

THE PHOENIX

A JOURNAL OF HISTORY

1984



THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND / CUNY

**Phoenix. The Journal Written By Students
Interested in History
The College of Staten Island**

Volume 2 Spring 1984

The Phoenix is a journal created by students who have written papers on history or history-related topics. It is published under the aegis of the History Department. It is devoted to the publication of historical studies written by students who are eager to share their exciting discoveries of the past with you. It is dedicated to history.

We think you will find this volume of the Phoenix to be particularly informative as the articles cover a time span from millions of years B.C. (Amerson's *The Origin of Man in Africa*) down through the 1970's (Clark's *We Were Fighting Against Communism. What Else?*). The essays contained in this journal represent the diversity which makes history the fascinating discipline that it is. You will enjoy reading how the eight student-authors who have contributed to this volume have treated a variety of topics with verve and style. Perhaps as you read through this volume you will come to share our notion that history is everything men and women have ever done — building, thinking, loving, fighting, working, owning, lending, killing, betraying, raising children, resisting, questioning, speculating and exploring. Students who are currently writing papers or who have written history papers which they think their peers and teachers might enjoy reading are encouraged to submit manuscripts for future volumes.

The essays that appear in the Phoenix have been selected for their high quality and because they reflect a variety of viewpoints which do not necessarily represent those of the faculty of the History Department.

Ms. Paula Carlo — Co-Editor
Ms. Maryann Castelucci — Co-Editor
Dr. Herbert J. Foster — Co-Editor

The Department of History

Dr. David Traboulay — Chairperson
Dr. Frederick Binder
Dr. Luther Carpenter
Dr. Sandi E. Cooper
Dr. Manuela Dobos
Dr. Herbert Foster
Dr. Soloman Gemorah
Dr. Michael Greenberg
Dr. Don Hausdorff
Dr. Calvin Holder
Dr. Charles LaCerra
Dr. Jules Levey
Dr. David Nasaw
Dr. Richard G. Powers
Dr. Phyllis G. Roberts
Dr. Alice Schuster
Dr. Stephen Stearns
Dr. James L. Strum
Dr. David Traboulay
Dr. Howard Weiner

Adjuncts

Mrs. Paula Carlo
Mrs. Maryann Castelucci
Mr. Vanig Hovsepian
Mr. Terence Julien

We gratefully dedicate this volume to Prof. Herbert Foster whose perseverance and devotion — to his students, to the College and to history — have been driving forces behind *The Phoenix* since its inception.

Table of Contents

The Origin of Man in Africa	
Iola Amerson	4
The Nature of Two Indian Cultures At The Time of The First European Contact	
Barbara Aiello	10
We Were Fighting Against Communism. What Else?	
Lois Clark	15
The Social Class Structure of Colonial America	
Cathy Cutting	21
The Causes and Consequences of The Civil Rights Movement	
Tony Davidow	28
English Capitalism in The New World	
Maria Morrow Gutterman.....	33
Response to Some Questions on The Philosophy of G.W.F. Hegel	
Virginia Hoolahan	35
The Origin of Slavery in The Colonial South	
Gina Navarino	40

The Origin of Man in Africa

Iola Amerson

For many years some scientists and anthropologists believed that the "cradle of mankind" was in central Asia. Others argued that it might have been in Europe, while still others insisted it was in Africa. Today we have enough information to indicate that it did exist in Africa. Our oldest living relatives, the great apes, lived in the forests of tropical areas across Africa and the Far East. According to the evidence it was in these areas that humans and apes separated; here the first hominids evolved as forest fringe animals feeding in open, savanna-like spaces.¹ The earliest hominid fossils and primitive tools have been found in Africa in the Pliocene (the epoch immediately preceding the Pleistocene) deposits. These sites exist in south and east Africa, with tools and fossils dating back as far as 5 million years.²

Of course, the biological evolution of man in Africa is theoretical, based upon previous fossil finds, but credit can be given to various anthropologists in their search for "the origin of man". Before the major discoveries of the Leakey family, it was believed that man originated in Asia with Java and Peking man, now classified as *Homo erectus*, who walked the earth more than 500,000 years ago.³

Mary Leakey's startling discovery in 1959-61 of *Australopithecus* fossils accompanied by stone tools in Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania, has been dated from about 1.9 millions years ago and has convinced scientists and anthropologists that Africa was indeed the birthplace of man.⁴

Considering the assumption that early man evolved from apes, the question arises: when did he become a man, or when did he topple over? Raymond Dart answered the question on the basis of behavior rather than on the anatomy and physiology of the creature's body; that is to say, the more we became human beings, the more we became distinguishable by acts and capabilities. Mankind shares a great many physical characteristics with the great apes (gorilla, chimpanzee, orangutan and gibbon). Major blood types and muscular structure are largely the same. The differences, however, arose from such distinctive human features as the head being balanced on the spine (and so needing fewer muscles to hold it up) and the upright position, which has led to musculature development in the lower back, legs and the knot of muscles in the buttocks, which none of the great apes share with man.⁵ It also has been stated that man and culture evolved together.

Anthropologists now believe that man's family tree goes back to a primate called *Dryapithecus*, a true ape that appeared some 20 million years ago. *Dryapithecus africanus* was found by Louis Leakey at Lake Victoria. Like all apes they frequented forests and their distribution followed the range of the great tropical forest belt that girdled the earth at the beginning of the Miocene (a period before the old stone age).⁶ This creature existed in several sizes and shapes, and

was scattered widely in Africa as well as Europe and Asia.

In 1938 Richard Boone discovered a new type of the southern ape. The second type of *Australopithecus* was found a mile away at Kromdraai in South Africa. This creature was called *Australopithecus robustus*. He was heavier and larger than the earlier South African finds and he had bigger teeth, set in a nutcracker-like jaw. *Australopithecus robustus* had a prominent bony ridge on top of his skull (see photo A in back). He was far more primitive than *Australopithecus africanus*. It is recognized that *Australopithecus robustus* is a descendent of *Australopithecus africanus*, as they were the same general type of creature — erect walking ape-men.¹⁴

Both *Australopithecus robustus* and *Australopithecus africanus* became extinct, probably because they were unable to compete successfully with large predators or were killed by *Homo habilis*, who lived around two million years ago.

In the late 1950's the anthropological team of the late Louis Leakey and his wife Mary found a skull at Olduvai Gorge from a very early time (early Pleistocene) which Leakey dated at 600,000 B.C. They called this creature *Zinjanthropus* or Zing. In the same deposits, the Leakeys discovered pebbles chipped to form sharp edged implements, evidence that even so far back man's ancestors knew how to use tools. A few years later they found remains of a smaller creature, similar to those which were associated with pebble tools at Olduvai.¹⁵

It was actually Johnathan Leakey who in 1961 discovered parts of a 1.8 million year old skull that failed to fit into the familiar *Australopithecus* male. Its teeth were more human-like and the brain cavity was larger; whereas *Australopithecus'* brain averaged 450 to 550 cc, in volume, the cavity of this brain measured nearly 700 cc. This brain size suggested that it belonged to a being that ideally fits between *Australopithecus* and *Homo erectus*. Therefore, Louis Leakey and his colleagues named him *Homo habilis* (handy man) because they believed him to be the manufacturer of the tools found in the vicinity. *Homo habilis* is the oldest human fossil known. He was a very primitive type.¹⁶

Recent discoveries have brought anthropologists closer to the answer of man's true ancestors. In 1972 a team of anthropologists lead by Donald Johanson found stone tools dating back 2.6 million years in a region of Ethiopia. A few years later the team made an even more dramatic discovery. Not far from the first find they uncovered the fossilized remains of a 20 year old female *Australopithecus* lying in a layer of sediments three million years old. This fossil was composed of a good part of the skeleton.

Named after the Beatles' song "Lucy in the Sky With Diamonds", Lucy was not more than three feet tall, had a brain capacity about a third that of modern man, weighed sixty pounds and lived about 3.5 million years ago. Lucy's skeleton gave scientists the best clues yet as to the proportions of *Australopithecus*. It revealed her to be surprisingly short-legged. But the find left no doubt that she walked erect. The shape of her pelvis showed clearly that she was bipedal.¹⁷

Homo habilis was a very primitive ape who evolved into *Homo erectus* around 1.5 million years ago. Before *Homo habilis* the human line may have run down entirely. Both *Homo habilis* and *Homo erectus* are hominids. They all were erect walkers. Some were human, even though they were exceedingly primitive

creatures. Lucy was placed in back of *Homo habilis*; she was not considered human.

The first *Homo erectus* finds were made in 1891–92 in Java by Dr. Eugene Dubois. Later discoveries by him in east Africa clarified the picture of his previous fossil finds as being members of a single genus that was directly ancestral to modern man. *Homo erectus* was about five feet six inches tall; his head was large and thick, but his brain was smaller than the human brain. He had big teeth, a big jaw, and enormous eyebrow ridges.¹⁸ He is associated with hunting large animals.

Java man and Peking man were contemporaries of *Homo erectus*. Males and females alike were extremely powerful people. Peking man lived in limestone caves, made tools, ate meat and used fire. He was not as tall as the Java people. His skull looked like the Java skull, except that it had a slightly larger brain capacity.¹⁹ The African sites of these fossils are Olduvai Gorge, South Africa, Algeria and Lake Turkana. In 1975 Richard Leakey discovered fossil remains of *Homo erectus* at Lake Turkana, Kenya, that have been dated at 1.5 million years old, preceding *Homo erectus* from Java and Peking by a million or more years.²⁰

It was the compactly built *Homo erectus* who evolved into *Homo sapiens* about 40,000 years ago. *Homo sapiens* — modern men like ourselves — have existed for about 200,000 years. The earliest fossils are from Swanscombe in England and Steinheim in Germany.²¹ These fossils have *Homo erectus* traits, but they were of a much more modern nature. The back of the head was neither very low or primitive, and the forehead was not very primitive, although there were big ridges over the eyebrows.

Fossils of Swanscombe and Steinheim-type man are said to be of a group called pre-neanderthaloids. Traces of these fossils were found throughout Europe during the third interglacial period around 100,000 years ago. But this population disappeared in Europe and was replaced with a population known as Neanderthal man. The Neanderthal population in turn disappeared in Europe after the last glaciation (from 35,000 to 50,000 years ago) and was entirely replaced throughout the world by a population of modern type.²²

The first *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*, “Neanderthal man” himself, was found in Neander Valley in Germany in 1856. He was recognized as the first human fossil. It is further believed that the pre-neanderthaloids who happened to get caught in the pocket of the southwest corner of Europe at the onset of the last great glaciation became the classic Neanderthals. Many of the finds have been found in caves.²³ Fossils of Neanderthal or Neanderthal-like people, however, have been found over a wide area of Africa, Asia and Europe. The “cave men” we see in movies and cartoons are probably meant to be Neanderthals.

