



HiPo: The Langara Student Journal of History and Political Science





Volume 8

March 2025

Jack Browne
Lecielo Fernandez
Sarah McIntyre
Zane McPhedra

All articles are anonymously student peer-reviewed and edited. HiPo is published online annually with the support of the Department of History, Latin, and Political Science; the Dean and Division Chair of Social Sciences; Langara Strategic Communications & Marketing; and the Langara Print Shop.

FACULTY ADVISOR

FORMATTING ADVISOR

DEPARTMENT CHAIR, HISTORY,
LATIN, & POLITICAL SCIENCE

DEAN, SOCIAL SCIENCES
& COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

DIVISION CHAIR, SOCIAL SCIENCES

Submissions

Email: hipojournal@langara.ca

Langara.

ʔə ɬ xʷməθkʷəy̓əm | at Musqueam

William the Hippo appears courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 17.9.1

Cover image: Eleanor Roosevelt and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Lake Success, New York. November 1949. Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, US National Archives and Records Administration. [NAID: 6120927](#)

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS

A Letter from the Department Chair NIALL CHRISTIE	1
--	---

ARTICLES

<i>Heavy Night: The Murals of Makoto Chi</i> CÍAN DONOGHUE-BROOKE	3
A New Deal or No Deal? SYLVIA LEUNG	12
The Jewish God: The Challenges Monotheism Represented to the Roman Empire Before Constantine I GABRIEL MAMEDE	19
Fighting Among Friends: The Left's Internal Struggles in the Spanish Civil War DYLAN ORDANO	25

The Un-Americanization of Homosexuals	
MIRANDA RUTTY	30
In the Shadow of the Rising Sun: The Dehumanization of	
Allied Prisoners in Japanese Captivity During WWII	
ZAK SMITH	41

A LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

It is Spring again, and consequently I am once again able to undertake one of my favourite tasks as department chair, which is to write the chair's letter congratulating everyone involved in the production of this year's volume of *HiPo*. In this case it is a bittersweet activity, as this is my last year as department chair, and consequently the last letter that I will get to write for the journal.

But this letter is not about me.

This volume is the result of a huge amount of work by the student editors. They have produced a collection of articles addressing topics from the ancient to the modern era, representing a wide range of disciplines including history, political science, art history, and religious studies. On behalf of the department and myself, I would like to congratulate the editors on their diligence and professionalism, which has resulted in an outstanding collection of articles. I would also like to gratefully recognize the work of the student authors, who provided the excellent papers that form the content of this volume. I am also immensely thankful for the work of the faculty advisors, especially Sean Maschmann, who has once again guided the editing team with his thoughtful wisdom and conscientious support. We also remain grateful to the college administration for their continued support.

NIALL CHRISTIE, PHD
Department Chair
History, Latin, and Political Science



HEAVY NIGHT: THE MURALS OF MAKOTO CHI

CÍAN DONOGHUE-BROOKE

While murals can foster a sense of community, they can be used as tools of gentrification and colonization. This manifests in the act of “artwashing;” the practice of using public art to distract from the negative effects of gentrification while encouraging its perpetuation. As a result, murals play a role in the continued oppression of marginalized communities living in these neighbourhoods. Focusing on the work of Makoto Chi, a queer, transgender artist of Japanese and Jewish heritage, this paper examines how his public artworks on both ceded and unceded territory in Canada contribute to a larger cultural narrative. One of his murals, Heavy Night, is contrasted with Indigenous public art initiatives like Blanketing the City, and in doing so calls for a more inclusive and decolonial approach to public art. The inclusion of Indigenous voices is crucial in addressing the ongoing effects of colonization and gentrification in public art spaces.

Murals are found in cities across the country, providing not only beautiful sights for passersby, but the potential for community forged through public art. While this is certainly a positive perspective, there is an often ignored aspect of mural art that is important to reckon with, particularly in Canada: the potential for it to be a tool in colonization. It is particularly relevant in Western Canada, wherein most of the land is unceded and being gentrified at a rapid pace. Knowing this, what does it mean to leave an artistic mark on this land, whether ceded or unceded? What does it mean to make art as a settler to these lands, but also as a marginalized person in your own right? Makoto Chi is an artist who, while being a settler, is multiply marginalized, and who has created murals on both ceded and unceded lands within Canada. How art from such a person fits into the cultural and national narrative of Canadian art is a complex issue, but one that must be interrogated.

Makoto Chi is a queer and transgender person of mixed Japanese and Jewish heritage who was born in Toronto/*Tkaronto* in 1989. In his own words, he is “a

settler on turtle island, currently living in ... [W]estern [M]assachusetts.”¹ He spent much of his life in Vancouver where he earned a degree in illustration from Emily Carr University in 2015. He went on to “[pursue] a career in tattooing and visual arts,” though the COVID-19 Pandemic forced him to shelve his tattoo practice for multiple years.²

Being a multiply marginalized person continues to influence Chi’s work, which is quite clear in the content of his portfolio. Chi’s artworks evoke imagery found in Japanese woodblock prints, such as mythical creatures like the *Kitsune*, a type of fox spirit known for being a trickster that can transform into a human. Chi has a figurative style that is “flat, iconic, [and] ornamental,” reminiscent of Greco-Roman pottery.³ Chi’s gender identity and sexuality play into the content of his works as well, which often depict transformations of the body through a fantastical lens, such as in *as above, so below* (Fig. 1). Figures often have multiple arms and breasts while having the heads of animals like rabbits or foxes. The figures contort and entangle themselves in ropes tied like *shibari* – also known as Japanese rope bondage – creating a sensual scene wherein “a lot of care, tenderness, and euphoria [is] folded in with the hard edges” of the works.⁴ Often these ropes are replaced or combined with snakes or long strands of hair, which flow across the pieces.

Chi has a broad portfolio spanning over ten years. He has worked with many mediums, and in many locations, from his thesis work at Emily Carr to his various solo and collaborative exhibitions. To narrow the scope to just mural work, *Heavy Night* (Fig. 2) stands as an interesting take on what a mural can be. The work, completed in 2021, is part of the now defunct Wall-to-Wall Mural & Culture Festival located in Winnipeg, Manitoba, and resides on Treaty 1 land. It depicts a crouching figure wearing a crying *Kitsune* mask. The piece, which was originally a 19x19 inch ink drawing, is blown up by quite a lot though no exact size is present on the work’s wall text. The figure has a jar overflowing with plant life attached to their back with rope, and long braided hair that twists around their limbs. The work consists only of white and red with the figure being primarily white with red details on a red background.

Heavy Night, according to the artist statement, “is part of a loose, informal series of drawings” that “reflect on sexuality, community, and different types of grief.”⁵ The name, *Heavy Night*, is itself an apt name for the feeling of “literal heaviness of

¹Chi, “About.”

²Wall-to-Wall Mural & Culture Festival, “Makoto Chi.”

³Estorninho, “A Hard World For Little Things With Makoto Chi.”

⁴Steyels, “Power & Euphoria.”

⁵Chi, “Heavy Night.”

being alive as a trans person.”⁶ Masks are central to the series and to *Heavy Night* in particular; when a person is marginalized, they feel the pressure to wear a face that placates others even to their detriment. *Masking* itself is a practice that neurodivergent people use to change themselves “for the comfort of others” as Chi puts it.⁷

As stated at the beginning, murals are a beautiful sight to behold and can create a sense of community around them. The Vancouver Mural Festival is known for decorating the city, with projects in various neighbourhoods. The murals range from large works that take up entire buildings, to smaller pieces hidden in alleyways. Makoto Chi’s first mural, *The Harpy and the Medusa* (Fig. 3), is an example of the latter, located behind a building in Mount Pleasant. The work is “sprawling and alive” in much the same way Chi’s tattoo works are and contains a variety of colours and figures.⁸ This stands in sharp contrast to *Heavy Night* which is entirely boxed in, evoking a sense of anxiety and frustration that *The Harpy and the Medusa* does not.

However beautiful murals are, there is still an elephant in the room when it comes to public art in Canada: its role in colonization. Murals can be a tool in the gentrification of an area by *artwashing* it, a term that means “deploying artists’ work, through public art and other projects, to make development seem more humane and palatable to the communities it’s displacing” as Alison Sinkewicz puts it in her article for Canadian Art Magazine.⁹ The Vancouver Mural Festival has come under fire for their active role in artwashing the neighbourhoods it takes place in thus displacing residents of lower income who have nowhere else to go. This is quite relevant when considering the fact that Vancouver itself rests upon unceded xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh) land. The Indigenous people who have been displaced and colonized over centuries are now being gentrified out of the only neighbourhoods they can afford to live in.

Gentrification, colonization, racism, xenophobia, and a host of other oppressive tools cannot be ignored in the larger conversation around public art, not only on unceded territory, but throughout Canada as well. For example, in Manitoba where Chi’s *Heavy Night* resides, these issues are still a concern, yet there is a notable difference in that the land in Manitoba was ceded and is under treaty. Treaties have

⁶Chi, “Heavy Night.”

⁷Chi, “Heavy Night.”

⁸Chi, “Timeline Cleanse, Face Tax, Intro For New People...”

⁹Sinkewicz, “Who Has The Right To Art?”

a complicated backstory, and their existence does not negate nor belie colonization's effects and the fact the land was still stolen from Indigenous people.

Interestingly, a comparative example wherein local Indigenous artists have a chance to work on largescale public artworks also comes from the Vancouver Mural Festival. The *Blanketing The City* series (Fig. 4) is an ongoing project in collaboration with the celebrated xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) artist Debra Sparrow, whose traditional weaving art has been “deeply involved with the revival of Musqueam art and culture” over the last few decades.¹⁰ The series has five installations across Vancouver as of 2024. The pieces depict “Coast Salish textile patterns” that incorporate “contemporary design elements” as well.¹¹ This incredible series has spread out to include more local Indigenous artists, like “master weavers Chief Janice George (Sk̓wxwú7mesh) and Angela George (səlilwətał)” who have collaborated with Sparrow to create “the first permanent public art collaboration between weavers from the three local nations in memory.”¹²

Murals continue to be a wonderful yet complicated art form in Canada. While they are often breathtaking and can inspire a sense of neighbourhood pride and community, their existence on stolen and unceded territory is something that cannot be ignored and must be addressed. Initiatives to include and uplift more local Indigenous artists, like in the *Blanketing The City* series are fundamental in breaking down the effects of colonization through public art, rather than furthering it through *artwashing*. Makoto Chi is an artist whose works grapple with an intersecting racial, sexual, and gender identity. Chi's inclusion in various mural festivals helps to create a more diverse cultural narrative within Canada, which, in tandem with active efforts to stomp out gentrification and oppression, will hopefully lead to a Canada that is truly equitable, made one brushstroke at a time.

¹⁰Create Vancouver Society, “Blanketing The City.”

¹¹“Blanketing The City.”

¹²“Blanketing The City.”



Figure 1: *as above; so below*, Makoto Chi, 2024. Acrylic on panel. 24 x 36" © Makoto Chi, makoto-chi.com. Image used with the permission of the artist.



Figure 2: *Heavy Night*, Makoto Chi, 2021. Originally ink on paper. Mural, 390 York Ave, Winnipeg, MB. Photo by Daisy Wu (cropped), used with the permission of the photographer.



Figure 3: *The Harpy and the Medusa*, Makoto Chi, 2016. Mural.
North-eastern side of the alley at 333 East Broadway, Vancouver, BC.
©Makoto Chi, makoto-chi.com. Photo used with the permission of the artist.



