Volume 5
Spring 2013

Phi Alpha Theta
Alpha-Nu-Gamma Chapter

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo
JOURNAL STAFF

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Matthew Brown
Undergraduate History Student

Andrew Pagan
Undergraduate History Student

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Laura Neylan
Undergraduate History Student

Elena Reynolds
Graduate History Student

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Mindy McKenzie
Undergraduate History Student

Nicola Williams
Undergraduate History Student

Marissa Millhorn
Undergraduate History Student

FACULTY ADVISORS

Wyatt Oroke
Undergraduate History Student

Dr. Molly Loberg
Professor of History

Elena Reynolds
Graduate History Student

Dr. Thomas Trice
Professor of History
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## FRONT MATTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Editor's Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>About the Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii</td>
<td>Article Summaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Remembering the Bomb: Science Fiction and the Mediation of Collective Memory from the 1950s to the late 1970s</td>
<td>Sean Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Marriage of Science Fiction and Egyptology</td>
<td>Kevin McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Identity and the Holocaust: American Jewry in the 1950s</td>
<td>Hannah Milstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SENIOR PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Constructing Identity in a Post-War World</td>
<td>Elizabeth Metelak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## HISTORY 100 ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Development of the Cal Poly Biochemistry Department, 1967–1977</td>
<td>Jackson Baumgartner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>The Civil Rights Movement at Cal Poly</td>
<td>Megan Manning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Cal Poly Veteran Village</td>
<td>Jenna Rovenstine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BACK MATTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Information for Authors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You hold in your hands the fifth edition of *The Forum*, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo’s journal of history. It represents a year’s worth of hard work from Cal Poly students, staff, and alumni, working to bring readers the best our history department has to offer.

This year, we’ve changed things up a little with the addition of two new sections, outside of our traditional content of research papers and book reviews. We have decided to initiate the tradition of publishing a Cal Poly history student’s final research project in each edition, as well as quality papers written by freshman students just learning how to interpret primary sources and write history. It is our hope that these new elements, along with our traditional research articles, will showcase the quality of our history department and the growth our students undergo at Cal Poly.

As a graduating senior, managing this journal has truly been a challenge for me; though an incredibly rewarding one. Working on *The Forum* has instilled in me a greater appreciation for the publication process and a deep respect for our previous editors. I know that our future editors will do what it takes to uphold our tradition of publishing high-quality historical research and put Cal Poly’s “learn by doing” philosophy into action.

Matthew Brown  
*Executive Editor*
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Remembering the Bomb: Science Fiction and the Mediation of Collective Memory from the 1950s to the late 1970s | Sean Martinez

The atomic bomb is a complex and multifaceted cultural figure that defined foreign relations, American domestic society, and how humanity viewed the world around them. Perhaps the most telling example of the atomic bomb as a cultural figure is the atomic bomb in Science Fiction. This paper argues that from the 1950s to the late 1970s, the depiction of the atomic bomb in Science Fiction shifted from an object that destroys all life completely to an object that destroys life but, with an attitude of survivalism, humanity can persist. In an ambitious attempt to understand how this collective societal memory was crafted in Science Fiction, a theory of memory has been constructed to pinpoint important historical events and figures, how they defined the world around them, and how Science Fiction mediated these real world events and figures to create a memory that would be imparted upon its readers and viewers.

The Marriage of Science Fiction and Egyptology | Kevin McLaren

“The Marriage of Science Fiction and Egyptology” is a research paper that addresses the beneficial relationship between Egyptology and science fiction. More specifically, the paper presents research and explanations of how science fiction stories have speculated and theorized potential answers to the questions addressing the mysterious nature, origin, and feats of Ancient Egypt, and how those possibilities correlate with actual scholarly theories. By tying together the fact that “soft” science fiction and Egyptology as a scholarly field had their advent in the late nineteenth century, the paper follows a timeline of Egypt-based science fiction stories and breakthroughs in the Egyptological community and demonstrates how science fiction written about Egypt has evolved simultaneously with the field of Egyptology. Sources include stories and scholarly works written in the late 19th century during the initial European spark of Egyptology, stories and research during the height of Egyptology in the 1920s due to the discovery of Tutankhamun’s
tomb, and more recent 20th and 21st century pieces that shake the foundations of traditional Egyptology such as the science fiction movie, “Stargate,” and scholarly works by Egyptologists that discuss the origins and purposes of Egyptian culture such as “Fingerprints of the Gods,” by Graham Hancock and “The Orion Mystery,” by Robert Bauval. The paper is intended to answer questions such as: Why is Egyptology a prevalent theme in science fiction? What questions are the science fiction authors attempting to answer, and how are those answers relevant to the field of Egyptology? What are the typical trends of Egyptian-based science fiction and how have those themes changed with newer discoveries and scholarly breakthroughs in Egyptology.

Identity and the Holocaust: American Jewry in the 1950s | Hannah Milstein

During the 1950s, American Jews were inherently bound together by their wariness of the Holocaust, as, even in the United States, anti-Semitism remained present in varying forms and severity. Various national sentiments against Jews coupled with the pressure to reevaluate Germany in light of the new Cold War geopolitics created an atmosphere in which American Jewry was caught between their duties as Americans and Jews; believing it was necessary to remember the Holocaust, but not comfortable enough to differentiate themselves as a minority on the National stage. This conflict would not only lead to a crisis of identity for American Jewry but create a climate in which an integral part of that identity, the Holocaust, would only be acknowledged among other Jews.

Constructing Identity in a Post-War World | Elizabeth Metelak

In the contemporary world, nationalism permeates societal conceptions of everything from foreign and domestic policy to schoolyard teasing and individual identity. Indeed, the nation has come to be seen as a permanent historical fixture around the globe, so much so that most societies have forgotten just how recent an idea it truly is. In a case study of
Lithuanian national identity from its birth in the 19th century through its initial fight for statehood, this paper seeks to shed light on the challenges and complexities inherent to defining a nation and reiterate the relative youth of nationalism in the historical record. Through my analysis of the international conflicts and communications surrounding the creation of a Lithuanian state and national identity, I conclude that the external influences on a community play just as crucial a role in defining a nation as the cultures and desires of those within the community itself. These conclusions present Lithuania as a national community that owes its existence at least as much to its enemies and emigrant cousins as to the sacrifices and imaginations of its own members.

**Development of the Cal Poly Biochemistry Department, 1967–1977 |**

*Jackson Baumgartner*

Utilizing archived course catalogs, this paper explores the development of Cal Poly’s Biochemistry Department from the late 1960s through the late 1970s. When the department was created, required courses for the Biochemistry program overlapped heavily with the courses required by the Chemistry Department. As Cal Poly developed from a college and earned the title of university, the Biochemistry major at Cal Poly began to take on a more unique character, reflecting the growth of science programs at the school, as well as the a general shift away from more vocational instruction.

**The Civil Rights Movement at Cal Poly |** *Megan Manning*

Using Cal Poly’s newspaper, the *Mustang Daily*, as a primary source, this paper looks at the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s on the Cal Poly campus. The primary focus is on the actions and requests of Cal Poly’s Black Student Union, reactions from university administrators, and the ways in which the discussion of civil rights occurred in the *Mustang Daily* during the Civil Rights Movement. This examination reveals a school at a historic crossroads, the opinions of students and staff, and the ways in which their ideas opposed each other at some points, while lending support at others.
This essay examines the living situations of military veterans at Cal Poly following the Second World War. Making use of Cal Poly’s newspaper, the Mustang Daily and the school’s annual yearbook, the El Rodeo, this paper dissects how the post war living situation for veterans was portrayed and what questions they leave unanswered. These sources demonstrate a particularly one sided representation of the veteran housing program, likely because of their official nature and the desire to attract more students.
SEAN MARTINEZ is studying for a Bachelor of Arts in History with a minor in Religious Studies. His interests range from Post-Colonial theory, Middle Eastern history, the history of memory, and cultural history. In his free time he enjoys reading Science Fiction and engaging in an active community of fanfiction writers and artists.
By Sean Martinez

The atomic bomb was not just a weapon but a cultural phenomenon that literally changed every aspect of society. Major authors such as Paul Boyer and Allan M. Winkler argue that everything from family dynamics to geopolitics to the definition of public safety was dramatically altered by the advent of the atomic bomb.¹ Philosopher Jacques Derrida stated that the atomic bomb and nuclear warfare as a whole have no precedent and therefore cannot be compared to any past event.² Thoughts and ideas of death, destruction, holocaust, mutation, fire, and countless others were incorporated into every single aspect of society from commercial products to music to movies.³ Although the imagery has never changed, a testament to the cultural and intellectual weight of the


³ Boyer, 10-13.
bomb, the way the imagery is felt and dealt with changed dramatically from the 1950s to the 1970s. Nuclear weaponry imagery in Science Fiction was originally defined by the initial fears about the atomic bomb but these same attitudes surrounding the bomb gave way to survivalism as humanity learned to cope with the idea of nuclear annihilation.

In order to argue this thesis, a theory of memory has been constructed to explain how the essay shall be argued. An actor or event creates a reality which is then mediated by a physical or nonphysical agent to produce a distinct collective memory. For this essay, the theory shall be called Reality-Mediation and will be used throughout this essay to show how nuclear imagery stayed constant while the attitude changed from the 1950s to the late 1970s.

An example of this Reality-Mediation can be seen when Little Boy and Fat Man were both dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Afterwards, CBS released a newscast on August 7th, 1945 detailing the account of the bombing of Hiroshima but did not explain how the atomic bomb was detonated or how many casualties occurred were expected. The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki occurred in the reality, or the space of existence outside our minds. The mediator then edits and modifies the reality by providing, excluding, or by commenting on the event. In this case, CBS is one of many mediators that shaped the public’s collective memory of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki through their reporting of the bombings.

It must be noted that physical objects and nonphysical objects can both be mediators. Mediators can be physical if they are living or are real objects that provide commentary on the event such as media groups or textbooks. Additionally, mediators can be nonphysical in the sense that they can be modes of thought, intellectual frameworks, or other reasons imagined by the individual. The essence of the mediator is the mediation itself or the ability to provide additional information that is inherently disjointed from the event. Emotion, 

---

4 To define “collective memory” is a complex task in the terms of cultural theory, cultural history, historiography, and epistemology. For this essay, “collective memory” shall be regarded as the image and attitude that is commonly and widely held by the public. For a more exhaustive definition and more thorough display of methodology, see Wulf Kansteiner’s Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies, Pierre Nora’s Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire, Frances A. Yates’s The Art of Memory, Mary Carruthers’s The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture, and George Lipsitz’s Time Passages: Collective Memory and American Popular Culture.