Many Neanderthaloid fossils have been found in Africa in the north, in Morocco at Jebel Irhoud and Hava Flech. They date back some 40,000 years. In south Africa “Rhodesian man” showed variations of Neanderthal traits. In east Africa, Neanderthal-like fossils have been found along the Ono. These skeletons belonged to people no different from many people we see today. Like people today, not everyone looked alike.²⁴

Although it is not known for sure whether the Neanderthal man was intrusive into Africa or originated in Africa, his culture suggests he originated elsewhere and moved into Africa. Archeologist Desmond Clark assumes this means that the Neanderthal physical type existed north of the Sahara, and the Rhodesian physical type of *Homo erectus* existed in the south. This assumption is based on skeletal material of Rhodesian man, the original skeleton of which came from the site at Broken Hill. In the Middle Stone Age, the Rhodesian type came to be replaced by modern man at perhaps 35,000 B.C., and in Europe in the Upper Paleolithic time, *Homo sapiens* replaced Neanderthal very suddenly.²⁵

The Diop essay presents evidence that during the Upper Paleolithic the first humanity, probably belonging to the lower layers of the Aurignacian, was that of the current Black type of humanity. The basic characteristics of that Grimaldi (black) type of man were negroid physically; the lower limbs are longer in comparison to the upper limbs, the skull very high and elongated, the forehead broad but not high, the nose broad and flat, and the jaw strong and protruding. The majority of these characteristics of the face and skull are, if not negritic, at least negroid.

The other types found in Europe probably belonged to the Cro-Magnon race. They had Ethiopian characteristics; tall stature, wide faces, broad foreheads and thin noses. Diop argues that Grimaldi man who was negroid in physical type preceded Cro-Magnon man who was described as having caucasoid characteristics. Some prehistorians claim that the order was the other way around and that the caucasoids were the first *Homo sapiens* to appear in Africa.²⁶

Diop further states that some of the most distinguished prehistorians and anthropologists of today consider Africa to be the "cradle of humanity", and that the Aurignacian culture was brought into Western Europe from North Africa by the new type of men. These and all subsequent races and their cultures have been termed Neathropic, and are grouped under the designation *Homo sapiens* of Lennacus. The Aurignacians were superior in every way to the old Neanderthal group of men whom they conquered and probably exterminated.²⁷

Deliberate fictional notions of the Negro have been invented by some anthropologists which allow them to consider, if need be, all the Negros on earth as fake Negros.

Biblically speaking, the Grimaldi men were the ancestors of Ham; therefore, the Nilotes and Hamites of east Africa were black people.²⁸ But, if one sticks strictly to scientific data and archeological fact, it is revealed that the early *Homo sapiens* originated in Africa, and the caucasoids migrated into south Africa from Europe and Asia.

Doubts about the sequence of man's emergence remain, as the prehistory of man's origin is based upon the theories of fossil fragments, and there are huge gaps in the fossil records. The picture of man's origin is far from complete; the possibilities are infinite.

However, I have explored some of the existing evidence and found proof that man in hominin (ape) form originated in Africa around 1.5 million years before he first appeared in Europe and Asia. Evidence further indicated that the earliest culture in the world also occurred at that unique site, Olduvai Gorge in

Africa, our mother country, and spread from there to other parts of the world when the last glacier receded and other areas became habitable.

*Submitted to Professor Herbert J. Foster, AFA 247, Peoples and Cultures of Africa, Fall 1982.

Notes

1. **Robert J. Braidwood**, *Prehistoric Man* (Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1975), p. 16.
2. Braidwood, pp. 16—17
3. "Puzzling Out Man's Ascent," *Time*, Nov. 7, 1977, p. 66.
4. "Puzzling Out Man's Ascent," p. 66.
5. Paul Bohannon and Philip Curtin, *Africa and Africans* (Garden City, New York: Natural History Press, 1971), p. 191.
6. "Puzzling Out Man's Ascent," p. 67.
7. Donald Johanson and Maitland Edey, *Lucy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), p. 366.
8. Johanson, pp. 366—67.
9. Bohannon and Curtin, p. 196
10. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
11. Braidwood, pp. 11—13.
12. Bohannon and Curtin, pp. 196—197.
13. "Puzzling Out Man's Ascent," p. 65.
14. Johanson, pp. 57—59.

15. Bohannan and Curtin, pp. 198—199.
16. Johanson, pp. 18, 100.
17. *Ibid*, p. 18.
18. *Ibid*, p. 37.
19. Braidwood, pp. 26—27.
20. “Puzzling Out Man’s Ascent,” p. 67.
21. Bohannan and Curtin, p. 199.
22. Braidwood, p. 27.
23. Braidwood, pp. 27—28
24. Braidwood, p. 29.
25. Bohannan and Curtin, p. 203.
26. Cheik Anta Diop, *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality* (New York: Lawrence Hill and Company, 1974), p. 261.
27. *Ibid*, pp. 265—266.
28. *Ibid*, pp. 268—274.

Bibliography

Bohannan, Paul and Curtin, Philip. *Africa and Africans*. Garden City, New York: Natural History Press, 1971.

Braidwood, Robert J. *Prehistoric Man*, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1975.

Diop, Cheik Anta. *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality*. New York: Lawrence Hill and Company, 1974.

Johanson, Donald and Edey, Maitland. *Lucy*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.

“Puzzling Out Man’s Ascent.” *Time*, November 7, 1977.

The Nature of Two Indian Cultures at the Time of the First European Contact

Barbara Aiello

The nature of Indian cultures at the time of European contact varied according to the environment of the Indians and the way they adapted to their surroundings. Different groups of Indians were at various stages of development. The agricultural revolution was a development which began independently in the New World. It caused great changes in society like an increase in population, a less nomadic existence, and the development of classes. Europeans were surprised when they entered the New World. They expected to see primitive people with little knowledge.

Culture includes many specific characteristics of a society such as technology, modes of dress, economic, social and political organization, styles of shelter, religion, methods of child-rearing, etc. It also revolves around myths which the society as a whole believes in as values. Indian societies such as the Aztecs and the Iroquois shared some similarities and differences, but it is the contrast between the two which reveals that different environments stimulated different cultural responses. On one hand, the Aztecs created a complex centralized political system which responded to their needs in a relatively densely populated lake region favorable to agriculture, while the Iroquois, living in a less densely populated area where cooperation was necessary for survival, developed a communal social and political system. Some aspects of the art, family life, marriage patterns, laws, religion, warfare, and methods of child-rearing of both societies reveal these similarities and differences.

The Iroquois were the most powerful North Eastern group of Indians who lived from the Adirondacks to the Great Lakes. Iroquois is a French name referring to the Five Nations of New York: Mohawks (People of the Flint), Oneidas (People of the Stone), Onondagas (People of the Mountain), Cayugas (People at the Landing), and Senecas (Great Hill People). This league was designed to prevent conflict among these tribes. Hiawatha, a Mohawk sachem, unified this league. There is a legend that Hiawatha lost his family and wandered off into the woods. He had a vision in which a supernatural creature named Dekanawidah appeared. Dekanawidah appointed Hiawatha as an agent to renew the Iroquois society. He became a messianic figure. Dekanawidah said to the Iroquois people, "We bind ourselves together by taking hold of each others' hands so firmly and forming a circle so strong that if a tree should fall upon it, it would not shake or break it, so that our people and grandchildren shall remain in the circle in security, peace and happiness."¹ This group was held together by the same language. They became heavily concentrated in the Northeast. By forming this League of Nations, the Iroquois were stronger, and grew in population. they also gained political mechanisms that helped them deal with the arrival of the Europeans.

The Iroquois were an influential group with closely-knit families. They were grouped in clans made up of a dozen or more. These clans formed the villages. The Iroquois families were matriarchal. This meant that the family line went down through the female members. Husbands joined the families of their wives. The sons who married joined their wives' families also. Each extended family lived in a longhouse. The longhouse was a symbol of identity and togetherness. It was an outstanding feature of the Iroquois. The settlement of the Iroquois was fashioned in longhouse style. Each settlement consisted of 30 to 150 longhouses. An average longhouse was 25 feet wide. The length depended on the number of families to be sheltered. These houses were considered common property. Nothing was owned privately in this society. Everything was shared. A Jesuit priest said, "The Iroquois have courtesy, kindness, and humanity. They don't need poorhouses or hospitals. Everyone does everything in common."²

Children in this society were taught independence at an early age. Knowledge and skill were instilled and passed down through the heritage of these people. The Iroquois had a strong sense of belonging to their group. Children were taught to hunt, make tools, grow crops, and identify plants and animals. Sharing was taught as a way of life. They were taught not to submit to overbearing authority. The parents were rather easy-going. They did not believe in harsh physical punishment. They taught the children to be tolerant.

Personality development was highly esteemed among the Iroquois. Determination, equality, independence and partnership were also important in this society. These Indians had a great love of nature. They were a kind and courteous group. Land and work were shared among the Iroquois. They mastered the art of agriculture and grew maize. Material possessions were not important to them. Their hunting was communal. Not every individual hunter captured the same amount of food but it was equally distributed. The Iroquois did not have complicated machinery. There were no formal laws, and no judges or sheriffs. They did have a certain rule against right and wrong. Wrongdoers were ostracized publicly until those persons proved themselves worthy.

Power was evenly distributed among the men and women, the young and old. The men hunted and fought. They held some political power and ran the villages. Authority came from Ochwachiras. They were senior women of the tribal council. They elected men to represent clans. This group also had the power to remove men from these tribal councils. They were well respected in society. They even had a role in military affairs. Women would make moccasins and supply food for the men. Iroquois women were also involved in the tribal economy with the men. Sometimes women were left in charge of the communities, if men would leave to go hunting for weeks at a time. It was the choice of a woman to divorce her husband. She would set his belongings outside of the house.

Religion among the Iroquois was quite interesting. They strongly believed that dreams resolved problems. They would discuss their dreams in group sessions like psycho-therapy. The Iroquois recognized the mind on the subconscious and conscious level. They believed dreams should be fulfilled. If a dream was left unfulfilled, psychosomatic illnesses were likely to occur. The Iroquois felt that dreams were the desires of the soul which had to be sought out. These Indians

emerged as one of the strongest, most politically unified, and militaristic native societies. Unlike the Aztecs, however, the Iroquois were not very culturally developed.

The Aztecs were a group of Indians located in the Valley of Mexico. Their origin stemmed from the Mayan, and Zapotec cultures. The Aztecs were a powerful group like the Iroquois. They were a society made up of about 60,000 people. Their language was Nahuatl. They were considered a strangely violent society.

At the time of the first European contact the Aztecs were highly civilized. They were at their height of power. Cortes, who was from Spain, came to the island and was greeted warmly by these Indians. The Indians believed that Hernando Cortes was their god, Quetzalcoatl, who had promised to return. Quetzalcoatl, which means Feathered Serpent, was the patron of learning and all good things. Legend states that he had sailed to Eastern Asia and promised to return. He was a god of peace, love, compassion and mercy. The emperor in 1519 was Montezuma who was a religious intellectual and the first Aztec emperor. Montezuma was a pacifist who wanted to restore Quetzalcoatl because he was supposed to be a peaceful god. Montezuma allowed Cortes and his men to enter their island, not knowing who they were. This caused one aspect of the Aztec decline. Their religion was a bloodthirsty one. It was based on human sacrifice. The Aztecs worshipped a god named Huitzilopochtli who was of partly human descent. Huitzilopochtli was a fearsome war god of Ancient Mexico. The name meant left-handed hummingbird. This god was greedy for human blood and gave the Aztecs advice which they followed. There was always a heart to be won for their god. Their god would give them victories for every sacrifice. Most of the victims were prisoners. The Aztecs believed that if they didn't have a certain amount of bloodshed, their sun would not rise. Four priests would hold down a man's hands and legs after he was placed on a large stone while another priest would jab the captive's heart with a stone knife. This was the way the ritual usually proceeded. As time passed, their god became greedier.

