NO. 42 JUNE 2021

CORNERSTONE

AN UNDERGRADUATE HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Editors:

Alyse Yeargen

Andrew Walters

Marissa Hull

Michael D'Amato

Faculty Advisors
Dr. Brian Lloyd

Managing Editor
Lynda Vernia

Department of History
University of California, Riverside

CONTENTS

Thomas and Evelyn Gahn Prize

"Arachne's Tapestry: Women's Voices in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*"

Seth Speerstra

"Rapta semel videor bis quoque digna rapi?"

"Do I, having been seized once, seem deserving to be seized again?"
Ovid*, Heroides* 17.21-22 *(Helene Paridi, Helen to Paris)*

Introduction

The lines above, in which Helen responds to Paris' advances, demonstrate Ovid's capacity to empathize with Roman women's plight with a nuanced eye. Recalling how she was abducted by Theseus in her youth, Helen asks if she now "deserves" to be seized by force (*rapi*) a second time. Even though Helen was not at fault for her kidnapping, her male contemporaries nonetheless considered her "tarnished" by it. Her question to Paris implicitly asks if he thinks that she was complicit in her first abduction and had therefore become a "looser" woman. Helen understands that the society she lived in did not regard women highly. Pointing out this unjust standard towards women's sexuality, chastity, and rape, and exposing it through the voice of a famous woman is what makes Ovid so unique among Roman authors. I want to explore whether Ovid captured the experiences and emotions of Roman women accurately. If so, this would demonstrate that at least some classical writers were cognizant of and sympathetic towards the lower status of women within their society.

Ovid often makes women the protagonists of his stories and pushes back against common tropes of depicting Roman women. His heroines have both positive and negative characteristics, they often subvert traditional Roman femininity, and they struggle with genuine social dilemmas faced by real Roman women. Since hardly any writing by Roman women has been preserved, Ovid's poetry offers unique opportunities to look for the perspectives of these women. However, we need to employ careful textual analysis and read between the lines of his poetry. My research will examine how Ovid depicts women in the *Metamorphoses*, the most prolific of Ovid's poems. I will be looking for women as active agents (rather than merely playing a passive role) to assess Ovid's empathy regarding women's role in patriarchal Roman society. Ovid's depiction of women suffering sexual assault is extremely important in my research, as it is one of the most persistent themes in his works. Justice and injustice are key issues in this paper, and I will determine whether Ovid intentionally depicts women being treated unjustly as a way of criticizing the treatment of women in larger society.

Ovid and the *Metamorphoses*

The *Metamorphoses* is Ovid's *magnum opus*—his longest and most famous work. The *Metamorphoses* is an epic poem, written after the style of Vergil's *Aeneid* and the epics of Homer. It was published in 8 CE, the same year in which Ovid was exiled by the *princeps* Augustus. Scholars assume that Ovid was exiled either because of an affair with the emperor's daughter Julia or because his previous work, the *Ars Amatoria*, was so salacious that it offended the emperor.[1] With regard to historical context, Alan Griffin points out the important generational gap between Ovid and the other famous Augustan poets Virgil and Horace. Whereas the older poets had lived through the Roman civil wars as adults, Ovid was just twelve

[1] Alan H.F. Griffin, "Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *Greece & Rome* 24, no. 1 (1977), 58.

years old when those wars ended. Therefore, Griffin argues, Virgil and Horace were more appreciative of the Augustan peace, and this is reflected in their works, which were extremely laudatory of the new emperor.[2] Although Ovid certainly pays his dues to Augustus in the *Metamorphoses*, there are hints of rebelliousness as well. Ovid's views on the principate are

outside the scope of this paper, but Ovid's willingness to criticize Augustus' conservative and patriarchal social agenda is relevant. This historical context helps to explain why Ovid's works depicted women with greater accuracy and empathy than the works of Virgil or Horace. In fact, according to Griffin, "Ovid actually liked women," unlike other Roman poets.[3]

I chose to focus on the *Metamorphoses* rather than another of Ovid's poems because it contains the widest sample of stories about women. Furthermore, the *Metamorphoses* are notable in that most of its female protagonists are young and unmarried women and girls. This contrasts with most other Roman sources, both literary and historical, wherein married women are far and away the most prevalent. While there is copious evidence for the societal expectations of married women, including behavior and clothing, there is hardly any evidence regarding unmarried women. Even studies which have sought to examine single women, such as Ilse Mueller's "Single Women in the Roman Funerary Inscriptions," ultimately focus primarily on older widows.[4] The Vestal Virgins are among the most widely studied unmarried Roman women, but Ovid primarily describes women who are unmarried simply by choice, and not for religious

[2] Griffin, "Ovid's 'Metamorphoses,'" 59.
[3] Griffin, 59.
[4] Ilse Mueller, "Single Women in the Roman Funerary Inscriptions." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 175 (2010), 296

reasons.[5] Therefore, the *Metamorphoses* offer unique insight into this often-invisible demographic.

Not all of Ovid's female protagonists were necessarily members of the upper class either. Though the *Metamorphoses* are certainly filled with princesses and the like, the social class of many other characters is ambiguous. Ovid emphasizes the shared struggles of all women rather than fixating on the elite. Moreover, he also blurs the lines between different female archetypes in Roman literature. Ovid's characters may be compared, for example, with anthropologist Maureen Giovannini's six female archetypes (which Holt Parker in turn related to Roman women). According to Giovannini, women are depicted positively as the Virgin or Mother or negatively as the Whore or Stepmother. The archetypes of women as Madonna and the Witch fuse both positive and negative archetypes respectively.[6] The Roman writers largely stuck to these archetypes when describing both historical women and living women. Livy's Lucretia, for example, is very much the ideal Mother.[7] Although several of Ovid's characters fit these archetypes, I will demonstrate that he often subverts and obfuscates these archetypes. Since Ovid does not try to fit most of his female characters into conventional archetypes, the *Metamorphoses* repeatedly presents uniquely genuine representations of Roman women.

In addition to textual analysis of specific episodes from the *Metamorphoses*, I will ground these episodes in their historical context with the help of recent scholarship and pertinent narrative accounts such as Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. Other primary sources that I will reference

[5] Holt N. Parker, "Why Were the Vestals Virgins? Or the Chastity of Women and the Safety of the Roman State," *American Journal of Philology* 125, no. 4 (2004), 563–601.
[6] Maureen J. Giovannini, "Woman: A Dominant Symbol Within the Cultural System of a Sicilian Town." *Man* 16, no. 3 (1981), 410. https://doi.org/10.2307/2801292; Parker, "Vestals Virgins," 582.
[7] Titus Livius. *The History of Rome*. Edited by Robert Seymour Conway and Charles Flamstead Walters. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1914), 1.58.

include Roman legal codes, such as the *Codex* and *Digest of Justinian*. Legislation by Augustus put a premium on marriage by providing advantages for men and women who married and had children, while calling for punishments of women who were not married or for being childless. Augustus also made adultery a state crime, rather than just a civil crime.[8] Ovid was writing in a time when morality, and especially women's sexual morality, was being monitored more closely than ever before, and not just by society, but by the state itself. With the *princeps* putting forth such an explicit and forceful portrait of proper Roman womanhood, it is striking that Ovid often subverted these prescriptive ideals in his depictions of women.

Historiography

There are two prominent schools of interpreting Ovid's depiction of women and rape in the *Metamorphoses*. The first is critical of Ovid, supposing that Ovid delights in depicting women's suffering. For example, Amy Richlin argues in *"*Reading Ovid's Rapes," that Ovid adopted a voyeuristic and almost pornographic lens. Richlin does not distinguish between Ovid as writer, Ovid as narrator, and the viewpoint of the male rapist in the story.[9] Rather, Richlin focuses on how Ovid displays violence against women: "The display of the woman's body and fear of her rapist-to-be (and reader) often precedes her rape."[10] Richlin argues that Ovid's conflation of the woman's fear and her perceived beauty undercuts any attempt to show empathy for the victim. By contrast, Leo Curran argues in "Rape and Rape Victims in the *Metamorphoses*" that Ovid is sympathetic towards the victims and sincerely critical of the rapists. Curran observes, for example, "Ovid's habit of reverting to certain themes and motifs

[8] Beth Severy, *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2003), 52-54.
[9] Amy Richlin, *Arguments with Silence: Writing the History of Roman Women*. (University of Michigan Press, 2014), 139.
[10] Richlin, 139.

suggests that he was on the verge of a realization that rape is less an act of sexual passion than of aggression and that erotic gratification is secondary to the rapist's desire to dominate physically, to humiliate, and to degrade."[11] William Anderson's "Aspects of Love in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'" similarly argues that Ovid criticizes Roman men's "hatred of female freedom to oppose."[12] I agree more with the arguments made by Curran and Anderson than Richlin. I will show that Richlin's analysis omits important aspects of the stories about rape in the *Metamorphoses*.

There is also the difficult problem of trying to form an accurate picture of women's experiences in antiquity from male-authored sources. As Richlin writes, "The problems with writing women's history, or a gender-inclusive history, stemmed from the same truths that caused problems with writing the history of the poor, or slaves, or children: these groups either did not themselves write, or what writing they did was not kept."[13] Therefore, we have no choice but to look at sources written by Roman men, which will likely have a patriarchal bias and may not accurately reflect Roman women's lives. Richlin makes two recommendations: the first is to use unorthodox sources, such as writings from outside Athens and Rome, examining "low" genres like satire, and studying tombstone inscriptions and obituaries. By using a wide variety of sources, and hearing "different stories when asked the same question," Richlin says, it may be possible to sketch out the historical reality.[14]

[11] Leo C. Curran, "Rape and Rape Victims in the Metamorphoses." *Arethusa* 11, no. 1/2 (1978), 236.
[12] William S. Anderson, "Aspects of Love in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *The Classical Journal* 90, no. 3 (1995), 267.
[13] Richlin, *Arguments with Silence*, 5.
[14] Richlin, 5-6.

By examining Ovid, I am not exactly following Richlin's advice, as Ovid is a mainstream source from the classical canon written in Rome under the watchful eye of Augustus himself. However, I believe Ovid has more to offer as a source on Roman women than most Roman authors. Ovid wrote an extraordinary amount of material both about women and even *for* women. In the *Heroides,* Ovid wrote fifteen fictional letters from the perspective of famous mythical women, such as Penelope, Helen, and Dido.[15] Furthermore, the third book of the *Ars Amatoria* (Art of Love) and the *Medicamena faciei feminae* (Medicines for the Female Face) were, at least ostensibly, directly addressed to a female audience.[16] Curran suggests that Ovid was "a keen student of female behavior and his painstaking observation of women gave him almost modern insights into the female condition." Curran calls the *Metamorphoses* the culmination of Ovid's "recognition of aspects of [women's] condition which are only now becoming common currency."[17] I would add that Ovid likely spent as much time observing men as women, as Ovid's depictions of sexual assault are often as much a criticism of Roman "courtship" as they are sympathetic to the victims.

A critical issue that needs to be addressed is whether it is possible to infer authorial intent. The issue of intent is partially relevant to my study, but not the crux of it. On the one hand, I believe the text of the *Metamorphoses* contains enough clues that one can infer Ovid's intentions, including certain criticisms of Roman society, such as its tendency to blame the victims of sexual assaults as much as the rapists. These criticisms were likely intended by the author and cannot simply be attributed to modern scholars' reading and confirmation bias. On

[15] P. Ovidius Nasom, *Epistulae*. Edited by R. Ehwald. B.G. Teubneri. (Leipzig, Germany, 1907), 1,7,17.
[16] P. Ovidius Naso. *Ars Amatoria*. Edited by R. Ehwald. (Leipzig, Germany: B. G. Teubner, 1907), 3.1-2; P. Ovidius Naso, *Medicamina faciei femineae*. Edited by R. Ehwald. B.G. Teubneri. (Leipzig, Germany, 1907), 1-2.
[17] Curran, "Rape Victims," 213.

the other hand, Roland Barthes' famous notion of the "Death of the Author" comes to mind. Barthes encouraged literary criticism which disregards the background or voice of the author. Barthes writes, "the true locus of writing is reading."[18] Therefore, a piece of writing does not have a single, definitive "answer." The text is not "solved" simply by studying the author. Rather, the answers of a text depend solely on what the reader can draw out from the text. I argue, then, that even if it is impossible to truly know Ovid's intentions for the *Metamorphoses* as a piece of social criticism, the epic can nonetheless be read as such.

Rape, Dehumanization, and Objectification

One of the reoccurring motifs in the *Metamorphoses* is rape and the sexual objectification of women. Phoebus Apollo's attempted rape of Daphne directly addresses this topic. Daphne's story is one of the most shocking episodes of the poem. It occurs very early on in the *Metamorphoses* as well, in the first book. In fact, it is the first rape of the entire poem. Therefore, Daphne serves as an introduction to one of Ovid's most important themes. Upon seeing Daphne, Pheobus desires "marriage" (*conubia*) with her.[19] Phoebus calls out to Daphne, and she immediately flees, having no interest in marriage or men. As he follows, Phoebus asks for pity (*me miserum*); he feigns concern for her well-being should she trip and fall and he appeals to his divine status: "You do not know, thoughtless girl (*temeraria*), you do not know whom you flee from, and so you flee."[20] Phoebus' attempts at courtship are one-sided, manipulative, and even threatening. Phoebus' use of *temeraria* talks down to Daphne, assumes she is foolish for fleeing, and suggests that there will be consequences for her flight. Phoebus' seduction exemplifies the

[18] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author." *Aspen*, 1967, 5. http://writing.upenn.edu/~taransky/Barthes.pdf.
[19] P. Ovidius Naso. *Metamorphoses*. Edited by R.J. Tarrant. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1.490.
[20] Ov. *Met.* 1.508-15.

power dynamic between himself and Daphne: he is a god, she is ordinary. All the while, Phoebus' intentions evoke possessiveness. When Daphne flees, Phoebus only sees how "the winds expose her body," oblivious or indifferent to her terror.[21] Phoebus soon loses patience: "for he does not continue blandishments/flattery/coaxing to waste [time] further." Phoebus then chases after Daphne, indicating he is no longer interested in her love or consent.[22] The chase scene, with Phoebus's breath literally on Daphne's neck (*cervicibus adflat*), is clearly not meant to be humorous or light-hearted.[23] For Daphne, it is deadly serious. Ovid shows Daphne's fear and unwillingness with a variety of words and actions: Daphne is afraid (*timido*), she "flees" (*fugit*), she "sought safety" (*petit...salutem*), she is uncertain (*ambiguo*), and "swift because of fear" (*celer illa timore*).[24] Clearly, Daphne never consents to Phoebus' advances and is in great distress.

Does Ovid intend this story to serve as a banal example of Roman courtship, or as an example of abuse? It is likely both. In "Reading Ovid's Rapes," Richlin attributes this passage to Ovid's voyeuristic intent, arguing that the point-of-view of Phoebus is merely a "thin glaze" over the violent unveiling of Daphne's body to both Phoebus himself and the reader.[25] Curran, in contrast, asserts that Ovid empathizes with Daphne by giving voice to her terror.[26] In addition, Anderson notes, "Ovid's third-person narration does not identify with Apollo's feelings but invites us to judge the lover from a distance."[27] Indeed, as I demonstrated, Ovid made Daphne's fear very clear, and continues to do so. Phoebus acts entitled to Daphne's love and body, and

[21] Ov. *Met.* 1.497-502; 527-30.
[22] Ov. *Met.* 1.530-32.
[23] Ov. *Met.* 1.542.
[24] Ov. *Met.* 1.525-39.
[25] Richlin, *Arguments with Silence*, 139.
[26] Curran, "Rape Victims," 233.
[27] Anderson, "Aspects of Love" 267.

Ovid never depicts Phoebus as particularly regal or honorable. Instead, he is compared to a wild hound chasing its prey (*canis...Gallicus*).[28]

The conclusion of the story supports Curran's and Anderson's readings, as Ovid clearly sees the severity of Daphne's trauma. Daphne, able to evade Phoebus no longer, prays to her father, the river god Peneus, to "destroy [my] figure, which pleases too much, by means of transforming." Daphne blames herself, her own beauty, before Phoebus. In response to her plea, Daphne's body grows numb, tender bark surrounds her, roots fix her in place, and leafy canopy replaces her human face. Daphne is transformed into a laurel tree, and, despite her prayer, her splendor (*nitor*) remains.[29] Regardless, Phoebus approaches and, touching the tree, "feels her anxious heart under the bark." Phoebus kisses the tree's trunk, and still "the wood flees his kiss."[30] Daphne remains aware of her victimization and still seeks to escape it. Then, Phoebus says, "But since you cannot be my wife, surely you will be my tree." Ovid writes, "*arbor eris certe dixit mea,*" separating and emphasizing the possessive pronoun— "'a tree you will surely be', he said, '*mine.*'" Phoebus claims the laurel wreath to adorn his hair, then to follow the Roman generals in the *triumph*, and finally to guard the doors of Augustus. In response, Daphne, as the laurel, bows (*adnuit*) its branches and "the canopy appeared to have shaked (*visa est agitasse*)," evoking a nod of consent.[31] Why, after all this, would Daphne give consent to Phoebus' demand? Obviously, she did not. *Agitare* means to shake, to trouble, to disturb some order. This word communicates the literal swaying of the tree, as well as the inner turmoil within Daphne's mind. The perfect tense of *agitasse* suggests continuing action, ongoing distress. The

[28] Ov. *Met*. 1.533.
[29] Ov. *Met*. 1.546-52.
[30] Ov. *Met*. 1.554-56.
[31] Ov. *Met*. 1.557-67.

trauma did not end when Daphne was transformed. Now, she is broken down and no longer has any other option but to acquiesce to Phoebus' whim. Despite giving up her body and her autonomy in a desperate bid to escape, Daphne is still raped and violently possessed by Phoebus.

As the curtain closes on Daphne, Ovid makes brief mention of Peneus, Daphne's father, in counsel with the river gods. The other gods do not know whether they should congratulate or console Peneus (*gratentur consolenturne*).[32] They clearly sense that something wrong has happened, yet they do not commit to that perception. Daphne's status is now ambiguous. Is she to be considered a married woman, or a raped woman? As Nghiem Nguyen writes in "Roman Rape," often the rape victim was seen as a source of shame to the male members of the family, and the rapist a stranger who invaded the privacy of the family. The charge of rape as *iniuria*, used especially when the woman's chastity is assaulted, is seen primarily as an "insult or outrage" to the honor of the victim's father or husband.[33] "To congratulate or console" reframes the whole issue as one of Peneus' *dignitas*, obfuscating the issue of Daphne's bodily autonomy and consent. Leo Curran argues that Ovid intentionally to criticizes the Romans' concern with the man's *dignitas* rather than the woman's suffering. Ovid here writes from the "point-of-view of society."[34] The sharp contrast between the actual rape scene, wherein the autonomy of Daphne is so emphasized, and the aftermath, where Daphne is all but forgotten, supports Curran's reading. Ovid creates sympathy for Daphne, and then silences her. The abruptness is the point. The end of Daphne's life as an individual is nothing more than happenstance for

[32] Ov. *Met*. 1.578.
[33] Nghiem L. Nguyen, "Roman Rape: An Overview of Roman Rape Laws from the Republican Period to Justinian's Reign" 13 (n.d.): 84.
[34] Curran, "Rape Victims," 223–24.

Phoebus. Larger society, symbolized by the river gods, is more concerned with Daphne's father than Daphne herself. The conclusion of Daphne's episode emphasizes the tragedy of her assault.

Chastity and Virginity: Controlling Women's Sexuality

Many episodes in the *Metamorphoses* allegorically reveal the extent to which Roman society subjected women to harmful and often contrary standards. As Curran argues, Ovid portrays the "cult of virginity" as a destructive force in Roman society which restricted women's sexuality rather than honoring the "inviolability of a woman's body."[35] The transformation of the maiden Scylla into the famous monster of the *Odyssey* in particular suggests Roman attitudes towards chastity and unmarried women. Before her transformation, Ovid explicitly tells us that Scylla was a *virgo*. Scylla is sought by many suitors, whom she rejects (*multi petiere proci...repulsis*).[36] Instead, Scylla prefers the company of sea nymphs, like Galatea. Scylla then, unlike Daphne, is a human girl, not a nymph. Her social status is entirely unknown, but the "many suitors" suggests she may resemble an elite Roman girl. Like Daphne, Scylla does not desire marriage. Whereas Daphne appealed to the virgin goddess Diana as an example, Scylla is simply disinterested in marriage. Scylla entertains the sea nymphs by "narrating the eluded/deceived/mocked loves of young men" (*elusos iuuenum narrabat amores).*[37] The verb *eludere* has a playful or sportive connotation, suggesting that Scylla is not seriously bothered by her suitors, and possibly takes pleasure in rejecting their advances. In fact, Galatea is envious that Scylla can deny her suitors "without punishment" (*impune*).[38] This line foreshadows Scylla's ultimate fate.

[35] Curran, "Rape Victims," 213.
[36] Ov. *Met.* 13.735-35.
[37] Ov. *Met.* 13.736.
[38] Ov. *Met* 13.741.

Later, Scylla flees the advances of the sea god Glaucus, before falling prey to the magic of the witch Circe. Circe, loving Glaucus but being spurned by him in favor of Scylla, transforms Scylla into a monster as revenge. Circe "taints/defiles/pollutes" (*inquinat*) the spring where Scylla bathes. Soon, Scylla's groin (*inguina*) is disfigured (*foedari*) by monstrous dogs. Scylla tries to flee before realizing the monsters are her own body. Scylla looks for her "thighs and legs and feet" but her abdomen/groin and belly/womb are maimed (*inguinibus truncis uteroque*).[39] Scylla's transformation focuses on Scylla's groin or genitals and the idea of corruption, pollution, or defilement. Considering Ovid's consistent referral to Scylla as *virgo*, the transformation appears to corrupt her virginity and make it monstrous. Scylla's former status of purity is destroyed, even without sex. In this sense, Scylla's metamorphosis is a metaphorical rape.

The Scylla episode treats the young, unmarried woman as aberrant, subversive, and ultimately monstrous. What did Scylla do to deserve her transformation into a monster? The only possible answer is that she rejected marriage from one-too-many men. However, Scylla herself is still sympathetic, not demonized. Her punishment is not depicted as just or merited. The actual villains of the story are Circe, first and foremost, and to a lesser extent Glaucus. Glaucus' appeal to Scylla resembles Phoebus' to Daphne—Glaucus crassly asserts his divinity and he both rages (*furit*) and is offended (*inritatus*) when he is rejected.[40] Glaucus asserts that his love will not change "with Scylla having been preserved" (*sospite quam Scylla nostri mutentur amores*).[41] She must be forced to "suffer that heat of passion" (*ferat illa caloris*).[42] Clearly, Glaucus does not

[39] Ov. *Met* 14.55-67.
[40] Ov. *Met.* 13.967.
[41] Ov. *Met.* 14.39.
[42] Ov. *Met.* 14.24.

care about Scylla's own desires. Glaucus wants Scylla's desires to be changed—*sospitare* [to protect/preserve] foreshadows that Scylla will no longer be "safe," she will be harmed. The idea that Scylla's "protection" or "preservation" must be removed also alludes to the loss of chastity. Circe, after she is rejected by Glaucus, is also offended and enraged (*indignata...irascitur*) and chooses to take out her anger on the innocent Scylla.[43] The stigma against the unmarried woman, therefore, comes from the story's villains. Scylla is perpetually sympathetic. She only becomes angry after her transformation, and her hatred (*odium*) is expressed through her attack on Ulysses' ship, an act of spite against Circe (who loved Ulysses).[44] Scylla's anger, then, is not from the sting of rejection. It is righteous fury from someone who has been abjectly wronged. Regardless, she continues the cycle of violence by taking out her anger on Ulysses' innocent companions. Therefore, rather than depicting Scylla's transformation as a justified punishment for her transgression against societal norms, Ovid shows Scylla to be a victim of an abusive culture which does not respect women's agency in love and marriage.