Figure 4: *Blanketing the City IV: Cathedral Square*, Angela George, Chief Janice George, Debra Sparrow, 2021. Six 30' columns. 566 Richards St., Vancouver, BC. Photo ©2021 [Ted McGrath](#) under Creative Commons licence CC BY-NC-SA 2.0 (cropped).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CHI, MAKOTO. “*as above; so below.*” Makoto Chi, 2025,
www.makoto-chi.com/iunbl1dkh7stcgbn222mw0s80c62bqv.
- CHI, MAKOTO. “Heavy Night - Wall-to-Wall Mural & Culture Festival.” Wall-to-Wall Mural & Culture Festival, 2021.
www.walltowallwpg.com/heavynight (site discontinued; no archive).
- CHI, MAKOTO. “About,” Makoto Chi, accessed November 2024
www.makoto-chi.com/about.
- CHI, MAKOTO (ma_ko_to_). “Timeline Cleanse, Face Tax, Intro for New People...” Instagram, photos and text, 15 October, 2024.
[instagram.com/ma_ko_to_/p/DBKbzKavBcp/](https://www.instagram.com/ma_ko_to_/p/DBKbzKavBcp/)
- CHI, MAKOTO. “*The Harpy and the Medusa.*” Makoto Chi, 2025.
www.makoto-chi.com/2vi51w1ymn1hdyljsw2as6kwifv8z-n2npj.
- ESTORNINHO, JOSEPH. “A Hard World for Little Things with Makoto Chi.” Outré Gallery, 5 October, 2021, www.outregallery.com/blogs/news/makoto-chi.
- SINKEWICZ, ALISON. “Who Has The Right To Art?” *Canadian Art*, 8 July, 2020,
www.canadianart.ca/features/who-has-the-right-to-art/.
- STEYELS, MIKE. “Power & Euphoria.” *Neocha - Culture Creativity in Asia*, 8 February, 2021, www.neocha.com/magazine/power-and-euphoria/.
- CREATE VANCOUVER SOCIETY. “Blanketing The City.” Vancouver Mural Festival (VMF), accessed November 2024,
vanmuralfest.ca/portfolio/blanketing-the-city.
- WALL-TO-WALL MURAL & CULTURE FESTIVAL. “Makoto Chi - Wall-to-Wall Mural & Culture Festival.” Wall-to-Wall Mural & Culture Festival, 2021. Site discontinued. At <https://web.archive.org/web/20220706011219/www.walltowallwpg.com/makotochi>.
-
-

A NEW DEAL OR NO DEAL?

SYLVIA LEUNG

The New Deal, introduced during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's presidency to address the Great Depression, implemented policies that transformed American agriculture but perpetuated systemic racial discrimination, particularly against African Americans. Programs like the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) of 1933 sought to stabilize farm prices and provide relief but disproportionately benefited white landowners while displacing Black sharecroppers and tenant farmers. These policies entrenched structural inequalities by denying Black farmers access to subsidies, credit, and legal protections, while local control by white elites deepened their marginalization. Excluded from government relief, Black farmers were forced into cycles of economic dependence that mirrored the oppression of slavery and sharecropping. By prioritizing alliances with Southern Democrats over civil rights, the Roosevelt administration undermined the principles of equality and justice. This essay examines how the New Deal's agrarian policies reinforced racial hierarchies and widened economic disparities between Black and white farmers in the Jim Crow South.

The New Deal enacted by Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) represented a key moment in the history of American progressive reforms. Given the severity of the Great Depression, the need for relief and reform programs could not have been more urgent, but some of the New Deal measures discriminated against African Americans.¹ Particularly grim was the agricultural program that effectively displaced Black sharecroppers and tenant farmers while benefiting white farm owners and tenant operators.² The New Deal farm policy laid bare the racial discrimination against Black farmers and perpetuated the 'unfree' labour that had been an enduring feature of the rural American South. This essay explores racist

¹Collins and Goldberg, *When Government Helped*, 294.

²Poole, *The Segregated Origins of Social Security*, 20.

aspects of the agrarian New Deal design as well as the different and disproportionate impacts it had on the Black and white American farmers.

The 1920s are remembered as a time of economic prosperity, but the agricultural sector suffered from falling farm prices and when the stock market crashed in 1929, sending prices in an even more downward cycle, many farmers were left in dire straits. The first major New Deal initiative attempted to raise prices to help farmers by creating artificial scarcity. Although farmers were paid to curtail production, they received only a small portion of the government compensation, and many were ultimately evicted.³ Since Blacks were overrepresented in the sharecropper and tenant farmer mix,⁴ the challenges facing farmers were effectively challenges for Black sharecroppers and tenants. The Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) of 1933 knocked out the sharecropper class and forced many Black tenants off the land.⁵ Unpacking details of the AAA policies reveals a racial bias against African Americans that is not uncommon in U.S. history. From slaves to sharecroppers to landowners, Blacks were stripped of the economic and political advantages enjoyed by whites. Due to structural racism and the lasting effects of a hundred years of slavery, they were forced into a form of medieval peasantry on white-owned land. While government policies often impoverished poor farmers, Black farmers bore the brunt of their consequences. In reality, Black Americans were the most politically vulnerable and disadvantaged major social group during the Depression, as they were denied the right to vote and lacked representation.⁶

Agriculture, and the slave labour that supported it, had been the backbone of the Southern economy throughout the New Deal era. With its abolition, it was necessary for Southern landowners to find new ways to perpetuate Black slavery. The sharecropping system was created, with former slaves farming the same land they once laboured on, giving a share of their crops to plantation owners in exchange for lodging and basic goods. Freedmen were unable to pay off their debts, causing them to fall deeper into debt and remain in long-term servitude—a practice that persisted despite repeated Supreme Court rulings declaring it unconstitutional.⁷ Not all was peonage, but most unfree labour under the auspices of legislation, such as vagrancy laws, came from sharecropping. Although both white and Black sharecroppers incurred debt, the system disproportionately disadvantaged African Americans who were “unable to challenge the bookkeeping”—if it existed at all—“without [risking] further economic, social or even penal sanctions.”⁸

³Poole, 20.

⁴Pahnke and Treacle, “From Creating to Confronting Racial Hierarchies,” 694.

⁵Depew et al. “New Deal or No Deal in the Cotton South,” 486.

⁶Perea, “The Echoes of Slavery,” 100.

⁷Pete Daniel, *The Shadow of Slavery: Peonage in the South, 1901 – 1969* (University of Illinois Press, 1990), referenced in Perea, 101.

⁸Pizzolatto, “Harvests of Shame,” 474.

The political economy of the South was based on the utter economic dependence of Black labour; any initiatives that would give Blacks income sources independent of the white planter elite and undermine the Southern racial hierarchy had to be banned. During the New Deal era, Congress was dominated by Southern Democrats who were deeply racist.⁹ Because they held the balance of power, FDR did not want to endanger the coalition necessary to enact his legislative agenda by fighting them on the race issue. Roosevelt's failure to support an anti-lynching bill highlighted the FDR administration's bowing to discrimination, which was further reflected in the exclusion of Black Americans from New Deal programs—an entrenched political norm of the era.¹⁰ The discriminatory nature of the AAA was evident in its administration. At the federal level, the FDR administration capitulated to Southern racists upon whom it was politically dependent. At the local level, county committees, which were composed of white landlords and associates as well as white tenants, ensured that white farm owners received almost all the benefits of this program.¹¹

In many ways, the New Deal offered little promise and did great harm to Black farmers. The immediate impact of the Cotton Acreage Reduction program of AAA was displacement for agricultural workers in the Cotton South despite claims by AAA administrators that there was little change in their numbers.¹² The situation was made worse by the extraordinary unemployment of the period, which weakened the competition for labour among landowners. Also, the Cotton South provided little legal protection for those on the lower rungs of the agricultural labour structure and for Black workers in general.¹³ If Blacks had less legal protection than whites, landowners were more likely to breach contracts that dealt with Black tenants rather than white tenants, all else equal. Black tenants were further down the hierarchical ladder than white tenants; landowners were thus able to exclude them from the AAA farm program by defining them as non-tenants, similarly to sharecroppers.¹⁴ Given limited government resources, whites would have been less inclined to support Black relief access if they were hit harder by the downturn.

There were also cases where landlords did not distribute the share of government benefit payments that belonged to their tenants or sharecroppers.¹⁵ Planters were

⁹Robert C. Lieberman, *Shifting the Color Line: Race and the American Welfare State* (1998), referenced in Perea, 102.

¹⁰Perea, 103.

¹¹Perea, 109.

¹²Depew et al., 477.

¹³Depew et al., 467.

¹⁴Depew et al., 475.

¹⁵Cohen and Horton, *Black Farmers in America*, 16.

wary, as allowing access to relief might make Black field labourers less willing to work during the harvest, or even ride out strikes.¹⁶ More often than not, white landlords either kept the money for themselves or shared only a very small portion with their Black tenants.¹⁷ Reporting to the government was useless, as any official complaints would inevitably be redirected to the landlord.¹⁸ Failing federal oversight, Black tenants were often left with nothing, as they could not “secure relief without white sponsorship”—sponsorship that could only come from the landlord.¹⁹ Without it, there was little hope of relief.

The New Deal also marked a significant increase of government services, for which distribution was controlled by politically connected groups in rural communities. This system denied many Black people access to essential services in much of the rural South.²⁰ From the perspective of Southern decision makers, centralized federal administration of New Deal programs would threaten to disrupt the racist status quo of the subordination of Blacks to whites.²¹ Yet, the devolution of power did little to improve the plight of Black farmers. As a function of the 1934 Soil and Conservation Act, local officials were deemed more appropriate decision-makers than federal government bureaucrats when handling agricultural financing issues. While theoretically this protected principles of democracy, in practical terms it empowered local interests to overrule federal policy, especially as the power rested in the white elite’s hands.²² Throughout the South, not a single Black farmer served on a county committee and when disputes arose, they were adjudicated before an elected local county committee composed of white landlords, white associates, and white tenants—individuals still governed by 19th-century racist ideologies and discriminatory thinking about Blacks. When the Farm Security Administration (FSA) tried to buy land for an African-American project in Mississippi County, Missouri, the county’s prosecuting attorney opposed it because he viewed Blacks as depraved and prone to criminality and other undesirable and immoral behaviours that were not characteristic of poor whites.²³

Another consequence of AAA was that it raised entry barriers to farm ownership. Although farmland prices were depressed during the 1930s, ownership was often not feasible for many Blacks who had diminished access to AAA programs.²⁴

¹⁶Fox, *Three Worlds of Relief*, 195 – 6.

¹⁷Marc Linder, *Farm Workers and the Fair Labor Standards Act: Racial Discrimination in the New Deal*, 65 TEX. L. REV. 1335, 1336 & n.12 (1987), referenced in Perea, 108.

¹⁸Fox, 196.

¹⁹Fox, 195.

²⁰Cohen and Horton, 16.

²¹Lieberman, referenced in Perea, 102.

²²Pahnke and Treackle, 292.

²³Adams and Gorton, “This Land Ain’t My Land,” 339.

²⁴Cohen and Horton, 16.

Despite the extraordinary efforts made by Black farmers from 1870-1920, only 25 percent had access to a certain degree of farm ownership; most remained locked in tenancy.²⁵ The racially-induced programs of AAA excluded Black farmers, in large part because of the white-led powerful elites who ran the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) offices and county committees.²⁶ The FSA was created to assist people who had endured racist discrimination in acquiring property.²⁷ However, it ultimately marginalized Black farmers while benefiting white tenant farmers due to New Deal policies and local enforcement practices that denied Black ownership options. Black farmers had substantially fewer sources of credit, more expensive credit when available, and an absence of legal redress in terms of contracts compared to white farmers, who had the advantage to circumvent courts in dealing with allotments and money during a time when half of the African American population farmed, but only 2% owned land.²⁸

Between 1930 and 1935, white farm owners and white tenants in the South gained over 35 million acres of farmland and 145,763 tenants, while non-white farmers lost more than 2.2 million acres and 45,409 tenants—reflecting a disparity likely driven by unequal access to subsidies as well.²⁹ The increased entry by whites into farming meant that for those who had added to their land holdings during the Depression, the benefits were gained once acreage restrictions were eased or lifted. Future inducements to expand farming acreage would especially jeopardize much of the land owned by Black farmers that was adjacent to or near white farms. The AAA programs and ongoing policies supporting agricultural price raised barriers to land ownership for Black farmers, limiting their opportunities to stay in farming or operate as independent farmers.