Married life among the Aztecs began between the ages of 20 and 22. Parents made decisions on marriages. The bride was customarily ornamented with feathers and make-up after the ceremonial bathing. The couple would then go to the nuptial chamber for four days of prayer and incense-burning and on the fifth day the marriage was consummated.

The Aztec society was highly advanced culturally. Tenochtitlan was the capital city. It was a mainland surrounded by three powerful cities and protected by water. Their environment was advantageous for them and permitted them to grow crops unknown to the Europeans. Their agricultural economy was elaborate. Irrigation systems, hillside terracing and artificial islands were some of their highly developed techniques. Their culture centered on beans, corn, squash, tobacco, and cotton. The Aztecs also hunted and gathered food and traded for support. Changes in the climate caused the death of many animals so they therefore used more vegetables and seeds. Smaller animals were hunted as a result.

Much of their energy was thrust into architectural projects like colossal temples and monuments. Tombs, plazas, ceramics, metal and stone were popular and well-

advanced among the Aztecs. They had an extremely well-regulated market place which was populated by many people. Engineering, painting, sculpture and urban design were tremendous in the Aztec society. They had figurines of men and women in their city. True leather weaving of soft cloaks was popular among the Aztecs. Pottery making and clay were also an important part of their culture.

War was frequent among the Aztecs. They fought whenever it was possible. The Aztecs had a strict way of entering war. Archer and javelin throwers went into action with swords at the sound of a conch shell horn. Their goal was to capture enemies for sacrifice. A city was conquered when the attacker got through to the temple and burned the sanctuary of its tribal god. Their method was beneficial to them because it helped them gain things like clothes, tools, weapons and other items.

Unlike the Iroquois, the Aztecs had written laws which governed the people. They were a hierarchy-conscious group. Drunkenness was an offense in the Aztec society. If a priest, dignitary, official, or ambassador was caught drunk, he was put to death. A citizen of the city would be publicly ostracized and have his head shaved on a first offense. The next time he would be executed.

This society had feasts, music and dancing. The Aztecs were lovers of birds, flowers and poetry. Etiquette was exclusively practiced by the upper-class. Unlike the Iroquois, the Aztecs did not have communal sharing.

These two societies varied in some ways. They were independent groups that were invaded by Europeans and destroyed by greediness and hate. The Europeans brought many diseases to the New World. Famine and cruelty were other hardships brought about by the Europeans. They took advantage of the Indians and broke many promises. They wanted gold and control over the Indians. The Indians knew the land a long time before the white men arrived and were subsequently driven away by them.

Both of these Indian groups are well remembered today. Political unity strengthened each of these societies. The Indian way of life was altogether different than the Europeans had expected. The Europeans and the Indians learned from each other. The Europeans introduced the idea of using wheels for transportation. The Indians showed the white men new agricultural methods as well as new kinds of food plants.

*Submitted to Professor Herbert J. Foster, HST 101, American Civilization, Spring 1982.

Notes

1. Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), p. 19.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Bibliography

LaFarge, Oliver, "*Myths That Hide the American Indian.*" Volume One. Edited by Nicholas Cords and Patrick Gerster. New York: Glencoe Press, 1973. pp. 23—44.

Leonard, Jonathan Norton, *Ancient America*. New York: Time Inc., 1967.

Nash, Gary B., *Red, White, and Black*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1974.

Soustelle, Jacques, "Soustelle The Aztec". *Newsweek*, 28 March 1960, pp. 98—99.

Zinn, Howard, *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

“We Were Fighting Against Communism. What Else?”

Lois Clark

When I ask a World War II or a Korean War veteran what the American role in the Vietnam Conflict was, without hesitation I hear, “We were fighting against communism, what else?” “What else”, I think, was always the part that bothered me the most, and I was determined to find out just what the “what else” was all about.

After reading and asking a multitude of questions about that dragged-out, senseless war, I realized what a horror, what a farce it really was. And I do not understand how Americans back home could honestly have believed we were fighting for the preservation of freedom. From the beginning, our boys were being pushed off to battle with hate instilled in their hearts, souls, and brains, to fight in a “fake” war — a war that was created by the American administration to give the American dollar a boost.

Think back to the incident that caused the United States to declare war. It was the Tonkin Bay Resolution in August 1964 when President Lyndon Johnson achieved the escalation he wanted while leading the American people to believe it was us being threatened. For years Americans believed the reasoning for our retaliatory action was the North Vietnamese attacks on our vessels, The Maddox and The Turner Joy. It was not until years later we were to find out facts surrounding that joint resolution. The first attack by the North Vietnamese is now believed to have been incited by the American vessels. The vessels are now believed to have been in North Vietnamese waters, where their presence would naturally warrant a defensive action on the part of the North Vietnamese. Yet this action was reported to have been one of aggression on the part of the North. Furthermore, the second attack, which served as the warrant for U.S. retaliation is now just an “alleged” attack. “Considerable doubt has been raised as to the exact circumstances of the alleged second attack on the two vessels, most particularly as to whether the administration had proof of it at the time that it ordered its retaliatory air strike on August 4, 1964, or whether it had occurred at all.”¹ With this information, I draw the conclusion that for some strange reasons, Lyndon Johnson anxiously wanted a state of war to occur.

Some strange reason. What could it be that would cause our president to be so eager to spend all those young lives on? Americans back home in the “Land of the Free” were listening to support of the “Domino Theory”. They believed that by allowing South Vietnam to become communist controlled, we were allowing communism to get closer to home. Americans were proud to think we were blowing away the “Commies”, this reinforced our feelings of international superiority and of our sense of duty to preserve freedom, at all costs. Americans thought that by freeing the Vietnamese, we were also protecting ourselves from

communism. All our previous war veterans and survivors were gung-ho to get the U.S. into battle. Yet, we should have realized something was wrong when so many young people began publicly objecting to our involvement in Vietnam. Americans were so used to being told what to do when it came to war, the ideas of the younger generation were viewed only as anti-establishment. The elders believed the U.S. would not enter a war if it was not the right thing to do, yet there were so many conscientious objectors, draft evaders, draft card burners, and public demonstrators, clearly there was something wrong about this war.

Soldiers returning from their tours of duty in Vietnam told us what it was like, yet we were too blind to see. John Kerry, a representative of Vietnam Veterans Against the War writes, "In our opinion, and from our experience, there is nothing in South Vietnam which could happen that realistically threatens the United States of America. And to attempt to justify the loss of one American life in Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos by linking such loss to the preservation of freedom is to us the height of criminal hypocrisy."² We were not fighting for the South Vietnamese; they did not want us there. They hated the American military. We killed their people, bombed their country, and used criminal war tactics, while claiming to abide by the Geneva Convention. I read one account of a Vietnam veteran who was fighting with the South Vietnamese Army—the ARVN. He said that every time the ARVN was attacked by the Viet Cong, they ran in the opposite direction! The South Vietnamese themselves were not willing to fight for a cause, so what were Americans doing there fighting? The fact is that the South Vietnamese people in general did not even know what they were fighting for or against. They had no idea what communism was or what democracy was. They wanted no part of fighting along with the Americans.

The American tax dollar was supporting a corrupt dictatorial government and the South Vietnamese saw no cause in fighting for that. In the form of foreign "AID" the Americans were keeping in power a government which the people themselves did not support. The Administration poured billions into South Vietnam. Between 1954 and 1972, assistance totalled more than \$6.3 billion. Yes, the U.S. contributed this much while bilateral aid from countries other than the U.S. amounted to an average of only \$20 million per year between 1950 and 1960.³

Yes, this looks as though we were diligently making efforts to help South Vietnam. But "the American taxpayer who thinks that AID means help, has missed the idea. AID is first of all, to achieve economic stability within the present system, i.e. political stability within the present system. Loans are extended, under the counterpart-fund arrangement to finance Vietnamese imports of American capital equipment (thus AIDing, with the other hand, American industry)."⁴ So here we have the American people at home believing that we were helping-out those poor South Vietnamese while in fact we were supporting a corrupt dictatorial government which the people wanted no part of. So strong was the opposition to U.S.-supported government that South Vietnamese people were burning themselves in protest. A South Vietnamese nun, who supported the burnings, told a journalist, "We knew Colonialism under the French and it was an unhappy

experience; now we're repeating it under the Americans, who behave like the French. They treat us as inferiors; they invade us, and stir up war for their own interests."⁵ If the South Vietnamese did not want us there, why were we there?

It appears that America was protecting her own interests. As early as 1950, the first \$10 million in credits were granted by the Truman Administration to the French and Vietnamese efforts against the Vietminh. Look at this investment. It was granted to one side which was active in suppressing the opposite side. This appears to be a protective action on behalf of the U.S. — so what were we protecting? We were protecting U.S. investments. The production of rubber in both Cambodia and South Vietnam was very largely in the hands of U.S.-owned plantations. Not only was it a U.S. enterprise, but it was proving to be a successful one. In 1955, Cambodia produced 28,000 tons of rubber, and South Vietnam 66,000 tons. After five years of U.S. involvement, in 1960 the production figures were 37,000 tons and 78,000 tons, respectively.⁶ The rubber industry was among the few successful industries of the area. Increases in productivity were results of increases in yield rather than of area planted, so that better production methods were the major factor. The "better" production methods were the American production methods.

Thus, the U.S. had to support this government, to maintain its prosperous little business. As owner of the plantations, the U.S. was beneficiary to their profits. The U.S. saw an excellent prospect for expansion. Planting areas could be increased and the cost of the needed increase in labor force was so low, it would be more than worth it. Maintaining the U.S. industry also guaranteed a need for U.S. machinery, U.S. engineers, U.S. executives and U.S. supervisors. In view of our prospects here, of course it was necessary to protect them.

Yet before we knew it, government instability increased, hostilities toward Americans increased, and support by South Vietnamese decreased. Therefore, the U.S. was led away from its protective motives and came up with a better way to stimulate our economy—full scale war. Capitalist governments prosper enormously during wartime.

The introduction of American troops to South Vietnam increased the necessity for American manufactured goods. First of all, the U.S. government now had the responsibility of feeding and clothing our soldiers. In order to do this, the government contracted for the necessities from American industries. What better stimulation to industry could we have than the production of goods already bought? Practically everything was sold before it was even produced. No marketing was necessary: sales were guaranteed. In addition to these necessities, demands for other supplies increased; military equipment, electronics, medical supplies, pharmaceuticals, tools, tires, fuel and oil were all in high demand, satisfying production rates of manufacturers.

An account from a Vietnam veteran told me how the civilian takeover in South Vietnam appeared even greater than the military takeover. He told me that driving into Saigon was like driving into a west-coast American city. American vehicles jammed the streets. Not just military vehicles, but Chevrolets, Chryslers, and Cadillacs were all maximally represented. It was not uncommon to watch the Saigonese cruise around in their brand new Cadillacs while American soldiers

busied themselves with filling out body count reports.

