections.archives.csudh.edu/digital/collection/p16855coll4/id/111 96/rec/16.

as a tool to further their own narrative and goals. This reinforces the position of recent literature on the topic, which discusses a "counter-narrative" to the Nisei soldier image. Odo points out that these men, in many cases, were not model soldiers. The idealized version of the Nisei soldiers painted an inaccurate portrait of events that the government exploited. [21]

The Nisei's service in Europe created a standard by which the US government could tout its progressive democracy and acceptance of non-Caucasian races. The federal government superficially respected these men but became more interested in their accomplishments which fed into the greater narrative of the "Good War."[22] Regardless of the celebration and praise their president and their commanding officers lauded upon them, the soldiers returned home to less-than-welcoming communities. Discrimination remained and opinions about Japanese Americans and their allegiances varied. The 442nd and 100th proved themselves as war heroes, and the government quickly pushed the narrative to represent them as such. The general public proved not as willing to swallow that narrative, despite its increasing popularity in the press.[23]

However, Nisei soldiers did not only serve in all Nisei units in Europe and Africa. Many Nisei, those who volunteered to serve in the MIS, fought in mixed-race units on the frontlines of the Pacific theatre. The MIS began training Nisei linguists before the events of Pearl Harbor and continued with the training even after the declaration of Executive Order 9066. In an essay penned in 1987, Lt. Colonel Roy Takai confirmed that he and several others enlisted to serve well before the creation of the 442nd and 100th.

[21.] Odo, "The Good War."
[22.] Odo, "The Good War."
[23.] Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 43.

These soldiers served in MIS Language schools.[24] These linguists became Japanese interpreters that served on the frontline in the Pacific Theater.[25] They interrogated captured enemies, translated intercepted messages, and printed propaganda leaflets aimed at the Japanese adversary.[26] Due to the sensitive nature of intelligence and counterintelligence, the military classified many of these assignments and missions. As a result, the American public remained largely unaware of the Nisei's service in the Pacific.

Nevertheless, the government responded favorably toward the MIS Nisei soldiers that served in the Pacific. The government refrained from disclosing many of the exploits of the MIS Nisei to the public, a direct inverse of their treatment of the Nisei who served in Europe. However, the federal government showed respect in different ways. The War Department and the War Relocation Authority (the bureaucratic entity responsible for the internment of Japanese American citizens) actively petitioned for increased peace and assimilation on the West Coast. Using the MIS Nisei service as an example of fine patriotism, the War Department dispatched speakers up and down the west coast to smooth racial tensions and help reintegrate Japanese Americans.

[24.] Roy Takai, Nisei volunteers for the U.S. Army, essay, August 1987, Japanese American Archival Collection, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, California State University, Sacramento, CA, http://digitalcollections.archives.csudh.edu/digital/collection/p16855coll4/id/10725/rec/113.

[25.] Niiya, "Japanese Americans in Military."

[26.] Wallace H. Moore, "Nisei in Intelligence and Counterintelligence" (Address, San Francisco Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, CA, Friday, November 30, 1945. Gerth Archives and Special Collections Department, California State University, Dominguez Hills, CA.), http://digitalcollections.archives.csudh.edu/digital/collection/p16855coll4/id/27132/rec/22.

One of these speakers, Lieutenant Colonel Wallace H. Moore, was assigned to a sixty-day speaking tour along the West Coast where he addressed a variety of audiences about the Nisei service in the MIS.[27] In one of his addresses, Moore spoke to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco and admonished the citizens about their treatment of Japanese Americans. He stated his message in clear, unambiguous terms— "don't upset the applecart."[28] Lt. Col. Moore's speaking tour demonstrated the attitude the government had towards Nisei soldiers. The government would not tolerate violence or discrimination. Furthermore, Moore spoke at the Commonwealth Club of California. His audience consisted of high-ranking members of the community. The War Department, through speeches like Lt. Col. Moore's, targeted the leadership organizations of the community. This focus on leaders in the community delineated the War Department's desire for the local leadership to assume responsibility for the treatment of the Japanese Americans and to work towards changing it.

In addition to speaking tours like the one Lt. Col. Moore embarked on, high-ranking military officials made clear statements about the MIS Nisei effort in the Pacific. On September 2, 1945, Nisei soldiers aided in translating the official Japanese surrender aboard the *U.S.S. Missouri* to General MacArthur.[29] Military officials stated that Nisei's service in the Pacific not only shortened the war and saved countless lives and dollars, but had also proved indispensable in the occupation of Japan.[30] The federal government handled the Nisei service in the Pacific differently than how they handled the Nisei service in Europe and Africa. Yet, the push by the War Department and the War Relocation Authority to credit the Nisei for

---

[27.] Moore, "Nisei in Intelligence."
[28.] Moore, "Nisei in Intelligence."
[29.] Sterne, *Go for Broke*, 136-137.
[30.] McNaughton, *Nisei Linguists*, 460-461.

their contribution demonstrated the government's recognition of their service and a measure of gratitude.

Ellen D. Wu argues that this move by the federal government had a different agenda. She claims the government was using the exploits of the Nisei soldiers and the speaking tours as a means "to prime whites to welcome Japanese Americans as fellow patriots and future colleagues, neighbors, and friends."[31] The federal government, in a broad sense, did indeed want to broker peace and prosperity by tamping down racial tensions on the West Coast. The government directly utilized the exploits of the Nisei soldier to achieve, or attempt to achieve, this goal. This, however, does not consider the fact that many of these officers had served directly with the Nisei soldiers. Their accounts were not merely propaganda displays; these men genuinely believed the Nisei soldiers aided in helping end the war. Their conviction shows that beneath the propaganda campaign carried out by the Federal government, there were real people who were profoundly grateful for the Nisei's contribution to the war. In his interview, George Kiyomoto confirms that Caucasian and Nisei soldiers got along and held a mutual respect, saying, "And they took care of us you know the guys took care of us just like we were their buddies you know. And we appreciated that."[32] This camaraderie between Nisei soldiers and Caucasian officers and soldiers aided in challenging the skepticism and fear that many civilians had about Japanese Americans.

This propaganda campaign by the government went on to create a poster-boy image of the Nisei soldier—a stereotype. The Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) worked closely with the federal government using this narrative as a means to secure civil liberties. The JACL and the US government made this joint decision to help ease the

---

[31.] Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 42.
[32.] Kiyomoto, interview.

tensions of Japanese Americans in the concentration camps and to assuage the fears of the nation that their Japanese American neighbors were spies or collaborators.[33] The JACL wasted no time in utilizing the Nisei soldier image to push for rights. The JACL weaponized the Nisei soldier image, highlighting sacrifices and the battlefield victories won by the 442nd and 100th. The JACL successfully lobbied for Hawaii's statehood, Japanese naturalization, and eventually reparations by using the Nisei soldier image.[34] While the process to gain civil liberties was slow, the JACL did make considerable progress by utilizing the Nisei war hero narrative.

The JACL's decision to use the "military heroism" narrative paid off in some methods. While West Coast citizens differed in opinion and reaction to Japanese Americans and Nisei service, it became obvious that the Nisei service was beginning to open doors that had previously been shut. Franklin Odo uses higher education as a barometer to measure social change before and after the war. He notes how before the war, only a few Nisei had graduated from "prestigious universities." After the war, the Nisei utilized the G.I. Bill—a direct result of their military service—to gain a higher education in much larger numbers.[35] This movement of the Nisei into higher education produced community leaders who eventually went on to become national leaders. As a result, these veterans pushed the Civil Rights movement forward, not only for Japanese Americans but for Asian Americans as a whole. This uptick in diversity in local, state, and federal government resulted directly from the Nisei service. Veterans were able to use their veteran status to bypass barriers of entry into more prestigious fields, thus allowing them to have a larger democratic platform.

---

33. Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 41.

34. Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 45-46.

35. Odo, *No Sword to Bury*, 253.

The downside of the "military heroism" narrative is that it allowed the federal government to perpetuate the idea that human rights were tied directly to militarism. The US government and the JACL created an image that placed loyalty and obedience above liberty and justice. The Nisei soldier narrative supported the idea that citizenship and rights were linked to military service. Brenda Moore remarks upon this point in her book. She claims that citizenship carries a certain responsibility—a responsibility that often presents itself as military service.[36] This concept solidifies the idea that the US government had superficial respect for the Nisei and was willing to extend rights accordingly. However, those rights were ultimately contingent on military service, not upon any form of humanity. As such, the US deemed Nisei and Japanese American citizens deserving of rights due to their military service, not because they were human beings and American citizens. For all of the good the JACL did and tried to do during this period, they ultimately perpetuated this idea by hoisting aloft the propagandized, jingoistic Nisei soldier narrative. This Nisei soldier narrative, as a direct result, increasingly contributed to the idea of an obedient, loyal, and productive minority which came to be known as the "model minority" concept.[37] This incorrect and monolithic view of this culture brought its own set of problems, many of which persist to this day.