Beyond farm policy, other institutional factors have also contributed to the denial of land ownership by Black farmers. The attempt to suppress Black land and property ownership extended well beyond political measures, as evidenced by the Greenwood riot and the Rosewood massacre of the 1920s. In each case, the allegation that a Black man had raped a white woman served as a pretext for racially motivated violence—murder and arson were used to dispossess affluent Black residents and devastate the once-thriving all-Black community. The story of Greenwood or Rosewood attested conclusively that most whites believed that “African Americans were meant to be tillers of the land – but never owners of their own land.”³⁰ Regrettably, this mentality carried over into the 1930s and was

²⁵Hinson, 918.

²⁶Perea, 108 – 9.

²⁷Pahnke and Treagle, 694.

²⁸Hinson and Robinson, “‘We Didn’t Get Nothing:’ The Plight of Black Farmers,” 291.

²⁹Cohen and Horton, 17.

³⁰Hinson and Robinson, 288 – 289.

reflected in how the federal government dealt with Black farmers.³¹ The twentieth century proved to be even more perilous for Black landowners. With land ownership came freedom and opportunity, but with Jim Crow laws came oppression and subjugation. Although farming declined for both Black and white farmers, the downturn was significantly more severe for Black farmers and it continues to this day.³²

Many scholars have argued that the New Deal discriminated against poor Black farmers and deepened the racial divide in the Jim Crow South. They also contend that the FDR administration retreated from supporting equal rights to avoid antagonizing white Southerners, who deliberately excluded African Americans from New Deal programs on racial grounds. Expanding on these scholarly arguments, this essay examines how agricultural policies under the New Deal disproportionately disadvantaged Black Americans, who made up the majority of sharecroppers and tenant farmers in the South. In sum, the AAA programs to take land out of production displaced sharecroppers and tenants, to devolve power to county government reduced the access to services for Blacks, and to raise entry barriers to farm ownership removed the last hope for Blacks to be 'free'. As historian W.E.B. DuBois described Reconstruction, "The slave went free; stood a brief moment in the sun; then moved back again toward slavery." Ironically, the New Deal, a remnant of Reconstruction-era racism, continued to inflict harm on Blacks against the country's advocated principles of freedom, liberty and progress.

³¹Hinson and Robinson, 289.

³²Hinson and Robinson, 288 – 290.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, JANE, and D. GORTON. "This Land Ain't My Land: The Eviction of Sharecroppers by the Farm Security Administration." *Agricultural History* 83, no. 3 (2009): 323 – 351. [DOI:10.3098/ah.2009.83.3.323](https://doi.org/10.3098/ah.2009.83.3.323).
- COHEN, RICHARD L., and CLIFFORD HORTON. *Black Farmers in America. Agriculture Issues and Policies*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2012.
- COLLINS, SHEILA D. and GERTRUDE SCHAFFNER GOLDBERG. *When Government Helped: Learning From the Successes and Failures of the New Deal*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- DEPEW, BRIGGS, PRICE V. FISHBACK, and PAUL W. RHODE. "New Deal or No Deal in the Cotton South: The Effect of the AAA on the Agricultural Labor Structure." *Explorations in Economic History* 50, no. 4 (2013): 466 – 486. [DOI:10.1016/j.eeh.2013.06.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2013.06.004).
- FOX, CYBELLE. *Three Worlds of Relief: Race, Immigration, and the American Welfare State From the Progressive Era to the New Deal*. Princeton Studies in American Politics: Historical, International, and Comparative Perspectives. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- HINSON, WAYMON R. "Land Gains, Land Losses: The Odyssey of African Americans Since Reconstruction." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 77, no. 3/4 (2018): 893 – 939. [DOI:10.1111/ajes.12233](https://doi.org/10.1111/ajes.12233).
- HINSON, WAYMON R., and EDWARD ROBINSON. "'We Didn't Get Nothing:' The Plight of Black Farmers." *Journal of African American Studies* 12, no. 3 (2008): 283 – 302. [DOI:10.1007/s12111-008-9046-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-008-9046-5).
- PAHNKE, ANTHONY, and JORDAN TREACLE. "From Creating to Confronting Racial Hierarchies: The Evolving Role of the US State in Land Policy." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 23, no. 4 (2023): 687 – 705. [DOI: 10.1111/joac.12559](https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12559).
- PEREA, JUAN F. "The Echoes of Slavery: Recognizing the Racist Origins of the Agricultural and Domestic Worker Exclusion from the National Labor Relations Act." *Ohio State Law Journal* 72, no. 1 (2011): 95 – 138. [DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1646496](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1646496).
- PIZZOLATO, NICOLA. "Harvests of Shame: Enduring Unfree Labour in the Twentieth-Century United States, 1933-1964." *Labor History* 59, no. 4 (2018): 472 – 490. [DOI:10.1080/0023656X.2018.1467259](https://doi.org/10.1080/0023656X.2018.1467259).
- POOLE, MARY. *The Segregated Origins of Social Security: African Americans and the Welfare State*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
-
-

THE JEWISH GOD: THE CHALLENGES MONOTHEISM REPRESENTED TO THE ROMAN EMPIRE BEFORE CONSTANTINE I

GABRIEL MAMEDE

This paper explores the intricate dynamics of monotheism within ancient Judea, specifically examining its impact and the challenges it posed to Roman imperial governance before Constantine I. Despite the extensive military and cultural prowess of the Roman Empire, its encounter with Judaism—a religion with deep-rooted monotheistic beliefs—presented unique administrative challenges. This study explores the significant ideological conflicts between the Roman Empire and Jewish monotheism, particularly after Pompey’s conquest in 63 BCE. Questions such as how did Roman policies adapt to the religious steadfastness of the Jews? What were the implications of monotheism for the Roman practice of religious assimilation? And how did the Jewish-Roman War influence Roman legislative and tax measures directed towards Judea? This investigation utilizes historical accounts and Roman legislative records to offer insights into these questions, illustrating the complex interplay between religious identity and imperial politics in shaping the policies of the Roman Empire towards its provinces.

The expansion of the Roman Empire through the Mediterranean not only showcased its military prowess and statecraft but also brought it face-to-face with other cultures and religious practices. One of the most significant challenges came from ancient Palestine, where the deeply rooted monotheistic beliefs of Judaism stood in sharp contrast to Rome’s polytheistic traditions. This paper explores how Judaism’s unyielding adherence to monotheism fundamentally challenged Roman imperial strategies, reshaping both the administration and cultural dynamics of Roman hegemony. By examining specific instances of interaction, such as the policies of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the Roman response to the Maccabean Revolt, this study highlights the broader implications of these confrontations on shaping Roman approaches to governance and religious integration within their diverse empire.

Judaism, since the Babylonian Captivity in the 6th century BCE, has centered around its monotheistic principle, encapsulated in the declaration, “God is one” (אֱלֹהִים יְחִיד).¹ This belief in a single and indivisible deity set Judaism apart in the ancient Near East and Mediterranean context, dominated by polytheistic traditions – a distinction that persisted until the consolidation of Christianity in the 2nd century CE. Although Judaism certainly did not have a monotheistic origin, Jewish self-determination benefited from its symbolic system of uniqueness and exclusivity.² This unique religious identity was put to the test as Judea came under the sway of successive Hellenistic empires, each leaving its mark on the region’s cultural and religious landscape.

Prior to Roman annexation, Judea was part of the Hellenistic sphere of influence in the Seleucid Empire (Βασιλεία τῶν Σελευκιδῶν). Under both the Seleucid and Ptolemaic rule, the Jews enjoyed significant autonomy over their internal affairs, including religion, law, and customs.³ In return, the Jews grew to adapt and embrace Hellenism in their way of life, while still preserving their traditional forms of worship. The Jews that had learned to read and write Greek are called Hellenized Jews and were the reflection of the extensive cultural exchange between Greeks and Jews.⁴ However, this period of relative freedom was disrupted when Antiochus IV Epiphanes ascended to the Seleucid throne in 175 BCE. His rule, which lasted until 164 BCE, sought to assert greater control in Jewish affairs, notably by the appointment of the High Priesthood of the Temple of Jerusalem in favour of Jason – a Hellenized Jewish leader who offered Antiochus a Greek vision of Judea.⁵

Jason’s priesthood lasted for around three years, and included the construction of a gymnasium adjacent to the Temple, which was considered unacceptable by the Jews. This imposition of Hellenistic culture culminated in a series of decrees against Jewish religious practices, sparking the Maccabean Revolt in 167 BCE, which granted the Jewish people a period of independence from 140 BCE to 63 BCE, under the Hasmonean dynasty (ממלכת החשמונאים). Yet, the independence and distinct identity cultivated during the Hasmonean dynasty would soon face new pressures under Roman rule, further complicating Judea’s religious and cultural fabric.

In contrast, Rome was a thriving environment for worship and ethnic cults. The movement of people and cultural exchanges facilitated the spread of religion throughout the empire. A key component of Roman conquest and expansion was the integration of new religious traditions. Traditionally, prior to battle, a senior

¹Deut. 6:4 (New Revised Standard Version).

²Jaffe, “One God, One Revelation, One People,” 755.

³Bove-Fischer, “Social Unrest and Ethnic Coexistence,” 3.

⁴Gruen, “Hellenistic Judaism,” 23.

⁵Gruen, “Hellenism and Persecution,” 335 – 358.

Roman commander would perform an *evocatio* to the protective deity of the enemy. This practice involved calling upon the enemy's deity, promising better worship and a place within the Roman pantheon. This practice, which involved assimilating the gods of conquered peoples, highlighted the pragmatic nature of Roman religious orthopraxy – prioritizing the correct practice over doctrinal correctness.⁶ However, the monotheistic rigidity of Judaism directly clashed with this approach, as the Jewish population maintained an exclusive devotion to their singular deity, rejecting the polytheistic integration essential to Roman rule. This tension became particularly evident during the campaign of 70 CE, which resulted in the destruction of the Second Temple of Jerusalem,⁷ marked by brutal warfare and no intentions to appease the local religion. While the Jewish resistance highlights a clear conflict of religious ideologies, other instances, such as the Bacchanalia affair, underscore the Roman approach to control and assimilate religious practices that deviated from Roman norms.

The Bacchanalia scandal serves as an important case study in understating Roman responses to religious practices that escaped its orthopraxy principle. Originally a cult devoted to Dionysius in Greece, the Bacchanalia stands out as one of the most well-documented instances of religious censorship by the Roman Senate before Christianity. Historians like Livy note that the cult, which operated in secret, remained unknown to Roman authorities until 186 BCE.⁸ The Bacchants were accused of “moral and even sexual debaucheries,”⁹ as the reason for Senatorial concern. However, a more critical analysis of the Bacchanalia affair and its context, suggests that the underlying issues were more of political nature than moral.¹⁰ Roman religion was inclusive, allowing the addition of new deities and cults within its territory, however, new practices were subjected to the supervision of the state to ensure they did not disrupt the established order. The Senate perceived the Bacchanalia, with its strong Hellenistic influences, to be spreading unconventional worship practices to lower class groups such as women and the working class, which the Senate feared to be corruptible,¹¹ thus a threat to social stability. This perception led to decisive Senatorial intervention through a decree in 186 BCE (*senatus consultum de bacchanalibus*) to curb what was seen as a corruptible influence in Rome. Similar to the Bacchanalia, the Jewish commitment to monotheism often put them at odds with Roman authorities, leading to significant confrontations and policy shifts that would resonate well beyond the confines of Judea.