Hand in hand with motor vehicles came the demand for fuel. And what better fuel for American vehicles than American fuel. "Esso" fuel tanks outlined the airport at Saigon and were never allowed to remain empty. Both the American and the South Vietnamese were dependent on this fuel. Without it, they would experience immobilization of their armies. This demand for fuel was an excellent stimulant to America's economy. The fuel had to be produced, refined, and transported to where it would be used up and requests for more sent back.

American industry was booming, "thanks to the war." Foodstuffs, alcohol, tobacco, radios, tape players, and even televisions were in demand in South Vietnam. Soldiers in Vietnam were paid between \$300 and \$400 a month, with nowhere to spend it but South Vietnam. So their salaries were spent on American goods to alleviate some of the pangs of homesickness. The soldiers would hire Vietnamese women to shine boots, wash laundry, perform KP duties, etc. They paid them American dollars which the women then went out and spent on American goods as well. So the economy was stimulated from all angles.

I read a story by an Army Information Specialist who, while in South Vietnam, had received a request from an executive of a manufacturing firm in Los Angeles. The firm manufactured a steam cleaner and they wanted pictures of their apparatus on the job. The soldiers thought it was rather funny, as the steam cleaner was used mainly on Army personnel carriers and tanks. These vehicles often had bodies and the remains of bodies crushed into the armor. The Army Information Specialist wrote:

I just saw what this guy was trying to do, this manufacturer. He was making money off the war and he wanted publicity so he could get more government contracts. I sent the pictures, and the next day I wrote a letter, a personal letter to the manufacturer, saying I thought his pictures were immoral. Three weeks later I had a visit from the Army's Criminal Investigation Division.⁷

I would consider this testament to U.S. protection of profit motives without a doubt.

Occasionally the profit motive was undisguised, as told by Mary McCarthy:

flying into Hue in a big C-130, I heard the pilot and copilot discussing their personal war aim, which was to make a killing as soon as the war was over-in Vietnamese real estate. From the air, while they kept an eye out for Viet Cong, they had surveyed the possibilities and had decided on the Nha Trang — 'beautiful sand beaches' — better than Cambodia's Lank Bay — 'a desert'. they disagreed as to the kind of development which would make the most money: the pilot wanted to build a high class hotel and villas, while the copilot thought the future lay with low cost housing.⁸

Profit motives were reaching everywhere. Everyone was waiting for the U.S. victory and then they would swoop down claiming for themselves whatever they wanted. Sure, everyone would argue, all wars have their profiteers, but in Vietnam it was so widespread that the only word we have to adequately describe it is "amoral". Young boys were being sacrificed so that the civilians, the Saigonese,

prominent officials and American manufacturers could enjoy living high off the hog. The U.S. experienced no sacrifices, no rationing, no black outs, all the things usually seen during war efforts. On the contrary, waste abounded. Another veteran told me that one night while in South Vietnam a Master Sergeant warned him not to be alarmed over the increase in explosive activity within the next several days. The Sergeant was told there was a surplus of explosives and it would be more economical to blow off the excess than to be concerned with storage or the transport of it.

Another area of economic advantage during wartime was the U.S. job market. By creating a war, the military literally provided jobs for all the "baby-boom" boys who were coming of age. With the drafting of boys into the military, it kept thousands of them off the job market. Although this may not have lowered the unemployment rate, I feel it kept it from rising. I recall sitting in a class at the college during the years when many Vietnam veterans were returning home. This particular class had a high percentage of veterans and the professor explained to them why they would receive benefits to attend college. He told them that for all the men returning, the U.S. did not have jobs for them, so the government tried to keep them in school, and out of the job market, by giving education benefits to veterans.

What else happened to all the returning boys from Vietnam? As the war was winding-down, U.S. troops decreasing, Vietnamization of the Vietnamese beginning — Mr. and Mrs. American citizen began to realize the immorality of it all. The Vietnam veterans were not received by throngs of people parading for their heroes as had been done after other wars. Instead, the Vietnam veteran was considered a freak in American society. These boys were now drug users. They threw the medals away and burned their uniforms. The Americans now had to deal with the realization that the Vietnam conflict was a tragic, amoral escapade where profit was the main concern. Both North and South Vietnamese people were killed or mutilated constantly—men, women, even children and babies. I firmly believe the U.S. Administration kept the war active in Vietnam purely on the basis of selfish motives. (To say nothing of trying to keep Nixon from being "the first president to lose a war.") Yet they were successful: the U.S. soared to and through prosperity throughout the combat periods. Unfortunately, we could not anticipate all the tragic horrors it would cost us and our children.

In support of my conclusion of the profit motive in the Vietnam conflict, I would like to include results of a Gallup Poll taken in 1969. According to "public opinion" the poll revealed that Americans considered "Maintaining economic prosperity in the U.S.," more important than:

1. Safeguarding national security,
2. Maintaining the unity of the Western Alliance, and finally,
3. Limiting the spread of communism"⁹

*Submitted to Professor Luther Carpenter, HST 200, Historical Method, Spring 1982.

Notes

1. William J. Fulbright, *The Crippled Giant: American Foreign Policy and Its Domestic Consequences* (New York: Random House, 1972.)
2. John Kerry, *The New Soldier* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971), p. 14.
3. United Nations, *Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East* (Bangkok: U.N. Publications, 1962). hereafter cited as *U.N., Economic Survey*.
4. Mary McCarthy, *Vietnam* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967), p. 18.
5. Oriana Fallaci, *Nothing, And So Be It* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1972), p. 64.
6. *U.N., Economic Survey*, p. 101.
7. Kerry, *The New Soldier*, p. 80.
8. McCarthy, *Vietnam*, p. 23.
9. Walter Isard, *Vietnam Issues and Alternatives* (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1969), p. 95.

Bibliography

- Bram, Phillips, and Dicky. Funk & Wagnall's New Encyclopedia. New York: Funk & Wagnall's Inc., 1975.
- Fallaci, Oriana. *Nothing, And So Be It*. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1972.
- Fulbright, William J. *The Crippled Giant: American Foreign Policy and Its Domestic Consequences*.
- Isard, Walter. *Vietnam Issues and Alternatives*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1969.
- Kerry, John. *The New Soldier*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1971.
- McCarthy, Mary. *Vietnam*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.
- United Nations. *Economics Survey of Asia and the Far East*. Bangkok: U.N. Publications, 1962.

The Social Class Structure of Colonial America

Cathy Cutting

As in all societies, colonial America developed its own social stratification. The Englishmen, who gave close attention to rank, status, and social roles, attempted to imitate their European way of life as the colonial societies developed into several social and economic groups. But since the colonies differed in their needs, values, organization, location, and economic assets, social roles were valued differently and four basic types of colonial communities had developed by the eighteenth century. With the introduction of indentured servants and African slaves, the influx of Scotch-Irish immigrants, and factors such as demographic trends, economic development, technological innovations, population growth, and wars, there was a movement toward more sharp distinctions and a widening gap in wealth.

One of the major factors responsible for the social classes that developed in America was the absence of the rich English aristocrats who preferred to remain comfortable in England. Very few of these men came to America in the seventeenth century, and still fewer came in the eighteenth century, although many of this class contributed the money and organizational ability needed for colonizing the New World. Below the aristocracy were the country gentry and the wealthier merchants, office holders, and professional men who ran the joint-stock companies which helped launch the early settlements and provided investment capital necessary for economic development in the New World. Some from this class migrated themselves, but most sent their sons. Close to one third of the immigrants were English farmers and artisan shopkeepers. They were not wealthy but were respected men who participated in England's political life and the Church. In the New World, they were able to move up the social ladder quickly, mainly by acquiring land and bound laborers, who comprised the bulk of America's middle class.

The remaining colonizers (about one-half of all the settlers) consisted of indentured servants who lacked sufficient funds for the voyage to the New World. In return for passage, these people contracted-out their labor for a period of time, usually five to seven years. Some indentured servants were from England's struggling working-class; some were the landless who were displaced into the cities after the farmlands were closed-off for the production of wool; others were beggars, vagabonds, or petty criminals who either left on their own or were exiled; still others were tricked or kidnapped by greedy merchants into becoming indentured, for it quickly became a prosperous trade.

The first batch of indentured servants were treated fairly well, and when freed, were able to become politically active landowners. As the colonists began to become class conscious, they bought, sold, and treated their servants as slaves. The servants, along with the African slaves, provided the colonists with badly-

needed cheap labor and the colonists quickly took advantage of this. Most masters did not allow their bound laborers to marry or to have a family life in order to get as much work out of their laborers as possible. By the end of the seventeenth century only one out of ten freed servants became a landowner and another one out of ten gained status as an artisan. The other eight either died or became poor propertyless day laborers or farming, tenants while the rest became vagrants.

From the very beginning of the settlement of the New World there had been social distinctions between the colonists which had been carried over from England. But they were by no means as rigid as in England, for in fighting for survival against the wilderness and the Indians, the colonists often rubbed elbows. Rank had little value when it came to fighting for survival. It is no wonder then that military figures such as John Smith and Thomas Dale of early Virginia rose to the highest rank on the social ladder. The colonists, although grudgingly at times, realized that martial leadership was necessary if they were to survive. Clergymen shared the highest rank of status with the military leaders who were the governors of most of the colonies. The early colonists were as concerned with their souls as with survival, and later with acquiring as much land as possible. The Puritan ministers of New England were especially held in high esteem.

In many of the early settlements, since land was abundant in the New World, the head of each family received a share of land according to his social and economic class. For instance, in Wallingford, Connecticut, the highest ranking men were given 476 acres, the majority of middlemen received 357 acres, and 238 acres went to members of the lowest class. In the North especially, land was at first easily obtained for very low prices, and the colonists were able to spread payments for the land over a number of years. In this way, the poor could become independent farmers who were entitled to vote, for in colonial America, land ownership was required in order to vote. But no matter how much land these poor colonists owned, they were still impoverished. They had to start out with uncleared land and they lacked the farm tools, animals, and labor necessary to make them prosperous. As a result, most of these farms produced little above subsistence level, thereby preventing the immediate development of large scale commercial agriculture. Due to the absence of a wealthy class, combined with the many hardships these first settlers faced, their subsistence farm communities had a very simple and sometimes hardly distinct social class structure. They treated the first servants and even slaves very decently, and in most cases dined with the bound laborers at the same table. Such communities existed at Cambridge and Hasick, Massachusetts; Groshen, Connecticut; and Berks County, Pennsylvania.

From the expanded use of servants and slaves arose the commercial farm society in communities located on navigable rivers or with easily accessible harbors. In contrast to subsistence farm villages, commercial farm communities had greater wealth, more rich men and larger farms with a greater concentration of property in the possession of the few wealthy. The communities also contained more free white laborers more artisans, merchants, and professional men who were also farmers. Groton, Connecticut; New Town and the Hudson Valley communities in New York; Burlington County, New Jersey; and Chester County,

Pennsylvania were such commercial farm communities.

Little by little, the control of the government fell into the hands of the military leaders and the few elite men who were given large land grants due to their political influence. These men, using bound laborers, became the wealthy ruling aristocrats, who monopolized rich farming land and forced poorer settlers and freed servants to seek land on the frontier. Thus, the third basic type of colonial community was born. Their inhabitants were mainly the poor in search of cheap farming land, for who would want to leave the protection of the established towns except for the desperate? In these societies the farmer produced barely enough to survive. They lived very simply, relying almost solely upon their surroundings for survival just as the Indians did. They even copied some Indian ways, such as their more practical style of dress which earned them the name of "buckskins" and the disdain of the already established colonists.