The Nisei soldier narrative stamped out other Japanese Americans who fought for rights and equality in other ways. Draft resisters spoke up from the concentration camps. The government silenced them with imprisonment. These resisters went on to fight court battles up to the Supreme Court. [38] However, the resisters focused on their rights as human beings and citizens. The JACL ignored these resisters in favor of the more

---

36. Moore, *Serving Our Country*, 159.
37. Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 46-48.
38. Odo, "The Good War."

politically palatable Nisei soldier propaganda. The US government buried the issue, as well, and focused on reintegration and resettlement of Japanese Americans returning from internment.[39] Lt. Colonel Roy Takai mentions these men in his essay and, though a career military man, acknowledges their bravery in standing up for their convictions. He criticizes the government for stripping these men of their freedoms and praises the resisters for their determination and beliefs.[40] These resisters have become the historical face of the "counternarrative" and budding literature about Japanese Americans in World War II.[41]

Nisei soldiers drastically affected how the government perceived Japanese Americans. The US government initially created the Nisei combat units as a way to combat foreign propaganda and the idea the US was engaged in a race war. The all-Nisei combat units from Hawaii, the 100th and 442nd, served with distinction in Europe and Africa. The military recognized them for their heroism and decorated them with citations, medals, and awards. Due to their success on the battlefield, the US bolstered their image and used a stereotyped version of the Nisei soldier to create an ideal version of the Japanese American citizen—loyal and brave, even in the face of prejudice. The MIS Nisei serving in the Pacific aided in bringing the war with Japan to a close. Serving as linguists, the MIS Nisei earned the respect of their commanding officers and fellow soldiers by fighting in mixed-race units. This helped ease racial tensions upon their return to America; the officers they had served under "went to bat" for them.

Vying for more liberties for the recently released internment survivors, the JACL utilized the growing popularity of the Nisei soldiers as a method to acquire more civil rights. The JACL used the "military

---

[39.] Wu, "GI Joe Nisei," 42.
[40.] Takai, Nisei volunteers for the U.S. Army.
[41.] Odo, "The Good War."

heroism" narrative as a major building block in their campaign for naturalization, Hawaiian statehood, and reparations for internment. This use of the Nisei soldier narrative, unfortunately, created a unilateral view of the Nisei soldiers, their service, and the Japanese American community as a whole. It overshadowed other attempts at gaining civil rights and helped grow and perpetuate the "model minority" myth about Japanese Americans.

The US government recognized the service of the Nisei soldiers and considered their service when the JACL pressed for more civil liberties. Though the process was not easy, the Nisei veterans used their service as a means to propel themselves into higher education and better careers, which aided in the fight for equality. The US government demonstrated a willingness to extend rights to Japanese Americans because of their perception of the Nisei soldiers. Ultimately, this extension of rights was predicated upon the military service of the Nisei. The government did not recognize the right of the citizens because of their humanity, but solely because of their contribution to winning the war. In effect, the government of the United States deemed the Nisei's service as satisfactory and extended basic human rights to the Japanese Americans as a result.

Bibliography

Kiyomoto, George. Oral History Interview with George Kiyomoto. Interview by Ralph Kumano. June 10, 2005. JACL-CCDC Japanese American Oral History Collection. California State University, Fresno, CA. http://digitalcollections.archives.csudh.edu/digital/collection/p16855 coll4/id/11196/rec/16.

McNaughton, James C. *Nisei Linguists: Japanese Americans in the Military Intelligence Service in World War II*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 2006. WorldCat.

Moore, Brenda L. *Serving Our Country: Japanese American Women in the Military During World War II*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2003. https://search-ebscohost-com.

Moore, Wallace H. "Nisei in Intelligence and Counterintelligence." Address, San Francisco Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, CA, Friday, November 30, 1945. Gerth Archives and Special Collections Department, California State University, Dominguez Hills, CA. Accessed June 25, 2021, http://digitalcollections.archives.csudh.edu/digital/collection/p16855 coll4/id/27132/rec/22.

Odo, Franklin. "The Good War and Japanese America." *American Studies Journal*, no.59 (2015). https://DOI 10.18422/59-07.

———. *No Sword to Bury: Japanese Americans in Hawaii*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003.

Niiya, Brian. "Japanese Americans in Military during World War II." Densho Encyclopedia, last updated January 25, 2021. https://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese_Americans_in_military_during_World_War_II/.

Robinson, Greg. "War Relocation Authority." Densho Encyclopedia, accessed on June 30, 2021. https://encyclopedia.densho.org/War%20Relocation%20Authority.

Sterner, C. Douglas. *Go for Broke: The Nisei Warriors of World War II Who Conquered Germany, Japan, and American Bigotry*. Clearfield: American Legacy Historical Press, 2008.

Takai, Roy. Nisei volunteers for the U.S. Army. Essay. August 1987. Japanese American Archival Collection. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, California State University, Sacramento, CA. http://digitalcollections.archives.csudh.edu/digital/collection/p16855coll4/id/10725/rec/113.

Truman, Harry S. "Remarks Upon Presenting a Citation to a Nisei Regiment." Presentation, Presidential Awards Ceremony, Washington D.C., July 15th, 1946. Harry S. Truman Library and Museum, NARA. Accessed on June 20, 2021, https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/public-papers/170/remarks-upon-presenting-citation-nisei-regiment.

Wu, Ellen D. *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013. ProQuest Ebook Central.

———. "GI Joe Nisei: The Invention of World War II's Iconic Japanese American Soldier." In *Warring Over Valor: How Race and Gender Shaped American Military Heroism in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries*, edited by Simon Wendt, 37-56. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2019. https://muse-jhu-edu.libproxy.troy.edu/book/63183/

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Social Gospel

Callie Wiggins

After centuries of slavery and then racial division, America in the twentieth century desperately needed a racial reckoning, which came in the form of the Civil Rights Movement. Martin Luther King, Jr., a young minister and theologian, rose to a position of power and influence to lead this movement, tackling the issue of racism through tactics that did not enjoy universal support, but proved to be incredibly effective. The most significant influence and motivation that shaped Dr. King's beliefs and actions stemmed from his own religion and faith in something greater. This theological base directed Dr. King as he developed the nonviolent direct-action tactics that shaped the Civil Rights Movement and began to chip away at racism and white supremacy.

Dr. King and his religiously influenced tactics to fight racism challenged a long history of racial division in the South. Slavery, one of the most exploitive and dehumanizing forms of economic gain, developed in the US into a race-based institution that relied on racial discrimination to justify its existence. Even after the passage of the 13th Amendment ended this dark institution, it left lingering effects including the dehumanization of an entire race of people. This ideology of white supremacy lengthened and justified slavery, and later entrenched the Jim Crow system of racial discrimination as well, Jim Crow proved even harder to get rid of than slavery itself, leading to the systematic racism that required forces such as the Civil Rights Movement to take it down.[1]

---

[1] "Religion and the US South," *Southern Spaces,* last updated Fall 2015, https://southernspaces.org/2004/religion-and-us-south/.

Ironically, the racism that flourished in the US developed right alongside the great revivals of Christianity, a religion that primarily instructs its followers to love their neighbors. Evangelical Protestantism succeeded particularly well in the south, despite being countercultural with its acceptance of all, including enslaved Americans. Many Christian abolitionists even arose from this group and placed tension on Christian slave owners, spreading the then radical belief that dehumanizing someone because of their color was immoral and sinful, and that slaves were brothers and sisters in Christ. Enslavers in turn searched for a defense for their actions. Their main argument claimed that abolitions had a simple "misinterpretation" of what the Bible was saying, and there was nothing immoral or ungodly at all about keeping slaves.[2] Despite the weakness of their arguments, to continue their growth, some Evangelicals would have to abandon their abolitionist mindset and merge with the already established white southern culture.[3] Even following the abolition of slavery, these white churches in the South stayed primarily segregated and still based their theology on these justifications of slavery and racial division. The idea that African Americans were not worthy of worshipping and learning about the same God as whites provides robust evidence of how deep white supremacy was weaved into society.[4]

The Civil Rights Movement ultimately developed to challenge white supremacy and remove these great immoralities occurring all throughout the United States. The vast mistreatment of African Americans had reached a level that required special attention and action. Montgomery,

---

[2] Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967), 72-73.