5 Boyer, 4.
imagery, sensation, and other things that are not part of the event are the ingredients mediators add to the reality. Therefore, the reality should be without the ethereal whereas the collective memory should have the ethereal.

A critique that is expected from readers is that the definition of a mediator is too broad and sweeping to provide an in-depth analysis. I argue that this wide definition is inherent because the concept of collective memory is inherently tied to popular culture. It can be argued that popular culture matches the general trends that occur politically, socially, economically, and in other layers. Since memories can be varied, complex, multifaceted, and nuanced, there needs to be a broad definition of mediation to account for these very complicated memories.

For this essay, Science Fiction has been chosen as a single mediator. I shall not address other mediators because to deconstruct a single memory, place that memory in a historical context, identify if any prior memories are similar to it, test if those prior memories influence the memory I seek to deconstruct, find all relevant mediators, and understand how each mediator contributed to the final memory is a task worthy of a dissertation.

Science Fiction is a mediator but not the only mediator in the process of crafting nuclear imagery and shaping nuclear attitudes. If Science Fiction is a mediator, and collective memory and images are both multifaceted and complex, and if there are multiple mediators influencing a single memory, then Science Fiction should follow the general trend or pattern that these multiple mediators are acting in to produce a coherent memory. Science Fiction is like an indirect indicator, in that its role in shaping the collective memory is implicit on its own but becomes explicit in conjunction with other mediators. If there is change, Science Fiction will mirror the change that is occurring as a whole. If there is no change, then Science Fiction should show no change in the description and definition of nuclear memory. So to test this theory, we must start at the beginning of a collective nuclear memory; we must start at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

On August 6th, an atomic bomb decimated the city of Hiroshima and two days later, another atomic bomb destroyed the city of Nagasaki. Initial reports were grim. The New York Times reported that Hiroshima, “...a city of 300,000 had virtually disappeared,” and that, “...the death toll [was] expected to reach
100,000.”⁶ The Los Angeles Times wrote that the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima had the force of two thousand B-29 bombers and that the explosion could be felt up to ten miles away.⁷ Immediately from the start, the atomic bomb had a power to destroy life and this inherent quality became imbedded within the public’s mind.

Due to the bomb’s unprecedented power, the only way for the public to grapple and understand the bomb was through Science Fiction, a genre built around imagination and theoretical experimentation. Adam Roberts, professor of English at the University of London, wrote, “This notion of science as ‘imaginative creation’ is of the greatest interest to the critic and historian of SF[Science Fiction], since SF is itself a more thoroughgoing mode of imaginative creation allied to Science.”⁸ Due to serious real world limitations and fears that gravity would no longer exist, all the water in the world would evaporate, and other wild imaginative fears expressed by the public; Science Fiction proved to be an excellent means for atomic ideas.⁹

The imagination took the information available from news reports and magazine photographs and transformed it into a shadow that engulfed humanity. This fear can be seen in the science fiction literature in the early 1950s to the late 1950s. To science fiction writers in this approximate ten year period, atomic warfare equated to the absolute destruction of life, humanity, and the Earth as a whole. They saw the atomic bomb was a one way street with no turning around and no stopping.

An example of this can be seen in Arthur C. Clarke’s 1951 short story “If I Forget Thee, Oh Earth.”¹⁰ A young boy named Marvin looks at the Earth from the moon colony that he now lives in and thinks of the beauty that Earth was told to contain. He wondered why his people could not return to Earth, but was suddenly reminded of the reason: “...an evil phosphorescence...the

---

radioactive aftermath of Armageddon.” Earth is destroyed, humanity exiled, and the fallout will not disappear the immediate future. In this scenario, humanity has no control over reclaiming their world, which is ironic when compared to the control they had in destroying it.

In addition, Ray Bradbury’s 1950 short story “There Will Come Soft Rains” draws upon the same nuclear imagery and plays upon the same fears. In 2026, a fully automated house goes about its daily routine. But as Bradbury slowly revealed, the inhabitants are not only gone but the only proof that people lived in the home are “The Five spots of paint—the man, the woman, the children, the ball—remained.”

This short story as a whole can also be analyzed in the context of the Reality-Mediation process. Bradbury’s image of nuclear death used the images of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that were easily available. Life Magazine’s photographs depicted Hiroshima and Nagasaki as ruins and graveyards. To an average viewer, it would seem as if the entire city was flattened and just charred pieces of rubble and concrete. Overnight, not a single soul lived in the cities. In this case, Bradbury took the raw information, modified it and added his own interpretations to construct a memory in the reader. He wrote, “The house was an altar with ten thousand attendants, big, small, servicing, attending, in choirs. But the gods had gone away, and the ritual of the religion continued senselessly, uselessly.”

The gods of the altar were destroyed, brushed away from time by an object so evil it could only exist as mythology. Bradbury knew that mankind could not possibly fathom the horrors or the destruction of the atomic bomb so he framed the bomb as a mythological weapon, a real world sword of Shiva. He implied that this bomb is, by far, the most unholy object in existence. It smothers cities, vaporizes life, and leaves behind a mysterious and invisible disease on the Earth. Here he took the knowledge of the bomb and the pictures of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, synthesized them, added his own commentary, and wrapped a certain emotion into the image to construct a memory.

---

11 Clarke, 405.
13 Ibid., 97.
15 Bradbury, 98.
Another example can be drawn from the iconic 1951 Science Fiction film *The Day the Earth Stood Still.* In the movie, an alien named Klaatu comes to speak to humanity but faces numerous obstacles such as politicians, military officers, and suspicious civilians. At the end, Klaatu says that the development of the atomic bomb has created a great concern amongst other extraterrestrial civilizations. He warns that this sort of violence is not tolerated by the powerful robot police force that keeps watch over the numerous civilizations and leaves Earth with a cryptic message, “The decision rests with you.”

At its face, *The Day the Earth Stood Still* is a warning message to the viewers that they suddenly have control over a weapon that has the potential to destroy not only the world but also disrupt the peace in the universe. This seems to suggest that the technology and power that humanity now has should be kept under control to prevent a disaster both at home and abroad, but Klaatu never explains why the atomic bomb has the capability to disrupt the peace in the universe. This enables the imagination to run free easily conjuring up images of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; civilization suddenly being wiped off the face of the Earth, calling upon the fear that the atomic bomb could set off an irreversible and catastrophic chain reaction throughout the universe or something even more catastrophic and violent. Regardless, the absence of explanation in the movie enabled the audience to imagine the horrors of the atomic bomb rather than be shown what is to be feared. Science Fiction, with its inclusion of imagery, and the imagination, which is infinite in its will and ability, can be combined to create anything, and more importantly, any memory.

So why does this trope of the atomic bomb, a weapon able to unleash unimaginable damage, recur throughout this wide body of science fiction during this time period? The reason is simple: this was the strongest image in the public’s mind at the time. Although Americans supported dropping the bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the support immediately turned into fear and paranoia as soon as the public realized what sort of weapon they have in their arsenal. For example, a Gallup Poll reported that eighty-five percent of the public approved of the atomic bomb being used and sixty-nine percent believed that the development of the atomic bomb was a good thing in 1945. But

---

16 *The Day the Earth Stood Still,* Directed by Robert Wise (1951; Los Angeles: 20th Century Fox, 2003), DVD.
17 Boyer, 183-184
when the potential of the nuclear bomb dawned on the public, their attitudes shifted as a result.

This shift in attitude can be attributed to the Soviet Union testing their own atomic weapons, specifically RDS-1. On September 3, 1949, the Air Force detected a large amount of radioactivity in the atmosphere that was traced to an atomic bomb detonation in the Soviet Union.\(^\text{18}\) On September 23, 1949, President Truman announced publicly that the Soviet Union successfully tested a nuclear weapon.\(^\text{19}\) As a result, the nuclear fears were amplified because the security blanket of America’s monopoly over nuclear weapons had disappeared and that, perhaps in the near future, the world would be in a standoff between two world powers.\(^\text{20}\) Even at this time, fears of a world completely destroyed and radically changed by nuclear weapons were starting to arise. After the Bikini Atoll tests, scientists reported that the islands’ food supply was contaminated by an “atomic bomb hangover” and that scientists did not know when the natives could return to the islands or even if the natives could return at all.\(^\text{21}\)

These Science Fiction works took Hiroshima, Nagasaki, the Bikini Atoll tests, and RDS-1 and mediated them to produce the memory of death and the attitude of fear. Knowledge of death and destruction was taken by Science Fiction and exacerbated. The nature of nuclear weaponry at this time was met with great hope but also great fear. Some hoped that the atomic bomb could be harnessed to create a new world with atomic powered cars, a warmer climate, and other utopian visions.\(^\text{22}\) But sitting behind the hope was a great fear that would show itself in Science Fiction and memory, the fear that the world would be fundamentally and irreversibly changed, that war-hawks would rather destroy the Earth than let the enemy live in peace, and that mankind would never be


\(^{22}\) Boyer, 109-121.
able to exit the shadow of the nuclear weapon and return to the light of peace.

Immediately after this first phase from the early 1950s to the late 1950s, Science Fiction underwent a transitory period that reflected the emergence of a new attitude from the early 1960s to the mid-1960s. Science Fiction began to experience the sudden realization that the bomb, in all of its terror and power, was a very real object and not something of fantasy. Society was learning to come to terms with the bomb and Science Fiction parallels this real world development. A prime example of this would be Leo Szilard’s 1961 short story “The Voice of the Dolphins.” Szilard first portrayed a scientific organization called the Vienna Institute discovering a dolphin language and that dolphins are capable of intelligent thought. Although the dolphins do not have hands or fingers to conduct experiments, the scientists performed the experiments on their behalf. These dolphins created numerous scientific discoveries such as the development of a food stuff based on algae which solves numerous food crises across the world.23

It is important to note that Szilard was a nuclear scientist. He worked for the Manhattan Project and he would become one of the key players in fighting against nuclear armament.24 This detail will be very important as it shows Reality-Mediation at work. Szilard’s knowledge and opinions are being mediated by the work of Science Fiction to produce a very specific and articulate memory. Although “The Voice of the Dolphins” is not a very prominent or well-known work of Science Fiction, it still shows the power of Reality-Mediation.