Throughout the colonial period class lines were hardening. As early as 1630, John Winthrop, the military governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, declared that at all times there must be some men who are poor, mean, and subjugate, while some must be rich, eminent, and in power. Many colonists believed that the social class differences were not only essential to maintenance or order, stability and advancement, but were sanctioned by God.

In the 1660's, John Locke wrote the Fundamental Constitutions of the Carolinas, setting up a feudal-type aristocracy. Forty percent of the land was owned by only eight barons! Only a baron was able to become governor. The colonists staged many rebellions over this policy. After a number of rebellions, the Crown took over control of the Carolinas, and the few barons seized over a half million acres of the rich land near the coasts. The rest of the settlers were forced to either head for the frontier or to remain and become squatters on bits of land for which they had to fight the attempts of the barons to collect rent throughout the rest of the colonial period.

The leaders of early Boston were a few rich men who were granted large amounts of land and who tried to impose England's social arrangements upon the colonists. They had much help and support from the clergy by carefully arranged marriages and controlled trade and the government through the Church.

In New York, Dutch immigrants set up a feudal kingdom along the Hudson River. Barons and lords owned enormous land estates and controlled the lives of their tenants. Under Governor Benjamin Fletcher, three-quarters of the land belonged to thirty people!

As the wilderness receded and the fight for survival was on, the tobacco planter of Virginia, through the sweat of servants and slaves, replaced the military leaders at the top of the social scale. Ownership of land, servants, and slaves became the criteria for social status. Also, with the profitable trade of African slaves and indentured servants, the merchants and sea captains gained enormous wealth and in turn, high social esteem. These merchants and sea captains were only able to profit so greatly through the horrible suffering the bound laborers were forced to endure on the voyage to the New World. They were packed and chained so closely together in the ship's hold where they could barely move. Because of these wretched conditions many became sick, died, or committed

suicide by jumping overboard. By 1700, nearly every colonist who was above the poverty level owned at least one bound laborer. The colonists were becoming more aware of their class status, and in most colonies laws were passed concerning the punishment of its citizens. Some even passed laws concerning the proper style of dress for various classes. The Massachusetts Act of 1651 declared;

. . . our utter detestation and dislike that men and women of mean conditions should take upon themselves the garb of gentlemen, by wearing gold and silver, lace or buttons, or points at their knees or to walk in bootes or women of the same ranks to weare silke or tiffany horlles or scarfes, which though allowable to persons of greater estates or more liberal education, yet we cannt but judge it intollerable in persons of such like conditions.¹

Whipping, the most common punishment for servants and slaves, was not permitted for those of high rank. Instead, the stripping of titles such as "Gentlemen" or "Mister" served as punishment for the high ranking — a lifelong embarrassment. Servants, in addition to being whipped bloody, usually by their master, were also punished with additional service when caught either running away or planning or participating in a rebellion. The additional service was usually twice the amount of time lost to the master, but sometimes, as in Pennsylvania, it was calculated at a five-to-one ratio, and in Maryland at a ten-to-one ratio.

In the New England colleges, students were given a class rank according to their families' social rank. Likewise Puritans were assigned seats in Church according to their rank in the community. Since each time they went to church they were reminded of their status, it is no surprise that they quickly became aggressive in obtaining land.

As the gap between rich and poor widened, the colonists' resentments over this situation brought classes and sections into sharp alignment — the small farmers, the landless day laborers, and the frontiersmen against the elite, rich, large landowning rulers. Many rebellions took place, especially in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, which toppled the aristocratic governments of New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. This led to political instability by the end of the century and helped ready the lower and middle classes for the Revolution.

Although the free white workers were better-off than the bound laborers, they resented oppressive and unfair treatment by the wealthier classes, especially in the cities. The city was the fourth basic type of colonial community to develop, and during the eighteenth century they expanded rapidly. In seventeenth century cities the contrast between rich and poor increased rapidly. The same was true for the small proportion who owned a large percent of the land and who made up the upper, aristocratic class. The merchants made-up the middle class, while small farmers, fishermen, and mechanics comprised the lower class, along with jobless freed servants, slaves, and beggars.

Many of the colonists and indentured servants saw release from the restraining bonds of civil and religious authority in the New World, and so they resented the elite ruling class. In New York in the 1650's, porters and truckers refused to carry salt, protesting government control of the fees they charged. These men

were prosecuted for striking.

In Virginia, a rebellion known as "Bacon's Rebellion" took place in 1676, shaking up Virginia's aristocratic government. Nathaniel Bacon, a former political aristocrat, led a few hundred frontiersmen, servants, and slaves against the ruling elite who refused to protect these settlers from the Indians after they were forced into Indian territory seeking land, because the friends of the governor had been given large grants of rich land. As their plantations were growing, the aristocrats found it beneficial to remain friendly with the Indians, and they attempted to pit the Indians against one another. Meanwhile, the rulers continued to collect taxes from the colonists. In response to the rebellion, England sent troops, hung many rebels and established the Navigation Acts. These Acts gave a trading monopoly to English merchants and allowed them to set their own prices. As a result, the colonists were exploited by the wealthy, and the entire colony in general was exploited by England.

By the eighteenth century, as population, wealth, and commerce increased, the distinction between the rich and poor became much sharper. Poverty became so great in the cities that the rulers were forced to build poor houses. Interclass mobility, especially for the freed servant, decreased. In New England, as conservative values began to erode, the colonists became increasingly aggressive and materialistic which aided the merchants in becoming more prosperous and powerful. Through this period, England was fighting a series of wars which, as usually happens, made many merchants rich. The merchants were able to charge outrageous prices for their goods, and the colonists were forced to pay the merchants' prices or do without. For most colonists, the wars meant higher taxes, higher prices, shortages of goods, unemployment, and poverty. A food shortage in Boston in 1713 led to extravagant prices. Andrew Belcher, a wealthy merchant, was exporting grain to the Caribbean because the profit there was greater. In May, two hundred angry people rioted on the Boston Common, attacking Belcher's ships and breaking into his warehouses. Riots also occurred throughout the colonies when England drafted men into her navy.

In the middle of the eighteenth century the use of violence by the poor and lower middle classes increased as the gap between the rich and poor increased. Attempting to gain the support of the middle class, the government made some concessions to the middle class. It was willing to kill-off the Indians when they were in the settlers' way, especially since the Indians were aiding the runaway servants and slaves. Strict laws were passed pertaining to anyone who aided runaway servants and slaves. White craftsmen, mechanics, and traders were protected from freed servants and slaves taking their jobs by laws that were passed by the government in another attempt to gain support.

In the North, slaves were rare, except in Boston and Philadelphia where they made up eight percent of the population, and in New York where they rose to twenty percent in 1770. The wealthy classes in the northern cities made up about ten percent of the population and owned over forty percent of the real estate in 1771. In Philadelphia the rich owned sixty-six percent of the land, and in Boston they owned fifty-seven percent. Nearly thirty-three percent of the city dwellers were extremely poor.² As more and more laborers were fighting the upper class

for their rights, a new class of lawmen just below the ruling landowners was created by the ruling class.

In the northern commercial farming communities the upper class continued to monopolize the land. More men were becoming landless and losing their vote and voice in the government. Those men who also ran small shops had the help of their wives in these shops as they struggled to get the most out of their farms. Their unmarried daughters became maids for wealthy women who occupied themselves by planning parties and seating arrangements for their dinner guests. Neither rich nor poor women were allowed to vote in any of the colonies, and only in the Quaker communities did women have any say regarding religious affairs.

The northern subsistence farm villages remained simple with a very small group of well-to-do residents. The majority of people owned a small amount of land. In Goshen, Connecticut in 1771 the richest ten percent paid only twenty-three percent of the taxes. Eleven percent paid taxes on nonfarm occupations.³ On the frontiers, land was still easy to obtain and there was still the absence of a wealthy class. For the most part, these communities remained poor, with the inhabitants relying upon themselves for all that they needed. But these people had to deal with the Indians and the wilderness.

In the South, with the exception of South Carolina, forty percent of the colonists worked as tenant farmers or agricultural laborers. No more than five percent of the white landowners were wealthy enough by the mid-eighteenth century to possess large slave-worked plantations. About two-thirds owned farms of two hundred acres or less and a small number of slaves or servants.⁴ Only in South Carolina was slaveholding widespread, and the plantations were much larger. Nonetheless, the southern colonists' idea of wealth and status was to own a large plantation with many slaves and servants. This belief, plus the fact that the southern farms were able to produce two crops a year, enabled these colonists to become agriculturally aggressive.

By the time of the Revolution, America was comprised of a majority of middle class free people who were ruled by a minority composed of the strong upper classes. At the expense of slaves, servants, Indians, and poor whites, the rich made many concessions to the middle class in order to continue to rule without losing any of their wealth or power. But the language of "Liberty" and "Equality" helped bring the classes together for a common cause — the fight for their freedom from England. For this was exactly what the rich wanted — to get enough white men united together to fight in the Revolution against England, without ending slavery or inequality.

*Submitted to Professor Herbert J. Foster, HST 101, American Civilization, Spring, 1982.

Notes

1. Gary B. Nash, *Class and Society in Early America*. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 6.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
4. Jackson T. Main, *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America*. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 33.

Bibliography

Main, Jackson Turner. *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Nash, Gary. *Class And Society In Early America*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Nash, Gary. *Red, White, And Black*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History Of The United States*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1980.

The Causes and Consequences of the Civil Rights Movement

Tony Davidow

In this paper, I want to examine some of the causes and consequences of the civil rights movements. As to be expected all the results of the civil rights movement have not been positive.

Behind every cause, there are a few people who become the martyrs and spokesmen. For example, Martin Luther King, Jr. was shot for his influence on his followers. Malcolm X lost his life, while Jackie Robinson withstood all the prejudice and forged ahead to break the color barrier in baseball. Eldridge Cleaver had a tremendous impact on the radical movement. In my research, I found a few people of whom I had not previously heard. People like William Monroe Trotter, W.E.B. DuBois, and James Howard Meredith have had big impacts but little publicity. If these men had not made their contributions, the movement would probably be still struggling along. Blacks have come a long way in gaining some rights and respect. Before the civil rights movement, blacks had their own designated restrooms, sat in the rear of the bus, and were barred from white-only restaurants. Possibly the worst feature of discrimination was the Supreme Court ruling of "Separate but Equal". Discrimination festered in employment, education, and living conditions. There were many acts of rebellion that eventually brought about the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

From the first day the blacks set foot on this continent, they were treated differently. In 1441 Antom Goncalvez captured the first Africans. After the news spread, more and more people began to get involved in the slave trade. Although the first Africans in the English colonies of North America were not called slaves at first, they had a different status than indentured servants. From 1500 to 1850, between 8 to 11 million Africans were brought to the Americas. That does not take into account the very high mortality rate. More than one half of the Africans died because of the poor treatment they received during the rigorous trip to the New World. Many Europeans came to the New World as indentured servants. That was their choice. There was an immediate distinction between indentured servants and the black man. Right from the beginning, the blacks had little choice or voice about anything.