[3] Nathan Andersen, "Slave Systems of the Old Testament and the American South: A Study in Contrasts," *Studia Antiqua* 3, no. 1 (2003): 63.
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1146&context=studi aantiqua

[4] "Religion and the US South"

Alabama, the first capital of the confederacy with a long legacy of institutional slavery, and longtime endorsement of Jim Crow, became a hotspot and breeding ground for white supremacists, but also contained a large and wearied, but determined African American population.[5] With the arrest of Rosa Parks after refusing to give up her bus seat in 1955 to a white man, the city was on fire for change. The Montgomery Bus Boycott drew nationwide attention to the harm of segregation. Looking for a passionate and determined leader, Montgomery leaders landed on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. A fairly new arrival from Atlanta ministering at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, Dr. King's popularity had quickly grown.[6] His methods did not encourage African Americans to treat their enemies with violence, but instead expanded the tradition and philosophy of nonviolent direct action in the Black community. In fact, his speeches not only discouraged violent responses but also encouraged African Americans to love their enemies. Even after the bombing of his home, Dr. King's efforts to remain nonviolent were unwavering. Dr. King's early success with the Montgomery Bus Boycott exemplified the effectiveness of his philosophy when the Supreme Court affirmed in the Browder v. Gayle decision that segregation bus laws were unconstitutional.[7] This Civil Rights battle firmly placed Dr. King on his pathway as a nationally known Civil Rights leader.

Dr. King's background helped him develop his later tactics and beliefs. Born in Atlanta, Georgia, Martin Luther King, Jr. followed his father and grandfather into a career in ministry. During his education in Sociology at Morehouse College, he encountered professor and social

---

[5] Troy Jackson, *Becoming King: Martin Luther King Jr. and the Making of a National Leader* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2008), 53-83.
[6] Jackson, *Becoming King,* 85-94.
[7] Civil Rights History Project Collection, Archive of Folk Culture (Washington D.C.: American Folklife Center).

gospel activist, Benjamin Mays.[8] Mays was responsible for providing much of Dr. King's knowledge on Civil Rights issues and understanding of tactics that allowed activists to pursue change in way that aligned with Christian values. He continued his education at Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania where he further developed his knowledge and faith in this active and practical form of Christianity. While pursuing his masters, Martin developed the mission behind his ministry, "The Gospel I Will Preach to the World." The social gospel, as it was more commonly known, was the true structure of this faith that Dr. King developed. It was practical Christianity, activism modeled primarily after the early church with the aim of correcting social injustices in society. Taking on the role of a social gospel activist he insisted on working towards a warless world with a better distribution of wealth and friendship that transcended race and color. He focused not only on spiritual well-being but also on material well-being, and strongly believed that social problems were moral problems as well, including Civil Rights issues.[9] These ideas, beliefs, and tactics continued to develop as he simultaneously attended Boston College for his doctorate and then accepted his first position as pastor at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery at the age of 25. [10]

Dr. King's speeches and sermons demonstrated the fundamental virtues that informed his beliefs and Civil Rights Movement tactics. One of these key virtues is love. During his time at Crozer and Boston College, Dr. King spent much of his studying and writing on the definition of love. He discovered that there were three definitions of love given by the Greeks: eros, philia, and agape. Eros is love that is romantic, philia is

---

[8] "Martin Luther King, Jr.," Britannica, last modified September 2, 2021, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Martin-Luther-King-Jr
[9] "Social Gospel," The Martin Luther King, Jr., Research and Education Institute (Stanford University, June 5, 2018), https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/social-gospel.
[10] Jackson, *Becoming King,* 35-36.

friendship love, and agape is love that is unconditional and is not given for the return of anything. This agape love is the love that God the Father has for his children, and it is an irredeemable love that surpasses all understanding. This is the love that Dr. King repeatedly urged his followers to hold towards those that they encountered who were against them. He acknowledged the fact that it makes little sense to try and like these people but argued that African Americans can do so much more by simply loving them with Agape love, Christ's love living inside them. For many people, this idea seemed alarmingly contrary to human nature, but while Dr. King's ideas seemed radical and countercultural to some to him, they expressed the true meaning of the Gospel, while also offering the best, and most moral opportunity for societal change.[11]

Throughout the Civil Rights Movement, King frequently returned to this idea of changing society through radical love. Celebrating the second anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation, Dr. King delivered a sermon titled "Death of Evil Upon the Seashore." In this message he clearly expressed his views on countering the white oppressors through love:

> Let us not despair. Let us not lose faith in man and certainly not in God. We must believe that a prejudiced mind can be changed, and that man, by the grace of God, can be lifted from the valley of hate to the high mountain of love. Let us remember that as we struggle against Egypt, we must have love, compassion and understanding goodwill for those against whom we struggle, helping them to realize that as we seek to defeat the evils of Egypt, we are not seeking to defeat them but to help them, as well as ourselves.[12]

Throughout this entire sermon, Dr. King encouraged his followers that the battle they faced was against good and evil, and that good will

---

[11] John J. Ansbro, *Martin Luther King, Jr.: The Making of a Mind* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books,1982), 8-9.

[12] Martin Luther King, Jr., *The Papers of Martin Luther King, JR.* Vol. 3, *Birth of a New Age, 1955-1956* (Berkely: University of California Press, 1984), 261.

always triumph. King encouraged his followers to continue to have faith in man and in God, because of this idea of love prejudiced-minded people can truly be changed. This idea remained constant in all of Dr. King's actions, and his philosophy of nonviolence developed as a direct result of this belief in love.

Dr. King imagined nonviolence to be possible and effective through this idea of Agape love. Dr. King strongly rejected violence, instead lingering heavily on the Biblical message of "turn the other cheek," which he deeply tied to the Agape love and loving without anything in return. In his book "Where Do We Go from Here?" Dr. King insisted that violence was the "antithesis of creativity and wholeness." He argued that violence intensified fears of the white people and left them feeling less guilty about their prejudice. He consistently argued that by being violent, the oppressed also become bitter like their oppressor.[13] As seen in his "I Have a Dream" speech, in which Dr. King encouraged those listening not to "satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred." Nonviolence then became the most successful option for change.[14]

While Dr. King's faith in the success of nonviolence stemmed from other sources such as Gandhi, Christianity remained the heart of his faith in nonviolence. Reminding his followers of the scripture Matthew 26:52, he insisted that "living by the sword you will perish by the sword." To Dr. King, participating and reacting with violence only in the end resulted in death by violence. Again, Dr. King kept with his social gospel and his envisioning of a warless world. Violence was not the answer.[15]

---

[13] King, *Where Do We Go from Here?* 61.
[14] Clayborne Carson and Kris Shepard, eds., *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King* (New York: Warner Books, 2001), 43.
[15] King, *The Papers,* 305.

Dr. King, with the use of nonviolent resistance based on his faith, was incredibly successful in his efforts for the Civil Rights Movement. The Montgomery Bus Boycott represents one of the first large-scale successes based on protestors' use of nonviolence, in part because some Christian whites found it harder to oppress a group of people who were so adamantly living Christ-like lives, and who even in their efforts for change were able to grip tightly to the idea of nonviolence and treat their oppressors with love.

In addition to love, justice was another important theme that Dr. King concentrated on for his cause. To Dr. King, white men were not the problem but were instead part of a larger battle between injustice and justice, evil and good forces. In his letter from a Birmingham jail, Dr. King utters the famous quote that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Through this letter, he made it adamantly clear that injustice was occurring. Defending his breaking of the law, Dr. King insisted that any law that is not of the law of God is an "unjust law." He went on to define what an unjust law is, in his definition, he states that "any law that degrades human personality is an unjust law."[16] Dr. King believed that God's law was just and therefore the laws that existed in America that contradicted that were to be defeated. He strongly believed that a victory in the Civil Rights Movement was a victory for justice in the law.

Dr. King was also an American at heart and relied heavily on his faith in democracy, as well as his belief in love and justice.[17] He repeatedly urged his followers to trust that justice will prevail in a democracy. In one of his addresses to the Montgomery Improvement Association, he

---

[16] "Susi Letter from Birmingham Jail - Home – CSU, Chico," Letter from Birmingham Jail (The Atlantic Monthly), accessed March 30, 2022, https://www.csuchico.edu/iege/_assets/documents/susi-letter-from-birmingham-jail.pdf.
[17] King, *The Papers,* 200.

repeatedly urged his followers on this conviction, "We are here also because of our love for democracy, because of our deep-seated belief that democracy transformed from thin paper to thick action is the greatest form of government on earth." He believed that change must go in a written law to be lasting. These practical tactics, such as nonviolence and changing laws brought together his Christian beliefs in love, justice, and democracy. In his first major speech at Holt Creek Baptist Church for the MIA, Dr. King ties these concepts together, encouraging the attendees to understand that "Justice is really love in calculation. Justice is love correcting that which revolts against love."[18] His mission never failed to embody his core beliefs about the Christian idea of love.