“The Voice of the Dolphins” is specifically in the first transitory phase of Science Fiction because of how Szilard addresses nuclear warfare. For example, Szilard wrote,

> When a scientist says something, his colleagues must ask themselves only whether it is true. When a politician says something, his colleagues must first of all ask, “Why does he say it?”; later on they may or may not get around to asking whether it happens to be true…Scientists rarely think that they are in full possession of

---

the truth, and a scientist’s aim is a discussion with his colleagues is not to persuade but to clarify.\textsuperscript{25}

Szilard’s writing shows his distrust of politicians to manage the nuclear arsenal but also his own belief that scientists, like himself, should be responsible over the nuclear arsenal. This view was not uncommon during his time as many of the critiques focused on the dangers of putting war-hawk politicians in charge of the nuclear arms and the need for an international body to mediate disputes and prevent a potential nuclear war.\textsuperscript{26}

Szilard’s story is an act of mediation. His story takes the events and desires for cooperation between the government and scientists and produces a memory that is positive to the readers. Readers take this new memory and balance the fears of the new nuclear era with the assurance that there are skilled individuals who can protect the nation’s interests and the nation’s people. He wrote this story to show both the government and the public, that mankind can live in existence with the nuclear bomb even if humanity would be better off without the nuclear sword dangling over their heads.

The result of the first transition would be the second phase of Science Fiction: the late 1960s to the late 1970s. This would be a period easily known as the Cold War, which featured the culmination of deepening geopolitical divides, decolonization, globalization, and aggressive nuclear armament. The defining characteristic of nuclear weaponry in Science Fiction is how the narratives comment on the dramatic change that the world would undergo if nuclear weaponry was used and the assurance that mankind shall survive, compared to first phase science fiction which viewed the nuclear weapon with uncertainty and defaulted to mankind’s imagination.

In the 1960 novel \textit{A Canticle for Leibowitz}, Walter M. Miller created a world that has endured a nuclear war approximately six hundred years ago and is now slowly starting to rebuild itself. After the nuclear war, called the Deluge by the inhabitants of this new world, mankind rebelled against those who it considered responsible. They exacted their revenge on “…rulers, scientists, leaders, technicians, teachers, and whatever persons the leaders of the maddened

\textsuperscript{25} Szilard, 24.

mobs said deserved death for having helped make the Earth what it become.”

The result would be a Dark Age where knowledge was lost and only preserved by various priests and monks.

What is immediately noticeable is how the *Canticle for Leibowitz* explores the notion of cyclical history. This cyclical narrative implies two things: the inevitability of nuclear war and the endurance of humanity. In consideration to the inevitability of nuclear war, the *Canticle of Leibowitz* goes to Biblical proportions to narrate the outbreak of nuclear war.

Miller does not explicitly explain the direct effects of nuclear warfare upon the environment but he does allude to the after-effects. He paints a world that is deserted, empty, and harsh but never specifically explains what happens or why nuclear warfare changes this world. He uses Biblical parables to narrate the chronology but this technique has two distinct effects. On one hand, this type of historical narration undermines the reality of the situation by speaking of the nuclear attack in parables and metaphors, words or phrases that can be manipulated by the reader’s imagination, rather than precise and non-negotiable language that cannot be manipulated by the imagination. This creates the problem of multiple interpretations and inconsistent images from person to person.

On the other hand, this type of historical narration adds a sense of grandeur and magnitude that can only be captured through a Biblical style. Miller captures this style perfectly as he narrates Lucifer seducing a prince into using a nuclear weapon, the bomb being as hot as Hell, and God smelling the burnt carcasses of mankind. This sort of destruction is completely unimaginable, not because mankind is ignorant of the dangers but because mankind simply lacks the imagination to think of such violence outside the context of Biblical accounts and myths. It is impossible to imagine so many people vaporized and burned by nuclear explosions but it is possible to imagine the smell of rotted bodies, burned and charred, rising up to heaven and upsetting God.

It is an excellent representation of Science Fiction acting as a mediator between the reality and the memory. Miller’s *A Canticle for Leibowitz* takes the unimaginable destruction and approaches it through the means of Biblical narration in order to provide the audience a means of accepting a future that is both bleak and terrifying. This form of mediation, although a bit unrealistic, is
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the most palatable form of mediation because it takes the past and reorganizes it to match present events.

In another iconic Science Fiction film made in 1968, *Planet of the Apes*, three men voyage across the cosmos and awaken after a two thousand year hibernation. When they crash land on another planet, they are kidnapped by a race of advanced apes who have developed some form of organized society. They can ride horses, they have a code of laws based on religion, and they have some kind of guns. This advanced ape society is starkly contrasted with the underdeveloped human population who cannot speak, carry diseases, and live in packs rather than cities or villages. As one ape says, “They stink.”

In a twist ending, the main protagonist falls to his knees at the sight of a sunken Statue of Liberty as he realizes that the planet of apes is a post-apocalyptic Earth. Although previous films, short stories, and novels have portrayed the same destruction, *Planet of the Apes* takes it a step further by suggesting that the simplest aspect of humanity, that man is greater than animal, is fundamentally altered when nuclear warfare is unleashed. Although this is not explicitly stated, given the year that men leave Earth (approximately 1972) and the year the movie was produced, nuclear warfare was seen as a legitimate cause for the destruction of the Earth. In addition, Dr. Zaius, the chief antagonist of the film comments, “The forbidden zone [the main desert outside the ape’s village] was once a paradise. Your breed [humans] made a desert of it, ages ago.” This hints at nuclear warfare since the nuclear bomb has been traditionally portrayed in Science Fiction as a device that can transform life into a desert.

This revelation shows the physical and social power of nuclear warfare in the filmmakers’ eyes. Not only is society destroyed but the most basic order of things is challenged. Apes ride horses and men are treated as animals. The implications are absurd but, as Derrida would point out, without a historical precedent there is no way to guarantee that the future portrayed in *Planet of the Apes* cannot happen.

The movie completely redefines the nature of Reality-Mediation because, unlike prior Science Fiction works explored in this essay, it stretches the imagination to incredible and unrealistic lengths. The notion that nuclear warfare can result in the creation of a hyper advanced society of apes and the same nuclear
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warfare can result in the devolution of mankind is absurd. But, coming back to Derrida, there is no precedent to nuclear warfare and no history to define what should and should not happen.\(^{30}\) In *Canticle for Leibowitz*, the imagination was used to create a cyclical history that will inherently result in the escape out of a Dark Age, a Renaissance of learning, and the creation of another nuclear war between two ideologically different opponents. This style of imaginative creation resulted in the creation of a world very much like our own, a world from the past. On the other hand, in *Planet of the Apes*, there is no deficiency of imagination as the filmmakers effectively created a world that is so foreign, so unusual, and so eccentric that we cannot help but immediately reject the world and cannot imagine a process that would result in such a world existing.

*Planet of the Apes* is a cornerstone in the Reality-Mediation theory because it shows the process down to the letter; an event occurred which was altered and edited by some force, and the result is the creation of a memory loaded with images and emotions. The creation of the atomic bomb and the future of nuclear warfare was commented on by *Planet of the Apes* which resulted in the memory of a world drastically altered to the point of madness and impossibility.

Another Science Fiction film produced in 1976, *A Boy and his Dog*, details the story of a survivor who lives in the desert with his mutated dog after a nuclear war.\(^{31}\) This film follows in the footsteps of *A Canticle for Leibowitz* by describing a world ruined by nuclear warfare. Blood, the mutated dog, narrates a brief history of how World War Three pitted the Eastern and Western Blocs against each other but ended in 1983 with the Vatican Armistice and World War Four, which took place in some unknown year, lasted about five days which was, “Just long enough for the final missiles to leave their silos on both sides.” The result of WW4 was the destruction of life and the creation of a post-apocalyptic world.

The movie presents a post-apocalypse world where people are illiterate, food is scarce, sex is animalistic, and violence is common. In this world, men are alone and fight for themselves. The film shows that a world forged by war leaves behind a people desperate to survive.

This movie takes the memories of what the nuclear bomb can and will do to the Earth and then mediates it to the audience. In this fictional world, very
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real concerns about how mankind will survive after the nuclear bomb have been personified by the movie. These fears were then mediated and given a face by the movie *A Boy and his Dog*. But throughout the movie, the fears were eased by the reminder that a community has been able to survive despite the bombs and the destruction. The movie is able to comment on the post-apocalyptic nightmare and give the audience a sense of peace and hope even though the movie does not explain how Vic, Blood, and the rest of mankind were able to survive in these new conditions.

Science Fiction from the mid 1960s to the late 1970s represented the emergence of survivalism in spite of the bomb, a tradition that started in the *Canticle for Leibowitz*, and the danger that the nuclear weapon poses to not only society but also the world as a whole. The trope of survivalism exists because of the rise of numerous developments in nuclear survival strategies known as civic defense. These civic defense programs were sponsored by the government to protect the civilian population from nuclear annihilation. JoAnne Brown, professor of history at Johns Hopkins University, writes that these civic defense programs emerged first out of WW2 as “…scrap drives, blackout drills, refugee relief activities, and conservation of scarce resources.”

When the Cold War began, civic defense curriculum in schools had a rich and strong tradition already instituted; thus enabling civic defense education to focus on the nuclear bomb. Subjects from home economics to safety education were molded and structured to fit the core tenants of civic defense: surviving in the face of the bomb.

The popular interest in the fallout shelter also contributed to the new emerging attitude of survivalism. Sarah A. Lichtman defines the fallout shelter as, “…an ideologically charged national do-it-yourself project that permeated America’s post-war consciousness.” The fallout shelter was not only designed to protect individuals from a nuclear explosion, but also to help people wait for the fallout radiation caused from an explosion to subside.

Civic defense and the fallout shelter represent the standardization of survivalism in the face of nuclear war. These real world developments created a
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culture and an idea of surviving in spite of nuclear war. Science Fiction then took these real world developments and mediated upon them by commenting on them, providing stories, and creating a fantasy world after the nuclear explosion. Although this fantasy was grim, desolate, and unforgiving; it was a world that life could fight to live. Science Fiction during this time sought to give hope that there is a life after the bomb and perhaps a life that similar to the one we live now.