The black man had to learn to live with a feeling of being inferior, almost sub-human. They were brutally oppressed during the colonial period of this country. When the colonists decided they did not like the way they were being treated by the English, they decided to break away. The blacks helped in the War of Independence, thinking maybe they would be treated better themselves.

Crispus Attacks was the first man killed in the Revolution. He was a black. Afterwards things did not change for blacks. However, the white men decided to create a better society for themselves. There was one catchy line in the

Declaration of Independence. It had to do with all **white men** being equal in the eyes of the law.

In 1865 a nice guy named Abraham Lincoln granted freedom for all blacks, nearly 100 years after the colonists got their freedom from England. Unfortunately, even after the Civil War most blacks were still employed as unskilled laborers because they lacked the proper training. Many whites still viewed the blacks as slaves, especially in the South. Although they were in essence “free”, they had difficulty in finding a lifestyle much better than before. A few years later the status of the black man was clarified in a Supreme Court decision, “Plessy vs. Ferguson”. The decision was that blacks were “separate but equal”. It does not sound very fair by our standards today but this was a Supreme Court decision.

The steps leading up to the civil rights movement were very slow and agonizing. The conditions the blacks lived under for centuries were horrendous at best. First they were treated as sub-human, being sold like livestock, then after their eventual freedom, they were separate but equal.

The civil rights movement was a series of little incidents on top of slightly bigger ones. The earliest rebellion to white supremacy was in Boston in 1905. William Monroe Trotter, a black Harvard graduate and a real estate broker, together with George Forbes formed the *Boston Guardian* in 1901. Trotter dedicated his life to the destruction of Booker T. Washington. Washington was an influential black leader but Trotter viewed him as an “Uncle Tom”. Trotter wanted to write the true black stories; he did not want the sugar-coated white man’s version.

On July 30, 1905, Booker T. Washington came to the AME Zion Church in Boston to speak. Trotter and his followers leaped to their feet and shouted insults and questions. A small disturbance erupted, which made all the papers. The blacks finally received some attention for actually having views. It seems a bit ironic that one of the first “riots” was between two blacks and their followers.

Another very outspoken black of this period was W.E.B. DuBois. He was one of the founding fathers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.) which was officially organized in May of 1910. DuBois was the only Negro officer. Its first branch was in Chicago in 1913, with 1,100 members. DuBois was the editor of the *Crisis*, the official paper of the N.A.A.C.P. Since the group was run by whites, they did not approve of some of DuBois’ writing. They felt he should not be so abrasive. But DuBois was not an Uncle Tom. He wrote what he felt so he was forced into resigning as editor. Blacks did not control the N.A.A.C.P. until 1920.

DuBois and Trotter tried to tell the people that black men were not going to be treated like servants anymore. They tried to instill a feeling of self respect in their followers. This philosophy gradually spread in the years to come. These two men were very influential in the civil rights movement although you do not hear that much about them — like I said earlier, a little incident followed by a slightly bigger incident until a full fledged rebellion was in progress.

One of the very biggest incidents happened on May 17, 1954. Segregation of blacks in school was outlawed in the “Brown vs. the Topeka, Kansas Board of Education” decision. This was a very important Supreme Court decision, but

extremely controversial. Unfortunately this decision was not enforced effectively. The Supreme Court did not announce its enforcement until May 31, 1955.

Georgia's governor, Herman Talmadge (later to become senator), stated he would not accept racially mixed schools no matter what the Supreme Court said. Louisiana's Governor Robert Kennon said the court did not have the right to tell them how to run their schools. President Eisenhower remained very quiet through all this. The Supreme Court was being challenged and was not getting any support even from the President.

In February of 1956, the Alabama court ordered admission of Autherine Lucy to the University of Alabama. A three-day riot ensued. The school consequently suspended Lucy. The Brown decision apparently had no impact on any of the southern states. This latest incident was followed by "The Declaration of Constitutional Principles" or Southern Manifesto. It was signed by 19 senators and 17 representatives from 11 states. Five more representative later signed. They said that the Supreme Court sent down an "unwarranted decision". They stated that the Supreme Court had substituted "Naked Power for established law". These senators and representatives rejected the Warren Commission's construction of the equal protection clause. They supported the "Plessy vs. Ferguson", separate but equal, principle. Forty-one elected officials refused to abide by a Supreme Court decision. The civil rights movement and the constitution were both being challenged. The president was silent and not willing to show any guidance.

Our next president was much more supportive. He spoke out and defended the civil rights movement and upheld the constitution. Kennedy and Johnson were very influential in helping this cause. Without these two white men, the black man might still be struggling today. In 1956 the southern states were dominating the mood of the country. There were many blacks who struggled for a cause they believed in but it almost seemed hopeless.

In 1962 a milestone was reached. It is called the showdown at Ole Miss. James Howard Meredith wanted to enter the University of Mississippi. Governor Ross Barnett strongly disapproved. President Kennedy would not allow Barnett to succeed in keeping Meredith out of Ole Miss. The Supreme Court said that it was a violation to deny admittance because he was black. Barnett said he would throw anyone who offered assistance to Meredith in jail. He stopped Meredith's admittance the first time he tried. The U.S. Court of Appeals fined him. On September 29, Kennedy ordered a stop to all legal resistance. On Sunday afternoon, September 30, the federal government flew Meredith to Oxford from Memphis and had him driven to the Ole Miss campus in a state police car, followed by U.S. marshals.

At 7:00 p.m., a riot broke out. There was a chant of "2, 4, 6, 8, we don't want to integrate." Three hundred seventy five U.S., marshals and rioters were injured, two killed. President Kennedy sent 400 more U.S. marshals to the campus. By daybreak the troops drove off 2,500 rioters. The president had sent a total of 30,000 troops. By the end of October, only 500 were left. James Howard Meredith graduated from Ole Miss in 1963 with a bachelors degree in political science. He then moved to New York where he got a law degree from Columbia.

In 1964 possibly the most important document ever for the black man was

signed. It was the Civil Rights Act. Another important act was the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Unfortunately a big price was paid; Kennedy was killed although it is not certain there is any connection. For centuries blacks have suffered, and even today they are still struggling. These two acts at least gave them hope.

Martin Luther King, Jr. set the tone for the years to come. He told his people that he had a dream, a dream in which all people were free. In Memphis in 1968, Martin Luther King was killed. But his dream still lives — because that is the way he wanted it. He had said in his speeches he might never live to see the day when his dream would come true, but he wanted his followers to remember the dream.

On June 19, 1965, Malcolm X was shot while addressing a crowd in New York. Malcolm X was more radical than King but had a positive influence just the same. Malcolm X had been in prison so it is only natural that he encouraged a more drastic change. Eldridge Cleaver was also a radical leader. What is important though is what the black leaders have wanted for their people, a better life for future generations. There were many great men and many great actions. Some of the bigger events were in Boston 1905, the Brown decision 1954, Greensboro 1960, Birmingham 1963, the march on Washington 1963, Selma to Montgomery 1965.

The civil rights movement did not end with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is still very much in progress today. The difference is that it is more widely recognized as being a full fledged movement. When Trotter and Washington had words in Boston, few people thought it was anything more than a little disagreement between two blacks. But the feelings behind this cause became intensified as time went on.

The movement is active today but it has different spokesmen. Athletes such as Mohammed Ali seem to have the loudest voices in the movement today. Vernon Jordan is another very powerful black man. The South even has black mayors now. With more and more blacks getting actively involved in politics, their voices are being carried farther. Many of the most renowned athletes are black so youths are being exposed to black men and learning to accept, even idolize them. With affirmative action, blacks are getting more educational and employment opportunities.

Affirmative action requires a minority quota. A college is required to admit a certain percentage of blacks. There have been opponents to this who have said that a reverse discrimination now exists. There was even a Supreme Court decision (the Bakke case) agreeing in this matter. But there is no denying the prejudice that the blacks lived with for centuries. Things will not be settled in a few years when it took so long to get so bad.

Blacks now have many more rights and powers but until people stop making the differentiation between the blacks and the whites, there will not be total equality. When you can see an athlete, a singer, a dancer, or a politician as a person first and a color second then equality will exist. When whites can be active in the civil rights movement, you know progress has been made.

*Submitted to Professor Herbert J. Foster, HST 101, American Civilization, Fall, 1981.

Bibliography

Bennett, Lerone, Jr., *Confrontation: Black and White*, Johnson Publishing Co., 1965.

Carney, John P., *A Changing Nation*, Consensus Publications, Inc., 1973.

Clarke, John Henrik, *Harlem Signet*, the New American Library, Inc., 1970.

Cleaver, Eldridge, *Soul on Ice*, Dell Publications, 1968.

Epps, Edgar G., *Race Relations*, Winthrop Publication, 1973.

Wilhoit, Francis M., *The Politics of Massive Resistance*, Francis M. Wilhoit, 1973.

English Capitalism in the New World

Maria Morrow Gutterman

Sir Walter Raleigh declared: "Who rules the trade of the world rules the wealth of the world and consequently the world itself."

In the seventeenth century, England's economic and naval supremacy in Europe allowed her to play a decisive role in conquering and colonizing the American continent. Although there were religious, economic and social reasons for immigration, I believe the main impulse for exploration and colonization was economic. And of all the economic motives the search for a shorter route to India was the first and the most persistent. The English were well aware of the advantages of discovering a northwest passage that would provide a shorter, more direct route to the East. Such a route, the English believed, would also open up a market for England's wool industry. Following Spain's discovery of silver and gold in Mexico and Peru, the acquisition of precious metals became another important economic motive for colonization. Wealth meant power, and the New World's unexplored riches beckoned them. Thus, capitalist impulses had set in motion the process of colonization, and the two became inextricably mingled.

Enthusiasm for English commercial expansion took tangible shape when Sir Walter Raleigh persuaded Queen Elizabeth to charter a scouting party along the Chesapeake Bay in 1585. This group of settlers devoted most of their energy to searching the countryside for silver or gold and exploring the nearby rivers seeking the northwest passage to the Pacific Ocean. They failed at both of course, and Raleigh returned to England the following year. After this failure, twenty years passed before England once again became intrigued with the promising possibilities of the New World. This renewed interest in America was financed mainly by groups of merchants or promoters who were organized in joint stock companies. The members pooled their capital, trusting its management to a small group of directors. Such English capitalists invested in the London Company's venture at Jamestown. The London Company was formed to develop trade in North America. It had a charter from King James I to make settlements along the coast of what are now the states of Virginia and North Carolina. Investors hoped for a quick and substantial return on their money through trade with these settlements. In April 1607, three ships sailed into the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay. The shores of the New World, dressed in the colors of spring, received the new inhabitants.

Earlier explorers had given glowing reports of the natural productiveness of the country, and these new settlers had great expectations. It was thought that many raw materials and other products that England needed might be available. The colonies proved to be sources of enormous wealth in terms of lumber, furs, and fish. The much-needed lumber would build English ships and the by-products,

pitch and tar, would make them watertight. The lumber would also fuel the iron and copper furnaces, plus supply needed potash and dyes for England's woolen factories. More directly, the profits to be made through the trade of all of these commodities would be high. Despite its many natural resources, the Jamestown soil did not produce the anticipated precious metals or minerals. However, it did produce a strong variety of tobacco cultivated by the Indians. Through experiments with a South American tobacco, John Rolfe produced a more pleasing mixture which soon became popular in the English market. By 1626, Virginia colonists were shipping over 500,000 pounds of tobacco to England. King James I granted huge areas of land to be used for the cultivation of tobacco, and settlers began acquiring land privately as the tobacco boom continued. With the emergence of tobacco as its major export crop, colonial growth was assured.