While King's values of love, justice, and democracy shaped his actions, his foundation in Christianity most clearly emerges in his dependency on divine intervention for his mission. To King, his cause was not just his cause, but it was a divine one, in which he believed God was intervening in. On one occasion he spoke about his lack of strength after being arrested during the Montgomery Bus Boycott. He was honest about how depleted and afraid he felt, but then he recalled his prayer's immediate effect, explaining that "I experienced the presence of the Divine as I had never experienced Him before."[19] This personal revelation convinced King that God was using him for this movement. Much of his belief and strength thus came from the idea that this movement was God-ordained, and the Divine was intervening. During one of his addresses to the MIA Dr. King furthermore assures listeners of this divine intervention, "this is a spiritual movement, and we are depending on moral and spiritual forces. That is the only weapon we have."[20] King had no doubt that God was with

---

[18] King, *The Papers,* 71-79.
[19] Ansbro, *The Making of a Mind, 52-53*.
[20] King, *The Papers*, 200.

this movement, a belief that resulted in his constant encouragement to persevere with the foundation rooted in Biblical truth.

As the movement persisted Dr. King faced opposition from both sides for his approach to an unchanging society. Even with the Civil Rights Movement, more groups began to develop that contradicted King's core beliefs including the Black Power Movement. King recalled times in marches where protestors, after being beaten and oppressed, would react in violence. Dr. King understood the frustration of these activists but urged them to see the long-term effects of what they were doing, and discouraged any ideas of separation into these different movement factions. His vision of unity remained based in his Christian values, even as other parts of the movement evolved in other directions. Some groups like the "Back to Africa Movement" or the "Gospel of Separatism" contradicted parts of King's message, to King not wanting to include white people in the movement defeated the purpose. He believed instead in equality for all and hope for the white man. Acting as if white people were a lost cause was detrimental to the movement all together.[21] Because of his Christianity, Dr. King continued to strongly believe that white people were redeemable, and the nation would be able to live equally together one day, despite the growth of different views in the larger Civil Rights Movement.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., undoubtedly made an enormous impact on many people and on the Civil Rights Movement. Whether sitting in the sanctuary at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, rallying in the streets of Montgomery, or on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C., Dr. King's strong passion undeniably moved and inspired many Americans. While the Civil Rights Movements was not a single man job, King deserves major credit for the impact of his dedication to his mission of the social gospel accompanied with his passionate oratorical skills. He

---

[21] Ansbro, *The Making of a Mind,* 204-205, 220-221.

used this to motivate an entire nation to break down years of segregation and unjustified discrimination towards an entire race of people. Dr. King's religion played a powerful role in the impact that he made. Without his faith in divine intervention in the movement, tightly intertwined with his value of Agape, philosophy of nonviolence, and emphasis on justice and freedom, Dr. King might have never been able to move a great population of Christian white southerners to realize their denial of practical Christian values. Dr. King's dismantling of the hold that racism had on white Christianity was key to breaking down decades of segregation and resulting in an increasingly more inclusive and welcoming South to all.

Bibliography

Andersen, Nathan. "Slave Systems of the Old Testament and the American South: A Study in Contrasts." *Studia Antiqua* 3, no. 1 (2003). https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1146&context=studiaantiqua

Ansbro, John J. *Martin Luther King, Jr.: The Making of a Mind.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1982.

Carson, Clayborne, and Kris Shepard, ed., *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Warner Books, 2001.

Carson, Clayborne. "Martin Luther King, Jr." *Britannica*. Last updated September 2, 2021. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Martin-Luther-King-Jr

Civil Rights History Project Collection, Archive of Folk Culture, American Folklife Center, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Goldfield, David R. *Black, White, and Southern: Race Relations and Southern Culture.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.

Jackson, Troy. *Becoming King: Martin Luther King Jr. and the Making of a National Leader.* Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 2008.

King, Martin Luther. "Susi Letter from Birmingham Jail - Home – CSU, Chico." Letter from Birmingham Jail. The Atlantic Monthly. Accessed March 30, 2022. https://www.csuchico.edu/iege/_assets/documents/susi-letter-from-birmingham-jail.pdf.

King, Jr., Martin Luther. *The Papers of Martin Luther King, JR.* Vol. 3, *Birth of a New Age, 1955-1956.* Edited by Clayborne Carson. Berkely: University of California Press, 1984.

King, Jr., Martin Luther. *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?* New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.

Smithsonian American Art Museum. "Jim Crow South." *American Experience. A*ccessed November 22, 2021. https://americanexperience.si.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/the-jim-crow-south.pdf.

"Social Gospel." The Martin Luther King, Jr., Research and Education Institute. Stanford University, June 5, 2018. https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/social-gospel.

Wilson, Charles R. "Religion and the US South." *Southern Spaces*. Last updated 2015. https://southernspaces.org/2004/religion-and-us-south/.

The Legacy of Self-Made Men

Carl Pratt

American society has long been enamored by the idea of one pulling oneself up by the bootstraps—the sought-after rags to riches story. Since people first began colonizing North America, individuals have fought for the chance to make *something* of themselves, taking incredible odds at the mere possibility of fame, fortune, and power. For those like Benjamin Franklin, the chance to move from lower middle class to timeless political figure was made through calculated risk and happened consciously. For others, born into the lowest status a human being can, enslaved like Olaudah Equiano, operating on his own merit and luck became a survival mechanism. Both men left a legacy of hard work, determination, and beating impossible odds to create a life worth reading about—regardless of embellishment, their legacies have left them perceived as self-made men. The perceptions of their lives are more important now than the actual lives they lived, since their autobiographies are what has a continuing impact today. *Even if* the Equiano and Franklin they wrote themselves to be are fabricated, their lasting impact as self-made are real, and the lessons they impose are valid.

Equiano had an insurmountable task when he wrote his narrative. Not only did he have to assure his audience that he was self-made, but he also had to convince them that he was even a man. The entire point of his narrative, as he put it, was not for "immortality or literary reputation... [but to] in the smallest degree promote the interests of humanity."[1] As a black man in the eighteenth century, sold (or born) into slavery, he would have

---

[1] Olaudah Equiano, *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African, Written by Himself* (reprinted, 2019), 1.

been immediately dehumanized, seen only in terms of the labor he could produce. Throughout his narrative, he told stories of enslavement and travelling under various people, in many unusual parts of the world. Equiano made sure the reader understood how much luck came into play, stating "I thought whatever fate had determined must come to pass; and therefore, if ever it were my lot to be freed, nothing could prevent me."[2] He spoke about the will of God, and how he, as a Christian, would know that Christian love would never allow for the brutality of the slave trade. Throughout his narrative, he included tiny details to humanize himself and everyone enslaved, and to build compassion and a sense of connection between the upper-class white audience and enslaved black Africans. Even if his narrative was not the exact truth, or was a polished version of events, the persona he created and the effect of said persona are what leaves Equiano as a self-made man. The fact that he was able to write a narrative compelling enough to alter British policy on the slave trade makes him worthy of being described as self-made, even if his narrative was woven with embellishments and half-truth.

Where there is some plausible deniability about Equiano's self-awareness surrounding his fame, Benjamin Franklin knew he was a star, and wrote his memoir accordingly. Where Equiano wrote that he does not seek fame or fortune in writing his book, and explicitly stated that he wrote for others, Benjamin Franklin admitted that he was "willing to 'suppress' publication if so advised",[3] specifically so he could fabricate his public image perfectly. Franklin wrote mostly for himself, using his autobiography to connect with his future family, in the same way he found himself bound to his own ancestors. Throughout his autobiography, he built his persona, describing himself not as just one profession, or even just as one person. During his life, he made up names for his different

---

[2] Equiano, 43-44.
[3] Benjamin Franklin and Louis P. Masur, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin: With Related Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016), 14.

writings, going by Benjamin Franklin sometimes, or Poor Richard Saunders, or quite a few others, quite literally becoming a "self-made" man. By creating different personas, and taking on different characters throughout his life, he made his own self-images, and when finally revealed to be Franklin, only added to his character. By switching professions, switching names, allowing himself to experiment with inventions, politics, and poetry anonymously, he gave himself the necessary space to create without fear of judgement and to accept what went well without the public scrutiny for what failed.

Franklin described the many travels, political battles, writings, and struggles he faced as he navigated through his life. However, the entire memoir is clouded with an air of self-approval, and smugness absent from Equiano's work. Where Equiano accepted that God's will, and luck, played a key role in building him as a self-made man, Franklin took most of the credit. For example, when describing how he skipped multiple grades in school, he did not say that perhaps he was born with a gift, or that he had been lucky to have had a family that emphasized education— no, Franklin did not allow for fate to decide anything—everything he created was a product of his own ingenuity and genius, and his autobiography was his way of showing it to future audiences.[4] This falls into the American myth of relying on oneself alone, with no outside help or support. Franklin did exactly that, and through his many stories, highlighted that. Because of how well-manicured the public's knowledge of Franklin was, and continues to be, it does not matter if he was "really" a self-made man. He is perceived, in a similar fashion to Equiano, to be a self-made man, so the character that is Benjamin Franklin simply is one.