Scylla's story demonstrates that Roman society did not respect women's ability to control their own sexuality. The Roman's chastity culture enforced this lack of agency. In fact, Romans believed that promiscuity in women—adultery, sex before marriage, and even suffering rape—threatened the legitimacy of children and therefore the maintenance of elite families. Women with sexual experience were considered "more likely to stray."[45] The loss of chastity was not excused when rape was the cause: "Raped women were seen as sources of embarrassment to

[43] Ov. *Met.* 14.40-41.
[44] Ov. *Met.* 14.71.
[45] Nguyen, "Roman Rape," 79–80.

their husbands and fathers. With the loss of their virginity, unmarried women had little hope for a marriage."[46]

The enforcement of Roman chastity culture is embodied in the concept of *univira*— a "one-man woman." *Univira* was a woman who only ever had sex with one man, a singular husband, for her entire life. *Univira* is both prescriptive for living women (an ideal to which they should strive), and descriptive for the dead: *univirae* were honored with the epithet after death.[47] *Univirae* sometimes received privileges in life. For example, only *univirae* could participate in the cult of Fortuna Muliebris (*Fortune of Women*).[48] Befitting the title of this goddess, there was a strong element of chance in remaining *univira*, because a woman who outlived her husband was expected to remarry, thereby compromising her *univira* status.[49] *Univira* was a troubling standard for Roman women to be held to, because both chance and other societal pressures worked against it, even as societal norms were also encouraging it. In Ovid's time, divorce was common and accepted, especially among the elite.[50] In fact, Augustus' moral policy required women to remarry after the husband's death or divorce. Unmarried adults could be restricted from attending the public games.[51] Despite this political pressure, the value of *univira* actually spread during the Principate.[52] Roman women were often placed in an unwinnable situation, as there was pressure on one side to be pure, chaste, and *univira*, as well as pressure on the other side to remarry and procreate.

[46] Nguyen, "Roman Rape," 84.
[47] Marjorie Lightman and William Zeisel, "Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society." *Church History* 46, no. 1 (1977), 24–25.
[48] Parker, "Vestals Virgins," 589.
[49] Lightman and Zeisel, "Univira," 20, 27.
[50] Severy, *Augustus and the Family*, 8.
[51] Severy, 53–55.
[52] Lightman and Zeisel, "Univira," 25–26.

What is the connection between Scylla and *univira*? The answer is a lack of real agency over one's sexuality and contradictory pressures. Scylla's virginity is emphasized: she has a "virgin's face", and Galatea refers to her as *virgo,* not Scylla.[53] Her virginity is clearly valued. And yet, many suitors, including Glaucus, beg her to marry them. By rejecting these suitors, Scylla protects her virginity and asserts her right to choose. And yet, this is what results in her transformation into a monster. Ovid explicitly exposes Scylla's tragedy: her society would not allow her to control her own body and still live in peace. Because she does not submit control of her body to a man, her body is made monstrous.

An important addendum to Ovid's Scylla episode is the notion that this portrait of the sympathetic Scylla was *not* Ovid's own invention, but a woman's creation. Dunstan Lowe attributes this characterization of Scylla to a female Greek poet from the third century B.C.E. named Hedyle of Attica. In the one surviving fragment from this poet, she combines an earlier legendary figure named Hydne, or Scyllis, who was courted by the sea god Glaucus, with the Scylla of the *Odyssey*. Though we cannot know if Hedyle depicted the transformation of Scylla in the complete poem, it is certainly a possibility.[54] The notion that Ovid's depiction of Scylla as sympathetic maiden-turned-monster was inspired by an earlier woman poet is profound. This connection between Hedyle and Ovid strongly suggests that Ovid was, in fact, listening to the voices of women and taking their perspectives into account when he wrote his own poems about women.

[53] Ov. *Met.* 13.733; 13.740.
[54] Dunstan Lowe, "Scylla, the Diver's Daughter: Aeschrion, Hedyle, and Ovid." *Classical Philology* 106, no. 3 (2011), 261–62.

Injustice and Guilt: Blaming the Victim

The fate of the huntress Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* clearly displays the savage injustice of Roman society's treatment of women. Callisto is raped, and then punished for her victimhood by the very forces that were supposed to protect and honor women. Callisto is introduced as a huntress and virgin follower of Diana. And no girl is dearer to Diana than Callisto (*nec...ulla gratior*). However, "no favor is long-lived," warning us of the fickleness of the gods (*sed nulla potentia longa est*).[55] Jupiter, lusting after Callisto, disguises himself as Diana. Callisto greets the disguised Jupiter, who "joins kisses (*oscula jungit)* without restraint and not as a virgin should give" (*nec moderata satis nec sic a virgine danda*). Callisto is not fazed by this affection until Jupiter reveals himself, "and not without crime" (*nec se sine crimine prodit*).[56] The verb *prodere* can also mean "spring forth" or "move forward," combining the casting-off of the disguise with an allusion to penetration, signifying the rape which has just occurred. Afterwards, Callisto is clearly shaken and traumatized. The woods suddenly feel hateful and judgmental of her (*huic odio...et conscia*). She almost forgets to retrieve her bow, and when she next sees the real Diana, "she flees and fears" that it is Jupiter again (*refugit et timuit...ne Iuppiter esset*).[57] Callisto's sense of trust and security have been shattered—she no longer feels safe where she should. She now struggles "to not reveal the crime from her face (*crimen non prodere vultu*)." Like Daphne, Callisto blames herself. And Callisto is no longer "joined/wedded to the side of the goddess (*iuncta deae lateri*).[58] The use of *iungere*, both here and in the earlier kissing scene—which can mean "fasten" or "join," but also "to wed" when

[55] Ov. *Met.* 2.415-16.
[56] Ov. *Met. 2*.425-33.
[57] Ov. *Met.* 2.438-44.
[58] Ov. *Met.* 2.447-49.

between people—portrays Callisto and Diana as not just companions, but lovers, and even spouses. Callisto, then, becomes not just a disgraced follower, but an 'adulterous' wife.

Callisto's feelings of fear and shame are shown to be justified. She becomes pregnant and, when the huntresses go to bathe months later, Diana discovers Callisto's pregnancy. Immediately, Diana expels Callisto from her band: "Go, far from here, and do not pollute the sacred fountains!"[59] Since she will soon give birth, Diana considers Callisto a source of ritual pollution, as explained by Shawn O'Bryhim in "Ovid's Version of Callisto's Punishment." Callisto is also denied "the only means of purifying herself after Arcas' impending birth."[60] She is expelled from the only life she knows. We may relate Diana's actions to those of a Roman husband, required by Augustan law to divorce an adulterous wife, or else be charged for pimping.[61] Just as an adulterous wife was considered a source of shame to her husband (even in the case of rape), Callisto is considered a source of shame by Diana. Diana's treatment of Callisto is profoundly unjust. Despite them ostensibly being lovers, Diana shows no sympathy towards Callisto whatsoever. The fact that Callisto's pregnancy is the result of rape is not even mentioned.

The entry of Juno only makes things worse for Callisto. After Callisto gives birth to Jupiter's son, Arcas, Juno decides it is time to punish Callisto for her "adultery." Juno calls Callisto *adultera* and considers Callisto giving birth an attack on her honor (*fieretque injuria partu nota*), as if Callisto had any choice in the matter. Juno blames Callisto for her "figure, by means of which you please yourself and my husband" (*figuram qua tibi quaque places*

[59] Ov. *Met.* 2.464.
[60] Shawn O'Bryhim, "Ovid's Version of Callisto's Punishment." *Hermes* 118, no. 1 (1990), 77-78.
[61] Judith Evans Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce, and Widowhood*. (London: Routledge, 2002), 84; Severy, *Augustus and the Family*, 53.

nostro...marito).[62] Again, rape is blamed on the woman's beauty rather than the rapist. Juno's accusation recalls the speaker of Seneca's *Controversia* 2.7, who claims that a woman who "wants to be safe against the lasciviousness of a seducer" should act and dress with the utmost modesty; women who do not advertise their chastity sufficiently are "so close to begging that whoever sees her might not hesitate to approach her."[63] Finally, Juno transforms Callisto into a bear. Leo Curran notes how Ovid's Juno embodies "society's attitudes towards marriage and such related matters as virginity and adultery" and "becomes the defender of society's rules regulating marriage and extramarital sexuality."[64] In the eyes of Juno and the society she defends, it is Callisto's own fault for being raped—she must not have been modest enough.

Now a bear, Callisto continues to feel "Jupiter's indifference" (*ingratumque Iovem*).[65] The rapist Jupiter suffers no consequences and feels no guilt. His wife Juno is more ashamed of his crime than he is. I am reminded of Cicero's defense of Cn. Plancius, who was accused of having raped a "little mime girl" (*raptam esse mimulam*). Plancius was actually on trial for corruption; Cicero mentions this rape only as an attempt by the prosecution to defame Plancius' character. He handwaves the accusation; he alludes to "a certain old custom towards actors" (*vetere quodam in scaenicos iure*) and claims that the rape would therefore be permitted (*licuerit*).[66] Plancius was acquitted; the rape was never mentioned again. Just as a Roman nobleman faced no consequences for raping this young actress because of the divide in their

[62] Ov. *Met.* 2.474-75.
[63] Seneca the Elder. *Annaei Senecae Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae Divisiones Colores*. Edited by Adolf Gottlieb Kiessling. B.G. Teubneri. (Leipzig, Germany, 1872), 2.7.3-4; Richlin, *Arguments with Silence*, 50–51.
[64] Curran, "Rape Victims," 225–26.
[65] Ov. *Met.* 2.488.
[66] M. Tullius Cicero. "Pro Plancius." In *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*, edited by Albert Clark. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1909), 12.31.

class, the king of the gods will never be rebuked for raping the mortal huntress, Callisto. Instead, Callisto is forced to endure the punishment for his crime.

At the end of Callisto's story, Jupiter transforms her and her son into the constellations Ursa Major and Minor [Greater and Lesser Bear]. Finally, it would seem, Callisto receives some recompense by being honored in the stars. However, Juno complains to the sea gods, making the following demand: "Prohibit the Bear's seven stars from your deep-blue flood and drive away her, having been received into heaven as a reward for defilement; do not let the concubine be bathed in the pure sea (*puro...in aequore*)"[67]. This final curse of Juno is supposed to explain why the Ursa Major does not set below the horizon. However, as Shawn O'Bryhim again elaborates, Callisto has now been repulsed from sacred waters for the second time. Once again denied purification, "Callisto must now remain throughout all eternity a polluted outcast among the stars."[68] Her final honor, then, becomes yet another exile, another rejection. Juno will never let the raped woman be 'clean' again. And Callisto's guilt, which is nothing more than a projection of the actual rapist's crime, may never be forgotten or absolved.

Voice and Agency

The *Metamorphoses* strives to give voice to women. This section deals with stories in the epic wherein women explicitly assert their voice and demand acknowledgment of their agency. The women in these stories are keenly aware that they lack power. Regardless, they resist the authorities which repress them.

[67] Ov. *Met*. 2.528-30.
[68] O'Bryhim, "Ovid's Version," 80.

The story of Arachne is extraordinary, as it is focused entirely on two female characters, and the topics of men, sex, love, motherhood, or chastity are nowhere to be seen. Arachne is "famous not because of her place of birth nor her family, but because of her art" (*non illa loco nec origine gentis clara sed arte fuit*). Arachne's parents are of little repute and "common birth" (*de plebe*).[69] No lover or husband is mentioned. Ovid does not even comment on Arachne's appearance. Rather, it is the beauty of her craft—weaving—which receives praise. Arachne's art is of such quality that "you would know she was taught by Pallas"—Minerva, the patron goddess of weaving.[70] However, Arachne's other trait is revealed: she is confident, headstrong, and even defiant. She "denies and is offended by the notion of such a teacher." Refusing to attribute her talents to another, Arachne invokes Minerva, challenging her to a contest of weaving: "Contend with me; there is nothing which I will object to, if I am defeated" (*certet...mecum; nihil est quod victa recusem*).[71] Arachne clearly feels threatened and belittled by the idea that she is not responsible for her work. Often a Roman women's worth existed only in her connection to another: the nobility of her father, her loyalty to her husband, her virtue in rejecting men. It is fitting then that some would seek to diminish Arachne's accomplishments by attributing her talent to divine intervention. Furthermore, Julia Hejduk argues in "Arachne's Attitude" that Arachne's challenge should instead be read, "there is no reason for me, having been defeated, to refuse." In other words, Arachne will not "refuse to compete, because she has already lost."[72] Hejduk's reading emphasizes the fact that Arachne's skill is integral to her weaving—she has

[69] Ov. *Met.* 6.7-10.
[70] Ov. *Met.* 6.23.
[71] Ov. *Met.* 6.23-24.
[72] Julia D. Hejduk, "Arachne's Attitude: Metamorphoses 6.25." *Mnemosyne* 65, no. 4/5 (2012), 764, 767.

nothing else. Furthermore, it suggests that Arachne is well aware that she is tempting her own doom by offending the goddess.

When Minerva first notices Arachne, she says, "let us not allow our divine powers to be spurned without punishments" (*numina nec sperni sine poena nostra sinamus*).[73] Minerva demands unconditional reverence. Already, she is considering violent retribution. In the guise of an old woman, Minerva tells Arachne to "yield to the goddess" (*cede deae*) and "beg for forgiveness with a humble voice" (*supplice voce roga*).[74] The adjective *supplex* suggests someone literally pleading on her knees. Minerva wants Arachne to demean herself. Arachne is furious. "Scarcely holding back her hand" she tells the old woman off: "I have enough wisdom/counsel in myself" (*consilii satis est in me mihi*).[75] Again, Arachne rejects Minerva's claim to her self-worth. Arachne's "dark wrath" (*iram...obscuram*) is shown bluntly.[76] Arachne is not depicted as a shy, serene maiden like Daphne or Scylla, prior to their transformations. After Arachne's outburst, Minerva reveals herself and the two women take to their looms.

Minerva's tapestry is a testament to absolute power. In the center, the twelve Olympian gods "sit on high and with heavy majesty" (*caelestes...sedibus altis augusta gravitate sedent*).[77] Minerva depicts herself and Neptune striking the earth with their staffs and producing the olive tree and seawater respectively.[78] The gods are represented as a creative force that brings bounty

[73] Ov. *Met.* 6.4.
[74] Ov. *Met.* 6.32-33.
[75] Ov. *Met.* 6.32-40.
[76] Ov. *Met.* 6.35-36.
[77] Ov. *Met.* 6.72-73.
[78] Ov. *Met.* 6.75-82.

into the world. Then, Minerva adds four scenes of mortals who were punished for their hubris towards the gods by being transformed, "in order that her rival may learn what reward she will expect for such furious audacity."[79] Minerva's message is clear: the gods are the one true authority. Mortals like Arachne must submit or be destroyed.

Then, Arachne responds. She weaves Europa being kidnapped and raped by Jupiter as a bull. She weaves Jupiter raping Asterie, then Leda, Antiope, Alcmena, Danae, Aegina, Mnemosyne, and Persephone. She then depicts six rapes committed by Neptune, including Medusa's rape, four by Phoebus, one by Bacchus, and one by Saturn.[80] All in all, twenty-one "crimes of heaven" (*caelestia crimina*).[81] Arachne's tapestry spits in the face of the powerful. Rather than depicting Jupiter and Neptune at their most majestic, as Minerva does, she depicts them at their most wretched and immoral. Also, Minerva, like Diana, is a virgin goddess, emblematic of chastity, and so Arachne's risqué tapestry is an intentional insult to the chaste goddess' eyes. Arachne exposes the gods' injustice: they are all-powerful, but not righteous. Arachne too depicts the creations of the gods—their offspring—by showing Minerva the rape victims who have suffered.

Seeing Arachne's tapestry, "neither Minerva nor Envy would be able to slander that work," and Minerva "grieved because of its success" (*Non illud Pallas, non illud carpere Livor*

[79] Ov. *Met.* 6.83-85.
[80] Ov. *Met* 6.103-26.
[81] Ov. *Met* 6.131.

possit opus. doluit successu flava virago).[82] The implication is clear—Arachne won the contest. She, a mortal, weaved more beautifully than the goddess of weaving herself. No longer could anybody claim that Arachne was "taught by Pallas." Now, Minerva drops all pretenses. The olive branches which framed her tapestry are forgotten. Minerva tears Arachne's tapestry to shreds (*rupit...vestes*) and, taking the wooden shuttle from her loom, beats Arachne on the head.[83] Minerva is here called *virago*, "the female warrior" or "the heroine," ironically emphasizing Minerva's decidedly unheroic behavior. This childish tantrum would be comical if not for the enormous advantage in strength and power which Minerva wields. Minerva acts not unlike the male gods in Arachne's tapestry, using her absolute power to take what she thinks she is owed. Jupiter and Neptune desired women's bodies; Minerva (like Juno) desires their submission.

However, Arachne does not submit: "The unfortunate woman has not endured it (*non tulit*), and undaunted (*animosa*) she ties her neck by means of a noose."[84] *Ferre* is in the indicative mood, suggesting literal content rather than mental content; it is not that Arachne *cannot* endure it, she *refuses* to. Seeing that her time is up, yet still *animosa*—literally "full of life"—Arachne asserts her agency a final time by taking death into her own hands. However, Minerva denies her this. So that her punishment is never-ending, Minerva transforms Arachne into a spider. Befitting the depth of her irreverence, Arachne is subjected to one of the most horrifying transformations in the entire poem. Her hair, nose, and eyes "fall off" (*defluxere*), her head and body are shrunken, her "slender fingers" become legs, "the rest is belly."[85] Arachne is literally and figuratively belittled—forced to crawl beneath Minerva's feet. Her art, once admired

[82] Ov. *Met* 6.129-30.
[83] Ov. *Met*. 6.130-33.
[84] Ov. *Met* 6.134-35.
[85] Ov. *Met* 6.141-45.

by mortals and nymphs alike, is reduced to miniscule size. Her defiant voice is silenced. And yet, "the spider keeps busy at its ancient webs."[86] Although she no longer draws a crowd, Arachne continues to speak through her art. The spider's web is a permanent reminder that Minerva lost.

Philomela's story is a strong thematic parallel to Arachne's. Tereus, a Thracian king, marries Procne, an Athenian princess. Tereus then lusts after Procne's sister, Philomela, kidnaps her, and imprisons her in secret. Through all of this, Philomela's voice is little heard. Philomela sweetly asks her father, with embraces and kisses, to allow her to go with Tereus to see Procne, reminiscent of Daphne's entreaties to her father.[87] Philomela's father bids her a tearful farewell, entrusting her to Tereus' care, before she is ferried across the sea to Thrace.[88] When locked away, Philomela is "pale and anxious and fearing everything, and now asking with tears where her sister is." Tereus "surmounts her by force." The scene is more graphic than most of the rapes in the *Metamorphoses*. Philomela cries "in vain" to her father, to her sister, and to the gods. She is likened to a lamb "wounded and discarded" by a wolf, and a dove "with feathers soaked with blood" (*madefactis sanguine plumis*).[89] The reader is reminded more explicitly than ever of the fear, pain, and violence of this crime.

Philomela's abduction and rape, not despite but *because of* its violence, reflects a typical Roman wedding. As Karen Hersch explains in "Violence in the Roman Wedding," the Roman wedding began with a ritual of reenacted abduction, "in which the bride was physically removed from the embrace of one of her family members." This practice was an allusion to the 'rape of

[86] Ov. *Met* 6.145.
[87] Ov. *Met* 6.475-80.
[88] Ov. *Met* 6.494-505.
[89] Ov. *Met* 6.522-30.

the Sabine women' that forms part of the Roman foundation myth.[90] Philomela's imprisonment is reminiscent of the bride being forcibly "lifted over the threshold of her groom's house...because the Sabine women were forced...[and] because the Romans wanted the young women to appear to be forced to enter their new house and life, and to be unwilling to lose their virginity."[91] After the wedding, the bride was said to suffer *vis* [force] from the groom; "the average Roman reader took this to mean that the bride suffered an attack and was expected to cry or scream." Despite the consummation being acknowledged as *vis*, forced sex, it was not considered a crime, because *injuria* could only ever be against the victim's male relatives, not the victim herself.[92] Here Ovid diverges from the standard wedding narrative. Although Philomela and Tereus are continually referred to as "married," in an intentionally twisted sense, Tereus' actions are undeniably depicted as a crime, not just against the dignity of Philomela's father, but against Philomela herself.

After she is raped, Philomela mourns her own tragedy, tearing her hair, scratching her arms, and beating her chest.[93] In mourning Philomela finally finds her voice. For the first time she speaks directly:

> "Oh, you barbarian! Oh, cruel, terrible deeds! Are you not moved by the trusts of my father, having been entrusted with tears, nor the care of my sister nor my virginity nor the law of marriage? You have thrown everything into disorder (*turbasti*); I am made a concubine

[90] Karen Kleiber Hersch, "Violence in the Roman Wedding." In *The Discourse of Marriage in the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Jeffrey Beneker and Georgia Tsouvala (University of Wisconsin Press, 2020), 71.
[91] Hersch, "Roman Wedding," 72.
[92] Hersch, 83.
[93] Ov. *Met.* 6.531-32.

> against my sister (*paelex...sororis*), you are made a two-fold spouse (*geminus conjunx*), an enemy to me with punishments having been deserved (*hostis mihi debita poena*). Why not steal this life, treacherous one, so that there is no crime left for you? And if only you had done that before the heinous rapes (*nefandos concubitus*); I would have considered my shade free of guilt. Yet, if the gods see these things, if the divine powers of the gods exist at all (*sunt aliquid*), if all things have not perished with me (*perierunt...mecum*), someday you will repay the penalties to me (*mihi poenas dabis*)! I myself (*ipsa*), with all shame cast off, will tell the things you have done. If the chance should be given, I would come before the populace. If I am held confined in the forests, I will fill the forests and shake the knowing stones! Heaven will hear this, and if there is any god in that sky, he will hear it!"[94]

Philomela's speech is an intense cry for justice. At first, Philomela frames the crime in conventionally Roman terms—as dishonor against her family. However, she invokes the idea of adultery by citing the laws of marriage (*conjugialia iura)*, even though Tereus' crime would be *stuprum* [debauchery/defilement/lewdness], not adultery, according to the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* [The Julian Law about Restraining Adultery]. The crime of adultery only applied to sex with a *married* woman; a husband cheating on his wife was not necessarily considered

[94] Ov. *Met.* 6.533-48.

adultery.[95] Philomela therefore points out a moral failing that is beyond the legal technicalities of Ovid's time. Philomela then asserts the harm done to herself, with *hostis mihi*, *perierunt...mecum*, and *mihi poenas dabis*. *Philomela* is the one who has been wronged. *She* was disgraced, not her father. Although Philomela first appears to implicate herself in the crime (*paelex ego facta; vacuas habuissem criminis umbras*), now she will "cast off shame" (*pudore projecto*). Philomela declares loudly that she is *not* to blame for her own rape.