⁶King, “The Organization of Roman Religious Beliefs,” 297.

⁷Josephus, *The Jewish War* 6.230.

⁸North, “Religious Toleration in Republican Rome,” 87.

⁹Takács, “Politics and Religion in the Bacchanalian Affair of 186 BCE,” 310.

¹⁰Takács, 310.

¹¹Takács, 310.

The Jewish faith was seen by the Romans as possessing a basis for revolt.¹² The *Tanakh*, part of the Jewish literature, is replete with stories that underscore the fundamental resistance to foreign domination to the religious community. This aspect of Judaism is vividly portrayed in the story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the Book of Daniel, where these three individuals supposedly refused to worship the golden statue erected by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. Their refusal was not only a personal choice but a statement of commitment to their god and illustrates how Judaism was inherently opposed to polytheism and political demands of foreign conquerors.¹³ The story also reinforces the idea of personal commitment between God and the Jews, as a protector of their people. These theological narratives provided a framework in which resistance against Rome could be celebrated and instigated by Jewish leaders. Josephus mentions an incident that took place around the year 39 AD, in which Emperor Caligula demanded the installation of his statue in the Temple of Jerusalem. Gaius Petronius, Governor of Syria, was to implement the emperor's wishes, but found great resistance from the Jewish people. Josephus describes Petronius's reaction to the demands of the Jews: "He demonstrated too the unreasonableness of their demands; for when all the subject races had set up the images of Caesar in their cities among the other gods, for Jews alone to object was tantamount to rebellion and deliberate disloyalty."¹⁴

Roman leaders such as Petronius, understood the importance of religion to Roman diplomacy with its provinces. Josephus conveys these leaders' frustration in dealing with the Jews. In the following passage, Josephus writes:

When he had secured silence Petronius asked: 'Will you then go to war with Caesar?' The Jews replied that for Caesar and the people of Rome they sacrificed twice a day. But if he wished to set up the images in their midst, he must first sacrifice the whole Jewish race: they were ready to offer themselves as victims with their wives and children. This reply filled Petronius with wonder and pity for the unparalleled religious fervour for these brave men and the courage that made them so ready to die.¹⁵

Following the catastrophic Fall of Jerusalem and the subsequent destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, the Roman Empire implemented significant changes in its approach to the Jewish population. Among these alterations was the introduction of the *fiscus judaicus*, a tax levied specifically on Jews throughout the empire. This tax, which was initially imposed by Emperor Vespasian, was intended to fund the Capitoline temple in Rome, symbolically subjugating the Jewish religion under the auspices of Roman Paganism. This fiscal measure not only served as a financial

¹²Beard et al., *Religions of Rome*, 348.

¹³Dan. 3:16 – 18 (New Revised Standard Version).

¹⁴2.193 – 194.

¹⁵2.196 – 197.

burden but also marked a distinctive shift in Roman policy—from a relatively tolerant coexistence to a more oppressive and controlling stance aimed at undermining Jewish identity and practices.¹⁶ This period highlights a critical moment in Jewish-Roman relations, illustrating the complex interplay of religion, politics, and power within the framework of imperial governance.

The challenges Judaism posed to Roman administrative policies highlight the difficulties of managing a diverse empire. Unlike other religious groups that could be integrated into the Roman religious framework, Judaism's strict monotheism and structure were inherently resistant to such assimilation. Jewish monotheism's steadfast resistance to the Roman practices of religious and cultural assimilation not only underscores the distinctiveness of Jewish religious identity but also prefigures the rise of Christianity. As Christianity began to spread, it similarly challenged Roman tolerance, precipitating important religious and political shifts across the empire. The interactions between Rome and Jewish Palestine are essential for understanding how religious diversity influenced imperial policy and the profound role of religious convictions in shaping historical trajectories.

¹⁶Goodman, “Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity,” 41.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BEARD, MARY, JOHN NORTH, AND SIMON PRICE. *Religions of Rome*. Vol. 1, *A History*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- BOVE-FISCHER, C. "Social Unrest and Ethnic Coexistence in Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Empire." *Past & Present* 229, no. 1 (2015): 3 – 45.
[DOI:10.1093/pastj/gtv036](https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtv036).
- GOODMAN, MARTIN. "Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 40 – 44. [DOI:10.2307/301179](https://doi.org/10.2307/301179).
- GRUEN, ERICH S. *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History*. De Gruyter, 2016.
- HALL, JOHN F. "The Roman Province of Judea: A Historical Overview." *Brigham Young University Studies* 36, no. 3 (1996 – 97): 319 – 336.
www.jstor.org/stable/43044136.
- JAFFE, MARTIN S. "One God, One Revelation, One People: On the Symbolic Structure of Elective Monotheism." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 69, no. 4 (2001): 753 – 776. [DOI: 10.1093/jaarel/69.4.753](https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/69.4.753).
- JOSEPHUS. *The Jewish War*. rev. ed. Translated by G. A. Williamson. Introduction, notes, and appendixes by E. Mary Smallwood. Penguin Books, 1981.
- KING, CHARLES. "The Organization of Roman Religious Beliefs." *Classical Antiquity* 22, no. 2 (2003): 275 – 312. [DOI:10.1525/ca.2003.22.2.275](https://doi.org/10.1525/ca.2003.22.2.275).
- NORTH, J. A. "Religious Toleration in Republican Rome." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 25 (1979): 85 – 103.
[DOI:10.1017/S0068673500004144](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500004144).
- TAKÁCS, SAROLTA A. "Politics and Religion in the Bacchanalian Affair of 186 BCE," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100 (2000): 301 – 310.
[DOI:10.2307/3185221](https://doi.org/10.2307/3185221).
-
-

FIGHTING AMONG FRIENDS: THE LEFT'S INTERNAL STRUGGLES IN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

DYLAN ORDANO

This paper examines the internal ideological struggles among leftist factions within the Spanish Republican side during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), arguing that these divisions were the most significant factor in the Republicans' defeat. Main points include the contrasting goals of anarchists, communists, and socialists, which led to mutual distrust, violent clashes, and ineffective military coordination. These rifts undermined the Republicans' ability to unify their resources, mobilize public support, and present a cohesive political vision while also exacerbating tensions with foreign allies. In contrast, the Nationalists, with a more unified ideology, were able to maintain strategic coherence and military effectiveness, contributing to their victory. These distinctions led to long-term consequences, which have left a lasting legacy on Spanish politics and society to this day.

The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) stands as one of the most pivotal conflicts in modern European history, representing a fierce struggle between the forces of the Spanish Republic and the Nationalists, led by General Francisco Franco. While numerous factors contributed to the Republicans' defeat, such as poor military strategy, foreign intervention, and economic hardships, the internal discord among the diverse ideological factions within the Republican camp—anarchists, communists, socialists, and other leftist groups—was the most critical component to their downfall. This lack of unity fragmented their military efforts, undermined public support, and sapped morale, ultimately leading to their defeat.

The Republican faction emerged as a coalition of various leftist groups, each with distinct ideological beliefs and goals. The Spanish Republic was established in 1931 following a progressive revolution aimed at implementing democratic reforms, land redistribution, and social justice. However, as the conflict escalated into civil war, the previously united front began to fracture. The primary factions within the Republican side held fundamentally different visions for Spain's future. The anarchists, led by the *Confederación Nacional del Trabajo* (CNT), sought to abolish the state entirely and create a society based on voluntary cooperation and

direct democracy. In contrast, the communists, aligned with the Soviet Union, aimed to establish a centralized socialist state under the control of a single party. Meanwhile, the socialists occupied a more moderate position, advocating for gradual reform rather than revolutionary change.¹ This ideological diversity resulted in profound distrust among the factions, which severely impacted their ability to amalgamate into a unified force.² The anarchists viewed the communists as authoritarian and repressive, fearing that a centralized government would lead to the very tyranny they sought to dismantle. Conversely, the communists considered the anarchists to be reckless and counter-revolutionary, undermining the Republic's efforts to build a cohesive socialist state. This mutual suspicion manifested in violent confrontations, notably during the May Days of 1937 in Barcelona,³ where clashes between anarchist and communist factions resulted in significant casualties and further deepened the divide. Such episodes of infighting not only diverted attention from the external threat posed by Franco's forces, but also illustrated how the lack of unity eroded the Republican cause.

One of the most critical consequences of this infighting was the inability to coordinate military strategies effectively. The Republicans fielded militias composed of volunteers eager to fight against fascism; but these militias operated independently, each adhering to its own leadership and tactics. For example, the CNT's anarchist militias emphasized guerrilla warfare and spontaneous actions, while the communists favored more conventional military strategies and strict discipline.⁴ This lack of a centralized command structure hindered their ability to respond swiftly and cohesively to Nationalist offensives. For instance, during the Battle of Teruel in late 1937 and early 1938, the anarchists, who prioritized local autonomy, resisted orders from higher command, creating confusion that the Nationalists exploited. The Republicans had initially captured the city but were unable to hold it due to conflicting orders from different factions and a failure to consolidate their military resources. As a result, Republican forces were disorganized and lacked unified command, failing to capitalize on their initial successes and ultimately losing this crucial battle. This disarray can be traced back to the factional struggles that undermined effective military planning and execution.

Moreover, the ideological rifts significantly affected the Republicans' capacity to mobilize resources.⁵ The Soviet Union provided crucial support to the Republican cause, supplying weapons, military advisors, and aircraft.⁶ However, this aid came

¹Koestler, *Spanish Testament*, 48 – 49.

²Firsov et al. "The Spanish Civil War," 68.

³Orwell, *Homage to Catalonia* 11.2.

⁴Zimmer, "The Other Volunteers," 32 – 33.

⁵Zimmer, 35 – 36.

⁶Duiker, *Contemporary World History*, 138.

with stipulations, as the Soviets sought to strengthen the communist party's influence within the Republican ranks by embedding Soviet officers among the Communist factions' leadership. This imposition exacerbated tensions, particularly with the anarchists, who rejected any form of external control. The anarchists' resistance to military centralization and the communists' efforts to dominate the Republican coalition resulted in a fragmented supply chain that hampered the Republicans' military efforts. The differing approaches to military organization created further complications. The anarchists favored a decentralized approach where local militias operated independently, which often resulted in inefficient use of resources.⁷ In contrast, the communists pushed for centralized command, advocating for a professional army that adhered to strict military discipline. This clash of military philosophies not only strained relations between factions but also prevented the Republicans from adapting quickly to the evolving battlefield conditions. Conversely, the Nationalists were able to coordinate military actions among themselves and with the assisting Italian and German forces, who shared the same political and military ideology.

Public support for the Republican cause also suffered due to the ongoing infighting. As the war dragged on, the visible discord among the factions became apparent to the Spanish populace and international observers. Many Spaniards, initially motivated by a desire to defend the Republic, grew disillusioned with the continuous bickering and violence among leftist groups. The perception of chaos and instability played into the hands of Franco's Nationalists, who framed the conflict as a struggle for order and stability. This shift in public sentiment significantly undermined the Republicans' ability to recruit new fighters and maintain morale among existing troops. Additionally, the failure to effectively communicate and unify their message hampered the Republicans' ability to gain broader support. The fragmented factions struggled to present a coherent vision for Spain's future, beyond the unanimous goal of eliminating fascism, leading to confusion among potential supporters. While the Nationalists portrayed themselves as the defenders of traditional Spanish values, the Republicans failed to articulate a clear, unified narrative that resonated with the populace. The internal conflicts led to mixed messages about the Republican cause, further alienating those who might have been sympathetic to their fight against fascism.