Though Franklin leaned more heavily into vanity than Equiano, both recognized their vanity to a certain degree. Franklin went through periods

---

[4] Franklin, 42.

of self-assured arrogance that ended with his own description as to why vanity was a fatal flaw, and why humility was the most important trait in a person, going as far as to shame his wife for buying silver. Equiano, pandering to the upper-class whites of Britain, could not afford to come across as disrespectful or disdainful, and was careful to appear almost pleading, begging his audience to relate to and have compassion for his humanity. Both works are extremely calculated, tailored to who they anticipate will be reading them. For Franklin, he himself wanted to read his life's events, and to connect with his future kin, so he wrote as if talking to a friend. Equiano knew his audience too and adjusted his writing style accordingly. By reading both narratives, one has a better understanding of two vastly different aspects of the eighteenth century and can better grasp the age-old idea of what it means to be self-made.

There are, however, many differences between the two. Equiano wrote to solve a specific problem: slavery. Franklin seemed to write for his own entertainment. He threw in a few lines here and there about wanting the memoir to help future generations, and while that may be true, having been regarded "as well known as the moon"[5] likely contributed to an inflated ego. The audience for each narrative was extremely different. Where Franklin tailored his autobiography to "fix" past mistakes and examine what he would have done differently (which was not much, according to him!), Equiano actively anticipated and prepared for public scrutiny and backlash. Because of this, the style and tone of each is vastly different, catering to the needs of the anticipated audience. When it comes down to it, Equiano wrote to humanize a brutalized group of people, and Franklin wrote because he felt important, and wanted to spread the message that any lowly person could become an important cultural and political figurehead, even without a revolution or general upheaval of the time. Where Equiano wrote to correct the wrongs he had seen throughout

---

[5] Franklin, 11.

his life, Franklin wrote to cement himself as the cultural icon he is today through spreading messages about frugality, hard work, and self-reliance.

Neither of the narratives were the complete and accurate truth, and that is permissible. Their embellishments add to the characters they were manicuring, which is more important than the truth. Their public image as self-made was more important than exposing the half-truths and exaggerations propping said image up. It matters not whether they were *actually* self-made, but what people perceived them to be, and the ramifications of how the public perceived them. They were able to procure an image of self-sufficiency and were able to use that for their own means, whether it meant Equiano helping end the slave trade in Britain, or Franklin's shiploads of silk and china. The public did, and continues, to look at these men as all-American examples of drive and willpower, and even if that is not the whole truth, they live on as self-made. Even if the actual people themselves were not self-made, the images they created and decorated for the public absolutely were, and those facades have merit on their own.

Bibliography

Equiano, Olaudah. *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African, Written by Himself*. Reprinted, 2019.

Franklin, Benjamin, and Louis P. Masur. *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin: With Related Documents.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016.

Book Review

Hilary Green, *Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865-1890* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016).

By Justin McPherson

The topic of African American education in the American South has received a great deal of scholarship. Countless works have been dedicated to examining the South's obstruction of *Brown v. Board of Education*, many of which study the continued impact that obstructionism had on the education system. Fewer authors focus on the initial gains of African Americans in the field of education. *Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865-1890*, examines the first twenty years of African American work in state funded education. By looking at this period, the book attempts to fill the gap in academic material on the earliest struggles for quality in schools. The author, Dr. Hilary N. Green, is a professor and historian at the University of Alabama. She has done other work on the time period, as well as the African American experience during that time. Dr. Green's primary research interests are "…race, class, and gender in African American history, the American Civil War, Reconstruction, Civil War Memory, the US South, 19th Century America, and the Black Atlantic."[1] She works as an Associate Professor of History in the Department of Gender and Race Studies and serves as the co-program director of the African American Studies program at the University of Alabama.

---

[1] Dr. Hilary N. Green, *Dr. Green – About Me:* https://hgreen.people.ua.edu/

Green uses the title of the book, "Educational Reconstruction," as a term to discuss the process as well as the period the book covers. The term can best be compared to other historical terminology such as Congressional Reconstruction. "Educational Reconstruction" effectively summarizes the 1865 to 1890 period beginning with the end of the Civil War and concluding with the lifespan, through its failure to pass, of the Blair Education Bill. If passed, the proposed bill would have secured federal funding for public education. The bill was passed by the Senate on three separate occasions and was endorsed by the President. Despite its early success, it died in the House of Representatives each time resulting in a failure to secure federal funding for the new system of public education.

Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865-1890 asks the question: "how did urban African Americans and their supporters create, develop, and sustain a system of education during the transition from slavery to freedom?"[2] Green focuses on two southern cities, Richmond, Virginia, and Mobile, Alabama, to narrow the focus and draw a comparison between education and the very idea of emancipation. Southern Black citizens viewed education as the means to upward mobility and the ability to take full benefit of their freedom. In Richmond and Mobile, Black citizens rallied around the schoolhouse as a beacon of freedom. These citizens stood as defenders of the concepts of free public education in the face of all challengers. Green frames this defense as the first step in a community identity as well as the training ground for the education-based challenges that came after.

The book is divided into four sections as well as an epilogue that expands further the initial question. Green begins each of these sections with a chapter that discusses the progress in Richmond and concludes each

---

[2] Green, *Educational Reconstruction,* 11.

with a comparative analysis as to the progress in Mobile. Green compiled primary sources from the time period to analyze activists' progress and communities' opinions of that progress. Primary sources range from newspapers, speeches, letters between people directly and indirectly involved, as well as the records taken from the religious and secular outreach groups that operated during the time. The outreach group records were extremely common in Richmond. Green attributes this to the desire of northern outreach groups to convert the formal confederate capital city into a bastion of advancement. Green notes that when charities and outreach groups reached Richmond the work had started without them.

It is one of the key assumptions of the book that the Black community saw education as a way of legitimizing and protecting their community. This point is argued using primary source documents that discuss the goal of creating an educated citizenry as well as a middle-class cadre capable of self-advocating and using electoralism and more social means to achieve their goals. The white community of Richmond at large was against the education of African Americans. They also resented the growing number of black education professionals fighting for teaching and administration positions in African American schools. Green discusses this at length as positions in African American schools were commonly given to white educators that failed to pass requirements to teach in white schools. While there was some success as a result of these struggles, and Black schools saw both Black teachers and Black principles, schools reverted to their previous habits following the Democratic rise to power after Reconstruction. Ultimately, the violence and arson in Mobile was not found Richmond. The book claims that this is because the Whites in Richmond were primarily concerned with getting Northerners out. Violence would only encourage them to stay.

The expectations in Mobile were different, because their diversity was an added layer to the obvious difficulties of building an education

system in the Deep South. Mobile's Creole population benefitted from the Adams–Onís Treaty, which meant that any African American in Alabama claiming French ancestry would be treated and counted as full citizens. This created a large divide between the experiences of Creole and non-Creole Mobilians of color. The Creole population, sometimes referred to as the "Treaty Population," did not see their education restricted even after the Nat Turner Rebellion led to stricter laws about education in the Black community. Green claims that the division led the Creole population to desire a place in the Antebellum South's racial hierarchy. While this was a barrier, the white population's indiscriminate discrimination forged an alliance that led to the advancement of public education. The white community utilized violence in an attempt to intimidate the communities of color in Mobile, but it instead served as an issue that united the communities of color. It is important to note, as Green did, that Mobilians gathered as soon as they were able and were not lacking for purpose. One of the most powerful images the book conjures is that of the Black community of Mobile gathering in 1865. Just eleven days after Confederate Troops had surrendered the city the community sang out: "Free workmen in the cotton-field, And in the sugar cane; Free children in the common school, With nevermore a chain. Then rally, Black Republicans— Aye, rally! We are free! We've waited long to sing the song— The song of liberty."[3] Unfortunately, Mobile saw many advancements counteracted as Reconstruction ended and troops were removed. Green draws blame to the lack of unity as well as the indifference or, in some cases, obstruction from the Alabama state government.