From the early 1950s to the late 1970s, Science Fiction depicted the nuclear weapon image consistently and never deviated from the stock of images that it was loaded with from the end of World War Two; but Science Fiction depicted nuclear weapon attitudes differently as it created a very distinct memory from event to event. Throughout the essay, Science Fiction has always portrayed the nuclear bomb as a weapon with the potential to wipe life off of the face of the Earth. From the early 1950s to the late 1970s, this collective societal memory has been consistent and has been constantly employed to ask questions beyond the bomb and imagine the world after the bomb has dropped. Even though the attitudes have shifted from absolute death to a conditional death, that is a death that can occur but is not ensured for all people, the image of destruction is constant. Therefore, this essay has properly shown that the image of death and destruction has been consistent despite the changes in the nuclear attitudes. But on a different note, this essay toys with the concept of the history of memory but does not effectively tackle certain methodological questions. Questions of what constitutes a memory and how do we reject the ideas brought to us and form contrary ideas are not addressed here. Nonetheless, this essay sought to show the interaction of Science Fiction works as a mediator of reality. Science Fiction at time invoked fear in its readers and viewers, forcing them to view a world not necessarily worth living in, but Science Fiction also inspired people to fight in the face of death and to hope for a future without the nuclear sword dangling over their heads. The relationship between the real world and the memory is complicated, it is my personal hope that this essay has shed some light on the subject and will be of use to other scholars in the future.
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THE MARRIAGE OF SCIENCE FICTION AND EGYPTOLOGY

Kevin McLaren

The unique mysteries of Ancient Egypt have been a subject of study by Westerners since the ancient Greeks and Romans.¹ Since ancient times, researchers have been enthralled by the mysterious nature of Ancient Egypt and have devised theories addressing Ancient Egypt’s seemingly-impossible engineering feats, enigmatic pantheon of gods, and excellent craftsmanship. The study of Ancient Egyptian culture by Westerners became dormant after the fall of the Roman Empire, but was again resurrected in the early 19th century when Napoleon arrived in Egypt.² Some scholars consider 1822 to be the official foundation date for the scholarly field known as “Egyptology,” which can be defined broadly as the “systematic exploration of Egypt.”³ Since 1822, Egyptology has undergone a series of major popular breakthroughs. The French occupation of Egypt and especially the translation of the Rosetta Stone resulted in a late 19th century boom of Egyptology. Later, in the 1920s, the discovery of Pharaoh Tutankhamun’s tomb started a second wave of Egyptological

² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
popularity. By the the late 20th century, Egyptology founded itself as a true academic discipline and social science grounding itself in history, anthropology, and sociology. Since the beginning of Egyptology, attempts to understand the origin, purpose, and history of Ancient Egypt have kept the field highly debatable (a primary example being the still-argued purpose of the pyramid complex at Giza—were they tombs built for kings like Richard Lepsius argued in the 19th century⁴, or were they for some greater and older spiritual/technological/symbolic purpose like Graham Hancock currently suggests?⁵). Mysteries and questions revolving around Ancient Egypt, as well as mainstream popularity among Westerners, have triggered many creative works of fiction to be written on the subject in the form of science fiction.

Because the field of Egyptology has always been subject to speculation, contemplation and opinions, Egyptology and Ancient Egypt have been recurring themes in science fiction. Science fiction since its advent has been a literature revolving around ideas, understanding, abstraction and hypothesizing. Because science fiction serves as such an efficient medium for conceptualizing speculative ideas, science fiction authors have written stories which often attempt fill the gaps of information that is missing or misunderstood by Egyptological scholars about Ancient Egypt or the exploration of Egypt. Egyptology’s study of Ancient Egypt’s abstruse nature and its timeline of breakthroughs have provoked science fiction authors to try to build on the speculation of Egyptologists and solve Egyptian mysteries through works of fiction. Writers have positioned themselves in Egyptological debates by writing stories that correlate with Egyptological theories, sometimes in direct response to the Egyptological theories of the author’s time period.

Egyptology and science fiction have had an important impact on each other, and science fiction written about Egypt has evolved simultaneously with the field of Egyptology. Science fiction stories/authors have continuously speculated and theorized potential answers to the questions regarding the mysterious nature, origin, and feats of Ancient Egypt, and those theories have perpetually correlated with actual scholarly theories. Egyptology has been essential to science fiction because Egyptology has been a forefront for historical, anthropological and

⁴ Richard Lepsius, *Discoveries in Egypt, Ethiopia and the Peninsula of Sinai* (London: Richard Bentley, 1852), 159.
sociological studies which provide the basis for “soft science fiction.” Arguably, Egyptology is one of the primary reasons that the social sciences were brought into science fiction. The simultaneous evolution of Egyptology and science fiction occurred because science fiction authors have continuously built upon new discoveries and breakthroughs in Egyptological studies which have been situated in intermediate expansions of information since 1822. An example of Egyptological science fiction correlation is the connection between the science fiction movie *Stargate* and the non-fiction theoretical book *The Orion Mystery*. *Stargate* suggests that Ancient Egyptians had access to a portal in which they could travel through a wormhole to another planet. The movie was released in October of 1994, mere months after the release of Robert Bauval and Adrian Gilbert’s *The Orion Mystery*, which suggests that the Giza plateau was intended to be a “gateway to the stars,” an Ancient Egyptian beacon to Osiris (the constellation Orion) in the sky. Though science fiction has benefitted from Egyptology, the reverse is also true, because scholarly Egyptological theories have formed, been refined, or improved based on the fictional works of science fiction authors. Once again using Robert Bauval’s “Orion Correlation Theory” (also originally presented in *The Orion Mystery* in 1994) as an example, Bauval began to better refine his theories after the release of *Stargate* by which Bauval began to use the term “stargate” to describe the connection between Giza plateau and the constellation Orion in his scholarly lectures. Though the “Orion correlation theory” and *Stargate* are more recent late-20th century examples of the correlation between Egyptology and science fiction, the connection between the two has been evident since the late 19th century.

Europeans in the 19th century rushed for information on Ancient Egypt, and pushed hard to excavate artifacts in Egypt to bring back to Europe. “The discoveries that were made…gave rise to a passion for all things Egyptian throughout Europe.” Rivalry between the major countries of Europe to gather artifacts and transfer those artifacts to Europe for private and public collections
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led to a reckless and unsystematic method of dealing with the exploration and excavation of Egypt, which in turn left a great number of mysteries and an absence of catalogued information. “Scientific expeditions unfortunately took place against a background of looting and collecting,”\textsuperscript{10} and many artifacts were brought back to Europe with a complete lack of context, information and historiographical records. The deficiency of historical information sparked wide scholarly speculation around the significance and historical importance of Ancient Egyptian culture. The equivocal characteristics of the seemingly endless amounts of Egyptian statues, scrolls, stelae, and sarcophagi brought to Europe were a marvel to scholars, and simultaneously, were also a marvel to authors that discussed through means of literature the purpose and significance of Ancient Egyptian culture. The mystery-solving intentions and curious outlook on Egyptian culture among scholars as well as fictional authors in the 19th century birthed a relationship between Egyptologists and science fiction authors that could arguably be the most important contribution to the invention of “soft science fiction,” which is a form of science fiction that concentrates on the social sciences (such as history, political science, anthropology, psychology, etc.) rather than the “hard sciences” (such as mathematics, astronomy, biology, etc.).

The 1890s marked an important time in which scholars and explorers formed theories and wrote grand narratives on their interpretations of the significance/purpose of Ancient Egyptian ways of life. At the same time, science fiction authors built upon the academic Egyptological theories, or formed their own theories on Ancient Egyptian matters. For example, the scholarly book made for the British Museum by Sir E.A. Wallis Budge, \textit{The Dwellers on the Nile}, published 1893 contains a chapter called, “Illustrations of the Pentateuch and Bible Passages From the Egyptian Monuments,”\textsuperscript{11} in which Budge attempted to present the Egyptian side of the story of \textit{Exodus}, and questioned those that “argue[d] that the manners of the Egyptians must have been savage and barbaric.” Budge wrote why a “nation with a history that numbered thousands of years,” and “that had shed the light of civilization” became “steeped in barbarism and ignorance,”\textsuperscript{12} which Budge argued started with the unkind treatment of the

\textsuperscript{10} Ian Shaw and Paul Nicholson, 91.
\textsuperscript{11} E.A. Wallis Budge, \textit{The Dwellers on the Nile} (Cambridge, UK: The Religious Tract Society, 1893), 80.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 98.
Jews, which in turn led to a domino effect of poor foreign policy.\(^\text{13}\)

In a seemingly direct response to *The Dwellers on the Nile*, Ellsworth Douglass wrote the story *Pharaoh’s Broker* in 1899, just a few years after the circulation of Budge’s *The Dwellers on the Nile*. *Pharaoh’s Broker* is a science fiction story in which the main characters take an explorational excursion to Mars (carried out much like the archaeological explorers of Egypt), during which they find a civilization on Mars that replicates what was once Egyptian civilization on Earth. After a sequence of events that lead them to meet the pharaoh of the Egypt-like planet, the main characters come to the realization that they are living and contributing to the story of *Exodus*, only on Mars instead of Earth. The characters come to the conclusion that “The Creator has given all the habitable planets the same great problem of life to work out. Every one of His worlds in its time passes through the same general history,”\(^\text{14}\) and realize that the reason that Mars’ evolution is slower in social history is because of its slower revolutions around the sun.\(^\text{15}\) Arguably, Ellsworth’s response to Budge dismissed Budge’s attempt to understand the Ancient Egyptian perspective, and rather, through science fiction, conservatively implied that the Judeo-Christian God’s will was the entire cause of Egyptian motives and the eventual fate of Ancient Egypt, rather than any decisions made on behalf of the Egyptians themselves like Budge suggested. Though *Pharaoh’s Broker* contains elements of “hard” science fiction (such as how the main characters get to Mars), its overall message is grounded in the social sciences by presenting Douglass’ interpretation and understanding of the evolution of the Egyptian social structure, culture and decisions. Therefore, *Pharaoh’s Broker* can be regarded as 19th century “soft” science fiction that benefitted from Egyptological theories (such as Budge) and potentially sparked new debates in the Egyptological field—a relationship cycle important to both science fiction and Egyptology.

Perhaps not as easily detectable as the relationship between *Pharaoh’s Broker* and *The Dwellers on the Nile*, *The Conquest of the Moon* by Andre Laurie is another example of a science fiction author that was influenced by Egyptology. The story consists of a group of scholarly explorers that bring the moon closer to Earth in order to explore and better understand it. Although *The Conquest of the Moon* is not specifically about Egyptology, the methods in which they...
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The way in which the characters explore the moon is identical to the way in which Karl Richard Lepsius, a mid-19th century explorer of Egypt, explored Egypt and documented it in his book *Discoveries in Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Peninsula of Sinai*. Laurie borrows from the field of Egyptology to invest ideas into exploration beyond the Earth and throughout the course of his novel makes suggestions as to what Egyptological methods could potentially evolve into. Egyptological methods of study would in fact evolve and become a more systematic and efficient field by the 1920s.

Howard Carter discovered King Tutankhamun’s tomb in 1922, which started a new wave of Egyptological popularity and pushed the field of Egyptology even further toward becoming a mainstream phenomenon. Carter’s discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb was “the first great media event in the history of Egyptology, capturing the imaginations of subsequent generations.”16 Carter wrote of Egyptology after the discovery, “…now all of a sudden we find the world takes an interest in us, an interest so intense and so avid for details that special correspondents at large salaries have to be sent to interview us, report our every movement, and hide round corners to surprise a secret out of us.”17 The discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb inspired a new wave of Egyptologists that were fascinated with treasure, tombs, mummies, and wondered what more could remain. The advanced craftsmanship, creativity, artistry and scientific advancement of Tutankhamun’s artifacts sparked new ideas about the origins, technology and motives of Ancient Egyptian culture, among both scholars and authors. The complex aspects of Tutankhamun’s tomb caused new questions to emerge, such as how a previously-thought primitive ancient people could make things of such grandeur, and what kind of society was capable and willing to make objects of utterly fantastic craftsmanship.