Philomela then goes a step further: she promises to personally testify to Tereus' crime (*ipsa loquar*). Notably, as Nguyen notes, "a charge of rape under the *lex Iulia de vi* [Julian Law about Force/Rape] could be brought by the woman's father or her husband," and *not* by the woman herself, unless she was legally independent, "under one's own law" (*sui iuris*), which Philomela was not. Moreover, "convention discouraged women from appearing in court, and while the case could be prosecuted for a woman personally, her male guardians would be the ones physically present."[96] Philomela clearly disregards this convention. Furthermore, she hopes to testify before the public (*in populos veniam*). Roman law considered it a disgrace for a woman to be "dragged into public." For a woman to "be compelled to be present...at trials," such as "on the pretext of prosecuting a lawsuit," was in "scorn of their matronly modesty."[97] Yet Philomela does not need to be dragged or compelled. She *wants* to be seen and heard by the public. Realizing that Tereus will never let her go free, Philomela insists that she will not be silenced; if no one else will hear her, at least the trees and stones of the forest will hear her testimony. Whereas Callisto was uncomfortable because of the "knowing woods" (*conscia silva*)[98],

[95] S.P. Scott, trans. "The Enactments of Justinian. The Digest or Pandects. Book XLVIII." In *The Civil Law*. *Cincinnati, OH: Central Trust Company, 1932), 48.5.6.1.
[96] Nguyen, "Roman Rape" 89.
[97] Grubbs, *Women and the Law*, 49; *Cod. Just.* 2.12.21; *Cod. Theod.* 1.22.1.
[98] Ov. *Met.* 2.438.

Philomela welcomes the "knowing stones" (*conscia saxa*). This demonstrates again that Philomela refuses to be shamed for her misfortune. Philomela refuses to hide herself away, either from the world or from her rapist, Tereus. She confronts him directly and even threatens him, with divine justice if not legal recourse.

Philomela's speech both infuriates (*ira*) Tereus, and no less terrifies him (*nec minor hac metus*).[99] His reaction is not unlike Minerva's response to Arachne's tapestry; in fact, Philomela's audacity is a threat to him. Even imprisoned, and ostensibly unable to escape, Philomela fiercely wounds Tereus' pride merely by speaking up to him. Tereus draws his sword and binds Philomela's arms. Like Arachne, Philomela tries to reclaim her agency by "offering her throat" to Tereus' blade. Philomela is courageous, and therefore "indignant" (*indignantem*).[100] Once Philomela does not cower in the face of death, it ceases to be an effective punishment, because what Tereus wants is for Philomela to demean herself. And so, like Minerva, Tereus looks for a crueler punishment. With pincers (*forcipe*), Tereus grasps Philomela's tongue (*linguam*)—the only weapon with which Philomela can harm Tereus—and cuts it off.[101] Philomela, like Arachne, is silenced.

Both Philomela and Arachne's stories end in tragedy, but this is not a condemnation of their character. Philomela and Arachne are shown to be far more virtuous than their foes, Tereus and Minerva. Rather, their defiance is evidence of Roman women's desire *to defy*. The women's silencing draws attention to the stark reality of Roman society. Livy records, for example, the speech of a certain Roman senator, Lucius Valerius, in which he states the following: "The

[99] Ov. *Met.* 6.549-50.
[100] Ov. *Met* 6.551-55.
[101] Ov. *Met.* 6.555-57.

slavery of women is never pulled off while their men survive; and women themselves detest the freedom (*libertatem...detestantur*) which the loss of father or husband creates."[102] Philomela and Arachne, as well as the other women in this essay, prove that this statement is false. They do not tacitly submit to power or patriarchy. Clearly, Ovid observed Roman women who strove to assert their own agency and take control of their own lives. Moreover, Ovid likely supported this effort, although he recognized it was an uphill battle.

Conclusions

My research and analysis show that Ovid was aware that Roman women held little power or agency relative to Roman men; Ovid was sympathetic towards Roman women on account of their plight. I have argued that the *Metamorphoses* was intended to shine a light on the injustice and cruelty of Roman patriarchy. In the story of Daphne, Ovid reveals sexual assault as a traumatizing experience which dehumanizes and permanently scars the victim, rather than merely a source of embarrassment for the victim's male relatives. In Ovid's presentation, Scylla's transformation from maiden to monster allegorically depicts the harm done to Roman women when their sexual agency and bodies were fiercely scrutinized and controlled. Ovid's version of Callisto's story further shows how Roman society's preoccupation with women's chastity and supposed infidelity regularly led to female victims of assault being shamed and blamed. Finally, Ovid's characters of Arachne and Philomela represent women who speak out against these unjust and harmful structures and are summarily silenced. Clearly these women did have agency and desired to express it but were repressed. Ovid's choice of syntax and rhetoric as well as his framing suggest that his depictions of women's plight were intentional. He never

[102] Livy. 34.7.11-12.

blames or admonishes his female victims and never treats their tragic situations lightly. Women's victimizers are explicitly painted as villainous—even gods and goddesses are depicted as hypocritical, petty, and insecure despite their position of authority.

A potential implication of my research is that people living in ancient, patriarchal societies like Rome were more than the products of their times. Ovid, as an upper-class male poet, had nothing to gain from criticizing traditional Roman patriarchy with such intensity, especially in the time of Augustus. It would be an unfair generalization to assume that all Roman men believed in the inferiority of women, or that all Roman women tacitly accepted this axiom. The *Metamorphoses* supports the belief that people willing to speak out against societal injustices or hypocrisy existed in the ancient past, as they do today. The uniqueness of the *Metamorphoses* as a source suggests that vocal proponents of such social justice were few and far between, and yet, they must have existed.

Furthermore, the sympathies towards women's issues expressed by Ovid in his poetry suggest that there were women in his own time speaking vocally and publicly about their marginalization. Hedyle of Attica, the female Greek poet who may have inspired Ovid's take on Scylla, likely was one of many female voices asserting women's agency and exposing the injustice of ancient patriarchies. Going forward, I would like to explore that avenue further. The lack of female-authored sources, as discussed in the beginning of this essay, would make such an investigation difficult. Nevertheless, the brief glimpse into the real experiences of Roman women offered by Ovid's *Metamorphoses* proves that such an undertaking is worth the effort.

Works Cited

Anderson, William S. "Aspects of Love in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *The Classical Journal* 90, no. 3 (1995): 265–69.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Aspen*, 1967. http://writing.upenn.edu/~taransky/Barthes.pdf.

Curran, Leo C. "Rape and Rape Victims in the Metamorphoses." *Arethusa* 11, no. 1/2 (1978): 213–41.

Giovannini, Maureen J. "Woman: A Dominant Symbol Within the Cultural System of a Sicilian Town." *Man* 16, no. 3 (1981): 408–26. https://doi.org/10.2307/2801292.

Griffin, Alan H. F. "Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *Greece & Rome* 24, no. 1 (1977): 57–70.

Grubbs, Judith Evans. *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce, and Widowhood*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Hejduk, Julia D. "Arachne's Attitude: Metamorphoses 6.25." *Mnemosyne* 65, no. 4/5 (2012): 764–68.

Hersch, Karen Kleiber. "Violence in the Roman Wedding." In *The Discourse of Marriage in the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Jeffrey Beneker and Georgia Tsouvala, 68–93. University of Wisconsin Press, 2020. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv136c5bq.

Lightman, Majorie, and William Zeisel. "Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society." *Church History* 46, no. 1 (1977): 19–32. https://doi.org/10.2307/3165156.

Lowe, Dunstan. "Scylla, the Diver's Daughter: Aeschrion, Hedyle, and Ovid." *Classical Philology* 106, no. 3 (2011): 260–64. https://doi.org/10.1086/661547.

M. Tullius Cicero. "Pro Plancius." In *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*, edited by Albert Clark. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1909. https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0015%3Atext%3DPlanc.%3Achapter%3D12.

Mueller, Ilse. "Single Women in the Roman Funerary Inscriptions." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 175 (2010): 295–303.

Nguyen, Nghiem L. "Roman Rape: An Overview of Roman Rape Laws from the Republican Period to Justinian's Reign" 13 (n.d.): 39.

O'Bryhim, Shawn. "Ovid's Version of Callisto's Punishment." *Hermes* 118, no. 1 (1990): 75–80.

P. Ovidius Naso. *Ars Amatoria*. Edited by R. Ehwald. Leipzig, Germany: B. G. Teubner, 1907. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.02.0068%3atext%3dArs.

———. *Epistulae*. Edited by R. Ehwald. B.G. Teubneri. Leipzig, Germany, 1907.

———. *Medicamina faciei femineae*. Edited by R. Ehwald. B.G. Teubneri. Leipzig, Germany, 1907.http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0068%3Ate xt%3DMed.

———. *Metamorphoses*. Edited by R.J. Tarrant. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Parker, Holt N. "Why Were the Vestals Virgins? Or the Chastity of Women and the Safety of the Roman State," *American Journal of Philology* 125, no. 4 (2004), 563–601.

Richlin, Amy. *Arguments with Silence: Writing the History of Roman Women*. University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Seneca the Elder. *Annaei Senecae Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae Divisiones Colores*. Edited by Adolf Gottlieb Kiessling. B.G. Teubneri. Leipzig, Germany, 1872.
Severy, Beth. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2003.

S.P. Scott, trans. "The Enactments of Justinian. The Digest or Pandects. Book XLVIII." In *The Civil Law*. Cincinnati, OH: Central Trust Company, 1932. https://droitromain.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/Anglica/D48_Scott.htm#V.

Titus Livius. *The History of Rome*. Edited by Robert Seymour Conway and Charles Flamstead Walters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1914. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0160%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3Dpr%3Asection%3D1.

Sterling Stuckey Award

"FBI vs. White Supremacy and Civil Rights: Analyzing the FBI's Interactions through the Freedom Summer Murders"

Griffin Freitas

The Freedom Summer Murders, or Mississippi Burning Murders as officially labeled by the FBI, have long been considered the turning point in the nature of the FBI's involvement in the Civil Rights movement. Until this point, most of the FBI's work during the Civil Rights movement consisted of actively working against Civil Rights agents under the guise of tracking suspected members of the communist party. However, while the FBI's involvement in the Freedom Summer Murders certainly signaled progress against white supremacist groups and white hate in general, it was not the call to action that it has often been painted as. First and foremost, the FBI's new directive to investigate white hate groups did not change the nature of their investigation into the Civil Rights movement and notable activists. This odd approach led to the FBI finding itself fighting both sides of the Civil Rights movement, albeit in much different and racially motivated ways. As illustrated in Farber, and perhaps the definition of all FBI action against white supremacist groups for years to come, "Johnson...pressed Hoover by playing to the director's greatest fear, that his beloved bureaucratic turf would be trod upon"[103]. Hoover set the tone of the FBI's investigation into the Ku Klux Klan and other white hate groups from the outset: forced, filling in the paperwork and doing what was required of them by federal

[103] David Farber, "The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s" ed. Eric Foner (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 94.

law. This attitude would linger for decades, and in quite a few respects still lingers today. While at first glance it may not seem like a major hindrance in their work pursuing white hate groups, (in fact the FBI pursued white hate groups aggressively in the years after initially being forced to do so) this attitude would bleed into the subtext of their investigations and effect the outcomes of quite a few cases. None more notable than their initial launch into the fight against white hate, the Mississippi Burning Murders, whose only landmark conviction would come nearly 40 years after the initial crime and with meager to no punishments for the nearly 20 other perpetrators implicated.

In sharp contrast to the FBI's begrudging investigation into white hate groups is the nature of their investigations into Civil Rights activists. Specifically, Bayard Rustin, whose only crimes listed in the massive amount of FBI case files on him consist of "homosexuality" and being at the wrong rally at the wrong time and then being followed for decades for suspected ties to the communist party. Alongside the all too prevalent crime of being a gay man in the 60s, these seemingly minor actions landed Rustin permanently in the FBI's line of fire. The cases of Bayard Rustin and the Freedom Summer Murders are quite different, but it is their differences that make the varying nature of the FBI's investigations so apparent. Intrusive investigative actions taken against Rustin are often absent from Freedom Summer Murder case files despite the incident's more violent nature. This paper will use FBI case files on both the Freedom Summer Murders and the Civil Rights activist Bayard Rustin to compare FBI responses to two possible threats to American law and order, both of massively varying degrees. In doing so it hopes to extend the shortcomings of the Mississippi Burning case to the FBI's dealings with white supremacy and race relations as a whole, both in the 60s and in today's political landscape.

As illustrated by the differences between the case files regarding the Freedom Summer Murders and the investigation of Bayard Rustin, the FBI's actions against the Civil Rights movement were ones of ideology while their actions against white hate groups were ones of obligation. In essence, this attitude did not affect the degree to which they pursued these cases but rather the subtext that pervaded them and their outcomes, softening the blow for dozens of white hate groups while inflicting more punishment than necessary on Civil Rights activists.

Section 1: The Freedom Summer Murders

The Freedom Summer Murders were the beginning of the FBI's involvement with action against white supremacy. And yet from the outset that involvement was characterized quite differently than their crusade against the Civil Rights movement. If the investigations and cases regarding the Civil Rights movement were driven by Hoover, the beginning of the FBI's involvement with white-hate was driven by Lyndon B. Johnson. Hoover's dispatch of FBI agents to Mississippi and the setting up of a new field office was effective at carrying out the investigation, but in large part it was more politically motivated than motivated by a desire to combat dangerous ideology. While the majority of the FBI's work on the Freedom Summer Murders was professional, this mindset would at times seep its way through into critical junctures of the investigation and hinder its results in subtle ways. As illustrated in Farber, the driving force behind the investigation into the Freedom Summer Murders was the Johnson administration looking to back up its stance on civil rights.[104] However even this support was not

[104] Farber, "Age of Great Dreams"

without its caveats. Although Johnson was more sympathetic than Hoover, he "never saw himself or his bureau as allies of the civil rights movement", and as such the frantic push of the White House to investigate the murders was akin to Hoover's more political motivation[105]. In essence, the decision was made because it was the right move for Johnson and not necessarily the right move for justice or equality, even if its results happened to lean that way. This is made most clear in excerpts of Johnson's presidential recordings and his discussion with Lee White regarding what to address in a meeting with James Farmer, an NAACP representative demanding answers about the case "I asked Hoover last...two weeks ago after talking to the Attorney General to fill up Mississippi with FBI men and infiltrate everything he could; that they haul them in by the dozens"[106]. In this recording and the countless others regarding the Mississippi Burning case, Johnson's focus is appeasement of the Civil Rights movement and the maintaining of law and order. In this way the investigation into the Freedom Summer Murders began not as a crusade for justice, but as a political move thrust upon both Hoover and in smaller part Johnson.

The effects of such an outset are most readily apparent in the case files dated closest to the initial crime, most of which occur in late June and early August. This initial response consists entirely of interviews of suspects and the first takes of FBI agents regarding the situation, many of which err on the side of believing the sheriff deputy who held the victims for an unjust amount of time. While only initial impressions, and ones that would change over the course of the investigation, these statements and summaries of interviews by FBI agents give insight into their natural tendency to both lean towards taking local law enforcement at their word and trusting the

[105] Farber, "Age of Great Dreams," 94

[106] Lyndon B. Johnson and Lee White, 4 June 1964, The Presidential Recordings Volume 8. https://prde.upress.virginia.edu/content/.

testimony of white witnesses more than black. One of the most egregious instances present in the case files of FBI agents including possible accounts of events is their initial summary of the timeline that took place after the three victims were arrested and brought to the Neshoba County jail. Their account dictates that, according to witnesses and testimonies, "Immediately upon receiving this information from Justice of the Peace LEONARD WARREN, [Name Redacted] released the three victims, they paid their fine and walked out" and yet recorded on their own pages are many instances where testimonies don't line up with those facts[107]. Although the name is redacted here, future files illustrating the same scene explicitly state it was Sheriff Cecil Price who released the suspects. There's nothing present to suggest that the agents outright lied regarding the nature of events, but they did choose to omit details that would call the exact nature of the victims' time in jail into question. While all the facts in their initial summary are technically true, they fail to include the details that "fines decided upon by the Justice of the Peace were posted on wall" or that "Price told the men that they'd need to wait for the Justice of the Peace to arrive", both of which appear later in the case files during witness testimonies[108] [109]. These key details that were consistent over several accounts were left out as possibilities in the agents' initial summaries, even though they had access to said information at the time of writing. Although not done maliciously, the agents' unconscious biases influenced their summaries to make them more forgiving to Sheriff Cecil Price. These wrinkles in the testimonies create an entirely new situation than depicted in the official summary; that despite the presence of the available information Cecil Price chose to keep the victims jailed until a certain time and that the

[107] The Federal Bureau of Investigation, "Miburn Case Files" Parts 1-9, accessed through https://vault.fbi.gov/civil-rights. Part 4 of 9, 1964, 15
Part 4 of 9, 1964, 15
[108] FBI, "Miburn," Part 4 of 9, 35
[109] FBI, "Miburn," Part 4 of 9, 40

criteria he initially gave them for their release turned out to be false. Eventually, these details would be included, and Cecil Price would be incriminated further, seemingly diminishing the significance of these lackluster initial impressions and their effects on the case. But it was these little concessions in favor of the perpetrators and, in today's terminology, microaggressions towards black testimonials that would ultimately pile up, delaying this case and possibly diminishing its outcomes. In the same batch of case files, the opposite effect can be viewed in the FBI's depiction of the victims: "[Name Redacted] neither SCHWERNER nor GOODMAN made any remarks indicating that they had had any trouble with the arresting officers and other than giving them the impression that they would be in jail for several days, they were calm and collected"[110]. This type of language as well as painting the black victim, Chaney, as an afterthought pervades these initial documents. In the case files own language, these were "good white boys" who were victimized and, while obviously tragic victims, they would take the focus away from Chaney during the outset of the investigation[111]. The omission of other possible accounts and diminishment of Chaney's role as a victim in the case might've waned over the course of the case, but at the outset these attitudes were indicative of the nature of the times, not a revolution in the FBI's stance on white-hate. Regardless of the enemy they were pointed at, the FBI was a law enforcement agency during a time when law enforcement was predominantly against the Civil Rights movement.

As the initial discrepancies of the first round of investigations faded and the investigation continued, what remained was the inescapable attitudes towards the black

[110] FBI, "Miburn," Part 4 of 9, 38
[111] FBI, "Miburn," Part 4 of 9

community. Despite the majority of the work done by the FBI on the Freedom Summer Murders being professional and complete, throughout every file there was no departure from the wider attitudes of the nation toward black individuals. The majority of these attitudes take the form of small inconsistencies when compared to accounts of white individuals. Instances like the mentioning of criminal history of non-suspects, delayed action interviewing Civil Rights organizers, and the invalidation of black testimonies. Such instances occur most prevalently in Miburn Case File Part 1 of 9, in which the FBI record the beginning of their interviews with black witnesses, nearly 3 months after the beginning of the investigation[112]. One example is an account regarding a week of testimonies from black individuals registering to vote in the Freedom Summer movement that occurred in September of the same year. Unlike accounts given by white individuals, the language used by FBI agents to describe the history of one individual, "Negro...disqualified because of two higher felony convictions while in jail on false pretense charges involving the utterance of a check...overheard unidentified male…", focuses heavily on past run-ins with law enforcement[113]. While this language is used in regards to suspects in the case such as Klan members convicted of past crimes, it is never used in regards to white individuals that were questioned but not suspects. The language also occurs in several more instances throughout the files, proving that despite its target of white supremacy the FBI had not escaped the attitudes of discrimination. Individually, none of the instances where these discrepancies arose were egregious enough to break the case. But they paint a picture of a different type of case than the revolutionary first push against white supremacy. The most

[112] FBI, "Miburn," Part 1 of 9
[113] FBI, "Miburn," Part 1 of 9, 6

ringing endorsement of the Mississippi Burning case would be that it was "standard practice" for the FBI after initial turbulence. It was not entirely defined by the racial prejudices that existed at the time and was a standard body of work that the FBI professionally completed in line with their other cases. And yet this "standard practice" case would reflect the racial disparity of the time regardless of attempts to evenly distribute justice. Perhaps it was less that the Freedom Summer Murders were "standard practice" for the FBI and more that cases against black individuals and Civil Rights leaders stretched far beyond such a definition, highlighting the discrepancies once the FBI had finally dipped their toe into the fight against white-hate.

Section 2: Bayard Rustin

The FBI's investigation into Bayard Rustin could perhaps be considered one of the most indicative cases regarding the FBI's investigations into Civil Rights activists. He was neither as notable as Martin Luther King Jr. nor as unknown as lower-level organizers. In this way the FBI's case against him could be considered "standard practice" when dealing with black Civil Rights organizers. And yet it is the major discrepancies between this form of "standard practice" and that employed in the Mississippi Burning murders that highlight not the failings of said case, but the failings of the FBI during the Civil Rights movement. John D'Emilio in his piece *Remembering Bayard Rustin* gives insight into Rustin's behind the scenes involvement in the Civil Rights movement when he states:

> Put all of these liabilities together-a communist past in cold war America, a pacifist in an armed-to-the-teeth national security state, and a homosexual during the years that one historian has labeled 'the lavender scare'- and one can understand why Rustin would have

> developed a style of leadership that tended to keep him out of the public eye.[114]

And yet despite Rustin's background involvement, he became a prime target of the FBI in matters regarding both communism and the Civil Rights Movement. Although Rustin joined the Young Communist League briefly in his youth, he left during the beginning of World War II after their focus shifted from racial equality to supporting the Soviet Union. However, to Hoover, Rustin's brief affiliation with communist ideals during college when the FBI first began their surveillance and his transition into a Civil Rights activist confirmed his fears about the movement being affiliated with communism. So much so in fact, that Rustin's case files begin with a personally signed letter from Hoover illustrating to the Attorney General the continuing nature of Rustin's surveillance: "Rustin is a former member of the Young Communist League...unless you instruct to the contrary, this technical surveillance will be continued for an additional six months"[115]. From the outset, Rustin's case files paint him as a dangerous threat to America in need of constant surveillance from the FBI. And yet, he had never been convicted of any violent crimes. The crimes he had been arrested for were few and far between and associated either entirely with protesting or questions of sexuality. Despite surveillance of Rustin beginning sometime in the 40s, 20 years later in 1963 (one year before the Mississippi Burning Murders), Hoover is still personally involved in the continuation of his surveillance. Furthermore, while Bayard Rustin was under surveillance in the 40s, unclassified case files available from the FBI begin in the 60s amidst the Civil Rights movement. It is difficult to speculate as to why there is a

[114] John D'Emilio, "Remembering Bayard Rustin." OAH Magazine of History 20, no. 2 (2006):12-14
[115] The Federal Bureau of Investigation, "Bayard Rustin" Parts 1-7, accessed through https://vault.fbi.gov/civil-rights, Part 1 of 7, 4

large gap in time between the beginning of Rustin's surveillance in the 40s to the available case files, but some ideas can be gleaned from the focus of his investigation. First off, the files begin in the midst of an already ongoing surveillance mission on Rustin, suggesting that they had been aware of and were collecting information from him before the indicated beginning of the case files. Secondly, and perhaps more speculative, they might have begun ramping up official accounts due to the increased presence of the Civil Rights movement. Before, he was simply a black communist campaigning for rights. But now the movement he was part of threatened to expand the rights of black American citizens, perhaps increasing the nature of the threat he posed. In any case, the files of Bayard Rustin are rife with odd gaps in documentation, a disproportionate response to the nature of his activities, and a significant level of focus and paranoia surrounding his activities.