The infighting also had implications for international assistance. While some countries like Mexico and the Soviet Union supported the Republicans,⁸ fragmentation made it challenging to present a united front to potential allies. The ideological divisions deterred foreign governments from providing substantial military aid, as they were uncertain about whom to support. The reluctance of Western democracies to intervene, driven by fears of communism and aggravating

⁷Zimmer, 33 – 34.

⁸McCannon, "Soviet Intervention in the Spanish Civil War," 156.

the Axis powers, was exacerbated by the inability of the Republicans to consolidate their position. In contrast, the Nationalists enjoyed a more cohesive alliance, with Franco's regime receiving direct support from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, who were eager to test their military technology and support a fascist ally in Europe.⁹ The inability to achieve a coherent ideological consensus ultimately culminated in the Republicans' failure to establish a strong military and political front against the Nationalists. The Nationalists, on the other hand, presented a more unified front under Franco's leadership, allowing them to coordinate their military efforts effectively. The ideological consistency of the Nationalist camp, composed mainly of conservative, monarchist, and fascist elements, enabled them to implement a centralized command structure and maintain a clear strategic vision throughout the war.¹⁰ Furthermore, the aftermath of the Civil War illustrated the long-term consequences of the Republicans' internal discord. The defeat led to a prolonged period of repression under Franco's regime, which systematically dismantled the achievements of the Republic. The lack of unity among leftist factions not only hindered their chances in the civil war, but also ensured that the ideological divisions would persist in Spanish society long after the conflict ended. The inability to reconcile these differences left a legacy of division that has continued to shape Spanish politics and cultural identity to this day.

While various factors contributed to the defeat of the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War, the internal fighting among the different ideological factions was the most significant reason for their downfall. The lack of cohesion undermined military effectiveness, depleted resources, and diminished public support, ultimately leading to a failure to counter the Nationalist threat. The lessons learned from this tragic conflict emphasize the importance of unity in the face of an adversary, and the dangers of allowing ideological differences to fracture a common cause. The legacy of the Spanish Civil War serves as a poignant reminder of how infighting can not only sabotage a movement but also leave lasting scars on a nation for generations to come. The ideological rifts among the Republicans not only doomed their efforts during the war, but also ensured that the struggle for a unified Spain would continue long after the guns fell silent.

⁹Alpert, "The Clash of Spanish Armies," 331.

¹⁰Alpert, 351.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALPERT, MICHAEL. "The Clash of Spanish Armies: Contrasting Ways of War in Spain, 1936 – 1939." *War in History* 6, no. 3 (1999): 331 – 51.
[DOI:10.1177/096834459900600304](https://doi.org/10.1177/096834459900600304).
- DUIKER, WILLIAM J. *Contemporary World History*. 7th ed. Cengage, 2021.
- FIRSOV, FRIDRIKH I., HARVEY KLEHR, and JOHN EARL HAYNES, "The Spanish Civil War." Chap. 4 in *Secret Cables of the Comintern, 1933 – 1943*. Translated by Lynn Visson. Yale University Press, 2014.
[DOI:10.12987/yale/9780300198225.003.0005](https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300198225.003.0005).
- KOESTLER, ARTHUR. *Spanish Testament*. Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1937.
- MCCANNON, JOHN. "Soviet Intervention in the Spanish Civil War, 1936 – 39: A Reexamination." *Russian History* 22, no. 2 (1995): 154 – 80.
[DOI:10.1163/187633195X00070](https://doi.org/10.1163/187633195X00070).
- ORWELL, GEORGE. *Homage to Catalonia*. Oxford University Press, 2021. Edited by Lisa Mullen. Originally published in 1938 by Secker & Warburg.
- ZIMMER, KENYON. "The Other Volunteers: American Anarchists and the Spanish Civil War, 1936 – 1939." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 10, no. 2 (2016): 19 – 51. [DOI: 10.14321/jstudradi.10.2.0019](https://doi.org/10.14321/jstudradi.10.2.0019).
-
-

THE UN-AMERICANIZATION OF HOMOSEXUALS

MIRANDA RUTTY

This paper explores how American Cold War policies helped facilitate the weaponization of modern homophobia against the American people in what has come to be called The Lavender Scare. It examines how the government targeted Homosexuals¹ through policies such as The Federal Loyalty Program under Truman, Senator Clyde Hoey's subcommittee report, and Executive Order 10450 under Eisenhower, systematically making traitors and deviants out of American nationals on the basis of their perceived sexuality. Industry restrictions such as the Hays code which prevented positive portrayal of Queer people in film worked in tandem with these policies, ensuring that likening Homosexuals to the villains in the movies and the communist enemy abroad became a staple of American society. This paper argues how the Lavender Scare framework which affected Queer Americans during The Cold War hasn't necessarily ended, but rather led to the continued un-Americanization of Queer people, resulting in contemporary workplace discrimination, poor representation, legislation against Trans people and an ongoing erosion of LGBT rights in America today.

The Cold War had Americans terrified of communism. There was widespread fear, suspicion and outright paranoia domestically in what we would come to call the Second Red Scare.² It did not help that Senator Joseph McCarthy used concepts like "un-American" to other those who did not fit the image of the American ideal

¹The decision to capitalize identity terms in this paper was an intentional choice by the author. It is essential to recognize the wishes of communities that have been historically and are presently persecuted for their identities, and allow them to self-determine how they wish to be addressed. Identities in this paper such as Homosexual, Queer, Transgender have all been treated as proper nouns, as a way to show respect and honor the cultural and political significance of these terms. This is in alignment with other groups who have similar protocols regarding the capitalization of identity terms, such as Black, Deaf or Indigenous. Although the 2slgbtqia+ community is not a monolith, and individual opinions may differ, this decision reflects a growing number of community members who wish to be recognized in this way.

²Carleton. "McCarthyism Was More Than McCarthy," 13.

(read: the white nuclear family).³ McCarthyism dictated that what was outside this ideal was not only different but potentially subversive and, therefore, a danger to national security.⁴ The Federal Loyalty Program (FLP), launched in 1947 under President Truman, aimed to weed out those working within government agencies deemed a risk.⁵ President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450 would later escalate this.⁶ Many marginalized groups were put at risk by government surveillance during this era, but one group in particular was Homosexuals.

The 1950s Hoey Report explicitly called Queer people a "security risk," arguing that "if blackmailers can extort money from a Homosexual under the threat of disclosure, espionage agents can use the same type of pressure to extort confidential information."⁷ Queer people were already dealt a rough hand when it came to social perception, often depicted as villainous in popular media, thanks in part to restrictions outlined in the Hays Code.⁸ It is, therefore, no surprise that when the FLP took effect, they would be cast in a deviant light that would last in some regards into the modern day. For Homosexuals, it was less of a Red Scare and more of a Lavender one. This paper will discuss how government-sanctioned homophobia during the Lavender Scare negatively affected 2SLGBTQIA people both during and long after the Cold War, sometimes by leaning on the media's demonization of Queer people set out by policies such as the Hays Code.

Movies have had a significant hand in the cultural villainization of Queer people, which certainly helped the government throw them under the bus during the Cold War. The Motion Picture Production Code, or Hays Code, were industry guidelines that lasted from 1934 to the 1960s, with an impact that is very much felt today.⁹ Its main goal was to uphold "positive moral standards" within the new film industry by preventing depictions of themes considered at the time as "harmful to society."¹⁰ Displaying Queerness was banned under the title "sex perversion" and sandwiched between depictions of rape, white slavery, and interracial relationships within the code.¹¹ Queerness could only be depicted negatively as a learning lesson, fundamentally in opposition to a "proper" American society.¹² This caricatured

³Belmonte, *Selling the American Way*, 136.

⁴Horowitz, "Culture, Politics, and McCarthyism," 107 – 108.

⁵Exec. Order 9835, 12 Fed. Reg. 1935 – 1939 (March 21, 1947).

⁶Exec. Order 10450, 18 Fed. Reg. 2489 – 2493 (April 27, 1953).

⁷United States Senate, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, 5.

⁸"The Motion Picture Production Code of 1930," Appendix 1 in Martin, *Hollywood's Movie Commandments*, 351.

⁹Noriega, "Something's Missing Here," 30.

¹⁰Noriega, 22.

¹¹"Particular Applications of the Code and the Reasons Therefore," Appendix 2 in Martin, 363.

¹²Noriega, 22.

LGBTQ+ people, reducing them to harmful Queer-coded tropes, such as the “pansy” male and “hardboiled” woman.¹³

Hundreds of people suspected of having “communist affiliations” were fired from the film industry in the 1940s because of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, making the need to conform to Hays Code limitations essential within the industry.¹⁴ This era of censorship resulted in decades of films reinforcing a binary of what is “good” and what is “bad.” Films such as *Different from the Others*, created in 1919 as a plea for Homosexual tolerance, were no longer possible to recreate.¹⁵ *The Children’s Hour* was distilled into the 1936 film *These Three*, swapping out Lesbian representation for a heterosexual love affair.¹⁶ More harmfully, in the 1955 film *The Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, the main character Brick’s closeted Queerness destroys himself and his family. His story ultimately ends in tragedy.¹⁷ The code acknowledged that entertainment has the power to sway societal behaviour as an argument for its censorship.¹⁸ Therefore, its impact is relevant to how people viewed Queerness during the Lavender Scare. When the government created a need to be suspicious of fellow Americans as disloyal, subversive and dangerous, the population was already primed to view Homosexuals as suspects. In both social views and government measures, Homosexuality was asserted as un-American at a time when loyalty was paramount. It is no wonder the heterosexual population didn’t question Queers being targeted by their government; they were already cast as villains.

Post World War II, America was experiencing an identity crisis, one of the ways this manifested being the reassertion of the nuclear, suburban family as the American standard. It was seen as the glue of American culture in the face of the communist threat and, therefore, the opposite of un-American.¹⁹ Marriage was promoted as an at-home defence against communism and a “rejection of social and ideological subversion.”²⁰ It was argued that men in “fulfilled” marriages would be able to reject degeneracy, such as Homosexuality and therefore be able to prevent “the destructions of the nation’s moral fibre.”²¹ The 1950 Hoey report stated that “One [H]omosexual can pollute a Government office.”²² By this logic, imagine what a Queer person does to society. With this framework, LGBTQ+ people were

¹³Mangin, “College Course File,” 50.

¹⁴Noriega, 25.

¹⁵Mangin, 51.

¹⁶Mangin, 60.

¹⁷Gindt, “Cat without Claws,” 58.

¹⁸Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., *Motion Picture Production Code*.

¹⁹Homer, *An Analysis of Elaine Tyler May’s Homeward Bound*, 16.

²⁰Homer, 16.

²¹Homer, 35.

²²United States Senate, 4.

clearly marked as outside of the scope of positive American morality. Making them villains served two purposes: it asserted the patriotic American cultural ideals of the time and created antagonists of these supposed “security risks.”

It is fair to consider the Lavender Scare a witch hunt and credit McCarthy for making it happen. Regarding Homosexuals working within the government, he said: “Once the people of a nation become complacent about moral degeneracy in its leadership, then the nation has not long to live.”²³ Queer people were no longer just evil on film but also in the eyes of their government. This is largely because in 1950, McCarthy claimed to have a list of “205 card-carrying communists” working within the government.²⁴ When pushed to elaborate, his focus became on Homosexuals, who were considered to have a “psychological maladjustment that could lead them towards communism.”²⁵ A Queer person in the government is not quite a card-carrying communist, but apparently just as dangerous. With McCarthy’s logic, films such as *Minority Report* feel less like Sci-Fi inspired by some fantastical future, but rather America’s very real past.