16 Ian Shaw and Paul Nicholson, 92.
Science fiction authors in the 1920s–1930s endeavored to write stories to introduce conceptual ideas about the unbelievable feats of the Ancient Egyptians, and presented that the Egyptians were perhaps affected by an out-of-this-world source. Beyond Pluto was written by John Scott Campbell in 1932, a science fiction novel that was early to suggest that the Ancient Egyptians had access to space travel, time travel and knowledge from advanced outer-space civilizations. The characters in the novel are Egyptologists that have set out to find a lost city, and rather, stumble upon an advanced technological society capable of space travel that takes the characters “Beyond Pluto.” Campbell promotes the idea throughout the storyline of his novel that the Ancient Egyptians were much more sophisticated and misunderstood than what was generally accepted by scholars. Campbell’s ideas would become a huge portion of Egyptological debates that remain today. Campbell’s questioning of how technologically, scientifically and culturally advanced the Egyptians were was likely originally evoked by the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb and Campbell’s ideas on Egyptian sophistication would also contribute to the field of Egyptology.

John Scott Campbell’s ideas formed prototypal theories on the possibility that an out-of-this-world influence may have helped form Egyptian culture. Perhaps unknown to Campbell, his ideas forced Egyptologists to finally approach and theorize on the origin and formation of Ancient Egyptian culture, whereas the majority of scholarly emphasis was before placed on the height of pharaonic culture. E.A. Wallis Budge, who by this time was the archetype of the Western Egyptologist, addressed Campbell’s ideas and formed a thesis about the origin of Egyptian culture, From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt (1934). Budge candidly argued against any unearthly influences on Egypt, and rather, argued that Egyptian culture was shaped mostly by tribal animist cults that slowly unified because of commonalities among tribes such as survival techniques, animal worship, and the belief in spiritual imburement of the natural world (which Budge calls “fetishism”). Budge’s work on predynastic Egypt would set a conservative standard for Western understanding of the development and creation of Ancient Egypt and push aside any science-fiction-like notions of alien or out-of-this-world influence on the formation of Ancient Egypt.

19 Ibid., 55-112.
Perhaps a reaction to both *Beyond Pluto* and *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt* was John Wyndham’s (under the name John Beynon) *The Secret People*, published in 1935. The Secret People portrays an opposite representation of Egyptian origins compared to Campbell, and pushes Budge’s ideas to the extreme. Similar to *Beyond Pluto*, the characters are explorers, this time exploring an artificial sea that was placed in the Sahara Desert by humankind. Upon exploring the sea, the main characters come across an ancient civilization, seemingly descendants of Ancient Egyptians. Unlike Campbell’s portrayal of an advanced race, Wyndham’s civilization is that of a backwards, underground, tribal pygmy culture that worships Egyptian gods merely because they are animals and doesn’t understand the most “trivial explanations” of concepts revolving around human nature. Wyndham, like Campbell, could have been addressing the same questions of who the Egyptians were and how advanced their civilization was, but took an opposite stance in which Wyndham felt that the Ancient Egyptians were an archaic and unintelligent civilization. Wyndham’s conceptual ideas on who the Egyptians were are definitely extreme reflections of Budge’s theories, in which Wyndham’s representation of Ancient Egypt is marked with animal worship, archaic survival techniques, and tribes. Wyndham’s portrayal is shaped by the same elements that Budge discusses in his thesis, but to Wyndham, those elements formed a barbaric and boorish culture. Though Wyndham and Campbell’s portrayals of the descendants of Ancient Egyptians in their novels are extreme, both viewpoints are contributions to Egyptology in regards to how advanced, cultured and enlightened the Ancient Egyptians truly were, which has remained a central debate in Egyptology since the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb and re-emerged as a major debate in the late 20th century.

The late 20th century triggered an interesting series of events. By the time of the late 20th century, Egyptology had founded itself as an official academic field, in which it is regarded as a true social science. At the same time, science fiction and the field of Egyptology have merged, in which many ideas discussed in science fiction have worked their way into the official scholarly debates regarding the history and nature of Ancient Egypt. The integration of “science-fiction-esque” theories into Egyptology has created a sharp divide between Egyptological communities. Erich von Däniken, author of *Chariots of the Gods: Unsolved Mysteries of the Past* (1968), was one of the first authors.
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to utilize science-fiction-esque ideas to blatantly challenge the foundations of scholarly Egyptological facts set by traditional Egyptologists. Von Däniken argues in *Chariots of the Gods* that aliens were an influence on many ancient cultures, including the Ancient Egyptians, and that clues were left by the Ancient Egyptians that provide proof for extraterrestrial intervention in Ancient Egypt. Though *Chariots of the Gods* presents information that sounds like science fiction, it is presented as a scholarly theoretical work designed to challenge the basis of traditional social science, including Egyptology. Von Däniken’s work on *Chariots of the Gods* would provide the basis for a string of challenges toward traditional Egyptology and inspire new types of science fiction.

*Stargate*, a 1995 film written by Roland Emmerich and Dean Devlin, presents a late 20th century science fiction work that embraces the merging of science fiction and scholarly Egyptological thought. In the movie, the main character is an Egyptologist who attempts to present broader ideas on Egypt and yet is rejected by his scholar colleagues. The first spoken line in the movie is by the main character, in which he says, “Pharaohs did not build the pyramids.” The frustrated scholar tries desperately to convince the other scholars of the notion of an older, more important purpose behind the pyramids, but is humiliated when his colleagues reject his ideas and leave. Throughout the course of the movie, the main character learns that his theories were correct, and to his surprise, the tyrannical alien Ra is responsible for Ancient Egyptian civilization on Earth as well as a parallel Ancient Egyptian-like civilization on another planet across the galaxy that is discovered by the use of a “stargate,” which is a portal that allows for quick space travel.

The struggles of the main character in *Stargate* are very similar to the real-life struggles of scholars such as Graham Hancock and Robert Bauval. Both scholars have proposed in their research that Ancient Egypt is much older and advanced than understood by traditional Egyptologists, and both scholars have also been rejected by the mainstream Egyptological community. For example, Robert Bauval and his co-author Thomas Brophy wrote on the prehistoric origins of Ancient Egypt in their book *Black Genesis* (2011) and emphasized the significant impact of Black Africans on pharaonic Egypt, which was widely dismissed by the academic community. Robert Bauval writes on the matter of...
scholarly rejection in *Black Genesis*, “In spite of many clues that have been in place in the past few decades, which strongly favor a Black African origin for the pharaohs, many scholars and especially Egyptologists have either ignored them, confused them, or, worst of all, derided or scorned those who entertained them.”

The struggle to have accepted theories in Egyptology are parallel between Daniel Jackson (the main character in *Stargate*) and scholars like Robert Bauval, which Roland Emmerich and Dean Devlin surely meant to approach in the storyline of their movie.

Aside from the struggles of rejected academics, Roland Emmerich and Dean Devlin definitely did their share of research and exploration in order to incorporate non-mainstream theories into *Stargate*. Conspicuously, Daniel Jackson of *Stargate* argues points in the movie before having knowledge of the stargate that are nearly exactly the same arguments that Graham Hancock makes in *Fingerprints of the Gods* (1995, published actually one year after the release of *Stargate*), though Hancock argued his points in controversial lectures prior to 1995, much like Daniel Jackson attempted to do in the movie), such as the idea that the pyramids were not made as tombs, that Egypt is a much older civilization than traditionally believed, and that Ancient Egypt may have been the result of an older mother culture.

Roland Emmerich and Dean Devlin’s movie *Stargate* presented their position on the matter of such Egyptological struggles and built on the ideas of contemporary controversial Egyptologists. The two used science fiction as a medium to engage the viewers into thinking that perhaps there is a potential for more radical theories in the field of Egyptology.

Perhaps as Emmerich and Devlin intended, the movie *Stargate* did birth new scholarly theories and help reinforce the ones already steeped in controversy and rejection. Though perhaps even more radical than the works of Bauval and Hancock, the television show *Ancient Aliens* which first aired in 2010 on the History Channel presented information by controversial Egyptologists that provided numerous theories on the origins of Ancient Egypt that were very similar to some of the ideas brought to the table in the movie *Stargate*. For example, in *Stargate*, the gods Anubis and Horus were portrayed as servant guards of the alien Ra whose suits and electronic battle garments look like a jackal and hawk and in turn, Anubis and Horus are not actual zoomorphic
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entities and rather they are humans wearing technologically advanced space suits that resemble animals. In *Stargate*, because the people of Ancient Egypt had no understanding of superior technology and no words or symbols to represent such technology, Anubis and Horus were depicted in Ancient Egyptian murals as zoomorphic entities as a result. Very similarly, in an episode of *Ancient Aliens* called, “The Mission,” Egyptologists that strongly argued in favor of “ancient astronaut theory” (the idea that humankind has been shaped by intruding aliens from outer space) provided evidence that Egyptian gods may have come from space and that their zoomorphic representations in Ancient Egyptian art may have only been because the Ancient Egyptians did not understand their truly advanced nature of genetic enhancement, space-exploring technology, and superior intellectual capacity. The noticeable similarity between the science fiction storyline of *Stargate* (16 years prior to *Ancient Aliens*) and the theories presented in “The Mission” on *Ancient Aliens* (which, despite its controversy, is intended to be a scholarly presentation of ideas) is a prime example of *Stargate* influencing Egyptology, and the true 20th century merging of science fiction and Egyptology.

The marriage of science fiction and Egyptology has been strong since the beginning of modern Egyptology (1822) and arguably, each has relied on the other ever since. Science fiction and Egyptology have evolved side-by-side with one another and have repeatedly borrowed material from each other as evident in the intertwining of stories and scholarly works such as *Pharaoh’s Broker* and *The Dwellers on the Nile*, or *Stargate* and *Ancient Aliens*. Science fiction authors have ever-constantly built upon the discoveries and theories of Egyptologists, and Egyptologists have repeatedly picked up on the ideas brought to light by science fiction authors, and the relationship between the two has been mutually beneficial. Periodic breakthroughs in Egyptological thought have led to strong changes in the science fiction based on Egyptology and vice versa. Egyptology as a social science embedded in solving mysteries was/is an excellent subject for science fiction authors to explore, and therefore was one of the reasons that social sciences were assimilated into science fiction, thus contributing to the creation of soft science fiction. As long as mysteries, debates, and puzzles
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remain for scholars to solve, science fiction authors will do the same, and the marriage of science fiction and Egyptology will endure.