Despite the level of resources directed toward Rustin's investigation, like all official documents the FBI declassified, the nature of their opinions and standards toward him and the Civil Rights movement as a whole lie in the subtext of the investigation. The most glaring of said subtext, as discussed previously, is the sheer duration of his investigation as well as the near total lack of declassified documentation prior to the 60s. However, from that time period, one document of four pages sheds some insight into the way the FBI wanted to classify Rustin. Said document is dated 1950 and was not an investigation conducted by the FBI, rather an arrest report collected in 1965 to highlight Rustin's past: "[Rustin] asked us 'if we wanted a good time', we asked him what he meant, he replied that 'he couldn't offer us much, but…'"[116]. While

[116] FBI, "Rustin" Part 5 of 7, 3

arrests during this time period for homosexuality were frequent, it is important to note the nature of this arrest in relation to the rest of Rustin's case files. This was not the inclusion of an arrest report that happened over the course of the 60s investigation of Rustin. This was a case file from a local police department gathered by the FBI in 1965 for the purpose of including a definitive instance of homosexuality in his complete portrait. While perhaps not immediately captivating, it is indicative of the way the FBI pursued black individuals as a whole during this time period. It was less about the crimes they committed and more about creating an entire criminal picture of them. They were looking for the portrait of a deviant communist involved in the Civil Rights movement, and they dug through old arrest reports to do so. It signals that cases like Rustin's and other Civil Rights activists were ones of ideology rather than justice. The FBI was looking to tear down a figure of the Civil Rights Movement, not just convict him on criminal charges. In this way, the FBI's interaction with White Supremacy and the MIBURN case falls short. No such dossiers exist for the suspects in the MIBURN case, and it is evident that the FBI's approach to combating White Supremacy was more about solving the crimes the ideology perpetrated rather than tearing down the ideology itself. In an extension of the characterization of Rustin as a deviant threat, there are also quite a few files concerning instances in which the FBI attempted to effect the general nature of his life both by inflicting "psychological stress" due to surveillance and promoting a criminal image of him in smaller, inconsequential situations that indicate a level of personal prejudice.[117] Once such document is a letter to Hoover from an unknown member of Internal Security, asking him to get personally involved to educate a liberal teacher about Rustin: "She wrote a note on (my son's) paper as following: 'Bayard Rustin is one

[117] FBI, "Rustin" Part 2 of 7

of the most respected men in the Civil Rights movement today. What is the source of the communist accusations?'...Please let me hear your comment on this and mail me some reliable literature on this man Rustin...so I can give it to her at the next PTA meeting"[118]. As insignificant as this request is, Hoover still took time to respond to it, enclosing his testimony to the House Subcommittee concerning Rustin: "Bayard Rustin is an ex-convict...has been arrested on sex charges and is a former member of the Young Communist League. In October 1965, it was necessary to cancel the lecture of a Bureau representative...because Bayard had also been invited to speak"[119]. Not only does Hoover take time to honor this request to spread Rustin's tainted image to a schoolteacher, but he alludes to an instance when the FBI cancelled a lecture to avoid being associated with Rustin in any capacity. The FBI was waging a war against Rustin at all levels. In one manner or the other, the FBI had inserted itself into nearly every part of Rustin's life in an attempt to either work against whatever motives they perceived or to take down a figure they believed might harm the American fabric with the expansion of rights. The subtext of the extensive and continuous investigation into Bayard Rustin illustrated two goals of the FBI: to dismantle him and discredit him, not to prove innocence or guilt.

Considering how diverse the nature of Rustin's refusal to fit the American social mold was, it can be difficult to pinpoint what exactly motivated the FBI to surveil him to such an extent. It could be argued that it was the combination of his sexual orientation, pacifism, communist ties, and Civil Rights activism that caught the attention of the Bureau, but steps taken against him were akin to countless other Civil Rights leaders who did not share the exact same lifestyle facets. In fact, the pervading reason behind the surveillance of Rustin throughout the

[118] FBI, "Rustin" Part 2 of 7, 69
[119] FBI, "Rustin" Part 2 of 7, 70

case files declassified by the FBI was not his position as a black activist, but rather a complete and total fear of communist Civil Rights activists, although the two issues are inexorably entangled. It is difficult to tell which aspects feeds off which, but as far as official documentation goes, the concern regarding communist ties regarding Rustin and other black Civil Rights activists takes center stage: "There has been no information indicating contact between BAYARD RUSTIN and the CP (Communist Party)...However, as in the past, RUSTIN and STANLEY DAVID LEVISON, secret member of the CP, have been in contact...contacts have been fewer"[120]. This language pervades the case files regarding Rustin. Concerns about communist ties dominate and yet evidence of any contact with communist members or officials is few and far between after his initial involvement in 1936 (at which time the FBI was not surveilling him). However, while less mentioned in official reports, it is no doubt that the suspicion as well as the measures taken against Rustin were motivated by race as well as communist concerns. They often refer to Rustin as "a Negro seeking political influence"[121] suggesting an awareness of the appeal of the communist party to the most oppressed demographic in America. It becomes a question of chicken and the egg that the case files are unable to properly answer. Were they suspicious of the communist ties in the Civil Rights movement because activists were black? Or were the communist ties present in the Civil Rights movement confirmation of the Bureaus already held racism towards black individuals? Regardless, the issues of race and communist paranoia were intermingled to an extent that they are nearly impossible to untangle. It may simply be a case of seeing "the enemy" and assigning

[120] FBI, "Rustin" Part 2 of 7, 11
[121] FBI, "Rustin" Part 1 of 7, 50

every definition to every enemy. While there is clear evidence of racial discrimination and motivation behind the FBI's actions against Bayard Rustin and other Civil Rights leaders, the clear and pervading officially cited reason is "communist ties". While perhaps not the complete story of the FBI's involvement in the Civil Rights movement, it is oddly enough, one of the major points of overlap between their work against the Civil Rights movement and their work against white-hate groups.

Section 3: The Discrepancies and Similarities

The investigation into Rustin and other Civil Rights activists and the work done on the Mississippi Burning case are no doubt quite different, and yet the major differences between the cases only serve to highlight the racially motivated approaches to law enforcement. Rustin was never arrested for a violent crime and yet the nature of his surveillance extends far beyond the declassified files of the Freedom Summer Murders. Suspects like James E. Jordan who was interviewed multiple times and confessed to his involvement each interview, "'Preacher Killen got into the car and said that he would show the group where they could go so they could park and watch for the workers when they were released from jail'"[122] would eventually go free or serve light sentences, and despite the FBI's supposed dedication to combatting white-hate groups as a whole surveillance on said individuals would grind to a halt. Furthermore, other than listing the past crimes of suspects and those arrested, there are no attempts throughout the Mississippi Burning case files to attack the character or discredit the individuals involved, even those at a leadership level in the KKK such as Edgar Ray Killen. Furthermore, while as a suspect Rustin

[122] FBI, "Miburn Case Files, Testimony by James E. Jordan," Part 4 of 9, 79

has a case file nearly as long as the Freedom Summer Murders, as a victim James Chaney, the black victim in the Freedom Summer Murders, is mentioned almost entirely in conjunction with the other white victims and often categorized as a separate entity from them: "GOODMAN and SCHWERNER were booked 'for investigation'.(REDACTED) victims were held in the Neshoba County Jail"[123]. This passage, along with many others, discusses the nature of the vague charges against the white victims and separates them from their black compatriot. While the case files paint them all as victims, it makes it abundantly clear that Chaney was arrested for speeding while the white victims were held unjustly. The investigation into the Mississippi Burning murders was supposed to be the beginning of an attack on organized white-hate and their beliefs, and yet when compared to cases like Bayard Rustin's, it is clear that it was first and foremost standard police work. In their fight against the Civil Rights Movement, the FBI proved that they knew the tools and tactics necessary to attack character and dismantle public figures, and yet none of these tools are present in their initial dealings with white-hate.

Despite the subtle failings of the Mississippi Burning case, the onus of blame does not lie entirely with the FBI. Nor did they shirk their responsibilities when confronted with a case aiding a part of the Civil Rights movement. The most notable difference between Bayard's case and the Freedom Summer Murders lies in the nature of law outside of the FBI's case files. While the extent of Bayard's arrest reports detailed in his file were from local law enforcement offices, nearly all of the files underneath the Mississippi Burning Murders were conducted by the FBI. There was no local law to do legwork, both because of racial prejudices and because local law was one of the prime suspects. Furthermore, while completely absent from Bayard's files, there

[123] FBI, "Miburn," Part 3 of 9, 83

are countless instances of "failing to secure rights to question"[124] and other such phrasing that indicates the failure to secure warrants and other necessary approval to question and surveil witnesses. Rather than assuming the agents of the FBI were entirely racially motivated in their discrepancies with cases against Civil Rights activists, it could be argued that some of the failings could have stemmed from the belief that when brought before a jury arrests would amount to nothing. In a way they were right, as once it was out of the FBI's hands convictions amounted to nothing more than several years in prison and the conviction of Killen for life nearly 40 years after the initial investigation. There is a pervasive theme of frustration among the Mississippi Burning case files. Phrases like "unwilling to cooperate" and "proceeding without help from local law"[125] occur frequently and paint the picture of a Bureau investigation that for possibly the first time was working against a white American community that was doing everything in its power to hinder them. The sharpest contrast to Bayard's file is the ease of investigation among both cases. While Bayard contains countless documents from high-ranking officials such as Hoover himself and "Congressman Samuel L. Devine"[126], the Freedom Summer files list many instances when they were unable to obtain a basic level of approval to continue the investigation. The FBI's involvement in the Freedom Summer Murders was not a landmark case because it was the FBI's first official stance against violence motivated by white-hate. Rather, the investigation of white-hate in the case finally matched the standards of investigation for the FBI as a whole. In comparison to cases against Bayard Rustin and other African-

[124] FBI, "Miburn"
[125] FBI, "Miburn"
[126] FBI, "Rustin" Part 5 of 7, 1

American's involved in the Civil Rights movement it falls short in a variety of areas, but only because said cases were unnaturally thorough due to fearful race relations and paranoia about communism. The similarities between Bayard's files and the files on the Freedom Summer Murders are few and far between, and yet the areas that overlap indicate the beginnings of an FBI looking to face white-hate for the threat it is, but perhaps never to the extent they faced the Civil Rights Movement.

Conclusion: The Evolution of the FBI following Miburn

The FBI would continue to engage in disproportionate responses to Civil Rights activists far after the events of the Freedom Summer Murders. Years of racial discrimination, profiling, and fear of communist ties were not going to evaporate the second the FBI found a target on the opposite side of the conflict. And yet as time proceeds, the similarities between cases grow as the FBI begins treating white supremacy groups like threats to national security and the American fabric that they had so long, and wrongly, perceived in the Civil Rights movement. Most notably, Hoover began perceiving white-hate groups as potential weapons of communism (as he often did), as communist propaganda overseas fed on the racial violence and discrimination present in the United States to recruit new members.[127] However even as these two areas of investigation drew closer, the motivations behind said investigations remained difficult to unravel and discern. For the most part, the main distinction remained that action against Civil Rights groups remained motivated by ideology and race, often to the detriment of political

[127] John Drabble. "To Ensure Domestic Tranquility: The FBI, Cointelpro-White Hate and Political Discourse, 1964-1971." (Journal of American Studies, 2004).

positions and American politics. Meanwhile, like the Mississippi Burning Case, decisions to fight white supremacy were almost entirely politically motivated or motivated by the desire to preserve law and order in the United States, not to crush a dangerous ideology. In many ways, this distinction persists to this day and pervades the constant distrust and struggle the United States has with its law enforcement. While there were triumphs and struggles across the entirety of the Mississippi Burning case, and similarities and differences when compared to cases like Bayard's Rustin, the main takeaway remains that despite the FBI's commitment to enforcing a standard of law beyond race, that enforcing never grew beyond being politically and order motivated. Despite the progress it incited, in the end it was a job, not a campaign like their work against the Civil Rights movement. As the threat of communism began being applied to white-hate groups, so too would the threat of communism fade. White-hate groups would lose that definition of a competing ideology and return to being subjects of the FBI's task of imposing law and order. Meanwhile, even as communist paranoia waned, Civil Rights groups and activists would never lose the distinction of being ideologies counter to the American fabric.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Johnson, Lyndon B. and Lee White, 4 June 1964, *The Presidential Recordings Volume 8.* https://prde.upress.virginia.edu/content/.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, "MIBURN Case Files" Parts 1-9, accessed through https://vault.fbi.gov/civil-rights.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, "Bayard Rustin" Parts 1-7, accessed through https://vault.fbi.gov/civil-rights.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation "White Supremacy Groups" Parts 1-2, accessed through https://vault.fbi.gov/civil-rights.

Secondary Sources

Cohen, Robert. "G-Men in Georgia: The FBI and the Segregationist Riot at the University of Georgia, 1961." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 83, no. 3 (1999): 508-38. Accessed March 19, 2021. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40584111.

D'Emilio, John. "Remembering Bayard Rustin." *OAH Magazine of History* 20, no. 2 (2006): 12-14. Accessed March 19, 2021. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25162027.

Drabble, John. "To Ensure Domestic Tranquility: The FBI, Cointelpro-White Hate and Political Discourse, 1964-1971." *Journal of American Studies*, 2004.

Farber, David. *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s: by David Farber ; Consulting Ed.: Eric Foner*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

"Murder in Mississippi." PBS. Public Broadcasting Service. Accessed March 19, 2021. https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/freedomsummer-murder/.

Whitlinger, Claire. "From Countermemory to Collective Memory: Acknowledging the "Mississippi Burning" Murders." *Sociological Forum* 30, no. S1 (2015): 648-70. Accessed March 19, 2021. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43654411.

Peter Schneider Award

“'That Which You Fear Will Come Upon You:' Betty Friedan, NOW, and the Rise of the Radical Lesbian Movement"

Alysson Distor

On the night of May 1, 1970, over 300 women united in a Manhattan school auditorium to participate in the Second Congress to Unite Women, a conference orchestrated by renowned feminist Betty Friedan’s National Organization for Women (NOW). The room was filled with passion as the women spoke to each other about their feminist goals while they waited for the Congress to begin. They were determined to create a hopeful history together on that very night. But as they waited, the lights went out. Pitch blackness. Gasps from the women erupted. Unknown ruffles and aggressive footsteps filled every corner. Yells and screams haunted the room. Heartbeats thumped as the women held their breaths in fear and confusion. Suddenly, the lights turned back on. The 300 women looked in complete dismay. A group of young women stood at the front of the auditorium. Bold in print, their shirts read “LAVENDER MENACE”.

However, the Lavender Menace present at the Second Congress was no menace at all—they were silenced lesbian feminists desperately trying to have their voices heard in the Women’s Liberation Movement of the 1960s. Undoubtedly, Women’s Liberation was not as glorious as many feminists had championed it to be. Behind the scenes was wreckage as women battled on what feminist goals should be brought to light. While Betty Friedan and NOW became the pioneers of the Movement, they also became its destructors. President of NOW, Friedan often manipulated NOW to exclude issues and those who did not align with her values and

rhetoric. This was especially true to those she labeled as the "lavender menaces"—gay women. The silenced voices of lesbians became a stain in Women's Liberation left untreated by Friedan. However, little to her dismay, her distaste towards lesbianism would only come to haunt her and the fate of the Movement. It was only a matter of time when anger, dissent, and power grew within the lesbian feminist community, ultimately framing the rise of the Radical Lesbian Movement. Friedan had started an internal war between sexualities.

Amplified by her media-based approach to feminism, the homophobic rhetoric of Betty Friedan in the National Organization for Women garnered outrage amongst lesbian women as it enforced their exclusion from the Women's Liberation Movement. The collective outrage in response to the exclusion mobilized lesbian feminists to develop the Radical Lesbian Movement, spurring the rise of a radical division in Women's Liberation that operated in defiance against Friedan's homophobic sentiments and NOW's reformist policies that emphasized heterosexism and the inclusion of men for the progression of feminism. This essay will explore how the lesbophobia conceived by Friedan's media-based approach imposed NOW's exclusion of lesbianism. It will consider how Friedan's attempts to silence lesbianism only served to intensify the issue between NOW and lesbians, therefore increasing lesbian dissidence and sparking a lesbian movement that challenged Friedan with radical sentiments of feminist separatism, anti-heterosexism, and the redefinition of 'lesbian' as a political weapon.

First and foremost, Betty Friedan is credited as the founder of the Women's Liberation Movement. Inspired by her discovery that many women shared her silent discontent with the housewife lifestyle,[128] Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963 and vocalized the silent struggles of heterosexual women—particularly white, middle-class housewives. She wrote, "We

[128]Manon Parry, "Betty Friedan: Feminist Icon and Founder of the National Organization for Women", *American Journal of Public Health* 100, no. 9 (2010): 1584. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.187534.

can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: 'I want something more than my husband and my children and my home.'"[129] She broadcasted the desire to break from gender roles and seek personal fulfillment, inspiring thousands of women to finally vocalize and find unity within each other.[130] Soon, women mobilized in consciousness-raising groups and spoke about their hidden desires and issues. They discussed the social and political implications behind their feelings. They questioned their role as women and how society had fated them to be subordinate to men.[131] Discontent grew ferociously; Friedan had reignited the flame for feminism.

Women began to mobilize and form the Women's Liberation Movement. Concerned with the government's avoidance to pass Title VII to outlaw gender discrimination in employment,[132] Friedan organized with other women in 1966 to create the National Organization for Women. Elected as the first president, Friedan played a crucial role in constructing NOW's goals and purposes.[133] She recalled, "I wrote on one napkin that NOW had 'to take the actions needed to bring women into the mainstream of American society, now… in fully equal partnership with men."[134] Friedan established NOW's foundational goal: seeking an equal platform to men by pressuring the government through media attention and complying with a reformist approach. This became the base principle of NOW and Women's Liberation.

---

[129] Betty Friedan, "The Problem That Has No Name" in *The Feminine Mystique*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1963), 57-78.
[130] Parry, "Betty Friedan", 1584.
[131] David Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams: The United States in the 1960s* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 255.
[132] Margaret Henderson, "Betty Friedan (1921-2006)", *Australian Feminist Studies* 22, no. 53 (2007):165. DOI: 10.1080/08164640701361725.
[133] Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 247.
[134] Betty Friedan, "Demanding Full Equality", *TIME Magazine*, March 13, 2003, http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1977881_1977891_1978447,00.html.

In its first conference in 1966, NOW rallied over 300 members, especially attracting lesbian women.[135] Feeling ostracized from gay communities and organizations due to sexism, many lesbians turned to NOW to seek inclusion.[136] Viewing feminism as a concept applying to all women regardless of sexuality, they vowed to ally with their heterosexual counterparts.[137] Through membership in NOW, lesbians believed they had finally had a platform to advocate for their rights. However, as the lesbian presence grew, Friedan's influences on NOW grew stronger. This marked the beginning of a war within Women's Liberation.

To understand how the homophobia within Women's Liberation influenced lesbian mobilization, it is vital to acknowledge *why* Friedan authorized anti-lesbianism into NOW. Friedan designed NOW to advocate for gender equality by gaining attention through mainstream media.[138] However, she knew this would come with complications. Mainstream media was dominated by men as they owned and operated the majority of the nation's newspapers.[139] To attain effective coverage, NOW had to appeal to men. That being said, many feminists took note of the media's heteronormative values, and Friedan was no exception.[140] Under the notion that lesbians are "man-haters", Friedan believed lesbianism caused the media to paint a distasteful image for NOW, barring attention away from feminist goals she desired to amplify. She makes this clear in her 1973 *New York Times* article "Up from the kitchen floor": "The manhaters are given publicity… because of the media's hunger for sensationalism. At last month's NOW

[135] Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 247.
[136] Sal J. Licata, "The Emerging Gay Presence: Part III", *The Advocate*, August 9, 1978, 17-18, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/emerging-gay-presence/docview/2371043926/se-2?accountid=14521.
[137] Clark A. Pomerleau, "Empowering Members, Not Overpowering Them: The National Organization for Women, Calls for Lesbian Inclusion, and California Influence, 1960s-1980s", *Journal of Homosexuality* 57, no. 7 (2010): 844. DOI: 10.1080/00918369.2010.493414.
[138] Friedan, "Demanding Full Equality."
[139] Donna Minkowitz, "THE NEWSROOM BECOMES A BATTLEGROUND: Gloria Steinem, Feminist Luminary", *The Advocate* May 19, 1992, 33, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/newsroom-becomes-battleground/docview/2100290675/se-2?accountid=14521.
[140] Minkowitz, "THE NEWSROOM BECOMES A BATTLEGROUND", 31.

convention… the television cameramen only turned their lights on for the resolutions on lesbianism… ignoring the hundreds of other resolutions on economic, political, social and educational breakthroughs."[141] Believing that addressing lesbianism caused men to focus on the "man-hating" controversy, Friedan blamed lesbians for any controversial views on NOW and the lack of coverage on issues she felt were significant. She feared that such advocacy would be political suicide for NOW and the progress of gender equality. To Friedan, the end justified the means—the exclusion of lesbian rights in NOW's agenda was absolutely necessary to attain her vision of feminism: an equal social and political platform to men. Whether her homophobic sentiments were of personal spite or of genuine political means, Friedan was nonetheless successful in marginalizing lesbian issues from NOW's agenda. She had discreetly shaped NOWs policies and sentiments to be unconditionally heterocentric—focusing solely on the struggles of straight women and urging the participation of men, all while shunning the organization's own lesbian population.

This negligence did not go unnoticed. Rather, the heterosexual members of NOW made the exclusion of lesbians quite apparent. Friedan's anti-lesbian approach in the media enabled hostility towards lesbianism, affecting lesbians' perspectives on NOW's environment. Former member Sharon Deevy recalled the impact of lesbophobia in NOW in her 1972 article "Such a Nice Girl" published in *The Furies*: "[I] was scared shitless that I would be kicked out of Women's Liberation if anyone found out [I was a lesbian]. At meetings in the [office], women protested loudly whenever the media or men denounced [Women's Liberation] as a 'bunch of lesbians.'"[142] Friedan's emphasis on media image impacted the views of heterosexual women

[141] Betty Friedan, "Up from the kitchen floor", *The New York Times*, March 4, 1973, https://www.nytimes.com/1973/03/04/archives/up-from-the-kitchen-floor-kitchen-floor.html?smid=url-share.
[142]Sharon Deevy, "Such a Nice Girl", *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, January 1972, https://idn.duke.edu/ark:/87924/r3t12b.

and enabled them to explicitly denounce lesbianism, especially when NOW was represented with it in the media. The overt lesbophobia in NOW's environment had clear impacts on lesbians. As Deevy explains, it created a sense of fear among the lesbian population, inciting them to hide away their sexuality. This resulted in many lesbians remaining in the closet to protect themselves.[143] As many had specifically joined NOW to advocate for their rights, the lesbophobic environment conceived by Friedan began to incite tension amongst the lesbian population.