This vague, flippant conflation of Queerness with being a subversive, nation-destroying communist monster led to nearly ten thousand people losing their federal jobs or being discharged from the military.²⁶ After all, the Hoey report did say, “There is no place in the United States Government for persons who violate the laws or the accepted standards of morality.”²⁷ This helped usher in Executive Order 10450, calling explicitly for the dismissal of all government employees considered “sex perverts.”²⁸ This singular, uniform concept of morality was weaponized against the American people who were unable to conform to it. The government exploited people’s fear of communism as a means to exert power and retain tight control of its population. Homosexuals and those accused of being as such were forced to bear the weight of these heavy, largely unrelated accusations.

Don. E Carlton’s summary of the Second Red Scare, of which the Lavender Scare is a part, correctly calls it “a widespread series of actions by individuals and groups whose intentions were to frighten Americans with false and highly exaggerated charges of communist subversion for the purpose of political, economic, and psychological profit.”²⁹ For one, McCarthy used it to solidify himself as a much-

²³Hall, “Americanism, Un-Americanism, and the Gay Rights Movement,” 1110.

²⁴Blumenfeld, review of *The Lavender Scare*, 159 – 160.

²⁵Johnson, “America’s Cold War Empire,” 57.

²⁶Hall, 1111.

²⁷U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, 19.

²⁸Cain, “Litigating for Lesbian and Gay Rights,” 1567.

²⁹Carleton, “McCarthyism Was More Than McCarthy,” 13.

needed weapon against communism.³⁰ Media outlets exploited homophobic sensationalism by offering reports of government firings and “exposés of potential Homosexual rings.”³¹ These stories of alleged “sexual perverts” kept Americans afraid of each other while giving the media something to write about. The FBI Benefited from Executive Order 10450 because it allowed them the broader authority to investigate individuals considered “security risks.”³² Communists, Homosexuals, and Civil Rights leaders were all seemingly interchangeable enemies of the American state. War and fear made these adjustments possible, and leaders were banking on voters “knowing little and caring less” as a means to pull it off.³³ Good American values were a safety blanket for its citizens, so political talking points and policies that ensure alignment with those values were, therefore, to be expected. Remember, the Hays Code doesn’t want you sympathizing with the bad guys, anyway.

It is essential to remember that real people faced tangible and life-altering repercussions due to these policies. Franklin Kameny was an astronomer fired from the US Map Service in 1957 for being Gay.³⁴ Madeline Tress was put under investigation, where two interrogators claimed she was an “admitted Homosexual.” They made crude comments about her sexual history, an interaction ultimately leading to her resignation.³⁵ In the military, at least two women were reported to have killed themselves directly as a result of the “purging of Homosexuals” and the repercussions the dishonourable discharges brought them.³⁶ These are not unique experiences but snippets into the lives of thousands of individuals who were institutionally villainized by both their government and its media. Once outed, individuals became a target, with newspapers sometimes printing their home addresses.³⁷ This made having a community challenging, unsafe, and dangerous, leaving many people isolated. Ironically, by subjecting Queer people to the threat of interrogation, unemployment and isolation, the government created ideal conditions for blackmail.³⁸ It is therefore worth noting, however, that there was no real example of an American Homosexual being blackmailed into treason by the Soviets to justify these measures.³⁹ This didn’t seem to matter, though; homophobia was ingrained into the culture by the government and media in tandem, creating a

³⁰Charles, “From Subversion to Obscenity,” 265.

³¹Bérubé and D’Emilio. “The Military and Lesbians during the McCarthy Years,” 760.

³²Charles, 273.

³³Niebuhr, “The Social Myths in the ‘Cold War,’” 54.

³⁴Hall, 1112.

³⁵Blumenfeld, 159.

³⁶Bérubé and D’Emilio, 763.

³⁷Leonard, “Containing ‘Perversion,’” 559.

³⁸Hall, 1113.

³⁹Shibusawa, “The Lavender Scare and Empire,” 725.

never-ending narrative that Gay means subversive, which is the same thing as un-American and, therefore, basically communist.

The criminalization of “Homosexual acts” may have been older than the Lavender Scare, but it certainly helped justify the systemic mistreatment of Queer people during this era onward. Police felt emboldened to increase their raiding of Queer spaces during this time.⁴⁰ Sometimes, they would lie about witnessing inappropriate acts as a way to justify arrests.⁴¹ Sodomy laws were used as an explicit justification for the police harassment of Queer people and spaces.⁴² It is worth noting that these laws were only deemed unconstitutional in 2003.⁴³ Modern-day social commentary calling for the criminalization of Transgender people trying to use the bathroom echoes a lot of the same Lavender Scare rhetoric. American politicians and news outlets are once more making boogeymen out of people based on identity rather than their actual transgressions. America very well may be looking down the barrel of war in the coming years. Despite this notion, the nation’s leaders and lawmakers spend valuable time banning Transgender people from bathrooms under the guise of public safety.⁴⁴ This creation of a villain next door, a scapegoat as to why society seems unravelling despite its irrelevancy to more imminent and tangible threats, feels familiar.

The repercussions of the Lavender Scare can also still be felt by LGBTQ+ people who serve in the military. For example, at least 13,000 LGBTQ+ individuals were discharged during “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”, which only ended in 2011.⁴⁵ During President Trump’s first administration, he banned Transgender people from serving, citing “tremendous medical costs” as his reason on Twitter.⁴⁶ These are extensions of the Lavender Scare sentiment that Homosexuals in the military “shouldn’t be tolerated.”⁴⁷ With Donald Trump securing the 47th presidency this year, it is not an unreasonable assumption that LGBTQ+ military personnel may

⁴⁰Eskridge Jr., *Litigating for Lesbian and Gay Rights*, 1566 – 1567.

⁴¹Evander Smith, as quoted in Eskridge Jr., 1565.

⁴²George, “The Harmless Psychopath,” 260.

⁴³George, 230 – 231.

⁴⁴Human Rights Campaign, *State Laws: Anti-Transgender Bathroom Bans*.

⁴⁵Hall, 1122 – 1124.

⁴⁶Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), series of 3 Tweets: “After consultation with my Generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow.....” “....Transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. Military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming....” “....victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail. Thank you” Twitter (now X), July 26, 2017, x.com/realDonaldTrump/status/890193981585444864; x.com/realDonaldTrump/status/890196164313833472; x.com/realDonaldTrump/status/890197095151546369.

⁴⁷Bérubé and D’Emilio, 766.

once more become a talking point in the Oval Office. How can Queer people be considered patriotic or loyal by their peers when their government doesn't even regard them as trustworthy enough to serve?

Another example of the long-term impact of the Lavender Scare is in the workplace. In a 2024 Williams Institute study, 25% of LGBT people who were "out" at work reported being fired based on their identity at some point in their life, as opposed to under 6% if they weren't "out."⁴⁸ The impact of othering LGBTQ+ as negative, unprofessional, and untrustworthy has survived the decades since the Cold War into current times. The social norms people grow up with, the stereotypes they absorb as truth, and the media they consume impact the way they will treat others. In some instances, this impact is felt in the workplace. In this way Queer people are still, in some regards, better off concealing their identity at work if they want to stay employed, seen as professional, and stay safe at work.

The Hays code may have been phased out more than fifty years ago, but the media still falls short in its representation of LGBTQ+ individuals today. Many of this generation of young adults were raised watching Disney films where the villains were Queer coded. Ursula was modelled after Divine, a well-known and historically significant drag queen, for example.⁴⁹ The 2024 GLAAD report finds that LGBTQ+ representation is actually on the decline, and when they are shown, they often still fall into tropes.⁵⁰ The Hays Code asserted that media helped shape society nearly 100 years ago as an argument for its censorship. By the same logic, its legacy of curating a "proper moral standard" continues to influence social perceptions of marginalized people today. From an early age, modern Americans are taught to associate Queerness with deviance. By the time they are old enough to enter the workforce, be engaged in politics, and form worldviews of their own, they have already been deeply affected by the impacts of the Lavender Scare, ensuring an easy scapegoat for LGBTQ+ people for generations to come.

In summary, the Lavender Scare and Hays Code both helped set the precedent of Homosexuality and Queerness at large being synonymous with immoral, dangerous, and subversive. If Queerness threatens American families, marriages, and the very social fibre of the nation, where do Queer people belong? Cold War Era sentiments still impact LGBTQ+ individuals in their work, in their social lives, and in how they are represented on screen. It also seeps painfully into things this paper didn't touch on, like healthcare and medicalization. Social perceptions can and should change to reflect the society it belongs to. Thankfully, most people today don't think that interracial relationships are detrimental to society, even if the Hays

⁴⁸Williams Institute, *LGBTQ People's Experiences of Workplace Discrimination*, 21.

⁴⁹Biason, "An Analysis of Monstrosity," 19.

⁵⁰GLAAD, *Studio Responsibility Index 2024: Assessing LGBTQ Representation in Film*.

Code told us so years ago. We have those who fought and continue to fight for racial equity to thank for this. Similarly, we should uplift those who worked and continue to work for Queer liberation. After being fired, Franklin Kamney dedicated his life to Queer activism, cofounding the historical Mattachine Society of Washington.⁵¹ The Stonewall Riots are often credited for being an integral moment of change regarding modern LGBTQ+ activism.⁵² Groups such as Advocates for Trans Equality work tirelessly for the maintenance and advancement of Transgender rights and protections.⁵³

Off-screen in the real world, LGBTQ+ people were not and are not the antagonists responsible for social unrest. Queer love is not subversive, though it is hopeful and fighting for a safer world worth living in. For many, it is their personal and inimitable version of the American ideal. Larry Mitchell wrote of it in 1977, saying, “Romantic love, the last illusion, keeps us alive until the revolutions come.”⁵⁴ In 2024, the ACLU reported a “record high” of 600 anti-transgender state and federal bills introduced.⁵⁵ Lavender is officially scary again, and it is imperative to combat this age-old tactic by “knowing more and caring a lot.” No matter what the government tweets.

⁵¹Hall, 1112.

⁵²Teal and Conover-Williams, “Homophobia without Homophobes,” 18.

⁵³National Center for Transgender Equality. *What We Do*.

⁵⁴Mitchell, *The Faggots & Their Friends*, 7.

⁵⁵ACLU, *The Impacts of Anti-Transgender Laws and Policies*, 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACLU. *The Impacts of Anti-Transgender Laws and Policies: Evidence from Empirical Research*. 2024, 1 – 24.
www.aclu.org/publications/the-impacts-of-anti-transgender-laws-and-policies-evidence-from-empirical-research.
- BELMONTE, LAURA. *Selling the American Way*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. EPUB.
- BÉRUBÉ, ALLAN, and JOHN D’EMILIO. “The Military and Lesbians During the McCarthy Years.” *Signs* 9, no. 4 (1984): 759 – 775. [DOI:10.1086/494060](https://doi.org/10.1086/494060).
- BIASON, EMMAROSE. “An Analysis of Monstrosity in *The Little Mermaid* With Respect to Christian Theology and Western Ideology.” *The Compass* 1, no. 11 (2024): 16 – 23. scholarworks.arcadia.edu/thecompass/vol1/iss11/3.
- BLUMENFELD, WARREN J. Review of *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*, by David K. Johnson. *Feminist Review* 83 (2006): 159 – 161.
[DOI:10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400297](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400297).
- CAIN, PATRICIA A. “Litigating for Lesbian and Gay Rights: A Legal History.” *Virginia Law Review* 79, no. 7 (1993): 1551 – 1641. [DOI:10.2307/1073382](https://doi.org/10.2307/1073382).
- CARLETON, DON E. “McCarthyism Was More Than McCarthy: Documenting the Red Scare at the State and Local Level.” *The Midwestern Archivist* 12, no. 1 (1987): 13 – 19. [DOI:10.31274/archivalissues.10539](https://doi.org/10.31274/archivalissues.10539).
- CHARLES, DOUGLAS M. “From Subversion to Obscenity: The FBI’s Investigations of the Early Homophile Movement in the United States, 1953 – 1958.” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19, no. 2 (2010): 265 – 273.
[DOI:10.1353/sex.0.0099](https://doi.org/10.1353/sex.0.0099).
- ESKRIDGE, WILLIAM N. JR. *Litigating for Lesbian and Gay Rights: A Legal History*. *Virginia Law Review* 79, no. 7 (1993): 1566 – 1567. [DOI:10.2307/1073382](https://doi.org/10.2307/1073382)
- “Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947, Prescribing Procedures for the Administration of an Employees Loyalty Program in the Executive Branch of the Government.” *Federal Register* vol. 12, no. 59 (1947): 1935 – 1939.
archives.federalregister.gov/issue_slice/1947/3/25/1935-1939.pdf
- “Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953, Security Requirements for Government Employment.” *Federal Register* vol. 18, no. 82 (1953): 2489 – 2493.
archives.federalregister.gov/issue_slice/1953/4/29/2489-2493.pdf
- GEORGE, MARIE-AMÉLIE. “The Harmless Psychopath: Legal Debates Promoting the Decriminalization of Sodomy in the United States.” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 24, no. 2 (2015): 230 – 260.
www.jstor.org/stable/24616568.