Lepsius, Richard. *Discoveries in Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Peninsula of Sinai.* Edited by


Von Däniken, Erich. *Chariots of the Gods: Unsolved Mysteries of the Past.* Translated by
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“Peter added, ‘The Jews have been and always will be the chosen people!’ I answered, ‘Just this once, I hope they’ll be chosen for something good!’” This excerpt from Anne Frank’s diary, written by a fifteen year old girl in Holland, somehow captures the spirit of American Jewry during the 1950s. While American Jews had finally begun to enjoy some of the benefits of American life, anti-Semitism and discrimination continued to pervade their existence. Most importantly, this quote signifies the American Jews of the postwar era were directly linked to their European counterparts through the Holocaust.

The Holocaust today is considered an integral part of defining the group identity of American Jewry. While this statement may seem concrete to the modern observer, there is heavy debate about whether this has always been the case.¹ There are two major camps of thought on this subject. Many historians

champion the argument presented by Peter Novick that Jewish Americans on the whole remained silent about the Holocaust in order to become full participants in the new Postwar American prosperity; conformed and consuming, patriotic members of the democratic society with God on its side.\(^2\) In contrast is the view presented by Hasia Diner, proclaiming that Jews did in fact talk about and pursue memorials of the Holocaust frequently in the postwar period while still pursuing these American goals.\(^3\)

Although both can be correct, what these two sides fail to acknowledge is the limitations that the scope of their argument creates. Novick and others like him mainly look to the greater American public and government, as well as national Jewish conversations on the Holocaust to draw their conclusions, ignoring the many local, community based conversation that construct Diner’s points. What they overlook is the medium between the two sides: that their accounts can coexist and can be explained by the context in which they occurred. Conversations may have primarily taken place on the local level, but they still contributed greatly to the construction of a collective identity for American Jewry.

During the 1950s, American Jews were inherently bound together by their wariness of the specter of Hitler’s Final Solution, as, even in the United States, anti-Semitism remained present in varying forms and severity.\(^4\) In some cases during the postwar period Anti-Communist and Anti-Semitic were synonymous in the way that Jew and Communist had been for those crusaders against un-American activity.\(^5\) On a more personal, level Jews were discriminated against in the work place and in college admissions, faulted for the “defects of their race” and praised for their disassociation with qualities deemed inherently Jewish.\(^6\) Those national sentiments against Jews coupled with the pressure to reevaluate


\(^3\) Hasia Diner, *We Remember*, 14.

\(^4\) Diner, *We Remember*, 300.

\(^5\) Clancy Sigal, “Hollywood During the Great Fear”, *Present Tense* 9 (1982), 45-48. Diner, *We Remember*, 287. While there were Jewish anti-Communists many believed that at least during the McCarthy era there was an element of anti-Semitism that was closely associated with anti-Communism.

Germany in light of the new Cold War geopolitics created an atmosphere in which American Jewry was caught between their duties as Americans and Jews; believing it was necessary to remember the Holocaust, but not comfortable enough to differentiate themselves as a minority on the National stage. This conflict would not only lead to a crisis of identity for American Jewry but create a climate in which an integral part of that identity, the Holocaust, would only be acknowledged among other Jews.

To understand this phenomenon it is imperative to examine the popular media of the postwar period, and the fact that during this time, few non-Jewish media outlets covered the results of the Holocaust. While searching through popular outlets like Life magazine, as well as The New York Times and Los Angeles Times, articles about the Holocaust are hard to find. Much of the coverage by major newspapers is only a brief mention of the horrors of the Holocaust in conjuncturc to the creation of the state of Israel. The articles rarely probed into the question of why the Holocaust happened; it was merely a detail to justify the creation of Israel, a state that held some political purpose for the U.S. in the Cold War. Life magazine also reflected this trend with only two pieces covering the Holocaust between August 1945 and December 1960. One piece about the Warsaw Uprising not only downplayed the role of Jews in the event but its main purpose was to prove that the Cold War was a Russian production started in the midst of WWII; the other an advertisement for the Destiny Campaign by the United Jewish Appeal, selling the idea of Israel to the American population as a humanitarian effort. The latter, produced in 1948, does little to educate its readers on the Holocaust, only taking one line to describe the Jews already and planning to live there as deserving, hard-working peoples who have “shown their caliber” and “emerged from the Holocaust and mass murder of the last ten years with an indomitable will to live and with an overpowering eagerness to be productive”. This description downplays the Holocaust and in part the Jewishness of these inhabitants of Israel in an effort to relate them to the average American through the American values of hard work and ingenuity. This
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9 Morgenthau, Jr., “History has privileged us”, 145.
was a fresh start for the Jewish image in postwar America and one in which
the Holocaust did not fit into the mainstream, non-Jewish media, even with
regards to the Jewish state of Israel.

All of these examples were geared to non-Jewish Americans and were mini-
mal at best, but the nature and coverage of the Holocaust in America changed
dramatically with the English publication of The Diary of Anne Frank in 1952. The
diary has been revered as a turning point in Holocaust awareness. According to
Historian Alan Mintz, it “create[ed] a bridge of empathetic connection, even
identification, between the fate of European Jewry and ordinary American
readers who had no ethnic or religious link to the victims”.10 While this publi-
cation brought higher visibility to the Holocaust than ever before, its cultural
advancement was imposed on by the belief of many historians that the text
was edited to downplay Anne’s Judaism.11 Mintz is careful to note the edits
done by Anne’s father to the original diary’s publication and the later editing
done for the stage version by Albert Hackett and Frances Goodrich are careful
to present Anne in the most flattering way to a Gentile audience. This meant
editing out accounts of her budding sexuality as well as making her Jewishness
seem “inessential” as her “identity is folded into the generality of victims of
fascism and even into the larger class of the unjust world”.12

Another historian argues that while this grouping of Anne with other vic-
tims of fascism may also occur, it is Anne’s perspective as a child that “muted
her Jewishness from the very beginning”. Like others, he stresses the fact that
American non-Jewish audiences would not have connected with a blatantly
Jewish character, therefore, it was because she was a child that “even latently
anti-Semitic American audiences of the 1950s welcomed her into their hearts”.13
All of these theories culminate in a New York Times book review of the diary in
1959. With the rerelease of her works, along with new short stories and sketches,
the reporter Charles Poore does not once mention that Anne is Jewish, instead
he describes her as “one of the great tragic figures of our century” and “the
conscious of a ruthless era” linking her plight to those of the victims of fascism,
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not the singular fate of Europe’s Jews. Her ethnic identity downplayed, Poore spends most of the article describing her as a child, a naïve window onto a cruel and quickly changing world. It is trends like this, directly in the post-war era that demotes *The Diary of Anne Frank* from the pinnacle of Holocaust remembrance to a mere whisper of the event, further proving that Jews and Jewish themes did not fit comfortably into the American cultural landscape.

With all of these examples of popular media coverage it is important to note which sources were actually covering the Holocaust related issues during the postwar period. The trend that surfaces is that these were commonly Jewish sources geared towards Jewish readers, a project spearheaded by the American Jewish Committee with its two most influential publications, *The Jewish American Yearbook* and the magazine *Commentary*. *Commentary* is probably the most prevalent, as throughout the postwar period they produced a variety of articles for the academic Jewish audience on subjects relating to the Holocaust and status of Jews in the United States. Within this forum of Jewish thought, mostly Jewish authors were able to express their thoughts and research, opinions and feelings, about the greatest catastrophe to ever affect modern Judaism. They were able to lament their losses and look to the future, all while crafting the Holocaust as a distinct part of their experience as American Jews. In their articles, Jews were able to confront the horrors of the death camps and the uniquely Jewish aspect of the Holocaust that mainstream media seemed unable to do. They also approached the question of who was to blame for this travesty, knowing full well that it was the pervasiveness of the world that allowed the Holocaust to continue as it did. Although there are reports on the actual events of the Holocaust, the bulk of *Commentary*’s discussion on the Holocaust during the postwar period is interwoven with pieces on anti-Semitism, presenting a type of constant vigilance and wariness of their Gentile neighbors. The Jews of the postwar period, to an even greater extent than their predecessors, were aware that they lived in a predominately Christian world and one that recently had, and could easily again, turn hostile towards them.

These were the feelings characterized by *Commentary*, as well as the *American Jewish Yearbook*, which encountered many of the same themes as *Commentary* but presented these issues of the Holocaust and the Jewish experience in report, rather than article, format.

While those two were some of the larger Jewish publications engaging the Holocaust at the time, there are countless examples of sermons, essays, and prayers written just for local Jewish communities and their memorialization of the Holocaust. One example is the “Seder Ritual of Remembrance: For the Six Million Who Perished at the Hands of the Nazis and for the Heroes of the Ghetto Uprisings” published by the American Jewish Congress in 1952 for “a broad usage in American Jewish homes, schools, and community settings”.

It is an interesting but strategic move to place a ritual of remembrance with the holiday of Passover. The story of Passover and the enslavement of Jews by the Egyptians is one that is deeply important to the Jewish faith and identity. Practically every practicing Jew celebrates at least some version of the holiday, and it is safe to assume that culturally and religiously Passover is a part of the Jewish identity. This pairing is significant in many ways, but mainly because as early as 1952, it shows an effort on American Jewry’s part to never forget the Holocaust and intertwine it with similar themes already existing in the Jewish identity. This type of remembrance was just one of many as “specially designed books and cemetery markers, invocations at meetings, and book dedications” provided American Jews with the tools to memorialize the Holocaust.

Another example of more localized Jewish memorialization comes in the form of an excerpt from an essay produced by a young Jewish camper Sharon Feinman at the Reform movement’s Camp Institute in 1956. The essay, while bearing the markings of a young perspective, fully engages the tragedy and pain caused by the Holocaust, but once again it is an example found deep within the confines of the Jewish community. Going to Jewish camp for Jewish children and teenagers is almost a universal experience, and for years has been a place for those youngsters to build their own budding Jewish identities and communities. What this and other mediums of memory like it have in common is the fact that they are directly linked to conversations within local Jewish communities. While some may have been published by larger national
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bodies they were meant as tools for conversation at the most commonplace level of Jewish culture, the synagogue or community. The language of these memorials or even the setting of them does not promote non-Jewish participation; in fact it encompasses the conversation it encourages to only Jewish circles.