*Submitted to Instructor Maryann Castelucci, ENG 511, Spring 1982.

Response to Some Questions on the Philosophy of G.W.F. Hegel

Virginia Hoolahan

1. How does Hegel explain the development of the Nation-State as the means whereby Freedom** is realized?

Hegel tells us that Freedom is history's basic theme — its goal and direction. And he tells us that Freedom, which is the realization of the Divine Idea, can only be achieved through the Nation-State. To understand why he believes this is so, it is essential to define what Hegel means by Freedom for it is a concept very unlike that of the individual freedom of Locke or collective freedom of Rousseau.

Hegel defines man as a social and political animal and believes that the freedom of man in the State of Nature, i.e., before society, is an illusion. Man, without the necessary and desirable restraints of social society, is not free but a "slave to appetite," for he will be guided not by thought or morality but only by destructive passions and instincts. It is only in his role as part of a moral and ethical community — the State — that the Spirit of man and, thereby, true freedom, can be fully developed.

This Spirit can be developed because, according to Hegel, man has a spiritual nature as well as a physical one. He remains a part of the natural world, but it is his spiritual nature which is the driving creative force that allows him to modify and develop the world around him. It is through the use of choice that the Spirit of man develops an aesthetic world of ideas, culture and civilization. The State is the form this Spirit takes when a people have reached a certain level of development. It is the only means by which this Spirit can manifest itself and this manifestation is the reason for its existence. True Freedom, then, will exist only through and in the State — and man's highest level of freedom is achieved when the private interests of the individual are one and the same with those of the State. So, we see that according to Hegel the State is a necessary development for the realization of man's potential as a Spiritual being and, therefore, a truly free one.

The State then takes its place in the ongoing historical process of the Spirit developing itself and striving for realization of the Divine Ideal of Freedom, not only for one but for all. This process may take centuries, but its direction is predetermined, and through the decline and growth of the Nation-States, the Idea continues to grow towards fulfillment. The Nation-State, then, is the realization of the Idea as it exists at any one particular point in time, and it is through its laws and morality that Freedom materializes on the world stage. Therefore, there can be no true Freedom outside the State; and in fact, Freedom is the result of the State.

2. What role does Hegel accord to the individual in history?

Hegel believes history is the unfolding and development of the Divine Idea. There is in history a pattern, a "law of development" and what is significant in this process is not the role of individuals or particular events, but the State as the manifestation of the Spirit in its struggle towards fulfillment. The individual can play a role, but only as a "tool" used by history for its own purposes. The individual does not create his own role; if he and the role have value, it is because they fit the part for which the forces of history have created an opening.

It is Hegel's belief that the traditional view of history has been mistaken in believing that the Hero can affect or change history. Rather, Hegel asserts that individuals do not influence the World Spirit or add anything to the Idea which was not already there. Instead, history's great figures are those who have the ability or insight to see what is happening and whose private interests and passions coincide with the needs of the moment. The Hero's motives are not important because Hegel believes that man cannot foresee the consequences of his actions and that, in fact, intentions and results are unrelated. The individual's role and the outcome of his actions are accidental and unknown to him.

Hegel believes the historical figure does play a role in the formation and maintenance of the State, for the State realizes itself by means of the individual's actions. This he calls the "raw material" of history. And for Hegel, these "great" figures must stand "outside of morality,"¹ for world historical figures are not to be judged by the same ethical standards of behavior as are other individuals. Indeed, Hegel tells us "the mighty form of the hero must trample down many an innocent flower,"² i.e., those individuals who lack the insight or energy to see or act on the historical situation. But in either case, whether Hero or Victim, both individuals are merely "tools of history" who after being used by it will be discarded.

Hegel does believe there is one way in which an individual can play a more permanent role in history: by contributing to the development of the World Spirit in the areas of religion, ethics and morality. Through such participation, an individual is participating in history and is not merely a "means to an end" as he is in all other instances.

I do not agree with Hegel that the individual is only a "tool" of history. The great historical figures are remembered not because their passions and interests fit in with the "tide" of history but because their impact on history was unique and could have been made by no one else.

I agree that time and place play a role and set the stage for the appearance of the historical figure, but it is the "Hero" whose ability and passions move and shape history. I do not believe that the history of Germany and Europe would have been the same without Adolf Hitler. Although the time may have been right for German nationalism, the events leading up to World War II and the horrors of that war itself were largely determined by Hitler's personality. They were not merely the inevitable results of time and situation. Germany, the world, and history itself were changed because of him — and given the same time and situation, but a different leader, I believe a very different history would have been forged.

I cannot imagine Elizabethan England without Elizabeth or Renaissance Italy without the Medici. These individuals were not pawns. They created their roles and molded their countries and times. And they are accountable to history for their actions, for unlike Hegel, I do not believe they are “outside of morality.” Rather they are to be judged even more scrupulously than the average individual for the potential to do good or harm is so much greater.

History does not use historical figures. Instead, these figures are active participants who bring about and leave their imprint on history forever.

3. Does the State constitute the “March of God” through history as Hegel believed?

I cannot see any Divine Force at work in the State or in history itself. I believe the State is merely the organized, collective actions of a particular group of people bound together by race, culture or religion. It is a practical and perhaps necessary arrangement for people to join together in such units, but it is not the “March of God.” Rather, I believe history and the roles individual Nation-States play in it are results of accident of geography and climate in combination with the actions and mistakes of man.

The history of Poland for example has been shaped by its geography. For centuries conquering armies have crossed Poland’s plains and the nation’s boundaries and history have changed with each of these surges. One can also see how the history of England has been formed by her physical location: as an island with no part located more than 75 miles from the water, it was natural for her to go to sea. The wealth and raw materials captured by the English brought them to world power and made England the birthplace of the Industrial Revolution.

Man also plays a role in shaping history, sometimes through his errors. One wonders what history would have been like if Hitler had not been misjudged by the world’s leaders and had been opposed before Czechoslovakia in 1938. Sometimes positive changes are made because of man’s actions. What would American society today be like without the impact and innovations of Franklin Roosevelt? And certainly one must always wonder what changes the assassin’s bullet brings. Would we have had a different Reconstruction period if Lincoln had not been killed, or a long, protracted war in Vietnam if JFK had lived? There are no answers to these questions; there cannot be because history is made by these individual acts and by chance events.

Further, how can one live in the nuclear age and feel comfortable with Hegel’s idea of a Divine Plan predetermining the fate of the State and of history? With nations living on the brink of disaster, talking more and more about nuclear war as a possibility, how is it possible to accept the Hegelian notions of “Reason” or “March of God” through history? No, I do not see a plan or pattern, Divine or otherwise. I see only the daily events of life moving along in an unknown and unplanned way. Hegel’s theory would be a more consoling view; I almost wish I could believe it.

4. If the State is successful, can it ever be wrong?

According to Hegel's philosophy, world-historical acts and agents are outside moral judgments. He believes it "irrelevant and inappropriate"³ for individuals to apply their own purely subjective standards of good and evil, right and wrong to these actions. History, he tells us, has its own morality. Whatever happened was "good" because it was meant to happen as part of the Divine Plan striving to realize itself.

I find this impossible to accept. I do not believe there is a Divine Plan at work in history, nor do I believe that because something happens, for whatever reason, that I must accept it as necessary and, therefore, good. Quite the contrary, I believe the actions of States and historical figures must be examined and judged by the same moral standards we use in our personal moral life. No acts of any individual or of any State can be "outside of morality"; they must answer to present and succeeding generations for their deeds.

From this perspective I see no connection between the degree of success of a State and its morality. England was an enormously successful State, but her power and wealth were built on the subjugation of others. Colonialism is a system that denies people their freedom, their identities and cultures, and is morally wrong, even if successful.

Certainly American history has several examples of success completely divorced from morality. This nation was very successful in its westward expansion and growth, but American policy towards Native Americans was indefensible and anything but moral. And the United States was successful in World War II — it emerged victorious and the strongest and richest nation in the world — but can anyone claim the bombing and destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were moral acts?

At best, I would say that the success of a State is not related to the degree of its morality. At times, in fact, it seems to be just the opposite: a State is often successful because it is willing to be immoral.

*Submitted to Professor Nathan Greenspan, POL 202, Spring 1982.

**Editor's note: The author used upper-case letters to indicate Hegel's use of certain concepts as distinguished from her own or the more general usage of these ideas.

Notes

1. G.W.F. Hegel, *Reason in History* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1979), p. 83.
2. Hegel, p. xxxix.
3. Hegel, p. 83.

Bibliography

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Reason in History*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1979.

Pelczynski, Z.A., ed. *Hegel's Political Philosophy: Problems and Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

The Origin of Slavery in the Colonial South

Gina Navarino

The history of black settlers in America began in 1619 with the arrival of twenty Africans in the colony at Jamestown, Virginia. The Africans, sold to the colonists in exchange for food, became indentured servants. Large numbers of white colonists were also indentured servants, thus black people started life in America on an equal basis with many whites. The white colonists, however, wanting to make large economic advantages, played on people's prejudices and ignorance and soon were able to lower the position of the African from servant to slave.

Cries for freedom were made by both blacks and whites before and during the period of the American Revolution. Black people wanted freedom from slavery; white people wanted freedom from England. But when freedom became a reality, it was for whites only.

Between the years 1640 and 1660, slavery in Virginia became a permanent fact. Historians do not know exactly when Africans became slaves. But it is known that the African population during this period included not only indentured servants but slaves and freemen as well. As time went by, an increasing number of Africans were threatened with permanent servitude.

The colonists and the English government both recognized and protected white servants' indentures. In comparison, Africans, who were considered foreigners because of their different skin color, lands of origin, and customs received no protection under the English law. Thus it was easy for the colonists to treat Africans harshly and to change their status from servant to slave. Legally, slavery was established first by court decisions on specific cases and later by written laws. After the year 1640, many Africans who were brought to Virginia received no indentures or contracts. They could not expect to gain their freedom after a set number of years.

In Maryland, slavery had started the same way as in Virginia. In both colonies the first Africans to arrive were servants. During the early colonial period, African servants in Maryland, and Virginia, gained their freedom upon completing their contracts or after becoming Christians.

More important than the ways in which blacks became free were the ways that they became slaves. Laws were passed which discriminated against blacks and set them apart from white colonists. After the 1660s both colonies passed laws which made Africans slaves for life. The law made it clear that if a mother was a slave, her child would also be a slave. To these laws it was added that conversion to Christianity no longer enabled Africans to escape slavery. The following are examples of laws that imposed slavery upon Africans:

In Virginia in 1662 it was decreed that: "Children got by an Englishman upon a Negro Woman, shall be Slaves or Free according

to the condition of the Mother”

And in 1670: “All Servants, not being Christians, imported into this Country by Shipping, shall be Slaves for their Life time, but such as come by Land shall serve, if Boys and Girls, till thirty years of age, if Men and Women, twelve years and no longer.”