- GINDT, DIRK. "Cat without Claws: Death and Homophobia in Ingmar Bergman's Production of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*." *The Tennessee Williams Annual Review* 19 (2020): 57 – 86. [DOI:10.2307/48630839](https://doi.org/10.2307/48630839).
- GLAAD. *Studio Responsibility Index 2024: Assessing LGBTQ Representation in Film*. September 17, 2024. Accessed November 18, 2024. www.glaad.org/sri-2024.
- HALL, SIMON. "Americanism, Un-Americanism, and the Gay Rights Movement." *Journal of American Studies* 47, no. 4 (2013): 1109 – 1130.
- HOMER, JARROD. *An Analysis of Elaine Tyler May's Homeward Bound*. 1st ed. Macat Library, 2017. EPUB.
- HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN. *State Laws: Anti-Transgender Bathroom Bans*. Last modified November 14, 2024. www.hrc.org/statelaws.
- HOROWITZ, IRVING LOUIS. "Culture, Politics, and McCarthyism." *The Independent Review* 1, no. 1 (1996): 101 – 110. www.jstor.org/stable/24560908.
- JOHNSON, DAVID K. "America's Cold War Empire: Exporting the Lavender Scare." In *Global Homophobia*, edited by Meredith L. Weiss and Michael J. Bosia. University of Illinois Press, 2013. EPUB.
- LEONARD, KEVIN ALLEN. "Containing 'Perversion': African Americans and Same-Sex Desire in Cold War Los Angeles." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 20, no. 3 (2011): 545 – 567. www.jstor.org/stable/41305884.
- MANGIN, DANIEL. "College Course File: The History of Lesbians and Gays on Film." *Journal of Film and Video* 41, no. 3 (1989): 50 – 66. www.jstor.org/stable/20687868.
- MITCHELL, LARRY. *The Faggots and Their Friends Between Revolutions*. Illustrated by Ned Asta. Calamus Books, 1977.
- MARTIN, OLGA J. *Hollywood's Movie Commandments*. Reprinted in the Margaret Herrick Library Archives, 1937.
- MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC. *The Motion Picture Production Code* (1930). Appendix 1 in *Pre-Code Hollywood: Sex, Immorality, and Insurrection in American Cinema, 1930 – 1934*, by Thomas Doherty. Columbia University Press, 1999.
- NIEBUHR, REINHOLD. "The Social Myths in the 'Cold War.'" *Journal of International Affairs* 21, no. 1 (1967): 40 – 56. www.jstor.org/stable/24381352.
- NORIEGA, CHON. "Something's Missing Here! Homosexuality and Film Reviews during the Production Code Era, 1934 – 1962." *Cinema Journal* 30, no. 1 (1990): 20 – 41. [DOI:10.2307/1224848](https://doi.org/10.2307/1224848).
- SHIBUSAWA, NAOKO. "The Lavender Scare and Empire: Rethinking Cold War Antigay Politics." *Diplomatic History* 36, no. 4 (2012): 723 – 752. [DOI:10.1111/j.1467-7709.2012.01052.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2012.01052.x).

- TEAL, JANA E, and MEREDITH CONOVER-WILLIAMS. "Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 38 (2016): 12 – 27. [DOI:10.55671/0160-4341.1039](https://doi.org/10.55671/0160-4341.1039).
- U.S. CONGRESS. SENATE. SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS. *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government. (Pursuant to S. Res. 280)*. 81st Cong., 2d sess., 1950. S. Rep. 241. stacks.stanford.edu/file/druid:fd720pb8753/employment-homosexuals-serialset.pdf
- WILLIAMS INSTITUTE. *LGBTQ People's Experiences of Workplace Discrimination and Harassment*. August 2024. williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Workplace-Discrimination-Aug-2024.pdf
-

IN THE SHADOW OF THE RISING SUN: THE DEHUMANIZATION OF ALLIED PRISONERS IN JAPANESE CAPTIVITY DURING WORLD WAR II

ZAK SMITH

Few theatres of World War II saw prisoner casualty rates as high as Allied prisoners of war within Japanese captivity. This paper aims to draw direct, historically reinforced connections between Japanese rhetoric surrounding the value of victory and the resultant treatment of the defeated. The research will show how the systematic indoctrination of an entire generation of Japanese citizens catalysed an ideological dichotomy between victor and defeated. As a result of the dehumanization of the defeated, the Japanese army subjected Allied prisoners to conditions rarely seen elsewhere during World War II. This paper draws a direct correlation between political rhetoric around dehumanization and the potential for indoctrinated populations to manifest tangible violence against targeted groups as a result.

The atrocities committed by the Japanese Imperial Army against their Allied captives in World War II were the direct result of the systematic adoption of national policies that led to the dehumanization of prisoners. The weaponization of malicious rhetoric and policies to further national goals is prevalent today, although this is not a novel concept. With the implicit goal being the disenfranchisement of a targeted group, structural violence against vulnerable demographics is an essential step towards extermination. This is seen in Japan in the decades leading to World War II.

By the early 20th century, Japan was a country of contradictions; former isolationists were now pursuing an empire, and a rapidly modernizing nation attempted to maintain its traditions. A streamlined adaptation of *Bushido*, the code of the Samurai, ameliorated this dichotomy. Acting as a foundation for *Kokutai*, the national polity of Japan, *Bushido*'s integration into both military and political spheres served as a glue to consolidate the concepts of self-sacrifice, racial

superiority, and absolute loyalty to authority.¹ This integrated interpretation of *Bushido* values would impact all aspects of Japanese involvement in World War II, but nowhere as profoundly as in the prisoner-of-war (POW) camps. Allied prisoners of the Japanese died at a rate seven times that of other Axis powers,² primarily because of the Japanese perception of surrender as dishonourable and, thus, their prisoners as subhuman. The only theatre with comparable casualty rates was the Eastern Front, and for similar reasons: indoctrinated combatants saw their enemies as less than human.³ Ultimately, these values were not intrinsic; they had to be taught before they could be manifested.

Historically, *Bushido* has had many facets, including teachings and methods to guide one through life. Two of these were specifically adapted for use in post-industrial-era Japan; fighting to the death for one's lord was necessary, and surrender was the ultimate shame. To yield to an enemy was to fail one's feudal obligations, an affront so dishonourable it rendered one unworthy of humane treatment.⁴ While *Bushido* had a long-standing military history in Japan, this modernization aimed to engage the general population as a whole.⁵

The youth of Japan did not inherently embrace these concepts leading up to World War II. Thus, systems of indoctrination were essential to their widespread adoption. Infused with national pride following victory in the Russo-Japanese War of 1905 and bolstered by the conquering of Manchuria in 1932, indoctrination of Japanese youth via government programs in schools began in earnest throughout the 1920s.⁶ These programs continued throughout World War II, reaffirming that the Japanese were chosen people, superior both culturally and morally.⁷ Taught that the inherent honour behind this near-mythical interpretation of Japanese folklore and historical acts of heroism elevated the Japanese citizen above other nations and races, educators maintained one central theme. This was that the honourable hero died willingly in battle rather than face the shame of surrender.⁸ Officers taught their subordinates that this was the essential spirit of Japan, the reason behind their superiority and their destiny of an empire. A fundamental contempt and disdain for anyone who did not follow this code was quickly instilled in the youth by both officers and nationalist educators.⁹ If death became a venerable outcome in a conflict, worthy of respect and adoration, the inverse was implicit: anyone who

¹Taylor and Brady, "Policy Centralization in Japan," 25.

²Tanaka, *Hidden Horrors*, 3 – 4.

³Smith, "Dehumanization, the Problem of Humanity and the Problem of Monstrosity," 358.

⁴Taylor, "Bushido."

⁵Taylor and Brady, 4.

⁶Borch, "Asia for the Asians," 22

⁷Borch, 22.

⁸Bergerud, *Touched With Fire*, 130.

⁹Bergerud, 129.

avoids death through surrender earns scorn and derision and is less than human. By the end of their formal indoctrination, an entire generation of Japanese students and soldiers believed the most significant value their life held was in its potential to be spent for their country and that anyone who hesitated to do so was worthless.

This new generation of soldiers, now socialized to see self-sacrifice as their most noble worth to both Emperor and country, began to view all conflicts through a lens far removed from Western understandings. Whereas traditional Eurocentric interpretations of war assumed death was a natural part of any battle, when faced with a choice between annihilation or surrender, capitulation was an acceptable response. Both the Axis and the Allies fought the European theatres of World War II towards the goal of total and unconditional surrender of the opposing forces through traditional combat.¹⁰ Not so for the Japanese soldiers inculcated to accept death as an honourable outcome in combat, officers viewed their soldiers as disposable. As remembered by a Japanese soldier, “[w]hereas German soldiers were told to *kill*, Japanese soldiers were told to *die*.”¹¹ If Japanese officers held such little regard for the lives of their soldiers, one could infer that the lives of their enemies were held in even lower esteem.¹²

The active mistreatment of Allied POWs by the Japanese was naturally precipitated by the rigid views on surrender afforded by *Bushido* tenets. Any captured soldier had dishonoured not only himself but their entire family name.¹³ It follows that executions by beheading, shooting, and other methods were banalities. The victims had forfeited all rights, and through death, they could perhaps regain some lost honour. It mattered none whether they had fought courageously, the single fact they had allowed Japan to capture them precluded any perceived respect or humane treatment.¹⁴ Some older Japanese officers defied these trends, spared from the rhetoric of indoctrination, although the prisoners understood that this was an exception, not a norm.¹⁵ It proves that the inclusion of *Bushido* concepts was a driving force behind the mistreatment of POWs; these officers who eschewed *Bushido* ideals would sneak sweets and extra rations to the near-starving prisoners.¹⁶ More commonly, attempts to provide relief to prisoners or even prevent executions incurred threats of death from officers. To those not properly indoctrinated, benevolence to the prisoners was a natural impulse, quickly eradicated by a younger officer corps adhering to the modern perversion of

¹⁰Weinberg, “Surrender in World War II,” 313.

¹¹Ohnuki-Tierney, *Kamikaze Diaries*, 4.

¹²Bergerud, 131.

¹³Russell, *The Knights of Bushido*, 55 – 56.

¹⁴Borch, 32.

¹⁵Sturma, “Japanese Treatment of Allied Prisoners,” 35.

¹⁶Dooley and Cooper, *To Bataan and Back*, 90 – 93.