Friedan's lesbophobic remarks in the late 1960s further amplified such tension as they patently and publicly confirmed Friedan's homophobic sentiment to the members of NOW. Already aggravated by her failure to acknowledge their existence, lesbians in NOW demanded Friedan to release an official statement regarding NOW's stance on lesbianism.[144] Finally, in 1969, she discreetly addressed the issue during a private executive board meeting.[145] Friedan declared that lesbians were "lavender menaces" and posed a threat to feminism as they harmed the political advancements of NOW.[146] Reflecting these comments in *The Advocate* in 1984, Friedan stated, "The whole issue with sexual preference… was irrelevant to the women's movement... If you focus the movement on sexual issues, in the end you polarize people… Right now, everyone's focus is on the priorities of survival… in terms of the legislation about sex discrimination."[147] She had justified her "lavender menace" remarks by claiming that the lesbian

[143] Donna Minkowitz, "Despite a Troubled History, the National Organization for Women Welcomes Lesbians into the Fold," *The Advocate*, December 17, 1991, 46, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/despite-troubled-history-national-organization/docview/2092394850/se-2?accountid=14521.
[144] Pomerleau, "Empowering Members, Not Overpowering Them", 845.
[145] Kristan Poirot, "Domesticating the Liberated Woman: Containment Rhetorics of Second Wave Radical/Lesbian Feminism", *Women's Studies in Communication* 32, no. 3 (2010): 270, DOI: 10.1080/07491409.2009.10162391.
[146] Stephanie Gilmore and Elizabeth Kaminski, "A Part and Apart: Lesbian and Straight Feminist Activists Negotiate Identity in a Second-Wave Organization", *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 16, no. 1 (2007): 96, https://www.jstor.org/stable/30114203.
[147] Eric C. Rofes, "Interview with Betty Friedan", *The Advocate*, October 16, 1984, 21, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/interview-with-betty-friedan/docview/2465379056/se-2?accountid=14521.

controversy would divide the Movement and destroy the focus on issues she believed were of more importance. She firmly asserted that the progress of feminism would be threatened if lesbians were given a platform. Surely, her word choice was strong yet deliberate. The usage of the term "menace" was selected to aggressively depict the antagonistic image of lesbians that Friedan desired to impose: the idea that lesbians were internal enemies of feminism and must be treated as such. With her strong and aggressive words, it was evident that a main component in Friedan's agenda for NOW was to antagonize lesbians and instill fear among the heterosexual population to cleanse lesbianism out of the Movement. Although such comments were made in secrecy in the board meeting, the news of her derogatory remarks would rapidly spread to all ears of the NOW members, especially to the ears of its lesbian members.[148] The internal feminist war between the sexualities had now begun.

Friedan's "lavender menace" comments had significantly destroyed the loyalty many lesbians had to NOW. In fact, many pointed to her comments as a significant factor in spurring lesbian opposition against NOW. In an interview in 1999 with *The Lesbian Review of Books*, Kayla Jay (author of *Tales of the Lavender Menace: A Memoir of Liberation*) stated, "Betty Friedan had called lesbians, including me, a 'Lavender Menace'… Some New York radical lesbians were so incensed about her remarks… that we formed a group using that name and seized the Second Congress to Unite Women in 1970. "[149] Friedan's derogatory comments served as the foundation of lesbian outrage as her statements as president seemingly authorized homophobia within NOW. This was the confirmation to lesbians that their exclusion was a legitimate operation on NOW's agenda. However, as seen in Jay's recollections, while the

[148] "Lavender Menaces Confront the Congress to Unite Women", *Gay Power*, 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/UJEQVL253460893/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=cce5223b
[149] Judith P. Stelboum, "An Interview with Karla Jay," *The Lesbian Review of Books*, 1999, 15, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/MVNTUS618759481/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=fac360fc.

comments had their negative impacts, it sparked a sense of rebellion amongst lesbian feminists. "Lavender menace" would transcend from a term of oppression to a term of empowerment as dissidence against Friedan grew stronger. Nonetheless, as lesbian dissidence intensified, Friedan began to fully implement her lesbophobic beliefs into overt discriminatory actions.

Friedan discriminated against lesbians by barring their participation in NOW, pushing lesbians to mobilize. In one instance, with no public announcement, Friedan removed all lesbian organizations from attending NOW's Congress to Unite Women. In a statement to NOW in 1971, lesbian feminist Del Martin noticed Friedan's silent removal. She angrily wrote, "The purpose of the meeting, mind you, [was] an attempt to gather as many women's groups as possible… and establish solidarity in the women's movement as a whole."[150] Though Friedan worked to unite women, Martin noted that she also ironically worked to destroy unity with women she believed were compatible with her vision of feminism. The hypocrisy enraged lesbians as it proved to be Friedan's way of conveying that their presence was not accepted in Women's Liberation. Representing the rage, Martin wrote, "Because NOW succumbed to the paralysis of… the fear that Lesbianism might be used as a divisive tool by the opponents of the women's movement… Lesbianism has become the center of raging controversy from coast to coast… There is an old metaphysical saying, 'That which you fear will come upon you.'"[151] Martin alluded to the growing rise of lesbian backlash directed towards Friedan and NOW. Friedan's derogatory comments and their exclusion from NOW's conferences made it clear to lesbian feminists that they were overtly being discriminated against. Lesbians, such as Rita Mae Brown, were beginning to break their silence, planning a way to end the dilemma of sexuality

[150] Del Martin, Statement to SF NOW, March 18, 1971, TS Box 40, Folder 33, Phyllis Lyon, Del Martin and the Daughters of Bilitis, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Historical Society, *Archives of Sexuality and Gender*, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/BFYFOY074845430/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=ca398466&pg=2.
[151] Martin, Statement to SF NOW.

Friedan tried to avoid. As Martin warns in her statement to NOW, it was only a matter of time until the pent-up wave of anger would fall upon Friedan. However, Friedan stubbornly continued to silence them from media attention.

What impelled lesbian mobilization was Friedan's infamous purge of lesbians. Friedan removed lesbians from official positions in an effort to "hide reliance on lesbian members."[152] The most infamous purge was Friedan's firing of Rita Mae Brown. Serving as NOW's newsletter editor, Brown wrote an article in 1969 about the homophobia within the Movement, intending for it to be published in NOW's New York newsletter. However, once Friedan learned of this, she removed Brown from her position. These systemic purges continued from 1969 to 1971, forcing many lesbians in NOW into a state of vulnerability as they feared removal.[153] However, to other members, Friedan's purges served as the final straw. Many began to resign from NOW and publicly denounce Friedan and the organization. In her resignation letter, Carol Turner wrote, "I resign from purges… I resign from placing organizations above human beings… I resign from hatred, fear (of anything or anyone you don't understand), slander…, innuendos, intolerance, … and lies, lies, lies."[154] As seen in Turner's resignation, the purges were the final blow to lesbian feminists' loyalty to NOW. Though they endured the exclusion and discrimination for years, Friedan's purges clarified to lesbians that their values did not align and that they would never find their place in NOW. They believed that regardless of their protests, Friedan would stay obstinate to her media-based values and continue to promote intolerance

[152] Pomerleau, "Empowering Members, Not Overpowering Them", 845.
[153] Minkowitz, "Despite a Troubled History", 45.
[154] Carol Turner, "ON AND ABOUT PURGES", February 12, 1971, Lesbians and Women's Liberation (Q463): Female-Female Sexuality (I5), Women and Health/Mental Health, *Women's Studies Archive*, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/CBZDPL183258068/WMNS?u=ucriverside&sid=WMNS&xid=170041b1&pg=34.

against lesbians. To these lesbian feminists, resignation was the only way to escape the Movement's lesbophobia.

Reflecting on NOW's lesbian exclusion, one thing remains clear: whether or not her homophobia was of personal bigotry or political strategy, Friedan's fear of lesbianism severely impacted her leadership over NOW. By prioritizing NOW's image and its alignment to her own values, she willingly silenced the rights of people. Keeping much of her lesbophobia subtle and silent (she made no publicly broadcasted remarks during her presidency), Friedan was determined to completely remove lesbianism from media attention to avoid sexual controversy in Women's Liberation. However, to her dismay, her silent avoidance of lesbianism only made the issue more prevalent. From 1966 to the height of the lesbian purges in 1970, Friedan's attempts to erase lesbianism ironically enabled lesbian activism. For years, the ostracization of lesbians produced feelings of betrayal, outrage, and dissidence. Friedan's actions made it clear to lesbian feminists that NOW operated on heterocentrism that contrasted severely with their own values. While Friedan continued to worship NOW's media image, lesbians began to collectivize. They formed on the idea that they could not advance their cause by associating with NOW. Rather, they needed to take matters into their own hands and advocate for themselves.

Once they resigned from NOW, lesbians mobilized in defiance against Friedan. In their article "Lavender menace: 'We are real'", Diane Davies and Judith Cartisan recall the beginnings of lesbian collectivism: "[We held] various consciousness-raising meetings, the gist of which was that it was about time that one of the really exploited groups and shit-upon groups of women rose up from under, that is, the lesbian community."[155] In these meetings, lesbian feminists found unity within each other as they shared their outrage towards Friedan's dismissal of their

[155] Diane Davies and Judith Cartisan, "Lavender menace: 'We are real'", *Everywoman,* May 23, 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/NYGWOU143999662/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=7e45161c.

community. Davies and Cartisan continued, "Out of these [meetings] came the ideas for setting up and carrying out an action guaranteed to make known our identity as a very real and beautiful part of the women's liberation movement."[156] Lesbian feminists began to realize that they could no longer stay complicit to Friedan's overt lesbophobic actions—they needed to create their own separate identity and force their voices in the public to be heard. Through these meetings, they planned their strategy to bring the discussion of lesbian issues to Women's Liberation. The rise of Radical Lesbianism was on the horizon.

Radical Lesbianism firmly began when lesbian feminists interrupted NOW's Second Congress to Unite Women. Calling themselves the Lavender Menace—a reference to Friedan's derogatory remarks—a group of lesbians took over NOW's Congress in Manhattan on May 1, 1970 to finally force the discussion of lesbianism into Women's Liberation.[157] The Lavender Menace stormed the stage and denounced NOW's avoidance of lesbian issues. As reported in an article in *Gay Power*, one of the Menaces spoke at the siege: "We… got fucked over. When we said lesbianism is an important issue for women's liberation, we were ignored or told that it was a dangerous issue which would divide women. We think that people who think that are looking for male approval." They spoke to NOW's women about their oppressive and isolating experiences of being a lesbian in the Movement.[158] For the first time, lesbians directly voiced their struggles regarding their oppression in NOW. This confrontation impacted many straight women within NOW. As Lavender Menace member Judy Cartisano recalls, "When the Congress was nearly over and the auditorium was retaken by the Lavender Menace, the reaction was almost entirely favourable. There was an instantaneous transformation in the women's

[156] Davies and Cartisan, "Lavender menace 'We are here.'"
[157] "The Lavender Menace Strikes", *Come Out*, June-July 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/URJHTU809578986/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=e5be7865.
[158] "Lavender Menaces Confront the Congress to Unite Women."

faces—from tension to relaxation, anger to peace and from boredom to interest."[159] Many women were genuinely enthused by their presence. As Friedan kept the lesbian issue silent, the siege was the first time many straight women were aware of the lesbian oppression within the Movement. As a result, they thanked the Lavender Menaces for informing them of their experiences that night.[160] The Lavender Menace siege created a brief moment of solidarity between lesbian and heterosexual women, allowing lesbian women to finally educate heterosexual women on their silenced struggle dealing with homophobia. This brief solidarity between the sexualities undoubtedly inspired lesbian feminists in their advocacy. Feelings of empowerment crushed the feelings of neglect amongst lesbian women, enabling them to advance their movement.

The interruption at NOW's Second Congress was the catalyst for the rise of the Radical Lesbian Movement in the 1970s. Though it was the first time lesbians effectively mobilized and spoke out against Friedan and NOW, it was an exceedingly successful operation. It not only forced lesbian issues into Women's Liberation, but it also accumulated the attention and support from a number of heterosexual women. In the siege, lesbian feminists were able to educate straight women and change their views on lesbianism. This served as a major epiphany to lesbians as it proved that they had the power to push for their own visibility and influence the mindsets of women in Women's Liberation themselves. Significantly, they realized they had the potential to create something bigger—an entirely separate identity for themselves outside of the constraints of Friedan's NOW and her approach to Women's Liberation. Inspired by their revelations in their consciousness-raising meetings, the success of the siege, and their collective

[159] Judy Cartisano, "Lavender Menace Does It," *Come Out*, June-July 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/BIGIVV582521965/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=337e557b.
[160] "The Lavender Menace Strikes."

anger towards Friedan and the homophobia within NOW, lesbians began to form separate organizations. Thus, the Radical Lesbian Movement was in full fruition. Immediately, lesbian feminists began to work in defiance against Friedan with the establishment of radical ideologies of feminism—feminist separatism, anti-heterosexism, and defining of the term "lesbian".

Crafting the ideologies of the Radical Lesbian Movement, many lesbian organizations based their principles on their critiques of Friedan's lesbophobia—this was especially true for the Radicalesbians. Immediately following the siege at NOW's Congress in 1970, the Radicalesbians formed in New York in an effort to declare the importance of lesbianism in feminist advocacy.[161] In their 1970 manifesto entitled "The Woman-Identified Woman", the Radicalesbians addressed Friedan's exclusion of lesbians: "[Women in the Movement] try to dismiss [lesbianism] as a 'lavender herring'... As long as the label 'dyke' is used to frighten women into a less militant stance, keep her separate from her [feminist] sisters… then to that extent she is controlled by male culture." They critiqued that Friedan's lesbophobia barred the progression of feminism and claimed that society's negative definition of lesbianism was created by men to subordinate women "who [dared] to challenge [their] prerogatives." They affirmed that Friedan's lesbophobia contributed to the subordination of women and upheld the male supremacy that feminists fought against. As a result, the Radicalesbians proclaimed that to escape male supremacy and fully achieve feminist goals, women needed to redefine themselves out of male society and proclaim feminist separatism—the idea of women living in a society completely separated away from men. This included redefining lesbianism and establishing its importance to feminist advocacy. They proclaimed, "A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion… Only women can give to each other a new sense of self.

[161] Gilmore and Kaminski, "A Part and Apart," 103.

That identity we have to develop with reference to ourselves, and not in relation to men."[162] The Radicalesbian manifesto preached the ideals of separatism from men, ultimately becoming a grounding principle in the Radical Lesbian Movement.

Introducing the radical concept of feminist separatism, the Radicalesbians crafted the ideologies of the Radical Lesbian Movement to operate in defiance against Friedan's approach in Women's Liberation. Friedan crafted NOW and its feminist goals on the basis of reformation and feminist partnership with men. Through her media-based approach to activism, she vowed to work with men (especially within the media) to pressure the government into allowing women an equal social platform to men.[163] This approach to feminism firmly involved cooperation with men and a compliance to male-dominated society. However, many lesbians attributed Friedan's desire for male inclusion as the root cause behind their oppression in Women's Liberation. As a result, the members of the Radicalesbians overtly rejected this stance in their manifesto. They claimed that so long as women abided by men and male society, feminism would never reach its full potential as women would still be bound to male control. To achieve full feminism, they believed that women must separate and associate themselves away from men. Given that the lesbophobia in NOW was conceived out of Friedan's compliance to men for reputable media attention, this principle in Radical Lesbianism was an indiscreet counteraction against Friedan's policies. Consequently, the adoption of female separatism into the Radical Lesbian Movement was designed to rebel against Friedan's notions of male partnership in which they believed were the source of their discrimination.

[162] Radicalesbians, "The Woman-Identified Woman," Duke University Libraries, *Women's Liberation Movement Print Culture*, https://repository.duke.edu/dc/wlmpc/wlmms01011.
[163] Friedan, "Demanding Full Equality."

The ideologies of the Radical Lesbian Movement were further radicalized when the political lesbianism and anti-heterosexual rhetorics were introduced. The Furies also formed in 1970 as a lesbian separatist organization.[164] In 1972, in first issue of their newspaper *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, they critiqued anti-lesbianism and publicized their radical insights. Introducing the organization and its beliefs, Ginny Berson spoke against NOW and Women's Liberation in the opening article: "Lesbians must get out of the straight women's movement… Lesbians cannot develop a common politics with women who do not accept Lesbianism as a political issue." The Furies brought forth the idea of sexual separatism, believing that lesbians cannot associate with heterosexuals if they authorized their exclusion. Berson also proclaimed a radical redefinition of lesbianism—the idea of "political lesbianism": "Lesbianism is not a matter of sexual expression, but rather of political choice which every woman must take if she is to… end male supremacy."[165] This instituted the idea that lesbianism was a choice and the only way to fully achieve feminist goals. This affirmed the anti-heterosexual stance in Radical Lesbianism. Supporting Berson's stance on political lesbian Rita Mae Brown declared heterosexuality as the main suppressor of feminism in her article "Roxanne Dunbar: how a female heterosexual serves the interest of male supremacy": "The political lesbian is committed to the destruction of male supremacy; therefore, the Lesbian is serious about a Women's movement… You can't build a woman's movement if women are still tied to their oppressors… and don't commit [themselves] to women, totally. Heterosexual women are still tied to men."[166] Thus, the concepts brought forth by the Furies were adopted as the ideologies of Radical Lesbianism.

---

[164] Gilmore and Kaminski, "A Part and Apart," 103-104.
[165] Ginny Berson, "The Furies," *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, January 1972, https://repository.duke.edu/dc/wlmpc/wlmms01033.
[166] Rita Mae Brown, "Roxanne Dunbar: how a female heterosexual serves the interest of male supremacy," *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, January 1972, https://repository.duke.edu/dc/wlmpc/wlmms01033.

The political lesbianism and anti-heterosexual principles in the Radical Lesbian Movement were overtly adopted in direct defiance against Friedan's lesbophobic sentiment in Women's Liberation. As discussed previously, Friedan claimed that lesbianism would destroy the progress of feminism as she feared it would taint NOW's representation in the media and divide the unity of women within Women's Liberation due to its controversy and the societal prevalence of homophobia. Affected by this, the lesbians within Radical Lesbianism took this sexual discrimination and backfired it onto Friedan and Women's Liberation. They embraced the idea that lesbianism was not a suppressor for feminism; rather, it was a weapon. Lesbianism made feminism more militant against male supremacy as it severed the notions of female dependency for satisfaction from men. In the same way that Friedan pushed anti-lesbianism into Women's Liberation, lesbians pushed anti-heterosexual rhetoric into the Radical Lesbian Movement. They claimed that heterosexuality destroyed the full potential of feminism as they believed that attraction to men still forced female subordination and upheld male supremacy. Reflecting their exclusion from Women's Liberation, lesbians excluded heterosexual women from the Radical Lesbian Movement, asserting that they must choose to be lesbian in order to be a true feminist. Evidently, these anti-heterosexual sentiments wittingly mirrored Friedan's lesbophobia to defy the lesbian discrimination she allowed into Women's Liberation.

Significantly, much of Radical Lesbian advocacy was voicing objection against Friedan and the heteronormative notions of NOW. Even after they disassociated themselves from Women's Liberation, lesbians still aimed to directly target Friedan. Amongst the many protests and conferences that spoke out in defiance against Friedan, one prominent altercation was at the protest at Friedan's speech at the University of Washington on May 12, 1973. As reported by Meredith Stannard in the newspaper *Pandora*, eleven lesbians took control of Friedan's podium

in front of 600 people. One of the protestors proclaimed, "We do not consider Betty Friedan to be a leader in the Women's Movement… She would have us, as lesbians, remain in the closet so that our sexuality could not be an issue… We are the 'lavender menace' Friedan has warned us about." This altercation resulted in "a shouting match" between Friedan and the protestors that lasted for the entire duration of the evening.[167] As the protest occurred in 1973, it is clear that even after lesbians separated from NOW in 1970, their advocacy still heavily focused on battling Friedan. The persistent continuance of this objection to Friedan explicitly proved that much of the main principles and agenda of the Radical Lesbian Movement revolved around denouncing Friedan's homophobic impact on Women's Liberation and collectivizing opposition against NOW. As Radical Lesbianism emphasized the denouncement of NOW, the division between Friedan and lesbian feminists was as distinct as ever.

In retrospect, the Radical Lesbian Movement was a mere recoil in direct response to the lesbian exclusion from NOW and Women's Liberation. At its core essence, the lesbians' movement was a form of organized, mass rebellion. The defining principles of Radical Lesbianism—the separation from men, the anti-heterosexual sentiment, the notion of political lesbianism, and the denouncement of lesbophobia in Women's Liberation—were essentially counteractions against Friedan's anti-lesbian rhetoric in NOW. Needless to say, while lesbians desperately wanted their voices to be broadcasted in mainstream feminism, they also desired to take this opportunity to spite Friedan in the same way she had harmed them. Inevitably, though Friedan attempted to suppress the lesbian presence, her efforts resulted in the creation of a countermovement that served to be the antithesis to her approach in Women's Liberation. Unintentionally, she had created an ultimate division within the wave of feminism. To Friedan's

[167] Meredith Stannard, "Lesbians Protest at Friedan's Speech," *Pandora*, May 29, 1973, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/UNUHPU336279877/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=f910066b.

dismay, lesbianism did not divide the Women's Liberation Movement—her exclusionist actions served to be the culprit.

"That which you fear will come upon you"—lesbian feminist Del Martin's words to NOW in 1971 described the exact turmoil that was the Women's Liberation Movement. Reflecting on the Movement, it is certain—Friedan's fear ignited a war that destroyed the unity she intended to create. Consequently, Friedan's fear of lesbianism tainting NOW's image and reputation in the media marked the beginning of the downfall. Though she believed that ignoring the lesbian issue would benefit NOW and Women's Liberation, she was unaware that her failure to accept such issues only made it grow stronger. Her failure to confront her fears incited a wave of anger from silenced lesbian feminists desperately trying to find their place in feminism. Conceived by the mass hysteria, Radial Lesbianism launched to destroy the oppression Friedan's fears had created. At this point, the battlefield was established. Lesbian and heterosexual women alike pointed fingers at each other, accusing each other of being the destruction of feminism. In the end, unity perished. The Women's Liberation Movement was divided into two fronts. The radical lesbianism which Friedan feared had come upon her.

Though the flame for Women's Liberation and Radical Lesbianism burnt out by the late 1970s, their effects still linger within the realm of feminism. While Friedan fought to uphold her belief that the end justified the means—that the advancement of feminism justified the sacrifice of lesbian rights—what she failed to recognize was that gender and sexuality are two sides of the same coin. The advancement of one can never exist without the other. As feminism progresses forward today, it is vital for feminists to learn from the mistakes of their forerunners and acknowledge the importance of intersectionality and the advocacy of the rights for all women regardless of race, class, and sexuality. Feminism is a collective effort, and as seen through the

feminist war between sexualities and the eventual burning-out of the Women's Liberation movement, it undoubtedly can only be achieved through compassion, acceptance, and unity.

Works Cited

Berson, Ginny. “The Furies.” *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, January 1972, https://repository.duke.edu/dc/wlmpc/wlmms01033.

Brown, Rita Mae. “Roxanne Dunbar: how a female heterosexual serves the interest of male supremacy.” *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, January 1972, https://repository.duke.edu/dc/wlmpc/wlmms01033.

Cartisano, Judy. “Lavender Menace Does It.” *Come Out*, June-July 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/BIGIVV582521965/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=337e557b.

Davies, Diane and Cartisan, Judith. “Lavender menace: ‘We are real.’” *Everywoman*, May 23, 1970,https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/NYGWOU143999662/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=7e45161c.