The scope of Green's analysis opens at the epilogue of the book. This section is dedicated to the Blair Education Bill. Green claims that the death of this bill marks the end of the Educational Reconstruction period. The book also examines the differences in opinions that led to the defeat of the

---

[3] Green, *Educational Reconstruction*, 65.

bill. Green points to the success of the Black community as the first aspect that led to defeat. In the epilogue, Green offers the success of black education as leading to the cooling off of northern resolve. With the school systems having made their achievements, white Northerners grew less concerned with the continuing support. Additionally, white supporters took what Green calls a "convenient off ramp," by aligning themselves with the Booker T. Washington philosophy. This philosophy was not widely supported by the Richmond or Mobile communities, as it focused more on industrial training than higher levels of education. The support that the cities were used to receiving was reallocated from a primarily liberal arts education to an industrial one. Green also notes the loss of support from Blair himself. W. E. B. Du Bois and other prominent members of the civil rights movement lamented the huge setbacks to the movement caused by these developments. After explaining these developments, Dr. Green holds to the book's central themes writing: "As race relations worsened, education–activists and other middle-class reformers were essential in preparing a new generation for future challenges and social mobility, advocating on behalf of the less-educated African Americans, and promoting a vision of freedom, citizenship, and equality still centered on education. They firmly felt that education remained the best vehicle."[4] Ultimately, Educational Reconstruction failed for the same reason many other movements fail: the Republican legislature in Congress was unable to force legislation to support the Black electorate. By the 1890s, the progressive plans had been fully abandoned by the Republican party at large, as many viewed the progress as good enough, and others did not care enough to have an opinion.

This book attempts to answer the question, "how did urban African Americans and their supporters create, develop, and sustain a system of

---

[4] Green, *Educational Reconstruction,* 322.

education during the transition slavery to freedom?"[5] Green effectively answers that question with in-depth primary sources and analysis of postwar urban cities Richmond and Mobile. By doing this, Dr. Green provides a histography of an era that has limited academic work written about it, effectively chronicling advancements in public school education as well as the role the federal government plays in it. A valuable feature of this work is the way it places much of the emphasis on the communities of color. Much written paints this era of education as white Northerners teaching hopeless communities the basic concepts of literacy. Green dissolves this myth by drawing on primary sources of the Freedmen's Bureau. These show a community that was willing and prepared to take charge of their own education. If there is a second focus of this work, it is to show how newly emancipated free communities saw education as a tool to establishing themselves and protecting their futures. With *Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865-1890*, Green successfully shows the flawed government actions and the resilience of the communities in the process of becoming equal citizens.

---

[5] Green, *Educational Reconstruction,* 11.

Bibliography

Green, Hillary. *Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865–1890.* New York City*:* Fordham University Press, 2016.

Harvey, Gordon. *"*Public Education During the Civil War and Reconstruction Era." In *Encyclopedia of Alabama*. http://encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-2600.

Butchart, Ronald. "Freedmen's Education in Virginia, 1861–1870." In *Encyclopedia Virginia*. https://encyclopediavirginia.org/entries/freedmens-education-in-virginia-1861-1870.

Former *Alexandrian* Authors

Beginning with the 2021 volume, the *Alexandrian* includes updates on past contributors and student editors. Each year we will highlight alumni whose work appeared in the *Alexandrian* to find out what they have been up to since graduation.

This year, we catch up with Abena Adaboh, whose article "The Conflict between Medical Science, Public Health, and the Antivaccination Movement in Nineteenth Century England," was published in the 2018 issue. Ms. Adaboh graduated that same year with a bachelors in Biomedical Science and her minor in Philosophy and Religion. She is currently attending medical school at UCLA.

Abena Adaboh, BS, MS

I completed my article for *The Alexandrian* only months before graduating from Troy University. Four years later, I look back on this experience as one of my most immersive scholarly activities from college. Like many Biomedical Science students, I spent more time mechanically memorizing facts than reflecting on their real-world application. When this order was flipped in graduate school, the research and analytical writing skills I practiced while working on my piece for *The Alexandrian* contributed to my early success. Moreover, I have been able to apply the insights I gleaned from delving into the beginnings of the antivaccine movement in England to my understanding of the present controversies surrounding vaccination.

Since graduating from Troy, I have obtained a master's in Medical Microbiology and Immunology from Creighton University and enrolled in medical school at University of California Los Angeles. I am currently leaning towards an internal medicine sub-specialty like cardiology or infectious disease, but only time will tell where I end up.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Karen Ross for sparking my interest in history and encouraging me to write for *The Alexandrian.* I hope more students from non-humanities backgrounds take advantage of the amazing opportunity that Troy University's history department offers to incisively explore different historical topics and get published.

Current Faculty Research

The *Alexandrian* regularly features articles and book reviews from students along with news from the staff. This year, we wanted to include what the faculty was up to research-wise. Joshua Dawsey and Mykaila Baker interviewed faculty around the History and Philosophy Department, learning what our professors were currently researching in their fields.

We asked three questions: what project are you working on? Where did your interest in this topic stem from? Have you learned any lessons, whether methodological or personal?

Here are their answers:

Dr. Buckner

I'm working on a book project about a free man of color named William Johnson in Mississippi, who was a barber and a slaveholder and probably the second richest black man in the state until 1851.

It's mostly about how he uses masculine identities of this time to make connections to his communities. Even though he was free, there were limitations under Mississippi law because of his race: he couldn't vote, he couldn't hold office, serve on juries, etc. So, he's not equal to white men but is able to establish a reputation in town through his barbershop (a profession that serves white clients), but also through other activities that men valued: gambling, hunting, fishing, even civic engagement, and politics to a degree.

Eventually, he got into a dispute with his neighbor, a man with a nebulous racial background (sometimes he was considered white, other times he's thought of as black). While the courts handled the dispute, the neighbor took the loss as an assault on his reputation and murdered Johnson. He never offered a defense for the murder; instead, he claimed

that he was white, meaning none of the evidence against him could be used in court. He escaped the murder charge and lived the rest of his life as a white man in Texas.

When I was an undergrad, what interested me the most about American History were the things that didn't fit cleanly into standard narratives. I did some work on Southern cities where free people of color interacted with whites and enslaved people. That carried over into my master's thesis. Some of this project grew out of some work I did in my dissertation and the book I published in 2011.

I'd say one of the things I've learned methodologically is that it is a much better time to do research now than twenty years ago. The ability to access information is so much greater; if you're patient, there's almost nothing you can't find.

Dr. Hoose

I am currently working on an article about a group of heretics, or religious dissidents, known as the Children of the Holy Spirit in early fourteenth-century Milan. They venerated a deceased holy woman named Guglielma as the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, and they recognized a nun named Maifreda as their pope. In early September 1300, after investigating the group, inquisitors ordered Guglielma's body to be disinterred and burnt, and they also handed over at least three of her devotees, including Maifreda, to the city government to be burnt at the stake. I'm especially looking at the role that gender and social class played among the devotees. The Children of the Holy Spirit appeared to have reversed gender roles by worshipping the Divine Feminine and privileging a woman as their leader. At the same time, the intersection of social class with gender makes this role reversal more complicated. Maifreda was from a prominent noble family, while the devotees believed that Guglielma was a Bohemian or

Czech princess, and other leading devotees were also women and even men of high social rank.

I wrote my dissertation on a topic related to heresy, orthodoxy, and sainthood in the Middle Ages, and I have published a few articles related to these topics. I became interested in the Children of the Holy Spirit as I explored the parallels between defining heresy and sainthood in the medieval period. When the medieval church examined a potential candidate for sainthood, they used methodological tools like those that inquisitors used to identify heretics. Though the inquisitors concluded that Guglielma was a heretic after her death, there were those, including monks in a monastery near Milan, who had venerated her as a Catholic saint.

My research into this topic has shaped the way I teach. Before I started this project, I didn't really focus that much on gender roles or the history of women or femininity or masculinity. But now, in my Western Civilization classes and my upper-division classes, I focus much more on issues related to gender and social class rather than only on political, religious, and intellectual developments.

Dr. Carlson

I actually just finished a project, an edited volume of the proceedings of the Provisional Congress of the Confederate States of America. The book should be published within a year. There was an organization called the Southern Historical Society that began in 1866. It was organized by Confederate veterans for the purpose of controlling the narrative about the Civil War and the South's role in the war. They wanted to create an alternative version of Civil War history that made the South look better. That initiative lost momentum by the turn of the 20th century when real historians took leadership of the organization. Their first project was to go through period newspapers and transcribe any congressional minutes they

could find. The actual congressional minutes were bare-bones; the newspapers gave much more detail. They transcribed all the minutes from 1862 through the end of the war, but they did not do the first year. This was because they looked at the newspapers in Virginia, where the capital was for most of the war. They completely skipped the year [1861] when the capital was Montgomery, so I went through newspapers from Montgomery, New Orleans, a couple from Georgia, Virginia, and the Carolinas, and gathered all the recordings of what happened during the first year of the Confederacy.

Truth? COVID. Looking for something to stay busy. I had used the previously published records before. In Civil War history, the top two main primary Civil War materials used are *The War of the Rebellion* [Confederate and Union military and governmental records collected by the US War Department after the end of the Civil War] and the *Southern Historical Society Papers*, which I described earlier. I was curious as to why the congressional minutes started in 1862 when the war started in 1861. So I did some digging and found that there were records available [just never published].