Looking at the conversations of the Holocaust in the national media only depicts a trend: that Jews, and Non-Jews did not engage in a conversation about the Holocaust, while Jews were eager to memorialize it among themselves during the postwar period. To understand this trend it is important to examine the atmosphere of the 1950s and its relationship to American Jews. Many historians state that the 1950s was a time of declining anti-Semitism as Jews were embraced by the suburbanized, consumerist, American society. While Jews did begin to enjoy American life in ways that they had never before had been able to, anti-Semitism in the United States was far from in its decline. In fact, anti-Semitism, while “latent” compared to that experienced before and after the war in Europe, still thrived within the United States.

This experience of anti-Semitism for postwar Jews can be divided into two major categories: discrimination and violence. The United States has had a long history with both of these but the best documented is discrimination. From the quotas on immigration and college admissions, to the refusal to hire based on religion American Jewry was not new to discrimination in the U.S. For the year of 1950 the American Jewish Yearbook dedicated most of their “Civic and Political” section to discussing the issue of discrimination against Jews in the United States. Jews received treatment similar to other minorities at the time; meaning they experienced things such as housing bias in which they were among a list of “undesirables” and therefore not given the opportunity to rent or purchase homes in certain neighborhoods. Jews were also discriminated against in the workplace as the American Jewish Yearbook reported that “Ninety-five per cent of the private employment agencies reported that Jewish applicants faced serious discriminatory barriers in attempting to qualify for jobs” and many agencies did not even list them for qualified jobs. At this point in time this

type of discrimination was still legal creating an unwelcome atmosphere for American Jews. This theme continued as many prestigious private universities instituted quotas on Jewish students as late as 1960.\textsuperscript{25} This discrimination not only barred Jews from reaching the upper echelons of academic achievement at the time, but represented American hostility to Jews gaining the status that came with those degrees. An Ivy League degree represented more than just an education, it was a level of society that, thanks to the quota system's discrimination, left Jews unwelcome.

This discrimination itself would motivate many Jews during the post war era to attempt to not single themselves out among the general American population. If keeping the conversation of the Holocaust within the community meant avoiding certain distinctions that would lead to discrimination, then many Jews saw it in their best interest to keep it that way. These feelings were only compounded when American Jewry was faced with the most dangerous product of anti-Semitism: violence. During the postwar period “there was a greater tendency of individual [anti-Semitic] agitators to combine operations, as well as increasing stress on the distribution of inflammatory literature as the principal form of overt activity” according to the \textit{Jewish American Yearbook} as they also noted that “the principal theme exploited by anti-Semitic agitators was the identification of Jews as Communists and as conspirators for world control” a sentiment that had greatly increased since the end of the second World War.\textsuperscript{26} The report dedicated six pages to the subject of “Anti-Jewish Agitation” breaking it down into groups of various themes from the Klu Klux Klan, to mother’s and patriot groups. While the majority of these groups and individuals mentioned were mostly dedicated to anti-Semitic propaganda and rallies some did cross the line into violence.\textsuperscript{27} Throughout the post war period there were multiple incidents of attempted and successful synagogue bombings and assaults on Jewish communities. In the Midwest and South, Jews were targeted by these groups and alienated by treatment that paralleled some events leading up to the Holocaust in Germany.\textsuperscript{28} This treatment could only

\textsuperscript{26} AJC, “Civic and Politics”, \textit{American Jewish Yearbook} 51 (1950), 110.
\textsuperscript{27} AJC, “Civic and Politics”, \textit{American Jewish Yearbook} 51 (1950), 110-115.
create an atmosphere in which Jews would feel uncomfortable talking about the Holocaust, in a way that would further differentiate them and call attention to potential tormentors.

As anti-Semites in the U.S. took cues from their Nazi predecessors, American Jewry was actively keeping an eye on their location of inspiration: Germany. During the late 1940s and early 1950s American Jews were particularly concerned with the state of Germany and were conflicted with its treatment by the United States. As the Cold War began to take shape the image of Germany was rehabilitated in the U.S. in a way that Jews found hard to reconcile. A country that had been an enemy only five or so years before was now an important ally of the United States in their geopolitical fight against the Soviet Union. Unlike the rest of the country, American Jewry did not forget quickly the horrors of WWII and the vital role that Germany had played in them. And while they supported the United States, most Jews were not ready to economically or politically support a state which still housed many supporters of Hitler.

In magazines like *Commentary* throughout the postwar period there was a particular focus and concern on the state of Germany and the anti-Semitism still prominent in their society. One particular example from *Commentary* is the article “The Aftermath of Nazi Rule: A Report from Germany” by Hannah Arendt. Written in 1950, it spends most of its length describing the state of the German people. Careful to remain unbiased, the author slips at certain points and ultimately reveals some of the undercurrents of Jewish-American opinion. She notes that one of “the most striking and frightening aspect” was what she believed was a “German flight from reality” and a “habit of treating facts as though they were mere opinions” in regards to the horrors of the Holocaust and the state of anti-Semitism in their country currently. Her choice of language depicts a sense of frustration, wariness, but most importantly blame as it becomes apparent that “reality” puts the guilt of these horrors on the German people. Throughout the pieces written there are echoes of fear for the past and a wariness of the future, but the sentiment that the Holocaust and most of the horrors of WWII were a direct consequence of German actions remains concrete. This pervasive opinion among America’s Jews did not fit the mold
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of a patriotic American during the Cold War and created a crisis of identity as Jews strove to be American yet could not forgive their nation’s new ally of its past actions. This dichotomy led to the suppression of talks about the Holocaust to just within the confines of the Jewish community, as Jews avoided being further singled out by not conforming to this aspect of American life.

This conflict of interest is what characterized the experience of American Jewry. Whether to be Jewish or American, to face discrimination but retain their ancient cultural heritage and belief system or to assimilate and forget events of the past? The Holocaust epitomized this struggle; Europe’s Jews had refused to, or not even been given a choice to assimilate and had therefore been eradicated by racist ideology. Despite the fact that these horrific events transpired far from the homes of American Jews, in a country and continent that many had never been to, they realized that it was merely luck of geography that separated them and Europe’s Jews from the same fate.\(^{32}\) This knowledge and understanding of the society in which they lived revealed itself in a pervading skepticism of American society by Jews who warily embraced it during this period.

Yet despite discrimination, violence and a heavy undercurrent of fear, Jews still continued to memorialize the Holocaust in their communities. In the end this is the key to a conclusion about Jewish identity in the 1950s, this continued persistence to memorialize the Holocaust within Jewish communities as one sociologist describes it was a “paradox of persistence through (not despite) persecution”. This theory labels persecution as “simultaneously timeless, dreaded, and expected” within Jewish culture.\(^{33}\) This seems to hold true while examining such cultural staples as Hanukkah and Passover; both center on the destruction of Jewish culture by a despotic foreign power. The Holocaust fits in with these religious stories as merely the most recent and cataclysmic of what constituted an ancient history of Jewish persecution. As American Jews experienced anti-Semitism within the U.S., or at least alienation to some degree, the idea that the Holocaust was an “imminent…danger”, a lesson to not be forgotten, became evident as a staple of the Jewish experience.\(^{34}\) Yet this certainty to remember was accompanied by a wariness that would come
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to characterize all Jews of the postwar period: a group willing to embrace their new culture yet unable to trust it at the same time.

During the postwar period the Holocaust encompassed all Jewry with its tragedy and repercussions leaving remaining witnesses affected and changed forever. In her diary, Anne recalls the Jews as a “chosen people” but never chosen for anything good. This mixed definition as a unique, even special, group but one characterized by persecution is exactly how American Jews saw themselves; conflicted by their past abroad as well as their more imminent future in the U.S. This identity of conflict was heavily influenced by the cultural context in which it persisted. While the directly perceived conflict of being American versus Jewish would eventually subside and allow for national conversations of the Holocaust, it would take the coming of the 1960s and a change in cultural and political context for the Holocaust to develop into an American issue, not just a Jewish one.35 Yet regardless of this public transformation the Holocaust, and what remains of that wariness of the 1950s, continues to be a vital part of the American Jewish experience as Jews continue on in a “paradox of persistence”.

35 Novick, Mintz, and Diner all note the 1960s as a changing point in Holocaust perception in the United States for either political or cultural reasons.
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“The Council of Lithuania, as the sole representative of the Lithuanian nation, based on the recognized right to national self-determination, and on the Vilnius Conference’s resolution of September 18–23, 1917, proclaims the restoration of the independent state of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with its capital in Vilnius and declares the termination of all state ties which formerly bound this State to other nations.”

On February 16, 1918, the Tarbya, or Council of Lithuania, signed the above Act of Independence of Lithuania, declaring the restoration of Lithuania as an independent state after centuries under Prussian and Russian imperial rule, and setting off more than a decade of regional conflict concerning what this could and should mean for Lithuanians and their neighbors. Although occupying German forces initially suppressed this document, ensuring a pointed lack of immediate results, the tides of war gradually bestowed the Tarbya’s words with more than mere symbolism. Even before Germany formally surrendered, the
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Lithuanian Constituent Assembly had authored a provisional constitution, and Lithuanians celebrated Armistice Day less than two weeks later with the establishment of the first government of an independent republic of Lithuania.

Relying on the democratic principles espoused by the victors of World War One and the promises of Wilson’s Fourteen Points, Lithuanian leaders forged ahead on the path to self-determination, immersing themselves in the tasks of designing and implementing a functioning government that corresponded to their understandings and expectations of a Lithuanian state. Within no time at all however, these leaders found their plans and definitions challenged on nearly every front. Within Lithuania itself, political parties old and new, from Christian Democrats and Populists to Social Democrats, Communists, and National Unionists, each struggled to ensure that their agenda took precedence in the newly formed state. Outside the government, Lithuania’s various ethnic, religious, class, and occupational groups engaged in their own conversations about independence and the new Lithuania.

External interpretations and agendas for the Lithuanian region also developed in the massive international realignment that characterized the end of the war. Despite the Allied victors agreement on the need for self-determination in post-war Europe from an ideological standpoint, many powers delayed official recognition of the new Lithuanian state as unimportant, asserting a need for additional evidence prior to considering the case. They demanded that the Lithuanian government prove in some way that they in fact held any sort of historic or ethnographic claim to lands and people contained within the borders of the new state. The fledgling League of Nations, suddenly responsible for determining the status of would-be states, excluded Lithuania from membership on the grounds that the United States already refused to recognize Lithuania. The United States, at the time embroiled in a frenzy of anti-communist hysteria known as the Red Scare, justified its refusal as an unwillingness to acknowledge the new Communist government of Russia and the loss of Russia’s imperial prerogatives to Lithuanian lands.