Deevy, Sharon. “Such a Nice Girl.” *The Furies: Lesbian/Feminist Monthly*, January 1972, https://idn.duke.edu/ark:/87924/r3t12b.

Farber, David. *The Age of Great Dreams: The United States in the 1960s*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

Friedan, Betty. “Demanding Full Equality.” *TIME Magazine*, March 13, 2003, http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1977881_1977891_1978447,00.html.

Friedan, Betty. “The Problem That Has No Name.” In *The Feminine Mystique*, 57-78. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1963.

Friedan, Betty. “Up from the kitchen floor.” *The New York Times*, March 4, 1973, https://www.nytimes.com/1973/03/04/archives/up-from-the-kitchen-floor-kitchen-floor.html?smid=url-share.

Gilmore, Stephanie and Kaminski, Elizabeth. “A Part and Apart: Lesbian and Straight Feminist Activists Negotiate Identity in a Second-Wave Organization.” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 16, no. 1 (2007): 95-113, https://www.jstor.org/stable/30114203.

Henderson, Margaret. “Betty Friedan (1921-2006).” *Australian Feminist Studies* 22, no. 53 (2007): 163-166. DOI: 10.1080/08164640701361725.

“Lavender Menaces Confront the Congress to Unite Women.” *Gay Power*, 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/UJEQVL253460893/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=cce5223b.

"The Lavender Menace Strikes." *Come Out*, June-July 1970, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/URJHTU809578986/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=e5be7865.

Licata, Sal J. "The Emerging Gay Presence: Part III." *The Advocate*, August 9, 1978, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/emerging-gay-presence/docview/2371043926/se-2?accountid=14521.

Martin, Del. Statement to SF NOW, March 18, 1971. TS Box 40, Folder 33. Phyllis Lyon, Del Martin and the Daughters of Bilitis, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Historical Society, Archives of Gender and Sexuality, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/BFYFOY074845430/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=ca398466&pg=2.

Minkowitz, Donna. "Despite a Troubled History, the National Organization for Women Welcomes Lesbians into the Fold." *The Advocate*, December 17, 1991, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/despite-troubled-history-national-organization/docview/2092394850/se-2?accountid=14521.

Minkowitz, Donna. "THE NEWSROOM BECOMES A BATTLEGROUND: Gloria Steinem, Feminist Luminary." *The Advocate*, May 19, 1992, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/newsroom-becomes-battleground/docview/2100290675/se-2?accountid=14521.

Pomerleu, Clark A. "Empowering Members, Not Overpowering Them: The National Organization for Women, Calls for Lesbian Inclusion, and California Influence, 1960s-1980s." *Journal of Homosexuality* 57, no. 7 (2010): 842-861. DOI: 10.1080/00918369.2010.493414.

Poirot, Kristan. "Domesticating the Liberated Women: Containment Rhetorics of Second Wave Radical/Lesbian Feminism." *Women's Studies in Communication* 32, no. 3 (2010): 263-292, DOI: 10.1080/07491409.2009.10162391.

Radicalesbians. "The Woman-Identified Woman." Duke University Libraries, *Women's Liberation Movement Print Culture*, https://repository.duke.edu/dc/wlmpc/wlmms01011.

Rofes, Eric C. "Interview with Betty Friedan." *The Advocate*, October 16, 1984, https://www.proquest.com/magazines/interview-with-betty-friedan/docview/2465379056/se-2?accountid=14521.

Stannard, Meredith. "Lesbians Protest at Friedan's Speech." *Pandora*, May 29, 1973, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/UNUHPU336279877/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=f910066b.

Stelboum, Judith P. “An Interview with Karla Jay.” *The Lesbian Review of Books*, 1999, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/MVNTUS618759481/AHSI?u=ucriverside&sid=AHSI&xid=fac360fc.

Turner, Carol. “ON AND ABOUT PURGES,” February 12, 1971. Lesbians and Women’s Liberation (Q463): Female-Female Sexuality (I5), Women and Health/Mental Health, *Women’s Studies Archive*, https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/CBZDPL183258068/WMNS?u=ucriverside&sid=WMNS&xid=170041b1&pg=

Cornerstone Essay Award

"Weapons and Tactics: On the LAPD SWAT's First Deployment and the Liquidation of the Black Panthers"

Alexandro Meza

On the morning of December 9th, 1969, readers of the *Los Angeles Times* were faced with an onslaught of news. The fresh developments reported on that morning's front page have stuck to the American consciousness, not just within academic settings but in the popular memory. They illuminate the ways in which the present-day United States has been shaped by the traumatic and violent experience of the late 1960's. One column began with "Manson Indicted With 5 Others in Tate Murders." Beside that is a column on Nixon's plans for "Vietnamization" of the Cold War's most infamous proxy war. Lt. William Calley Jr.'s arguments before a court martial, formed to try him over his role in the My Lai massacre, were given space. The events referenced by the headlines all have in common their relative notoriety - their significance has been acknowledged by Americans over the last several decades. They constitute the basis of AP US History flash cards and have guided people's understanding of the world around them.

These had not been, however, the only headline-newsworthy pieces in the December 9th edition of the *Times*. An equally remarkable but less remembered headline, "Police Seize Panther Fortress in 4-hour Gunfight, Arrest 13,"[168] approached readers on the left of the page somewhat boldly. It was the second largest headline, and what it described was explosive, a showdown with

[168] Dial Torgerson, "Police Seize Panther Fortress in 4-Hour Gunfight, Arrest 13," *Los Angeles Times*, December 9, 1969, 89 edition, sec. 1, pp. 1-32.

an all too obvious outcome that fit a noticeable and traceable pattern. That pattern had first become visible in 1968. If a given reader had not yet noticed it, they could count on a headline to the immediate left of this one - "National Pattern Followed in Raid on Panthers Here."[169] So began an article which briefly, if only partially, recognized the scale of what was unfolding.[170]

Some details did not make it into the summary-level, officiality-tinged stories then published by the *Times*, but which could be viscerally perceived with all the senses by the more than 300 spectators, 350 or so policemen, and a mere 13 Black Panthers who were holed up inside the headquarters during the shootout. The Panthers of the typical age range, 17-21 years, fought the police for a total of 5 hours. The two sides fired 5000 rounds of ammunition before the Panthers' surrendered to a 40-man assault team. The LAPD, by all accounts, gave the Panthers' militancy a truly military response, albeit one that was haphazardly executed.

The gun battle of December 8th provides a glimpse of deep continuities in the social and political history of the United States. I hope to shed light on these continuities by analyzing the concrete facts of the leadup to the shootout as well its significance. Broadly speaking, however, historians have unfortunately remained distressingly silent about this event. In my view, this event is no less worthy of attention than those which take up the rest of that morning's front page. The events of December 8th are only made more remarkable when one begins to familiarize oneself with the details of this profoundly violent urban event. In terms of mortal confrontational violence, little of consequence happened. Nobody died, but the shootout was both a culmination of a plague of social ills and an indicator of what was to come. The Panthers' main motivation of addressing those ills may have driven it towards conflict with the police, but

[169] Kenneth Reich, "National Pattern Followed in Raid on Panthers Here," *Los Angeles Times*, December 9, 1969, 89 edition, sec. 1, 1-31.
[170] Reich, "National Pattern," 1

it was ultimately the police who foreseeably began a new era in policing through the rough arm of paramilitary response. The gun battle that erupted on 41st and Central was a spectacularly American occurrence which should be presented sensibly and within the context that helped determine the battle in the first place.

Bobby Seale and Huey Newton formed the Black Panther Party in Oakland, CA in 1966.[171] By this time, the future members of BPP chapters, which ranged from Los Angeles to New Haven, had already undergone experiences which would lead them to become Panthers and ultimately be targeted by the LAPD in 1969. Since black familiarity with the abomination of American white supremacy tends to start early, many of those who risked their lives at the shootout were remarkably young. Wayne Pharr, who was 19 when he participated in the LA shootout, had his formative political experiences come to him in waves during his civil rights era upbringing. They came to him, early on, in the printed contours of Emmet Till's disfigured, bloated face, which he saw while flipping through *Jet* at the age of 5 and struggled to comprehend then.[172] Pharr's most significant experience leading up to the LA shootout was the Watts riots in 1965. For more than 860 people those days of rioting, which developed from an intolerable situation of residential redlining and police brutality, incurred physical wounds. For 36 people they meant death. For 15-year-old Wayne Pharr they meant further progress towards a political awakening: he experienced revelations about race and American hierarchy that led him to embrace the Panthers. Because of what he saw Pharr believed at the time that, compared to Jim Crow cop bosses like Bull Connor, "Los Angeles police chief Bill Parker was no better."[173]

[171] David R. Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s*. (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2000), 206
[172] Wayne Pharr and Karin L. Stanford. *Nine Lives of a Black Panther: A Story of Survival*, (Chicago, Illinois: Lawrence Hill Books, 2014), 13.
[173] Pharr, *Black Panther*, 43

Pharr's example suggests that in the 1960's there was no inherent contradiction between youth, political conviction, and a resulting willingness to die should the situation genuinely call for it.

The deadly riots in Watts were not only critical for Pharr and other black Americans, but for the LAPD as well.[174] The same incidents which scarred future Panthers and helped carve out their path in life did the same for the figures who made administrative and strategic choices which led to the battle on December 8th. The city of Los Angeles, like Chicago and other urban areas of conflict, was an environment in which the praxis of politics and tactics of fighting became considerably developed, and the LAPD was a party to that development. For the LAPD, Watts signified a new kind of situation which required renewed vigor and proactive tactics.[175] Daryl Gates, "a young inspector" and future chief of the LAPD, greenlit a plan for a "special weapons and assault team" that embodied those notions of proactiveness. The concept would be refined into the special weapons and tactics unit, or SWAT.[176] Gates would come to be chief of the LAPD from 1978 until 1992, when he resigned in the wake of the Rodney King beating. In the mid-1960's, however, the scope of Gates' ambition and career advancement was not yet known to those around him. The Los Angeles police department formed a paramilitary unit trained and armed to overcome "sniper and hostage incidents" and other situations that had been observed during the tremendous crackdown in Watts.[177] The police in Los Angeles were actively accounting for the animosity, resourcefulness, and will to violence that was emanating from the ghetto; they were preparing to take the offensive, to be preemptive, and to be overwhelmingly well equipped for the gunfights ahead of them.

---

[174] Pharr and Stanford, *Black Panther*, 43
[175] Farber, *Great Dreams*, 111.
[176] Matthew Fleischer, "50 Years Ago, SWAT Raided the L.A. Black Panthers. It's Been Targeting Black Communities Ever Since." Los Angeles Times. Los Angeles Times, December 8, 2019. https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2019-12-08/50-years-swat-black-panthers-militarized-policinglos-angeles, 1.
[177] Fleischer, "50 Years Ago," 1.

The leadup to the shootout is crucial to understanding the reasons the LAPD used the considerable arsenal of weapons and tactics they did, as well as why the Panthers were prepared to deploy military measures in an effort to resist them. Armed confrontations with police had become increasingly common across the United States during the late 1960s. "Little" Bobby Hutton, one of the first Panthers of the Oakland chapter, died at the close of a shootout with police in 1968 when he was still 17. Panthers "charged for months that the raids [were] linked to a nationwide crackdown ordered by President Nixon," leaving little doubt that the Panther leadership both perceived a threat and was perceived as one.[178] The Black Panthers were openly charging the federal government with trying to liquidate them and began appealing for support against them. The Panthers instilled in their lower ranks a sense of urgency, augmented by the system of political education and hierarchy the Panthers had in place. Those young people who joined the Panthers were quite aware that they were joining an organization of self-declared revolutionaries. It seems clear that the entire organization was on the same page as far as the idea that Panthers should brace themselves against the police, the FBI, and every other armed, determined enemy that could be rolled up within the term "pigs." In the aftermath of the LA shootout an attorney representing the Black Panther Party said that, from January1968 to December 1969, 28 panthers had been killed by police in some form of action.[179] Before any of the violence on December 8th had broken out, the LA Panthers were already discussing the recent nationwide wave of confrontations. Their comrades were being eliminated, and they figured that they also were targeted for elimination in the days and even crucial hours before the raid. Pharr

[178] Reich, "National Pattern," 31.
[179] Reich, 1. These deaths are attributed to any confrontation that led to death between police and Panthers, whether they were shootouts or more dubious situations. When one says "dubious situations" it is important to clarify, perhaps, just how dubious. "Little" Bobby's killing is not the only example of this, and there were fresher details in the minds of the Panthers in LA. When Fred Hampton was killed the Panthers fired one round compared to the roughly 100 rounds fired by the agents attacking them.

believed that "it could be at any time, especially since the police had just ambushed the Illinois chapter a few days earlier, on December 4, killing two black Panther Party leaders, Mark Clark and Fred Hampton, as they slept."[180] The BPP, whether because of or despite its violent relationship with police, became a formidable presence in many black communities. The party extended urban African Americans an offer of physical and mental nourishment, camaraderie, and practical revolutionary politics. It caught the imagination of a generation of young disaffected black people and, as a proponent of a radical vision of liberation, became a symbol of their most daring hopes.

If even Chairman Hampton of the Chicago chapter was 21 when he was killed, age was neither an indicator of rank in the party nor a deterrent to dying at the hands of police. And the difference between individuals who were Panthers, like Wayne Pharr, and other black teenagers in Los Angeles getting by inside a ghetto that was being incinerated, one day figuratively and another day literally, is minimal. Bernard Arafat, one of the Panthers at the LA shootout, was "a 17-year-old runaway from juvenile hall whose parents had both died when he was 13."[181] The fact Pharr was at the BPP office defending the Panthers against the LAPD does not intrinsically set him apart from others in his age group or community. Everything from his habits to his politics are well-observed, maybe even iconic traits of black inner-city youth in this period. People could, in short order, develop strong beliefs tied to trauma as part of a declining urban life. They had formative experiences as deprived African Americans living under a social construct by which they had been made out to merely be the horde.

Teddy, a film released in 1971, poignantly constructs a film out of the life and opinions of a Los Angeles black teen named Teddy. The eponymous teen was 15 at the time of the shootout,

[180] Pharr and Stanford, "Black Panther," 5.
[181] Fleischer "50 Years Ago," 1.

an age by which he had already being expelled from high schools over his political posturing and alleged defiance towards teachers.[182] The walls of his home are modestly but very openly decorated with propaganda from the whole spectrum of black liberation ideology, be it anti-abortion propaganda from the Nation of Islam or Maoist epithets put out by the Panthers. Teddy consumes such things readily between school, extracurriculars, community meetings, and playing games at the table with his family where political conversation is abundant. What he does not consume is marijuana, though he says that he observes a chunk of his entire generation, "young brothers and sisters, smoking weed" whenever they can after nightfall. Teddy observes that the white American power structure uses "violence and wars to win over things." That same power afforded through violence was "the only way [he] could see that things could be accomplished." Teddy's life experience corroborates Pharr's description of life leading up to the shootout. Pharr was a witness to the same African American city life in Los Angeles, a part of the social sea Teddy navigated. Teddy's family and friends hang around together and discuss the "fascists" - the "dogs" of the police department. Teddy laments that all the genuine Panther leadership is being wiped out. As for their replacements, he explains that "they're good followers, but they're not leaders." His friend across from him is not convinced and suggests replacing the leadership and carrying on anyway. Worried about crippling losses from so much continued rebellion, Teddy warns "how far can we go?" It does not keep his friend from replying that "it's got to start somewhere." Another of Teddy's companions, this one just beside him, speaks up. "You said 'starting,'" he begins, asserting that "that's the whole point. We're starting in all types of places, man. Nah, starting to be destroyed." He giggles at the frustration of it all. A

[182] *Teddy*. University of California at Los Angeles, Extension Media Center. Internet Archive, January 1, 1971. https://archive.org/details/Teddy1971.

curious and disaffected teen could go from a blurrily defined sympathizer of radical ideology to an active member of the Panthers without too much trouble. Instead, Teddy would only come to be a witness to the shootout from the outside.

The evening before the shootout Pharr contributed his thoughts on defending the building from an anticipated police raid to his comrade, "Geronimo" Pratt. Pratt was Deputy Minister of Defense of the BPP chapter on 41st and S. Central. He had received five decorations during his two tours in Vietnam, having come out of that conflict a sergeant.[183] He was arguably somewhat familiar with the real demands of modern combat with all its maneuvering, covering, and emphasis on the use of munitions over lives. He had, at any rate, found something to like in Pharr's approach to the question of potential police attacks. Pratt "had given [Pharr] the go-ahead to implement a new tactic of defense," which meant Pharr would get to survey part of the LA sewer system to work out a retreat plan in case of a shootout. He did as he was asked and made his way to the Panther HQ when finished. There he was given an automatic shotgun and ordered to clean it. Just before his bout of sewer reconnaissance Pharr had been "listening to 'Trane, smoking weed, and playing chess" with his comrades. In a momentary lull he slipped into a nap with his newly assigned shotgun in his lap.

Pharr woke on December 8th to the initial rustling and battering right before the gunfight broke out. When the LAPD SWAT initiated its raid, they entered a zone where their arrival was considered a matter of time and nothing else. The Panthers had built a bunker on one side of the room and several Panthers were near the prepared positions. They carried rifles and shotguns and were staying at what one would imagine to be a startling range from the entrance. The raid began

[183] Douglas Martin, "Elmer G. Pratt, Jailed Panther Leader, Dies at 63." The New York Times. The New York Times, June 4, 2011. After he came out of Vietnam a sergeant, he went out of the service and became a student of political science at UCLA. After that he became a Panther. It is simply emblematic of the 1960's, never mind that Pratt's presence at the shootout on December 8th was likely very appreciated by the Panthers there.

catastrophically, as did the exchange of gunfire with its proximity and hastiness. The fire did not prove deadly, but it was withering to those who didn't count on cover. Of the four officers who first entered upon ramming the door "three were immediately shot down" and had to be dragged away under immense covering fire.[184] The LAPD was supposed to have accounted for the Panthers' likeliness to plan a defense in according with their present resources. The Panthers inside the SoCal headquarters, who were being served warrants for illegal weapons possession in any case, were extremely likely to possess the cornerstones of modern warfare: explosives, intermediate range assault weapons, close range weapons, plenty of ammunition, barricades to cover from fire, and slightly layered defenses that permitted fallback. The LA Panthers thoroughly considered the tactical aspect of their predicament, and this is an ingenuity and dedication which could be sensed from far away. With some effort the LAPD, especially its investigator Darryl Gates, the brainchild of the operation, should have been able to account for the Panthers' military preparedness. They seemingly did not. The special weapons and tactics for which the SWAT had been named did not preclude the involvement of some 300 other officers of the LAPD in the ensuing gunfight. Modern combat is predicated largely on maneuver and is a time consuming, ammunition-consuming experience which is totally ill-suited to urban conditions, not because it isn't militarily feasible but because it is a chaotic disturbance for the city. It is loud, destructive to the surroundings, and requires hours of combat achieved though the constant exploitation of cover and suppression. Naturally, the LAPD was going to need reinforcements and to keep civilians away from the immediate scene of a 5-hour gun battle. The fact 300 officers were being called into action against 13 Panthers is remarkable. Despite the small presence of defenders inside what the LA Times called a "fortress." When one inquisitive

[184] Torgersen, "Panther Fortress," 1

reporter called a female Panther picked up, relating to the reporter that they were under attack from the "pigs." Asked how many Panthers were inside the HQ to contend with the attackers, she replied "that's irrelevant."[185]

For more than 300 in-person spectators it was not necessary to watch these events unfold on color TV sets. Along with those suburbanites who watched from remote, comparatively comfortable living rooms, the shootout was witnessed by people who were held back by a large number of the policemen who had been called to the scene of their attack after it became obviously complicated. These local witnesses were held back from an area of ten blocks near the scene of the shootout.[186] The police probably held them back this far on account of the immense firepower they had brought to bear on the Panthers. The M14 rifle was being used extensively by the SWAT team, along with the M16A1, which in 1969 officially phased out the M14 for good in the Army. These were assault weapons by any measure, perfectly fit for issue to American forces in South Vietnam; they had been gradually incorporated into the usual infantryman's loadout there for the last five years. The Panthers also carried M14's and had on their side at least one probable veteran in its use in combat. The SWAT used tear gas, but the Panthers had been trained and geared for that contingency. "The Panthers, wearing gas masks, threw tear gas grenades back at officers," while also throwing pipe bombs and firing a combination of assault rifles and semi-automatic shotguns.[187] The occasion was unmistakably special - a premeditated liquidation of a clearly identified and well-armed, fairly disciplined young enemy. When that liquidation took too long, an armored personnel carrier from the National Guard which the *Times*

[185] Torgersen, "Panther Fortress," 31. The reporter had just called the Panther headquarters not long after the shooting began and asked to know how many Panthers were inside the building.
[186] "3 Policemen, 6 Panthers Hurt in 4-Hour L.A. Battle," *Jet*, December 25, 1969, 6-7.
[187] Torgerson, 1

described as "tanklike" appeared for possible use to finally defeat the Panthers.[188] Teddy, one of many witnesses that day, observed that "every time the Panthers came out, the police brought something bigger."

A stalemate having been reached while the police figured out their next move, the Panthers had time to consider the implications of what was transpiring around them. They had seemingly gunned down three men at point blank range, which was likely weighing on their minds because of what this might bring them at the shootout's conclusion. "Little" Bobby Hutton had been shot by police the year before in the middle of an obvious surrender.[189] It seemed to a Panther in this situation that Hutton was shot over the fact that he had stooped to the level of a shootout with the police. If Hutton was dead for participating in one of the many short and arguably more conventional shootings which plagued the late 1960's, the LA Panthers had much reason to fear that their opponents were looking for a chance to simply execute them. For this reason, it was reported that as the wounded and exhausted Panthers proposed their surrender, they "wanted newsmen to be on hand… because they feared they would be shot by police if there were no reports around."[190] This was allowed, and they surrendered.

Renee More, 19 years old and one of the two female Panthers defending against the police, said "we gave up because it's not the right time." But that time did not come. What Renee More was already witnessing was the ceiling for violence and killing between the two groups. The shootout on December 8th, 1969, was part of a years-long peak in what could be called defensive insurgency. The late 1960's was a time in which the American inner city literally and figuratively collapsed under a considerable number of pressures, as deindustrialization sapped

[188] Torgersen, "Panther Fortress," 1.
[189] Joshua Bloom and Waldo E. Martin. Black against Empire. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2013), 119.
[190] "3 Policemen, 6 Panthers Hurt," 7.

the urban economy of jobs and wealth. This collapse drove African American youth to both a tremendous anxiety and to superb exertion in the name of a style of insurgency they were certain was a righteous one. The situation in the ghetto was extreme enough to lay the groundwork for a class of young men and women, a vanguard even, which was willing to combat its enemy on penalty of death and to fight for its own survival and in defense of the Black community generally. Commitment to combat is an extraordinary thing which the Panthers possessed leading up to the shootouts of the late 60's, something which in 2021 is unfamiliar even to the fringes of militancy in black liberationist or leftist organizations It can be contrasted with mere militancy, which might raise a fist to the police but not a rifle of its own. One reason for this is that institutions like the LAPD zeroed in on and decimated organizations such as the Black Panther Party. The suppression of the BPP is often left out of the history of the period, but that event was crucial in shaping future developments. Most strikingly, the shootout on South Central served as a test run for the tactics now commonly used by the 9,000 police department SWAT units in the United States when faced with widespread urban unrest. The complacency with which many Americans have accepted the militarization in America's police forces has been underwritten by our unawareness of its explosive historical origins. The events of December 9, 1969 are part of the moment in which much of the ideology used to justify the militarization of police tactics and weaponry was first conceived and put to use. People who have been denied any familiarity with those events nonetheless live constantly in its shadow.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

"3 Policemen, 6 Panthers Hurt in 4-Hour L.A. Battle." *Jet* 40, no. 12, December 25, 1969.