Bushido.¹⁷ During the Sandakan Death Marches in Borneo, the Formosan guards, absent the indoctrination of the Japanese officers, initially refused to partake in mass executions of prisoners. Under the threat of death, they capitulated. Prisoners were worked to death, executed by firing squad, starved, and crucified.¹⁸ Six men would survive where 2,400 did not, a testament to the dehumanization of the prisoners and a radical shift from previous treatment of POWs by Japan.

Japan did not have a history of mistreating its prisoners during wars. The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 saw 80,000 Russian soldiers captured by the Japanese.¹⁹ Despite overtly racialized opinions, white foreign journalists almost universally praised the Japanese treatment of Russian prisoners. The Japanese were considerate and kind to their prisoners.²⁰ Even minor deprivations, such as exposure during rail transit, were understood to be ramifications of inadequate planning and supplies, not malice.²¹ The Japanese still viewed surrender as a dishonour. However, the glorification of death and racial superiority seen by World War II had yet to manifest, along with their corollary effects. Incorporating their triumph over a white European power into *Kokutai*, the Japanese military-political machine had tangible evidence of Japan's ascendancy on the world stage. Japan renounced the old tenets of *Bushido* in favour of newer, more nationalistic interpretations, and Allied prisoners would feel the effects within decades.

Situations like the Death Marches show terrible, active malice and stand out because of the poignancy of the violence involved; the vast majority of Allied prisoners who lost their lives during their internment did so slowly, killed by malnutrition and disease, not by blade or bullet.²² After initial successes in 1942, Japan's supplies were stretched thin. If Japanese soldiers had to deal with privation, their Allied prisoners then must suffer more. Shortages of essential foodstuffs were widespread across the Southeast Pacific Islands, leading to systematic malnourishment of prisoners.²³ The prisoners, seen as dishonourable and sub-human due to their capture, were then kept in terrible conditions. Malaria, vitamin deficiencies such as beriberi, jungle diseases, and persistent cholera outbreaks wreaked havoc on prisoner camps.²⁴ Of the approximately 60,000 prisoners along the Thai-Burma railway from 1942 to 1945, 15,000 would die, dysentery being the leading cause.²⁵ At Songkurai, the site of three work camps in Burma, inmates were

¹⁷Tanaka, 59 – 64.

¹⁸Tanaka, 59 – 64.

¹⁹Kowner, *Historical Dictionary of the Russo-Japanese War*, 2.

²⁰Towle, "Japanese Treatment of Prisoners in 1904-1905," 115 – 18.

²¹Towle, 115 – 18.

²²Roland and Shannon, "Patterns of Disease," 69 – 83.

²³Borch, 27.

²⁴Shanks, "Gastrointestinal Mortality," 30.

²⁵Shanks, 29 – 32.

allowed to set up a prisoner-run hospital camp. Of the almost 2,000 men sent to this hospital camp in January and February of 1944, 750 died, primarily from cholera, dysentery, and malnutrition.²⁶ This methodical neglect reified the Japanese perspectives of the prisoners as less than human and unworthy of consideration. Unfortunately, the Allies would compound this as naval operations in the Pacific intensified.

Initially utilized to transport prisoners to destinations where their labour was needed, by the end of the conflict, Japanese transports in the Pacific were used to move imprisoned Allies away from potential liberation.²⁷ Colloquially named 'Hellships,' these retrofitted steamers were packed beyond capacity with prisoners from Allied nations. Conditions aboard a Hellship were as dire as anywhere in the Pacific theatre: men were forced to stand in lightless holds for days at a time, unable to move, or stacked in bunks below the waterline, often with one latrine for every 100 men.²⁸ As in Burma and elsewhere, diseases were rampant, and the men suffered.²⁹ This ill-treatment of the prisoners was a manifestation of racial and cultural superiority, owing to *Bushido*'s influence; to surrender was to forfeit one's humanity. The Hellships had no markings identifying them as prisoner transports, and their routes were not made public for fear of revealing supply lines and convoy routes to the enemy. In some cases, the Japanese actively painted over the red cross markings on ships.³⁰ This ultimately made the vessels indistinguishable from standard troop transports: prime targets for American aviators and submariners.

As with casualties across all theatres of World War II, it is nearly impossible to glean exact figures, but the losses aboard the Hellships were immense. Estimates of Allied POWs lost on the Hellships vary, with an unofficial figure of 12,000, of those roughly 1,500 from disease, suffocation, starvation, or murder.³¹ The remainder were victims of friendly fire incidents when the prison ships carrying them came under attack by Allied planes and submarines. The *Shinyo Maru*, sunk by a torpedo on September 7, 1944, saw Allied prisoners shot at by Japanese survivors and later strafed by Japanese planes, with only 81 of 750 men surviving.³² The subsequent sinking of the *Kachidoki Maru* and *Rakuyo Maru*, days after the *Shinyo*, left 2,200 Australian and British prisoners in the water. Once aboard rescue boats, the Japanese made efforts to run over the POWs struggling to swim in oil-slicked waters.³³ This treatment of prisoners did not coincide with behaviours

²⁶Dunlop, "Medical Experiences in Japanese Captivity." 481 – 86.

²⁷Michno, *Death on the Hellships*, 1 – 62.

²⁸Sturma, *Hellships Down*, 14.

²⁹Lowry, *No mercy from the Japanese*, 96.

³⁰Michno, 245.

³¹Sturma, "Japanese Treatment of Allied Prisoners," 200 – 202.

³²Levine, *Captivity, Flight, and Survival in World War II*, 165.

³³Levine, 165.

exhibited by Japanese soldiers in previous conflicts. This was the end result of *Bushido* indoctrination, causing Japanese soldiers to view their captured foes as something below human and unworthy of saving, opening the doors for otherwise unthinkable crimes.³⁴ When considering the concentration camps throughout Europe, the battles of ideology and extermination fought in the USSR, and the POW camps, Death Marches, and Hellships of Japan, there is one clear consistency. It is that the systematic indoctrination of one's enemies as subhuman facilitates the most egregious of abuses.

The extreme violence, malice, neglect, and contempt shown to Allied prisoners by the Japanese Imperial Army during World War II was the direct result of *Bushido* tenets manipulated into *Kokutai* and the Japanese military spirit. Based on previous examples in history prior to World War II, Japan's treatment of Allied prisoners during World War II was a novel phenomenon fostered by the methodical reinforcement that any soldier who surrendered was less than human. By rigidly enforcing the concepts of self-sacrifice and never surrendering, the Japanese military sought to raise themselves and, in doing so, reduced their enemies to such a depth that no treatment was considered undue. This historical example of political rhetoric manifesting tangible violence allows an understanding of the inherent dangers of dehumanization and its ramifications.

³⁴Murrow and Murrow. "A Hypothetical Neurological Association," 3, 5 – 7, 28.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BECKENBAUGH, LISA LEE. "Only the Strong Survived: Survival Rates among American Prisoners of War of the Japanese during World War II." PhD diss., University of Arkansas, 2002.
www.proquest.com/docview/287903993.
- BERGERUD, ERIC M. *Touched With Fire: The Land War in the South Pacific*. Penguin Books, 1997.
- BORCH, FRED L. "'Asia for the Asians,' *Bushido*, and Japanese War Crimes in the Netherlands East Indies, 1942 to 1946," Chap. 2 in *Military Trials of War Criminals in the Netherlands East Indies 1946 – 1949*. Oxford University Press, 2017. [DOI:10.1093/oso/9780198777168.003.0003](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198777168.003.0003).
- DOOLEY, THOMAS, and JERRY COOPER. *To Bataan and Back: The World War II Diary of Major Thomas Dooley*. Texas A & M University Press, 2016.
- DUNLOP, E. E. "Medical Experiences in Japanese Captivity." *British Medical Journal* 2, no. 4474 (1946): 481 – 486. [DOI:10.1136/bmj.2.4474.481](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.2.4474.481).
- KOWNER, ROTEM. *Historical Dictionary of the Russo-Japanese War*. Scarecrow Press, 2006.
- LEVINE, ALAN. *Captivity, Flight, and Survival in World War II*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2000. EPUB.
- LOWRY, JOHN. *No Mercy from the Japanese: A Survivors Account of the Burma Railway and the Hellships 1942-1945*. Pen & Sword Military, 2008.
- MICHNO, GREGORY F. "Relocating the POWs," in *Death on the Hellships: Prisoners at Sea in the Pacific War*. Naval Institute Press, 2001.
- MURROW, GAIL B., and RICHARD MURROW. "A Hypothetical Neurological Association between Dehumanization and Human Rights Abuses." *Journal of Law and the Biosciences* 2, no. 2 (2015): 1 – 29. [DOI:10.1093/jlb/lsv015](https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsv015).
- OHNUKI-TIERNEY, EMIKO. *Kamikaze Diaries: Reflections of Japanese Student Soldiers*. University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- ROLAND, CHARLES G., and HARRY S. SHANNON. "Patterns of Disease among World War II Prisoners of the Japanese: Hunger, Weight Loss, and Deficiency Diseases in Two Camps." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 46, no. 1 (1991): 65 – 85. [DOI:10.1093/jhmas/46.1.65](https://doi.org/10.1093/jhmas/46.1.65).
- RUSSELL, EDWARD FREDERICK LANGLEY. *The Knights of Bushido: A History of Japanese War Crimes during World War II*. Skyhorse Publishing, 2016. Foreword by Yuma Totani. Originally published 1958 by Cassell.
- SHANKS, G. D. "Gastrointestinal Mortality in Military / Prison Camps of the 19th-20th Centuries." *Journal of Military & Veterans' Health* 31, no. 4 (2023): 29 – 32. [doi-ds.org/doi/10.2023-79933527/JMVH Vol 31 No 4](https://doi-ds.org/doi/10.2023-79933527/JMVH_Vol_31_No_4).

- SMITH, DAVID LIVINGSTONE. "Dehumanization, the Problem of Humanity and the Problem of Monstrosity." Chap. 23 in *The Routledge Handbook of Dehumanization*, edited by Maria Kronfeldner. Routledge, 2021.
[DOI:10.4324/9780429492464](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429492464)
- STRAUS, ULRICH. *The Anguish of Surrender: Japanese POW's of World War II*. University of Washington Press, 2016.
- STURMA, MICHAEL. *Hellships Down: Allied Pows and the Sinking of the Rakuyo Maru and Kachidoki Maru*. McFarland & Company, Inc., 2021.
- STURMA, MICHAEL. "Japanese Treatment of Allied Prisoners during the Second World War: Evaluating the Death Toll." *Journal of Contemporary History* 55, no. 3 (2019): 514 – 534. [DOI:10.1177/0022009419843335](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009419843335).
- TANAKA, YUKI. *Hidden Horrors: Japanese War Crimes in World War II*. Routledge, 2019.
- TAYLOR, JEREMIAH. "Bushido." In *Salem Press Encyclopedia*, 2022.
research.ebsco.com/c/blyu2p/viewer/html/v7h2n2hh4z.
- TAYLOR, WILLIAM H., and ROBERT A. BRADY. "Policy Centralization in Japan Under the Kokutai Principle." *Pacific Affairs* 14, no. 1 (1941): 51 – 77.
[DOI:10.2307/2751775](https://doi.org/10.2307/2751775).
- TOWLE, PHILIP A. "Japanese Treatment of Prisoners in 1904-1905--Foreign Officers' Reports." *Military Affairs* 39, no. 3 (1975): 115 – 18.
[DOI:10.2307/1986902](https://doi.org/10.2307/1986902).
- WEINBERG, GERHARD L. "Surrender in World War II," Introduction to Part VI in *How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender*, edited by Holger Afflerbach and Hew Strachan. Oxford University Press, 2014.
[DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199693627.003.0032](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199693627.003.0032).
-
-