The law in Maryland in 1692 stated: “Where any Negro or Slave, being in Servitude or bondage, is or shall become Christian, and receive the Sacrament of Baptism, the same shall not, nor ought to be deemed, adjudged, or construed to be a Manumission, or freeing of any such Negro or Slaves, or his or her Issue, from their Servitude or Bondage, but not withstanding they shall at all times hereafter be and remain in Servitude and Bondage as they were to the contrary not withstanding.”

And in 1705: “. . . . all servants imported and brought into this country by sea or land, who are not Christians in their native country shall be accounted and be slaves, and as such be here bought and sold not withstanding a conversion to Christianity afterwards.”

Slavery was not to be limited to one or two colonies for one simple reason — it was useful. The Carolina settlers saw other English colonists profiting from the cheap labor and wanted slaves to improve their rich lands. Members of the Royal African Company, a group of English businessmen who shipped slaves from Africa to the New World, held claim to the Carolina colony. They were interested in having slaves enter Carolina both for the large profits they could make from the trade and to promote the economic growth of the colony through the use of slave labor. The original settlers were encouraged to import slaves. They were offered twenty acres of free land for every male African slave and ten acres for every female African slave brought into the colony in the first year, or ten acres for males and five acres for females brought into the Carolinas during the first five years. This offer induced colonists to import as many Africans as they could possibly afford.

In Georgia, slavery did not begin until the mid eighteenth century and under different conditions. The colony was settled by Englishmen who had been released from prison and sent to start a new life in the New World. Trustees held the land and set up restrictions to govern it. In these restrictions, no African slaves were to be let into Georgia. The trustees felt that most of the new settlers would not be able to afford slaves, and even those who might save the necessary funds would be better-off restoring themselves. Georgians knew that other colonists owned slaves and were benefitting from their cheap labor. Eventually in 1741 the restrictions were lifted and Georgia’s colonists began hiring slaves from Carolina planters. By 1750 Georgians were allowed to own slaves.

Most of the Africans came from the west coast of Africa and represented many tribal and ethnic groups. Among the slaves were Yorubas, Ibos, Efiks, and Bianis from what is now Nigeria. Mandingos and Hausas came from the western Sudan; Ashantis and Fantis from the Gold Coast which is now Ghana; Dahomeans

from Dahomey; and Senegalese from Senegal. Although the Africans from these various areas had some things in common, in many ways they were different from one another. Each group possessed its own highly developed skills which had been formed by geography and culture. Africans brought a knowledge of agriculture and an understanding of an economy which in some places very much resembled the plantation system. In addition, some were skilled craftsmen such as woodcarvers, basket makers, weavers, potters, and iron workers.

In America, the Southern colonists paid little or no attention to the knowledge and skills the Africans brought to the New World. Instead, emphasis was placed on training Africans to do work needed on the plantations. When the Africans arrived on a plantation, they were assigned in groups to chosen slaves who led them in plantation life. The slaves used for this task were called drivers. A driver taught the new arrivals the little English that he knew and trained the newcomers to do plantation work which needed little skill. At the end of one year, the master or an overseer of the plantation took-over the training and assigned the slaves specific jobs. Unfortunately, plantation-training aimed only at preparing Africans to be slaves. It did not help them to improve their talents.

Many African servants in both the South and the North became slaves after 1640, but some did become freemen. Manumission could be achieved in a number of ways. Some slaves were freed by acts of legislation. These acts demanded that slave owners register the discharge of any slave in the court records. Some slaves gained their freedom through a statement in their masters' last will and testament. Other slaves received freedom as a reward for long and praiseworthy service. The more fortunate were able to purchase freedom for themselves and maybe for other members of their families. There are accounts of male slaves who worked to buy their wives and children. At times, wives worked to buy their husbands. Some mothers remained slaves themselves but worked so that their children might become free. Slaves who worked in towns had more opportunities to save enough money to meet the price they would bring if sold on the market. These slaves were skilled workers such as blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, shoemakers, cabinetmakers, painters, plasterers, and seamstresses. To gather the money they needed, town slaves worked nights and Sundays. They hired themselves out to other masters and used their skills on specific jobs until they had saved enough money to buy their freedom. Some masters, those who were more sympathetic or generous, allowed their slaves to buy their freedom in portion payments, while others lowered the market value of their slaves.

Although there were several ways in which slaves could gain freedom, there were numerous problems that kept most from becoming free. It was difficult when a master agreed to let a slave buy his freedom. Usually, several years would pass before a slave could save the money he needed. Occasionally a master would change his mind or even die before the slave could purchase himself, and the master's heirs would not honor the agreement. Those slaves who hired themselves out to other masters sometimes had difficulty collecting fees. There were even instances when a slave was sold before he could save the money that was needed. In such a case the slave had to make a bargain with his new master, who might ask a higher price.

Even though the number of freed slaves grew, the hopes, wishes, and dreams of freedom for many of those still enslaved would not become a reality. Instead their lives were to be filled with demands for hard work without pay, fear of separation from family members, unequal housing and food, and the frustration of having a position not much above that of farm animals. By 1790, 32,543 free blacks were living in the Southern states, as opposed to 641,691 blacks who were still living in slavery.

There was a common feeling among the slaves in America — a longing for freedom. Most of them seemed to be peaceful and obedient, but they really had no choice, and deep inside many were restless and resentful. Therefore, it was easy to persuade them to take action, at times violent, to gain their freedom. Almost from the beginning there were slaves who rebelled against the cruelty of their masters and the harshness of the slave codes.

The first uprising was in the colony of Virginia during the latter part of the seventeenth century. Even though the rebellion was put down, the slaves were not frightened. In 1739, a rebellion known as the Cato conspiracy was organized in South Carolina. It also failed. Even though they were not successful and many whites and blacks lost their lives, these early rebellions against slavery gave some hope to the slaves.

There were slaves and rebellions in the North as well as in the South. In New York in 1741, whites and slaves joined together to set fire to a building. The militia was called out and a number of the rebels were killed. Some of the rebels even chose to take their own lives rather than to be captured. In a short time after this, New York City experienced a series of unexplained fires. Harsh laws had been passed to control Negroes in New York, and it was believed that these fires had been set by poor whites and blacks who wanted to gain control of the city. There was a panic, and even though there was not much evidence against them, more than 150 people, including twenty-five whites, were seized and tried. In all, 101 Negroes were convicted, thirteen were burned alive, eighteen were hanged, and seventy were expelled from the colony. The public was so hysterical that it was virtually impossible to hold a fair trial.

Among the uprisings that went on into the nineteenth century, three stand out as examples of bravery and devotion to the cause of freedom among the slaves. The first of these, Gabriel's Revolt, took place in 1800. Gabriel Prosser was a thirty-four year old slave on a plantation near Richmond, Virginia. He organized thousands of slaves, armed them, and planned to attack the city of Richmond. But the authorities were contacted before the outbreak, and the state militia stopped the rebelling slaves. Many escaped, but among those captured, thirty-six, (including Gabriel), were executed. One slave told his captors that, like the soldiers in the revolution, he was willing to give his life to help his fellow slaves.

Denmark Vesey, another leader of a slave revolt, had been a slave in South Carolina. He had purchased his freedom and had become a successful carpenter. He learned to read, write and speak several languages. For a number of years, he carefully planned what became known as Vesey's Rebellion in 1822. He chose his troops from the ranks of the slaves, named his lieutenants, and gathered weapons, which he hid in secret caves. He prepared disguises for his army, in

what amounted to a true cloak-and-dagger plot. Again there were informers and again the authorities succeeded in crushing the plot. It has been calculated that Vesey had gathered together an organization of over 9,000 Negroes. More than 100 were arrested, and forty-seven were executed.

The slave owners became worried. They passed harsher laws to prevent their slaves from rebelling. In 1831 came the most famous of all rebellions — the Turner Rebellion — largest and most violent of them all. Nat Turner, the leader, was a Virginia slave who with his fellow rebels roamed through the Virginia countryside and killed more than sixty whites. State and Federal troops were killed, and over a hundred blacks lost their lives during the fighting. More were captured and hanged. Nat Turner made a dramatic escape into the woods, where he hid in caves and underbrush. He was finally tracked down by the authorities and executed.

By this time, white southerners were very frightened and were still not convinced that slavery was wrong. Instead, they decided to pass more stringent laws in order to restrict slave activities and to end the manumission of individual slaves, under any conditions. The only thing this did was to increase the number of slave uprisings in the South and it placed the free blacks in danger of losing whatever freedom they had, no matter how they had gained it.

After both the American Revolution and the War of 1812, Negroes who had served in the army were given freedom. Northern states provided for the gradual overthrow of slavery and many slaves were freed. They were considered by the slave owners not as free men, but as free persons of color. Free Negroes could not expect to enjoy the privileges of other free men.

There were numbers of free Negroes in the eastern states of Virginia and Maryland, and in many of the large cities of the Deep South, including New Orleans. Many of the free Negroes lived in Cincinnati, and Philadelphia, although some did go into the west and into communities in South Carolina and Florida.

To southerners, the presence of free Negroes in their midst was a threat and they took steps to prevent them from influencing the slaves. As far back as 1793, Virginia had forbidden free Negroes to enter the state. Soon other slave states adopted similar rules. Free Negroes in many states were forbidden to carry weapons or hold meetings without a special license. Similar to the slaves, the free blacks could not conduct church services unless a white minister was present. In many states they were restrained from visiting their families or friends, and they could not hold good jobs or own a business which might compete with whites.

Free Negroes had been given the right to vote in some of the original southern states, but the slave states that entered the Union after the Revolution denied Negroes this right. After 1800, some states in both the North and the South barred free Negroes from voting. The children of free Negroes, along with those of slaves, were not permitted to go to public schools, although their families were taxed, and part of their tax money went towards public education. In spite of this, free Negroes did not fail in their duty to their country.

After they had proven their bravery and dependability, free Negroes were barred from signing up in the armed forces. In the Navy, a small number of them

stayed, but new rules were passed restricting the number of Negroes to one twentieth of the crew of any ship. Negroes were not recruited for service again until the Civil War.

The majority of free Negroes lived in poverty because they could not get good jobs and they could not take part in civic affairs. Some were able to get an elementary school education, but as far as higher education was concerned there was very little opportunity for Negroes to go to college. Many had to travel to Europe to get the education that was denied them in their own land.

To be a free Negro did not guarantee a man the rights of privileges that came with freedom. If they had been given humane treatment and opportunity, Negroes, both free and slave, would have made even greater offerings to American life and culture. Slavery deprived the Negroes of what the Declaration of Independence had promised to all men- life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The history of slavery in America proves that no laws can put an end to men's desire for freedom, either for themselves or for others.

*Submitted to Professor Herbert J. Foster, HST 101, American Civilization, Spring, 1982.

Bibliography

Drimmer, Melvin. *Black History*. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969.

Frazier, E. Franklin. *Negro in the United States*. (rev. ed.) New York: The MacMillan Co., 1957.

Franklin, John Hope. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans*. (5th edition) New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1980.

Ingraham, Leonard W. *Slavery in the United States*. New York: Franklin Watts, Inc., 1968.