"The Los Angeles Times on December 9, 1969." Newspapers.com. The Los Angeles Times, December 9, 1969. https://www.newspapers.com/newspage/385898114/.

Reich, Kenneth. "National Pattern Followed in Raid on Panthers Here." *Los Angeles Times*. December 9, 1969, 89 edition, sec. 1.

Teddy. University of California at Los Angeles, Extension Media Center. Internet Archive, January 1, 1971. https://archive.org/details/Teddy1971.

Torgerson, Dial. "Police Seize Panther Fortress in 4-Hour Gunfight, Arrest 13." *Los Angeles Times*. December 9, 1969, 89 edition, sec. 1.

Secondary Sources

Bloom, Joshua, and Waldo E. Martin. *Black against Empire*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2013.

Farber, David R. *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2000.

Fleischer, Matthew. "50 Years Ago, SWAT Raided the L.A. Black Panthers. It's Been Targeting Black Communities Ever Since." Los Angeles Times. Los Angeles Times, December 8, 2019. https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2019-12-08/50-years-swat-black-panthers-militarized-policinglos-angeles.

Jeffries, J. L. *On the Ground: The Black Panther Party in Communities across America*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.

Martin, Douglas. "Elmer G. Pratt, Jailed Panther Leader, Dies at 63." The New York Times. The New York Times, June 4, 2011. https://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/04/us/04pratt.html.

Pharr, Wayne, and Karin L. Stanford. *Nine Lives of a Black Panther: A Story of Survival*. Chicago, Illinois: Lawrence Hill Books, 2014.

Cornerstone Essay Award

"Pigeons in Great Britain during World War II"

Jesus Ruvulcaba

The day is June 6, 1944. The Allied powers are landing the largest amphibian military operation against Germany. The British waited for the first messages of the landing, expecting them to come through radio. However, the British were mistaken. The first message that arrived back from the European mainland was from a pigeon named Gustav. Gustav was a pigeon of the Royal Air Force assigned to a paratrooper unit which landed behind enemy lines. The mission of the unit of paratroopers was to disable the turrets on the beach so that the troops waiting off the coast could land. Once the turrets were disabled, the paratroopers had to send a message back to the ship so that the full-scale landing could begin. However, once the paratroopers disabled the turrets, the unit of soldiers could not send a message back to the ship due to the malfunction of the radio. Instead, the soldiers sent the message with Gustav, who delivered the message to begin the assault on the beach. A few months after Operation Overlord, Gustav was awarded the Dickin medal for delivering the message successfully after radio communication had faltered.[191]

Gustav is just one example of how pigeons were involved in the war effort. From the beginning of the war, pigeons were among the animals that were of high priority for the British government. Even though the Second World War was a modern war, in which the use of technology was more prevalent, animals, such as the pigeon, were still important in changing the war. Pigeons were used as an ulterior method of communicating, as radio was still not perfected

[191] *War of the Birds.* Directed by Richard Cane. (2005; USA, Atlantic Productions), Documentary.

at that time. Yet, at the same time, pigeons were as well harmful to the British war effort, as some pigeons would consume some of the resources that were needed for feeding animals and humans alike.[192] By examining the pigeon in the British government's view during World War II, one can notice the influence an animal can potentially have on a war and its belligerents. The British government noticed the usefulness of the pigeon during the early stages of the war leading to a change in British policy to not just preserve the population of pigeons, but increase it as well. However, the British government likewise noted the harmful nature of non-domesticated pigeons on the war effort, leading the government to push for the shootings of pigeons. Thus, by exploring the British government's actions in relation to pigeons, one can see how an animal could influence a war.

Birds have been in constant relation to war throughout history, whether it be through symbolic meaning or directly involved in the war. John R. Nelson discusses both sides of how birds are related to war, including the use of pigeons as well.[193] Nelson glances over how the Allies used pigeons during World War II, but his main focus regarding pigeons was to demonstrate how birds are directly related to war. On the contrary, the documentary *War of the Birds* focuses on pigeons during World War II.[194] The documentary discusses how pigeons were used by the British military during war, covering individual pigeons and the missions that the pigeons ran. However, one of the aspects that lacks in relation to the discussion of pigeons during war is the government side. *War of the Birds* briefly mentions some government aspects, such as the formation of the National Pigeon Service and the push to hunt and then later preserve

[192] "Wood-Pigeons". *The London Times* (London, England). February 3, 1941.
[193] John R. Nelson, "Birds and War," *The Massachusetts Review* 56, no. 3, 2015, 451.
[194] *War of the Birds*.

peregrine falcons. However, the focus of the documentary is on the stories of the pigeons and how they helped the war effort. With this paper, I seek to highlight the British government's position on the use of pigeons during the Second World War, which is lacking in the scholarship. This paper will add to the previous discussion of the influence of birds in war, while at the same time making the claim that an animal can influence a country as a whole, not just a specific battle or mission. Moreover, this paper will show the dichotomy of that influence, because the pigeon offers both positive and negative impacts an animal can have on a country during war.

The British government pushed to expand the numbers of the National Pigeon Service at the beginning of the war. In early 1939, the National Pigeon Service Committee was formed within the British government as a preventative measure in case war broke out in Great Britain. The original thought was that around 40,000 pigeons would be registered under the National Pigeon Service. Individuals who wanted to register their pigeons needed to meet a few requirements. Those requirements included having the pigeons well maintained and trained, while as well having at least 20 pigeons that met those requirements. The National Pigeon Service's requirements were revised by members who were already in the committee, in an attempt to keep the standards for the pigeons high. However, once the war began, numbers were low within the National Pigeon Service. From the original 40,000 members that were expected to join, only 2,000 pigeons were registered as members for the National Pigeons Service. The standards that the National Pigeons Service Commission established at first were too high, creating the response from the commission to lower the standards to increase the amount of memberships within the National Pigeon Service. The committee within the British government noticed once the war began that pigeons were helpful as an additional form of communication for the military, as radio communication was still not completely reliable. The British

government's response of lowering the standards to include more members into the National Pigeons Service shows the importance of the pigeon to the war.[195]

Yet, lowering the standards of the National Pigeon Service was not the only method that the British government used to increase the numbers of pigeons the military could use. In the early stages of the war, the British government contemplated bringing pigeons from the United States to quickly increase the number of usable pigeons in Britain. The British government was given an offer by American pigeon breeders to import 3,000 pigeons from the United States to which Parliament eventually declined.[196] The rationale of declining the pigeons from the United States was due to the limited resources the British had to maintain those pigeons. Instead, it was wiser to recruit more pigeons within Great Britain. In March 1941, during a House of Commons sitting, Mr. Mander of Wolverhampton noted that most of the recruits of the National Pigeons Service have been from the coastal region of the country, while pigeon fanciers from the Midlands have been ignored.[197] Pigeons from the Midlands were accustomed to flying from England to countries like France and Spain, making them ideal to be used during the war by the National Pigeon Service. The British government's need to increase the number of pigeons within the National Pigeon Service immediately shows how the pigeons were important to the war effort. Pigeons being useful for the British military created the sense of urgency in increasing the numbers within the National Pigeon Service, hence why the British government's focus extended in the early stages of the war to pigeons.

[195] Royal Pigeon Racing Association. National Pigeon Service.
[196] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 2nd, 1941.
[197] Parliamentary Debate. House of Common. March 18, 1941.

In addition to the policies the National Pigeon Service Committee took to increase the number of members within the society itself, the British government's policies in relation to food rationing shows the importance and impact the pigeon had on the war. Once the war began, resources for animals were only a fraction of their prewar totals. For pigeons in specific, only 7,400 tons of feeding stuff were allocated to them, 16 percent of their prewar totals.[198] The limitation of feeding stuff for animals would cause the rationing of the feeding stuff and the prioritization of certain animals over others. The prioritization of animals was made clear when Major Lloyd George listed cattle and sheep alongside working animal such as horses and pigeons as the animals that required the most resources devoted to them.[199] Cattle were considered the most important animal for the British due to its ability to produce dairy products, beef, and other goods that help maintain the civilian and military population. However, pigeons were still among the animals that received large amounts of feeding stuff from the government due to their ability to be carrier pigeons for communication. In a House of Commons session, this sentiment was confirmed that pigeons should be provided feeding stuff because they were "useful to the public service."[200] With World War II occurring, most aspects that were considered public service were in reality for the war effort. In stating that the feeding of pigeons was for public service, members of Parliament were in reality stating that the feeding of pigeons was for the war effort. Thus, the rationing of food by the British government for animals, which included pigeons among the animals with priorities, shows the impact pigeons had on the war.

[198] Parliamentary Debate. House of Common. June 18, 1941.
[199] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 2, 1941.
[200] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 9, 1941.

The feeding of pigeons, however, was restricted to only those pigeons that were registered under the National Pigeon Service. Due to the limited amount of food quantity that was available to animals, the National Pigeon Service Committee in Parliament came to the decision of only providing food coupons for pigeons who were registered under the National Pigeon Service.[201] In controlling the amount and recipients of the feeding stuff for pigeons, the British government achieved two different results. For one, the number of members within the National Pigeon Service would increase. Pigeon fanciers who would not have originally registered their pigeons into the National Pigeons Service now have an incentive to register their pigeons. Wars reduce the purchasing power an individual has due to the increase of prices of goods, making individuals choose whether or not they would continue paying to maintain their pleasures. Many pigeon breeders and fanciers faced this decision about whether they preferred to register their pigeons under the National Pigeon Service to receive aid and maintain their pleasure of pigeon breeding and racing.

Yet, the decision of limiting government aid to civilians regarding pigeon feeding stuff was not favored by some of the British population. In one case, a Mr. De la Bére discussed with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food about the government's lack of aid for those pigeon fanciers who continued to maintain pigeons during the war. Mr. De la Bére's argument revolved around how pigeon racing was the recreational activity for people in the middle class, in which morale was important to the war effort. Major Lloyd George responded to this claim from Mr. De la Bére by stating that pigeons were not the only animals that raced that were impacted due to the war, rejecting his proposition as well as aid to pigeons which were not

[201] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. March 4, 1941.

registered under the National Pigeon Service.[202] Thus, the rationing of feeding stuff to only pigeons who were registered under the National Pigeon Service had both a positive and negative impact on the war effort. By limiting which pigeons would receive aid, the British government helped their own war effort since more individuals would register their pigeons to the National Pigeon Service to receive aid from the government. However, at the same time, the government harmed their own war efforts by not maintaining racing pigeons who were not in the National Pigeon Service, lowering the morale of some of the British population.

Another impact of the food rationing for animals is that certain animals were harmed for the benefit of pigeons. Among the animals that were given less in order to give more to pigeons were pigs and poultry. In the March 4, 1941, House of Commons sitting, Mr. Mander pointed out that there may be an excess of corn used to feed pigeons, posing at the same time the question of what should be done with the excess until the numbers of the National Pigeon Service increase.[203] To this, Major Lloyd George answers that the excess should go to pigs and poultry, since their supplies for feeding have gone down. For the British, pigeons offered more value in the war effort. The ability of a pigeon to transfer information between the front and home was of greater importance than feeding the population with pigs and poultry, as there are other substitutes to feeding the civilian population. This policy would continue afterwards, as in future Parliamentary meetings the ranking of the importance of animals were made clear, with pigs and poultry being at the bottom, while pigeons still received aid.[204] Thus, for the British, investing more food to maintain the population of pigeons who are serving the National Pigeon Service

[202] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 2, 1941.
[203] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. March 4, 1941.
[204] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 2, 1942.

was a priority, meaning other animals, such as pigs and poultry who can eat the same food, were affected in a negative way.

Another aspect in which government policy shows the importance of pigeons is in the preservation of the animal. In Great Britain, pigeon shootings are a form of recreation for individuals. During Christmas in particular, these pigeon shootings are more prevalent, in which people from the city, not just farmers, join shooting parties. However, these people from the city could not tell the difference between carrier pigeons that were being used by the National Pigeon Service and wild wood pigeons, which were the target of the shootings.[205] The inability of people to notice the difference between wood pigeons and homing pigeons worried the British government and the National Pigeon Service, as in the early stages of the war the amount of pigeons that were available for usage by the British military were limited. The Secretary of State of Air Sir Kingsley Wood raises awareness to this issue in a House of Commons sitting, to which the response was that the Minister of Agriculture would make notices to reduce the amount of shootings.[206] The preservation of the homing pigeons was important to the war effort, so reducing the amount of pigeon shootings in order to preserve homing pigeons was important to the British government. This push to preserve the population of pigeons in general to protect those that are in the National Pigeon Service is demonstrated by the enforcement of the Wild Birds Protection Act of 1880, a set of laws that were made to protect wild birds, including the wood pigeon.[207] By protecting all pigeons from shootings, the British government attempted to prevent the continuation of the shooting of homing pigeons. Thus, the British government

[205] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. December 7, 1939.
[206] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. January 24, 1940.
[207] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 18, 1940.

prioritized the preservation of pigeons in order to maintain and increase its numbers, at least for the first stages of the war.

Eventually, as the war progressed, the British government did not see a necessity to preserve the population of the wood pigeon in order to protect the homing pigeon. In certain counties of England, the wood pigeon was never protected by the Wild Birds Protection Act, as the wood pigeon was classified as a "vermin."[208] In reality, a large part of the British population considered wild small birds such as the wood pigeon as vermin, since it would be harmful to the crop production of the country. This sentiment was shown in various newspaper publications by the London Times, in which individuals would call for the shooting or the harm of wood pigeons in order to preserve the crops of the country. In one case, for example, an individual named Lymington responds to a Mr. Lawford, a man who pushed for the preservation of all wild birds, regarding the feeding of wild birds.[209] Lymington states that the only reasonable reason to feed wild birds would be if they aided in the growing of crops, yet Lymington doubts that would happen. Instead, Lymington claims that the wild birds would harm the crops, in particular taking note of the wood pigeon.

For farmers, especially during the war, pigeons were a menace in order to grow crops in order to provide not only food for soldiers and civilians, but as well as the animals that the country is using. The ruining of crops by wood pigeons would lead farmers to push for the increase of pigeon shootings. In another newspaper article from the London Times, there is a call for people to join the pigeon shooting parties that are gathering in order to help "the nation's

[208] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 18, 1940.
[209] Lymington. "Feeding of Wild Birds". *The London Times* (London, England), February 10, 1940.

food supplies."[210] In the article, there are various points of notice. For one, the main focus is to involve more expert shooters so that the wood pigeon's numbers would be reduced by a vast amount. The wood pigeon was considered harmful to the crops that will soon start to be grown, as the weather is beginning to warm. There was a sense of urgency to this claim, in which the author appeals to the people's nationalistic feeling, making the shooting important to the war effort. However, in addition to the attempt to bring more numbers to the shooting parties, at the end there is a statement that counters the British government's previous attempt of preserving the wood pigeon. The author claims that countrymen could easily tell the difference between wood pigeons and racing/homing pigeons, yet if there is a doubt then not to shoot.[211] This follows previous statements from the British government, in which shooting parties were advised that if there was a doubt about what the breed of pigeon the bird was, then not to shoot was the better option.[212] The author by stating this is creating the impression that the shooting party is following government regulations, even if during the shoot individuals were shooting any pigeons that were spotted. Thus, it is clear from the civilian perspective that wood pigeons were a menace to the war effort, in which pigeon shootings were justified for the war effort.

In a similar manner, the British government did prefer the preservation of crops over the wood pigeons. With knowledge that the wood pigeon was harming the growth of crops in England, the Ministry of Agriculture decided to advocate for the shooting of wood pigeons, in which they joined with various organizations such as the National's Farmer Union, Central Landowners' Association, and the British Field Sport Society to achieve this goal.[213] Due to the

[210] "Wood-Pigeons". *The London Times* (London, England). February 3, 1941.
[211] "Wood-Pigeons".
[212] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. December 7, 1939.
[213] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 4, 1940.

lack of resources the British had available, maintaining and expanding the output of crop growth was a priority for the government. In order to ensure crop growth was protected, the shooting of pests such as the wood pigeon were pushed by the government. The local governments in Britain would classify wood pigeons as vermin in order to justify the shooting of the pigeon.[214] The classification of wood pigeons as vermin aids in the increase of participation of people in shooting parties, as people would feel the need to kill these birds as a form of aiding the war effort.

As previously mentioned, civilians organized pigeon shoots in order to reduce the population of wood pigeons. However, the British government also pushed for the pigeon shoots to occur to reduce the population of wood pigeons. The Ministry of Agriculture, for example, advocated for the civilians to shoot pigeons using wording such as "launching an offensive over the whole country"[215] to increase the number of participants in the shooting parties. The diction the Ministry of Agriculture uses creates the feeling that if civilians participated in the pigeon shoots, then they were in reality helping the British war effort. By killing the wood pigeons, crops are being protected, thus maintaining a resource that can be used to feed the military, civilians, and animals. Thus, even though there was an attempt by the British government to protect homing pigeons that were registered under the National Pigeon Service by protecting all types of pigeons, at the end the government preferred to advocate for pigeon shootings, as the

[214] Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 18, 1940.
[215] "Wood-Pigeons". *The London Times* (London, England). February 3, 1941.

wood pigeon was doing more harm to the war effort compared to the good the carrier pigeon was doing.

The last area in which the impact of the pigeon on the government is shown is in the recognition the animal received during and after the Second World War. Animals throughout the war performed heroic actions, even leading to monuments such as the Animals in War Monument to be built in honor of those animals that sacrificed their lives for the country.[216] Pigeons, like animals such as the horse and dog, are among the animals that contributed vastly to the war effort, delivering messages for the Allies even through heavy fire and predatory threats. The heroic actions of the pigeon and other animals would lead the People's Dispensary for Sick Animals, or PDSA, to create the Dickin Medal. The Dickin Medal is what is considered the equal to the Victorian Cross, however, given to animals for their bravery and devotion to the war effort. [217]Of the 72 times the award has been awarded, 32 of the recipients have been pigeons, all of them having served during World War II.[218] These pigeons were celebrated by the British government and people, as these pigeons would have to deliver messages through harsh conditions, while saving the lives of countless soldiers as well.

One pigeon in particular named G.I. Joe sticks out from other pigeon recipients of the Dickin Medal. G.I. Joe, an American pigeon, received the Dickin Medal by the British for saving the lives of at least 100 Allied soldiers by delivering a message 20 miles in 20 minutes to prevent the bombing of the town of Calvi Vecchia, which had already been captured by the allies.[219]

---

[216] Judith Tydor Baumel-Schwartz. "Beloved Beasts: Reflection on the History and Impact of the British "Animals in War" Memorial." *History and Memory* 29 no. 1 (2017), 104-133.
[217] Royal Pigeon Racing Association. National Pigeon Service.
[218] PDSA Dickin Medal. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2021, from https://www.pdsa.org.uk/what-we-do/animal-awards-programme/pdsa-dickin-medal.
[219] PDSA Dickin Medal for G.I. Joe the HEROIC pigeon. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2021, from https://www.pdsa.org.uk/what-we-do/animal-awards-programme/pdsa-dickin-medal/gi-joe

Because of his heroics, G.I. Joe was given a large ceremony by the British military at the Tower of London, in which the heroics of the pigeon were on full display for people and other birds alike.[220] For the British, the heroics of pigeons merited the recognition and praise that the animal deserved for its efforts in the war. By having ceremonies and awarding medals to these pigeons among other animals, the British acknowledged the value and impact the pigeon had during World War II.

Once the war ended, these pigeons that were recipients of the Dickin Medal would be showcased for the public to view, as a form of not only recreation, but to raise money for organizations. In one case, a show of pigeons valued at around six thousand pounds was displayed to raise funds for the Hospital of Sick Children, in which many of the pigeons displayed were recipients of the Dickin Medal.[221] In another show, a group of surviving pigeons were displayed at the Royal Horticultural Hall, in which the proceeds of the shows would go to disabled soldiers, sailors, and airmen.[222] In a way, the service of the pigeon had not ended when the war ended, as the showcases of the pigeon continued after the finalization of the conflict as a method to maintain those who were incapable of providing for themselves. Thus, even though the war ended, pigeons were still of great importance to the British as shown by the awarding of medals and the showcases that were held with those pigeons once World War II ended.

The impact and influence of pigeons on the British war effort is shown by how the British government's discussions and decisions placed priority on pigeons over many other aspects of the war. However, the pigeon also created a dichotomy, as they were a species that both

[220] "War Pigeon's Medal". *The London Times* (London, England). November 6, 1946.
[221] "War Service Pigeons". *The London Times* (London, England). November 27, 1945.
[222] "Pigeons as War Veterans". *The London Times* (London, England) January 18, 1947.

benefited and harmed the war effort for Britain. The Nation Pigeon Service Committee within Parliament made pigeons one of the center aspects of the war, as demonstrated by the organization raising the amount of participating members and the British government's changes in policy, such as the rationing of feeding stuff for animals. By receiving more rations, pigeons diminished the amount of food that was rationed to other animals, which was harmful to farmers and the food production of certain animals, such as poultry and pigs. Parliament viewed homing pigeons as important in the early stages of the war and were later recognized with the Dickin Medal for their heroics, in which they were part of showcases that would raise money for soldiers that had been injured during the war. On the other hand, Parliament promoted pigeon shootings in order to eliminate the wood pigeons, a breed that was considered vermin and harmful to the war effort as they would destroy the crops of British farmers. Also, the prioritization of pigeons who were registered within the National Pigeon Service over racing pigeons that civilians owned led to the loss of some recreational activities in British society, which would diminish the morale of these civilians. Ultimately, the value of the pigeon in the perspective of the British government outweighed the negatives, as the pigeon provided security in communication for the military, whether it be to deliver a message to start an assault, like Gustav, or a message to save hundreds of soldiers' lives, such as G.I. Joe. The usage of the pigeon during the Second World War offers insight to how an animal can impact a modern war via either providing support or harming the war effort.

Works Cited

Baumel-Schwartz, Judith Tydor. “Beloved Beasts: Reflection on the History and Impact of the British “Animals in War” Memorial.” *History and Memory* 29, no. 1, 2017: 104-133

Cane, Richard, dir. *War of the Birds*. (2005; USA, Atlantic Productions) Documentary

Lymington. “Feeding of Wild Birds”. *The London Times* (London, England), February 10, 1940

Nelson, John R. "Birds and War." *The Massachusetts Review* 56, no. 3 (2015): 447-60. Accessed March 20, 2021. doi:10.2307/24494424.

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. December 7, 1939

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. January 24, 1940

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 4, 1940

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 18, 1940

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. March 4, 1941

Parliamentary Debate. House of Common. March 18, 1941

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 2nd, 1941

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 9, 1941

Parliamentary Debate. House of Common. June 18, 1941

Parliamentary Debate. House of Commons. April 2, 1942

PDSA Dickin Medal. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2021, from https://www.pdsa.org.uk/what-we-do/animal-awards-programme/pdsa-dickin-medal

PDSA Dickin Medal for G.I. Joe the HEROIC pigeon. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2021, from https://www.pdsa.org.uk/what-we-do/animal-awards-programme/pdsa-dickin-medal/gi-joe

“Pigeons as War Veterans”. *The London Times* (London, England) January 18, 1947.