I gained a greater appreciation for what the Provisional Congress was doing during that first year. It was a government in its opening stages, not only trying to create a new country but having to address the concern of citizens who last week looked to Washington D.C. for certain things. Now they're asking these citizens to refocus their loyalties to a new government. Examples such as patents and legal protections were interrupted by this shift. I also looked at how citizens engaged in the process of creating this new country and establishing their nationhood. It was something not just happening in Montgomery or Richmond, but people everywhere on the ground were involved.

Dr. Valentine

In general, all of the research I do is largely historical regarding one subset of Tibetan Buddhism called the Northern Treasure Tradition. It was founded in the 14th century and continues to the present, but its peak was in the 17th century. When a great many Buddhists fled Tibet during the 1950s and 1960s and reestablished their religious organizations in India, Nepal, and the West, my focus group was not on its upswing, so it has not been researched much until recently. I work with a research group that is partially funded by the French government and studies various aspects of the Northern Treasure Tradition. I am, in particular, currently focused on the biography of the founder, named Rigzin Godem (14th c.). While it is on the rise to study this particular group, there is no English translation of his biography. Imagine the difficulty of trying to study the history of Protestantism, for example, without a biography of Martin Luther. I am translating the 15th century biography from Tibetan to English, but including footnotes, annotations, etc. from a range of Tibetan sources that were written between the 14th and 21st centuries.

I am also working on a second project, an autobiographical travel memoir of Pema Trinle (17th c.). He breaks away from his regular life and travels for approximately four or five months to go back to central Tibet in 1690. Pema Trinle was a "reincarnated lama," which means that his successive reincarnations have acted as the patriarchs of the Northern Treasure Tradition. His journey was in part motivated by his desire to return to the homeland of his most significant preincarnation, who happens to be Rigzin Godem, i.e., the individual whose biography I discuss above.

My academic direction came from taking a world religion class as an undergraduate. Growing up in a largely secular family but in a Catholic community, I always had the feeling that there was much more information out there regarding religion, the nature of reality, the meaning of life, etc. than what I got from my life experiences. I felt immediately

intrigued and impressed by Buddhism in general, but was specifically drawn to Tibetan Buddhism because of the institutionalized elements of Tantric Buddhism that are not found anywhere else in the world.

Methodically, all the time I am finetuning how I find secondary sources. I am creating my own personal database and using this software called Docfinder which essentially treats your computer how Google treats the internet, helping you find information from your sources instantly.

At this stage of my career, I am also focusing on creating long-lasting research groups with broad research agendas and supporting these groups through grant writing. I have been pushed in this direction by the realization that the amount of work that needs to be done, even just with regards to my small focus group, is more than any individual or small group of scholars can accomplish in a single lifetime. Thus, I seek to establish an organization that can continue the work far into the future.

Dr. Lim

My main research focus is on the philosophy of human nature called personal identity and its related issues in ethics and religion. I am trying to answer the question: what is human nature and what are we made of? Another question I want to answer is how are we existing over time? Is it because you have the same soul or the same psychological function or biological continuity? Or are you really the same person over time?

I am also applying the philosophy of human nature to issues in ethics and religion. Personal identity is closely related to ethical issues. For example, your view of personhood can affect your view of the human fetus. Is it a person? Why or why not? Your answer then affects your view of abortion. The same goes for the patient in a PVS and the issues in euthanasia. I hope my research in the philosophy of human nature can clarify and answer these questions about moral problems. I am also using

the philosophy of human nature to address religious issues, including the incarnation and life after death. For example, in the Christian tradition, the second person of the Trinity, the Son, became fully human while at the same time fully divine. What does it mean that Christ is fully human like you and me? Is it because Christ has a human soul or that he has a physical body like ours or something else? Depending on your metaphysical idea of human nature, you will have a different perspective on the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Resurrection.

These are some of the topics that I am working on in my research area.

I got my first interest in philosophy when I was in high school in South Korea. We were required to take philosophy in high school and as it continued, my interest was getting stronger and stronger. When I went to college, I majored in philosophy; I went on to do a graduate program. I met wonderful professors who were experts in this research area. I was also interested in what I am, what we are. This is the kind of permanent question we always ask, even though you do not study philosophy. Naturally, I was interested in working on the philosophy of human nature for my doctoral dissertation working with those wonderful professors. I got very lucky that I met those people for my career and my life. I have never regretted choosing this topic for my research area. After all, it is about us humans like you and me.

This may be from more than just my research, but studying philosophy in general. There are so many theories and arguments that I do not know about. When I study philosophy, I realize how much I don't know. That is a great intellectual lesson. If you realize you do not know so much, you can be intellectually humble and hungry. You will try to learn more and better. Applying this to my research motivates me to read more along with thinking harder and more carefully. This is important in my life

in that we have to perform lifelong learning to learn more about human nature and society.

I also came to respect diverse opinions and thoughts. People have their own reasons to say why they are right and I am wrong. I cannot only say I am right because I have to listen to them. This is helpful in understanding more about human nature issues and more in my life. This came from not only my research, but philosophy as a whole.

Dr. Puckett

I am currently on my second book. It's looking at Nazi racism, WWII and the Holocaust, and how that affected perceptions of race in the Jim Crow South and African Americans' demands for civil rights. I am focusing on Alabama specifically, and how African-Americans within Alabama perceive events in Europe: the antisemitism, the racism, and the claims of racial supremacy that was emanating from Germany. How did African Americans react to white southerners condemning Nazi Germany for their claims of racial supremacy and their persecution of the Jews?

White Alabamians/southerners exhibited profound dissonance when it came to their own treatment of African-Americans in the South. How did African-Americans respond to this? From what I'm finding it increased greater agitation for civil rights and greater organization, that's how I'm going to follow this. I am looking at it from the early 1930s to 1948 with the Dixiecrat revolt, just prior to what we view as the beginning of the modern civil rights movement. I'm actually looking at the generation right before the war. You have to understand that to understand the 50s.

This project actually started in graduate school as a project originally assigned as a seminar paper that eventually turned into my dissertation topic. Originally, I focused on newspapers and the press. I had planned to

use this as my first book, but what I did instead was focus on the Jewish community and the Jewish response, which was only a chapter or so of my initial proposal. That became my first book. I took a chapter/chapter and a half and turned it into a book. Since then I have reimagined what I am doing, and I am going to address the African-American response, which is much, much broader than what I began with. I would say back in graduate school it piqued my interest.

We all learn from History in some form or fashion. I don't believe History repeats itself. Santayana wrote, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." I don't believe history repeats itself, but there are lessons you can learn. It informs our understanding of the present.

Dr. Ross

I'm currently working on a book project, which is about how American biomedical researchers defended animal research in the 1910s, '20s, and '30s. So you have institutions, such as universities and the Rockefeller Institute and other major organizations, that were doing biomedical research – not seeing patients, but doing lab experiments – and they are using a lot of mice, dogs, cats, guinea pigs, and monkeys. There was an anti-vivisection or animal rights movement (though that's not what it was called at the time) that was protesting the use of these animals in medical research. My research project is about how the scientists tried to defend their research to the public, in a time when they were not as well respected as they will be later. It is an interesting time period in which they're trying to establish their cultural authority.

Without regulations, they could do whatever they wanted in their labs (within the confines of the local and state anti-cruelty laws). There is this push back by these groups, who say "no, we want to see the animals and

experiments." So, you have outsiders trying to regulate the laboratories of these universities and big institutions. The institutions do not want that; they want to regulate themselves. Today we do have regulations. They (the scientists) were wary of outsiders without training having a say in experimental methods and design. And they were also trying to build up their professional authority. They wanted to be the exclusive scientific authorities on health. And, suddenly, they find that they have to talk to the public and, in a sense, justify their methods.

I wrote my dissertation, a million years ago, on the rise of some of these institutions. I was interested in where the money for them came from and how they became these really important centers worldwide. I was very interested in particular in the Rockefeller Institute, now called Rockefeller University. I kept finding these really interesting tangents in the archives about anti-vivisection meetings, discussions about the advisability of attending or defending animal experimentation, *et cetera*. And the questions about how to deal with what could potentially be an obstacle…the anti-vivisectionists. At the time I couldn't focus on that, I had to focus on my dissertation. So in 2015, I decided that my next project would be to look at those tangents and try to figure out what was really going on there.

Methodological, record keeping. This project has taught me the importance of really detailed record keeping. So every day when I would go to an archive, I would write the date and time I got there, and then they would bring you a box, and I would write down the box number, the file number, *all* the information. I took pictures of everything, and I took a lot of notes. I probably have 300-400 pages of just notes on these documents. Thousands of images of documents. You're basically drowning in documents. The only way you can make sense of them is with really good record keeping. I have spreadsheets with all the image numbers, who the letters are to and from, what the main topic is, the date, and all that. That

makes it doable. Otherwise, I would be under a mountain of documents. I would be unable to see what to look at next.

Some professors were unable to do interviews, but they sent us their answers instead so we could celebrate their work!

Dr. Hagler

I am working on two projects at once, although I just finished one of them. My first book, *The Echoes of Fitna: Accumulated Meaning and Performative Historiography in the First Muslim Civil War* was just recently accepted for publication by Brill. It is an exploration of how making the meaning of one particularly important event, from the standpoint of the Sunni-Shi'i split, became the focal point for certain medieval Arabic chroniclers from Syria and northern Iraq, and why. It's a project that is a long time in the making, and seeing it so close to publication is tremendously gratifying.

My current project, another book-length study, is an exploration of monotheistic responses to community-threatening catastrophe. Owning Disaster is the tentative title. In it, I explore a sequence of disasters that threatened to destroy the communities or theologies of premodern monotheists: the destruction of both Jewish Temples, the execution of Jesus, the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem and, later, Constantinople, the Crusader conquest of Sicily, and the Mongol conquest of, well, everything. In each case, monotheists, be they Jewish, Christian, or Muslim, blamed themselves (or others in their communities) and their own sins or improprieties, casting the conquerors or executioners as an instrument of God sent to punish them. I find that regardless of which tradition is at play, the mechanisms by which monotheists explain and contextualize disaster are very similar--and perhaps necessary. This owning or coopting of

disaster may be a key strategy for explaining why bad things happen to God's favorite people, which allows those communities to survive them; no run of good luck lasts forever, after all!

I came across explanations of very different disasters--the loss of Sicily to the Crusaders and the destruction of the Second Temple--that seemed to have similarly bizarre explanations within historical narratives designed to explain them (the loss of Sicily being explained, in part, by the tendency to overindulge in alcohol of Ibn al-Thumna, the Emir of Syracuse, in the Arabic chronicle of Ibn Abi Dinar, and the Temple's destruction by the Romans being explained a misaddressed party invitation and the public shaming of a Jerusalemite notable named Bar Kamza in the Babylonian Talmud). The similarity got me questioning why such monumental events would be explained as the result of such commonplace incidents. The more I looked, the more I found the same answer: whatever the catastrophe, its cause was "our own sin."

Personally, I've learned that people will go to great lengths to explain catastrophe, whether communal calamity or personal tragedy, by blaming themselves for it. This allows people to maintain the notion that the world is not chaotic and random, but that it is under the control of an all-powerful being. This notion is comforting, even in those moments when one might fear that that being's anger is directed squarely at one, because the alternative is to assume that nobody is in charge, and that thought can be terrifying! It is emotionally easier to assume that "x happened because I/we/you were wicked, and this is my/our/your natural divine consequence" than it is to conclude that there is no God whenever something bad happens--which it inevitably will.

 Methodologically? I've learned that trying to write a book in which I must grapple with no fewer than eight different historiographical approaches (Biblical; Church Fathers; Talmudic/Rabbinic; Arabic biographical dictionary; synthetic, universal Arabic and Persian chronicle;

Orthodox and Arabic apocalypses; Crusader chronicle; Russian historical chronicle), which must be read in seven different languages (Hebrew; Greek; Aramaic; Latin; Arabic; Persian; Russian), some of which I don't know....is inviting no small measure of exhaustion, and I should definitely only undertake such projects while on sabbatical. I am more grateful than you can imagine for those intrepid souls who translated the Greek and Latin stuff, otherwise I wouldn't be able to complete this project at all.

Dr. Merriman

I currently am researching the Espionage and Sedition Acts in World War I. I want to position them in terms of the larger framework in the time period. These acts were labeled as acts to save America from domestic enemies, but their application told a different story.

It started out in my dissertation which looked at the same time period. I have also been continually interested in the First Amendment in all of its areas, but particularly the areas of the freedom of religion (and the freedom from religion) and the freedom of speech.

The main lesson I learned is the value of methodical research. Many of the most interesting things I've learned have been tucked away deep in the records.

I think that the biggest lesson is that it has shaped the way I teach now. Before I started this project, I didn't really focus that much on gender roles or the history of women or femininity or masculinity. But now, especially in my Western Civ. classes and my upper-division classes, I have a much deeper focus on the role of gender in understanding medieval society or societies in general.

Departmental News

Award Winners

The Department of History and Philosophy would like to congratulate our undergraduate and faculty award winners of 2022, recently honored at the Troy University Honors Convocation:

> Alexander Beerenstrauch, senior: Nathan Alexander Memorial Phi Alpha Theta Scholastic Award
>
> Mykaila Rose Baker, junior: Louis Hopper Perpetual Scholarship
>
> Carl Pratt, junior: G. Ray Mathis Memorial Award
>
> Claire Aplin, senior: Leonard Y. Trapp History Education Award
>
> Alyssa Kaitlyn Allen, senior: Colonial Dames of America Paper Award
>
> And faculty member Joe McCall won this year's Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award. This award, presented annually, recognizes students, faculty, and staff for excellence of character, humanitarian service and spiritual qualities.

Congratulations to all of our students and faculty on their awards.

Faculty and Staff News

Welcome, Deborah Faulk!

The department is excited to welcome Deborah Faulk as the new Secretary for the Department of History and Philosophy. Mrs. Faulk is a resident of Brundidge, Alabama. She joins us after spending the past eight years working as an Education Resource Specialist for Head Start in Troy.

Mrs. Faulk's affiliation with Head Start dates back all the way to 2001. She was ready for a change and we are delighted for the opportunity to have her contribute to our educational mission! Welcome aboard, Deborah.

Professors Aaron Hagler and Joungbin Lim were awarded sabbatical this year to pursue their research. We look forward to seeing them next fall!

We are fortunate to have Stephen Ward visiting this semester while Joungbin is away. Stephen is a PhD candidate from UCLA, and his work focuses on Egyptian Languages and Religions.

David Carlson's manuscript, *Congress of States: Proceedings of the Provisional Congress of the Confederate States of America, 1861–1862,* has been accepted for publication at University of Alabama Press. He continues to serve as Book Review Editor of H-Net's Civil War network.

And Scott Merriman published *Same Sex Marriage: Exploring the Issues* in 2022 with ABC-CLIO.

This academic year (2021-2022) marks Dr. Valentine's first year as a tenured professor at his new rank of Associate Professor.

And Avington Medeiros is now officially *Dr.* Medeiros! Congratulations, Avie, on completing your dissertation.

Gratitude

This year's gratitude is written by editor, Mykaila Baker. Mykaila is currently working on her BS in American History and Sociology.

Year Eleven of publication! We did it!

First, I want to thank Dr. Ross. This publication and its continuation would not be possible without the organization, passion, and hours she dedicates to *The Alexandrian* each and every year since its founding. While not (yet) being in any of her classes, the way she works so diligently outside of her requirements speaks volumes toward her character that everyone should aspire to be.

A huge shout-out to the student authors whose works are now published! It is through your research and writing that we have the honor of sharing your arduous work. While some writings are forced projects from class assignments, the research that stems from genuine questioning can bring life back to a drained student. It is the general love of learning and thinking that drives us to continue in our field. Thank you for your work and dedication; always keep questioning.

I want to thank each faculty member in our department. I along with Joshua worked with a little over half of the History and Philosophy faculty to interview and learn about their research. Getting to spend time with our educators outside of just the classroom is a wonderful experience that I have held even closer to my heart since March of 2019. I am so proud of the department I am a part of and the faculty that constitutes it. I am even more proud to hear their research and how they continue to push themselves within their specialties. A love of learning and growing are traits to never outgrow.

We of course cannot forget to thank the Alexander family! Your support for the journal has continued for the past decade, no small feat.

Eleven years of supporting student achievement and growth. While Nathan may not have known every person now in the department, his legacy and name are living on. Thank you, Steve, Rachel, Sarah, Andrew, Elise, and Nathan.

Mykaila Baker,

Editor

And a quick addition from Dr. Karen Ross: To add to Mykaila's note, I just want to say what a pleasure it is to work with the students who volunteer their time and energy to the *Alexandrian*. Mykaila, in particular, has spent many hours pulling together all of the many parts that make up the *Alexandrian*: formatting, proofing, and chasing down documents (and occasionally authors and faculty!). Thank you also to Joshua Dawsey and Alyssa Allen for their hard work, the student authors, and the faculty who support them each year.

I think Nathan would be pleased to see how a journal started in his memory in 2012 has become a permanent fixture to showcase the many talents of Troy University students.

As always, we appreciate the love and support of the Alexander family who have been on this journey with us. It is exciting to know that the journal reaches their many friends, as well as our University community.

Phi Alpha Theta Inductees, Fall & Spring 2021-2022

Mykaila Rose Baker
Carl Pratt