The Royal pigeon Racing Association. (n.d.). Retrieved March 20, 2021, from https://www.rpra.org/pigeon-history/pigeons-in-war/

“War Pigeon’s Medal”. *The London Times* (London, England). November 6, 1946

"War Service Pigeons". *The London Times* (London, England). November 27, 1945

"Wood-Pigeons". *The London Times* (London, England). February 3, 1941

Cornerstone Essay Award

"Patriotutes, Saints, and Red Women: Women and Venereal Disease within U.S. Military Culture in WWII"

Playlist: https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLeRhqbn37ssoqvuF_9LXeoGPrfrR-hLUt

Amber Mak

This liner note essay and the playlist that it accompanies depict elements of the history of African American women empowerment and expression in 1900s music. African American women have long been recognized for using their platform in the entertainment industry to change and influence the Civil Rights Movement (CRM), whether through their songs reflecting on racism or black sexuality. Despite the popularity and fame that these artists have within upper-class white society, many of the artists listed in the playlist have faced harsh criticism and backlash from their white audiences for their poetic songs that sing for black liberation and equality. This playlist features Billie Holiday, Bessie Smith, Nina Simone, Aretha Franklin, Eartha Kitt, and Mahalia Jackson. There will be two intermissions; one on an interview of Eartha Kitt on the concept of relationship and love, and the second intermission will be a scene from the TV show *Dynasty* where Diahann Carroll, playing Dominique Deveraux, challenges the wealth and status of a wealthy white woman through sophistication and class. These women listed in the playlist are not the only ones that used their fame and talents to make civil commentaries, but they can act as an example for the way that female African American singers used music as a reflection of the realities of their time and thus showing us the evolution of protest music for African American artists.

The first song featured in the playlist is Billie Holiday's "Strange Fruit". It was first recorded in 1939 and the story goes that it came from a poem by a Jewish white man about the horrors of lynching in the American South.[223] This song has been credited as an example of early protest music and how protest music is embodied as a performance beyond the lyrics.[224] Billie Holiday sings a horrifying depiction of lynched African Americans as "strange fruits" of "Southern trees". The poem is written as a commentary on the regularities of lynchings in the South and the brutality of racism in America.[225] Billie Holiday turned this song beyond a protest poem and used her stage presence to promote the political commentary as a serious concern for American society, even at the risk of her career.[226]

According to NPR, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics sent warnings to Holiday in 1939 to get her to stop singing and performing "Strange Fruit".[227] The Bureau was, at the time, run by the infamous Harry Anslinger who is largely credited as the secret founder of the War on Drugs. She refused and thus became the first victim of the War on Drugs. Anslinger spent the next two decades getting Holiday addicted to heroin through many sleazy tactics like employing agents that would get close to her and coax her into using heroin or by planting drugs to falsely imprison her.[228] She still refused to stop singing "Strange Fruit" even though she knew of Anslinger's attacks and thus, through Anslinger's influences, Holiday lost her performance license and subsequently led to her public fallout.[229] She was forced to sing in dangerous places

[223] Concord CCPA, "Strange Fruit," Billie Holiday, accessed March 14, 2020, https://billieholiday.com/signaturesong/strange-fruit/.
[224] Rund Abdelfatah, "Throughline: Strange Fruit," Throughline, accessed March 14, 2020, https://www.npr.org/2019/08/20/752909807/strange-fruit.
[225] Concord, "Strange Fruit."
[226] Abdelfatah, "Strange Fruit."
[227] Abdelfatah.
[228] Abdelfatah.
[229] Abdelfatah.

and bars, but still insisted on singing "Strange Fruit" in all her performances, even in the deep South.[230] In the end, her cause of death in 1959 is largely due to Anslinger's agents causing her to withdraw through methadone, a medical version of heroin. She collapsed due to liver disease and was taken to the hospital, where the Anslinger's agents arrested her and controlled what the hospital did to her, refusing to treat her conditions and instead forced Holiday to go into withdrawal.[231] Thus, "Strange Fruit" isn't just a song about the horrors of lynching, but also a political statement on racism and racial profiling.

The next two songs come from Bessie Smith, a popular blues singer in the 1920s and 30s. She's nicknamed the "Empress of the Blues" for her strong vocals and her touching, personal songs that sing about the troubles of regular life.[232] Unlike Billie Holiday, Smith's songs are not what we'd expect in protest songs because it sounds like what Blues is expected to sound like, but these two songs still hold the characteristics of protest songs for its lyrical reflections on the realities of life and struggles of the African American experience.[233] In "Washwoman's Blues", released in 1928, Bessie Smith sang about the struggles of a poor, African American woman that washes clothes for a living and comments on the lack of job opportunities for African American women because of their race and class. In "Poor Man's Blues", released in 1928, she insults the rich for the wealth disparities they inflict on the poor working class. She depicts the hard-working, poor man in comparison to bosses and the government that don't do anything, essentially saying that the wealthy class reaps the profits of war and labor from the lower class.

---

[230] Abdelfatah.
[231] Abdelfatah.
[232] Gwen Thomkins, "Forebears: Bessie Smith, The Empress of The Blues," NPR.org, accessed March 16, 2020, https://www.npr.org/2018/01/05/575422226/forebears-bessie-smith-the-empress-of-the-blues.
[233] Reiland Rabaka, *Hip Hop's Amnesia: From Blues and the Black Women's Club Movement to Rap and the Hip Hop Movement* (Lexington Books, 2012), 72.

Bessie Smith is seen as an early pioneer for African American protest music. The lyrics may seem like a simple commentary of poor African American life, but at the time Bessie Smith's songs were seen as too crude and unladylike. Bessie Smith is now famous for her tough honesty on the realities of poverty, African American life, and African American female sexuality. She sang about the realities of what was happening for the poor, but people of her time commonly brushed her off as being too "rough" because of the topics of her music.[234] Her failed marriage and rumors of her being a homosexual further made people disregard the severity of her politically charged messages in her music. Other male African American blues and folk singers that came later than Bessie Smith, like Robert Johnson, "... became the benchmark of authenticity, the symbol of black melancholy, a safely rural figure..."[235] As a black woman, she wasn't able to gain the fame, recognition, and respect like later black male singers despite depicting the same types of social commentary in their music and thus is commonly forgotten in mainstream musical and social discourse. She died due to untreated wounds from a car crash and was buried in an unmarked grave because of her estranged husband running off with the money raised to pay for a proper burial.[236] Despite this, Bessie Smith continued to be an influential singer to later female revolutionary artists like Janis Joplin.[237] She may have been unable to gain the success and freedom of her successors in the music industry as a protest singer, but her influences are still felt and honored by a niche group of singers like Janis Joplin and Nina Simone that use powerful vocals to sing about political and social concerns in later decades.

[234] Ann George, M. Elizabeth Weiser, and Janet Zepernick, *Women and Rhetoric between the Wars* (Southern Illinois University Press, 2013), 143-158.
[235] Jayna Brown, "From The Tent Show to The Parlor: Bessie Smith's Travels In Her Time," NPR.org, accessed March 16, 2020, https://www.npr.org/2019/08/06/748312631/from-the-tent-show-to-the-parlor-bessie-smiths-travels-in-her-time.
[236] Thomkins, "Forebears."
[237] Thomkins.

The Civil Rights Movement (CRM), lasting from the late 1940s to 1960s, started due to immense pressures from different African American leaders all with the one goal of pushing for equality. The most famous leaders were figures like Martin Luther King Jr. and Malcolm X, and with such high tensions within communities of color, many African American female artists also used music as a way to reflect and promote the CRM. One of the most prominent figures being Nina Simone. She is a trailblazer as being a popular black female singer and pianist that was favored by both black and white audiences in the 60s to 90s. Throughout her career, she has made many protest songs that directly commented on the realities of the time, but her most famous protest song is "Mississippi Goddam".

Released in 1964, the song was written in response to the 16th Street Baptist Church Bombing of 1963.[238] Four white supremacists bombed a local black church that resulted in the deaths of four African American girls, age eleven to fourteen, and injuring twenty-two other people. The incident shocked the nation. Even MLK Jr., while doing the eulogy for the four girls, described the incident as "one of the most vicious and tragic crimes ever perpetrated against humanity".[239] A previously unpolitical artist, the story goes that the incident angered Simone so much that it led to her writing her first protest song that not only reflected on the horrors of what happened in the church bombing, but also other racial attacks and killings that happened around the US at the time.[240]

[238] Mike Marqusee, *Wicked Messenger : Bob Dylan and the 1960s, Chimes of Freedom, Revised and Expanded*, 1st Seven Stories Press Edition, rev. expanded (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2005), 85.
[239] David J Krajicek, "Justice Story: Birmingham Church Bombing Kills 4 Innocent Girls in Racially Motivated Attack," *New York Daily News*, September 1, 2013.
[240] Marqusee, *Wicked Messenger*, 85.

The power of this song, as simple as it is, embodies the hidden anger of the CRM.[241] It is used to represent the frustration of the protesters in a time when MLK Jr., Motown, and white supporters of the CRM were attempting to "go slow" with the civil movement. The movement had to be peaceful even in the face of brutality by extremists, the police, and the government working at large to keep the African American population as second-class citizens. No one expresses the significance of "Mississippi Goddam" better than the famous black comedian and activist Dick Gregory in the Netflix movie, *What Happened, Miss Simone?*, stating, "If you look at all the suffering black folks went through, not one black man would dare say 'Mississippi Goddam'. We all wanted to say it. She said it."[242]

With the success of "Mississippi Goddam" and the CRM officially backing her as a musical figure, Nina Simone released "Four Women" in 1966 which further solidified her position as a CRM protest singer. This song became her first to directly recognize the history of African American women.[243] The song is written from the viewpoint of four different black women, one of the four being mixed-raced and others being of different occupations, but all of these women shared the same struggles for civil liberties. The lyrics challenges the tales of a shared struggle amongst all black women, and although Simone does not directly say it, the dark and forced narration of the last woman and the yell of the woman's name is meant to call for unity among all African American women because all African Americans come from a history of poverty and slavery. Under this context, "Four Women" proceeded to become an important song

[241] Adam Chandler, "How the Civil-Rights Era Made and Broke Nina Simone," The Atlantic, June 27, 2015, https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2015/06/nina-simone-and-mississippi-goddam/396923/.
[242] Chandler, "Nina Simone."
[243] Thulani Davis, "Nina Simone, 1933-2003 | The Village Voice," accessed March 16, 2020, https://www.villagevoice.com/2003/04/29/nina-simone-1933-2003/.

that represented black women's struggles in both the CRM and the second wave Feminist Movement in the late 1960s.

In the 1982 documentary, *All by Myself: The Eartha Kitt Story*, there is a legendary scene where Eartha Kitt talks about the concept of love and relationship. She gives a loud and forceful laugh when the interviewer asks Kitt if she would compromise to be in a relationship with a man, which she rejects and finds unreasonable. She asks, "Compromise for what? A relationship is a relationship that has to be earned. Not to compromise for." I added this clip into my playlist as an intermission because of the significance of her statement in relations and preparation to the different ways that people used music as a way to protest against social, economic, and cultural norms. During the 1960s, there's notable fragmentation in the way that African American women expressed themselves and protested against the conditions of society. Women entering this decade, partially fueled by the arrival of second-wave feminism, also began to question their place in black societies beyond housewives and docile secondaries to black men. Black women began to fight back against the societal notion of African American women as being unfeminine and embraced Black female beauty against the constraints and standards set by White society, and Eartha Kitt is one of the leading figures for African American sexuality.[244]

In 1953, Eartha Kitt released her famous Christmas classic, "Santa Baby". The song is filled with sexuality, with Kitt embodying the persona of a gold digger while sexually enticing a man to buy her expensive gifts. By the mere lyrics, this might not sound like a protest song, but "Santa Baby" and Kitt's public persona is important to the revolution of black female

[244] Fran Tirado, "The Enduring Legacy of Eartha Kitt, a Subversive Icon Targeted by the CIA," *Vice* (blog), December 25, 2017, https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/8xvqbv/the-enduring-legacy-of-eartha-kitt-a-subversive-icon-targeted-by-the-cia.

sexuality.[245] In a time when Marilyn Monroe's sexuality was also seen as a threat to pure Christian society, Kitt became a leading figure that also proved African Americans can be a sex symbol in a predominantly white entertainment industry. Despite her race and ethnicity, she was allowed roles beyond the traditional stereotypical characters of a housekeeper and was allowed to be a strong female sex symbol in Hollywood. In 1967 she was casted as Catwoman, a white character in the comics, for the final season of *Batman*. Although the directors didn't follow the comic depiction of Catwoman as a love interest for Batman due to the taboo of mixed-race couples, Eartha Kitt was still a sexual figure that enticed white audiences as a sex symbol nonetheless.[246] She was confident as a performer and she embraced the public perception of her being a gold digger that can wrap any man around her fingers.[247] Even in the dynamics of mixed race relations in film and personal life, Kitt had equal and sometimes more agency over white men in the relationship. The popularity of this song and the mere stage presence of Kitt's legacy in the entertainment industry was a necessity in allowing Black women to be openly seen as sexual and beautiful in a time when white women were the standard of beauty.

Sexuality isn't the only medium that artists used to protest for social changes. During the March on Washington in 1963, Mahalia Jackson, a popular gospel singer at the time, sang "How I Got Over" and "I've Been Buked and I've Been Scorned". The gospel nature of the songs used the call-and-response technique, enticing participation and response from the crowd. Gospel functioned as a perfect example of unity for a MLK Jr. 's march, bringing both black and white audience members to participate in Jackson's songs. Although the song lyrics are biblical in

[245] Tirado, "Eartha Kitt."
[246] Nicole Myrie, "Why Eartha Kitt Is the Only Catwoman Worth Paying Attention To," *ComicsVerse* (blog), June 18, 2019, https://comicsverse.com/catwoman-eartha-kitt/.
[247] Tirado.

nature, it can also be seen as a protest song in context with what was happening during the CRM and the call for unity and equality for all races by MLK Jr. and his supporters.[248]

In "How I Got Over" and "I've Been Buked and I've Been Scorned", the lyrics are in direct relation to the march.[249] The hymns act as a protest song because of its support and remembrance of the March on Washington. "How I Got Over" is a song about getting to heaven and the long journey that's required to get there as well as the unity of different people in the lyrics such as, "coming from the north, south, east, and the west". "I've Been Buked", on the other hand, is about the struggles of making a journey because of "children" that would discourage the narrator of the song, but through the will of Jesus the narrator will not give up. The hymns are in clear connection to how the March on Washington brought together different people from all over the USA to Capitol Hill and how they were united for the concept of unity and equality in society despite the discouragement the police and white vigilante attacks on protesters. Jackson thus used her Christian and gospel background to connect the tales of Christianity with the realities of the CRM as a way of reflecting on the journey as the right thing to do to achieve the perfect society envisioned by many supporters where racial segregation is abolished. The bible was constantly used in relation to the CRM for MLK Jr,[250] and it is no surprise that King would have Jackson open his speech with hymns that connected spirituality to the movement as well.

[248] History com Editors, "Mahalia Jackson, the Queen of Gospel, Puts Her Stamp on the March on Washington," HISTORY, November 13, 2009, https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/mahalia-jackson-the-queen-of-gospel- puts-her-stamp-on-the-march-on-washington.
[249] History.com, "Mahalia Jackson."
[250] Drew Hansen, "Mahalia Jackson, and King's Improvisation," August 27, 2013.

While Jackson changed biblical hymns and gospel into protest songs for the CRM, Aretha Franklin used her gospel fame as a way of promoting black women empowerment. In section III, chapter 24 of *The Rock History Reader*, Rat Magazine describes Aretha's music as an expression of, "[her] own experience of being a woman, of pain and humiliation and of love."[251] One of the most notable songs of Franklin's that features the experience of womanhood and love is her cover of Otis Redding's "Respect", a cover that became popular for its embrace and promotion of female empowerment.

Franklin uses her music to protest the notion of African American women as second to men in society. In "Respect", she changed the lyrics that were originally about a man asking for his wife to respect him, into a song about a woman asking for equality and equal respect from her husband. While the original song by Otis Redding is demeaning the wife by listing all the activities and work that the man does for the family, Aretha Franklin's version functions as a response to the original song, where the woman is telling her husband the amount of work that she does for the family as well. Love is barely mentioned in the lyrics because the main point of the song is about how the marriage dynamic cannot function unless the husband respects his wife.[252] Franklin is thus protesting against the notion of the passive woman and sees women as an equal to men. Alongside with the vocal power and the catchy, gospel nature of the rendition, Franklin's cover of "Respect" became an anthem for the women's movement and is used as a promotion for black female empowerment.

[251] Theo Cateforis, *The Rock History Reader*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2013), 121.
[252] Wesley Morris, "Aretha Franklin Had Power. Did We Truly Respect It?" *The New York Times*, August 16, 2018, sec. Arts, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/16/arts/music/respect-aretha-franklin-death.html.

I want to end this playlist with Diahann Carroll and her portrayal of Dominique Deveraux in the 1984 television run of the show, “Dynasty”. Carroll functions as a great example of the struggles that African American women faced in the entertainment industry. Her ability to get the role of a rich, intelligent African American woman came from not only her hard work in the film industry as an African American star, but also through the CRM and other protest moments that continued to promote the narrative of African Americans as more than slaves and cleaners. Dominique Deveraux, lavished in a white fur coat, teased hair, and diamond jewelry, challenges a white woman in power not only through money and wealth, but also through sophistication, intelligence, and class. She challenges the white character Alexis Colby, saying “I can be as tough, or tougher than you”. Like Billie Holiday, Dominique as a character is allowed to have the courage to directly challenge white people in power. Like Bessie Smith and Nina Simone, Dominique is allowed to be bold and outspoken. Like Eartha Kitt, Dominique is allowed to be sexual, even as a challenge against white beauty. And like Mahalia Jackson and Aretha Franklin, Dominique is allowed to see herself as equals with her white counterparts. This African American female character in the 1980s is everything that the protest singers were fighting for. Dominique embodies the traits of what African American women can and should be; as equals to white people and as forces to be reckoned with.

The playlist functions as a historical timeline that explores the changes of protest music and female expression through entertainment by African American women. Their demands and usage of music are largely influenced by the conditions of society and the state of civil unrest during their time, leading to different ways of expression for equality and change. Earlier artists before the CRM were penalized for their activism, while later artists during and after the CRM were praised and encouraged for their work. Nonetheless, the protest music isn’t just about the

mere song itself, but also about how the artist embodies and promotes the message beyond the lyrics of the song. Even to this day, protest music is still being created by black artists and many are influenced by legends like Nina Simone. Their music transcends beyond their time and are still influencing the sounds and lyrics of modern-day American music.

Works Cited

Abdelfatah, Rund. “Throughline: Strange Fruit.” Throughline. Accessed March 14, 2020. https://www.npr.org/2019/08/20/752909807/strange-fruit.

Brown, Jayna. “From The Tent Show to The Parlor: Bessie Smith’s Travels In Her Time.” NPR.org. Accessed March 16, 2020. https://www.npr.org/2019/08/06/748312631/from-the-tent-show-to-the-parlor-bessie-smiths-travels-in-her-time.

Cateforis, Theo. *The Rock History Reader*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Chandler, Adam. “How the Civil-Rights Era Made and Broke Nina Simone.” The Atlantic, June 27, 2015. https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2015/06/nina-simone-and-mississippi-goddam/396923/.

Concord. “Strange Fruit.” Billie Holiday. Accessed March 14, 2020. https://billieholiday.com/signaturesong/strange-fruit/.

Davis, Thulani. “Nina Simone, 1933-2003 | The Village Voice.” Accessed March 16, 2020. https://www.villagevoice.com/2003/04/29/nina-simone-1933-2003/.

Editors, History com. “Mahalia Jackson, the Queen of Gospel, Puts Her Stamp on the March on Washington.” HISTORY, November 13, 2009. https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/mahalia-jackson-the-queen-of-gospel-puts-her-stamp-on-the-march-on-washington.

Facing History and Ourselves. “The Staple Singers Historical Background.” Accessed March 16, 2020. https://www.facinghistory.org/sounds-change/the-staple-singers-historical-background.

George, Ann, M. Elizabeth Weiser, and Janet Zepernick. *Women and Rhetoric between the Wars*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2013.

Hansen, Drew. “Mahalia Jackson, and King’s Improvisation.” August 27, 2013.

Huang, Hao, and Rachel Huang. “She Sang as She Spoke: Billie Holiday and Aspects of Speech Intonation and Diction.” *Jazz Perspectives* 7, no. 3 (December 1, 2013): 287–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/17494060.2014.903055.

Krajicek, David J. “Justice Story: Birmingham Church Bombing Kills 4 Innocent Girls in Racially Motivated Attack.” *New York Daily News*, September 1, 2013.

Marqusee, Mike. *Wicked Messenger : Bob Dylan and the 1960s, Chimes of Freedom, Revised and Expanded*. 1st Seven Stories Press Edition, rev. Expanded. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2005.

Morris, Wesley. “Aretha Franklin Had Power. Did We Truly Respect It?” *The New York Times*, August 16, 2018, sec. Arts. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/16/arts/music/respect-aretha-franklin-death.html.

Muhammad, Latifa. “7 Pioneering Black Female Singers Who Made Music History.” Vibe, June 30, 2018. https://www.vibe.com/2018/06/pioneering-black-female-singers-music-history.

Myrie, Nicole. “Why Eartha Kitt Is the Only Catwoman Worth Paying Attention To.” *ComicsVerse* (blog), June 18, 2019. https://comicsverse.com/catwoman-eartha-kitt/.

Rabaka, Reiland. *Hip Hop’s Amnesia: From Blues and the Black Women’s Club Movement to Rap and the Hip Hop Movement*. Lexington Books, 2012.

Rath, Arun. “‘I’ll Take You There’: The Staple Singers’ Rise from Church to Fame.” Accessed March 16, 2020. https://www.npr.org/2014/01/18/263095847/ill-take-you-there-the-staple-singers-rise-from-church-to-fame.

Thomkins, Gwen. “Forebears: Bessie Smith, The Empress of The Blues.” NPR.org. Accessed March 16, 2020. https://www.npr.org/2018/01/05/575422226/forebears-bessie-smith-the-empress-of-the-blues.

Tirado, Fran. “The Enduring Legacy of Eartha Kitt, a Subversive Icon Targeted by the CIA.” *Vice* (blog), December 25, 2017. https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/8xvqbv/the-enduring-legacy-of-eartha-kitt-a-subversive-icon-targeted-by-the-cia.

About *Cornerstone*

Cornerstone, an Undergraduate Historical Journal, is published yearly by students of the Department of History at the University of California, Riverside. The journal provides undergraduates with the opportunity to publish historical works and to train graduate students in the editorial process of an academic journal. Recent issues are posted publicly on our website; past print issues are available in the department.

If you are interested in submitting your article for publication in *Cornerstone*, please visit our website listed below for information on our calls for submissions. We also welcome feedback, suggestions, and general inquiries from our readers. Contact us at the email listed below.

Cornerstone
An Undergraduate Historical Journal
Department of History, University of California, Riverside
900 University Ave., HMNSS 1212 Riverside, CA 92521
Tel: (951) 827-5401
Email: history@ucr.edu