In this period of uncertainty, several of Lithuania’s neighbors saw the opportunity to make their own claims concerning the nature of the Lithuanian state. The Red Army invaded in November 1918, seeking to reclaim lands once considered part of the Russian Empire. A group of German military adventurers also took up arms against Lithuania in hopes of preserving German influence in the region. Hot on their heels, newly independent Poland swept in from the
southeast as part of a grand offensive against the Russian army. In the process, they unashamedly occupied Lithuania’s capital at Vilna, and claimed over a third of Lithuanian territory as its own.

Given the lasting impact of this period on future political developments and diplomatic relationships, the dearth of academic analysis on this region proves particularly disappointing and problematic. This partially stems from fifty years of Soviet occupation that limited scholarly access to materials concerning Lithuania, and also discouraged public discussions and displays of nationalism within Lithuania itself. Most studies that even mention the formation of the Lithuanian state do so briefly or within an analysis of the Baltic States as a group.² Moreover, authors tend to frame the 1910’s and 1920’s in light of the 1990’s round of independence, a mere blip within the more general story of occupation and oppression finally shaken off in 1991. Not until recent years have a few more-informed studies of this topic emerged, mostly by Lithuanian citizens or expatriates, indicating continued lack of interest toward the region among the majority of scholars (and the world at large).

In Alfred Senn’s exploration of the Polish-Lithuanian conflict and its relationship to Western powers, he blames the situation’s lack of resolution on the ignorance of the Western Allies concerning Eastern Europe’s nationalist trends and their inability to engage Poland and Lithuania as two sovereign nations.³ For Senn, this combination of condescension and incomprehension drastically crippled the League of Nations’ and Entente Powers’ abilities to act decisively or effectively in Lithuania, to the detriment of the young Lithuanian state. Unfortunately, Senn refuses to engage the Polish perspective in his analysis because he perceived it as less meaningful than Lithuania’s. Meanwhile, Zigmantas Kiaupa eschews any detailed analysis of the League, and focuses instead on the military conflicts that plagued Lithuania’s early years, and their influence in shaping the political structure of the state.⁴ Both these studies suffer however, from the innate nationalist sentiments of their own authors, adopting Lithuania’s historic enemies as their own and failing to address conflicting viewpoints objectively. This paper seeks to remedy these deficiencies by creating a more
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complete and multi-dimensional analysis concerning the formative years of the first Lithuanian Republic. Moreover, it will attempt to draw further conclusions concerning the creation and interpretation of Lithuanian national identity as a multi-directional discourse between Lithuania and other entities.

Over the first years of the new state’s existence, Lithuanians expelled the Russian and German troops, and held off further advances by the Poles, while presenting and re-presenting their case for existence and certain prerogatives to the League of Nations and individual national governments. Set upon on all sides, and desperate for acceptance as a legitimate European state, the Lithuanians compiled mountains of historic, ethnographic, and linguistic evidence to support their right to exist and to claim certain territories. Given the intensely nationalistic rhetoric surrounding nearly every aspect of the First World War, it comes as no surprise that this evidence would ultimately outline Lithuania’s own equally intense brand of national identity. More importantly, however, these interactions created a vast international dialogue concerning the nature and identity of the Lithuanian state that reached far beyond Lithuania’s disputed borders. This dialogue engages a wide variety of speakers in complex issues of democracy, national identity, and self-determination, both within the Lithuanian state and without. Ultimately, these players have as much, if not more, impact on the nature of the Lithuanian State as the Lithuanians themselves, and it is this dialogue that truly shapes the strength and character of Lithuania’s national identity.

While a significant number of new nations, states, and combinations thereof, emerged from the chaos of the First World War, and the international community devoted significant time and energy to each case, this paper restricts itself to issues of Lithuanian national identity and statehood, except where other cases (such as Poland) play a direct role in Lithuanian development. This approach does not seek to belittle the efforts of other groups or organizations in this process, but rather to focus on the methods, successes, and failures of one people whose story and importance find themselves frequently overlooked in studies of the region and period, but still hold vital historical significance for anyone concerned with issues of national identity in the formation of states.

In its interpretation on nationalism as a multi-directional discourse, this paper relies on people and documents from a wide range of sources, which have been incorporated as much as possible in the scope of this work. Unfortunately the author’s own language limitations have heavily impacted the types of sources
consulted in the course of this research. Thus, while a few documents have been translated from Lithuanian specifically for this paper, the majority of sources are those originally published in English - diplomatic correspondence, US newspaper articles, US Senate, and League of Nations documentation - or those translated to English by Lithuanians and Lithuanian Americans for the benefit of the international community. While these circumstances might neglect the voice of the Lithuanian peasantry particularly, certain travelogues serve as a vehicle for some peasant sentiments concerning Lithuania’s place in the world at large. Moreover, this approach demonstrates the intricacies of the dialogue surrounding national identity and the vast international scale within which these conversations occur.

Due to the complexities of war and ever-shifting borders, as well as conflicting claims over Lithuanian territory and identity, many people, places, and organizations appear under different names in different accounts. In striving for historical accuracy, this paper incorporates the most relevant terminology in each situation, dependent on the time period and the term used by each particular document. Thus Lithuania’s present capital, Vilnius, may appear as Wilno (Polish), Vilnius (Lithuanian), or Vilna (international), and certain people’s names may appear in their Polish or Lithuanian renditions (for example) depending on the context. These distinctions are not intended to confuse, but to realistically reflect the language of the period and reiterate the complexities inherent to the formation of national identity within Lithuania.

**Young Nationalism: Infancy to Adolescence**

Modern Lithuanian nationalism traces its roots to Lithuanians’ reactions against growing oppression in the second half of the nineteenth century. While regional uprisings and agitations, supplemented by differences in language and culture, fostered a level of national consciousness in many parts of Eastern Europe, Lithuanian nationalism found its growth stunted by the region’s historic union with Poland, the Polonization of many Lithuanian elites, as well as the region’s absorption into the Russian Empire in 1795. Not until Tsar Alexander II officially abolished serfdom throughout the empire in 1861 did
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nationalist sentiment in Lithuania truly develop a life of its own.\textsuperscript{7} 1861-1862 saw widespread demonstrations by Lithuanian peasants angry at delays in emancipation, followed by a joint Polish-Lithuanian uprising in 1863. The tsar’s harsh dealings with the Uprising led to a general decline in the power of the Lithuanian gentry, who suffered land confiscations and heavy fines for their involvement. Alexander II and his son’s ensuing policies of Russification restricted the use of Lithuanian language, the practicing of Catholicism, and otherwise limited Lithuanian politics and culture.

The same agitations that set Lithuanians at odds with their Russian masters ultimately severed ties with their Polish brothers-in-arms as well. The paths of the two peoples converged in the fourteenth century through the marriage of their two sovereigns, the Lithuanian Grand Duke Jagiela and the Polish queen Jadwiga, to form a kingdom that stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Lithuanians claim that in 1569, the Polish coerced Lithuania into a formal union signed at Lublin that infringed upon their status as a sovereign people.\textsuperscript{8} The Poles conversely claim that this union sprang from the mutual strengthening of their ties and that it brought unity and culture to the Lithuanians.\textsuperscript{9} Over time, much of the Lithuanian gentry adopted Polish language and culture, leaving Lithuanian peasants to preserve their own language and traditions, but inadvertently blurring the lines between the two cultures more than replacing either. Authors like the poet Adam Mickiewicz wrote proudly of the Lithuanian fatherland, but referred to the Polish \textit{Litwa} rather than the Lithuanian \textit{Lietuva}.\textsuperscript{10} Even in Vilna, Lithuania’s historic capital, one could hear far more Polish or even Yiddish spoken in the streets than Lithuanian, making the city a source of contention until the end of the Second World War.

Over time, a small Lithuanian intelligentsia emerged, striving to reestablish the language and culture that had fallen out of use among the educated under Polish influence. The region found itself divided, at times so much that one brother might identify as Polish while another declared himself Lithuanian. The 1863 Uprising brought these tensions to the forefront as Polish and Lithuanian
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aims for the rebellion diverged drastically. Polish leaders spoke of Lithuania as a territory of Poland, while many Lithuanian leaders viewed the uprising as an opportunity to pull away from the Poles and restore Lithuanian autonomy. These conflicting viewpoints led to irreparable divisions between the Polish and Lithuanian nobilities in their plans for the uprising and the future of the region. Such radically different interpretations of the region’s history and culture sparked massive conflict that continued unabated and unresolved despite larger conflicts with the Russian and German Empires and even as younger generations of Poles and Lithuanians began to develop new forms of nationalism within their respective cultures.¹¹

Thomas Balkelis traces the origins of this new Lithuanian nationalism to an emerging intelligentsia born from the imperial Russian education system and subsequent exposure to Russian intellectual culture.¹² As increasing numbers of Lithuanian students graduated from Russian universities and began seeking employment, many of them found work as doctors, lawyers, and teachers, and made their way into Lithuania’s Polish and Jewish dominated cities for the first time. In Balkelis’ estimation, cities like Mariampol and Vilna became centers of patriotic activity, while other members of the intelligentsia assimilated into Russian culture or else took refuge abroad.¹³ These increasingly secular urban intellectuals orchestrated the creation of illegal patriotic publications like Aušra (Dawn) and Varpas (The Bell) that allowed them to voice their nationalist sentiments and political agendas in the now-banned Lithuanian language. This defiance however, required time to bridge the gap between the city and the country, between the wealthy and the peasants. An urban middle class grew slowly and painfully as professionals from peasant backgrounds struggled to adjust their way of life.¹⁴ By the turn of the century, this group, while by no means cohesive, had somewhat consolidated political leadership within a covert Lithuanian nationalist movement.¹⁵ Unfortunately, this movement’s discussions and actions remained disconnected from society at large.

Lithuanians only began to remedy this breach with the outbreak of revolution across the Russian Empire in 1905. Massive unrest within the peasant
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and labor populations ignited a fire of political unrest at every level of society within the imperial context. Emboldened by the actions of the lower classes, underground political leaders throughout the land also arose in opposition to the tsar’s autocratic government with calls for representation and democracy. Lithuania proved no exception to this case. Workers’ strikes and agricultural demonstrations demanded social equities long denied to the lower classes, jolting Lithuanians into action on every level while also providing an audience with which political leaders could share their agendas. While the Lithuanian intelligentsia welcomed such opportunities to promote national consciousness, they proved tremendously unprepared to harness the energies of the peasants and workers.  

Hopelessly divided amongst themselves, various political parties broached numerous resolutions designed to end the conflict and secure a permanent peace, but achieved little in the way of unifying the movement.

Despite the lack of political unity in this moment, a 1919 publication recalls that in 1905, “the national consciousness in Lithuania was so strong and widespread, throughout the land that it was possible to call a convention from all parts of Lithuania.” As Lithuanians gathered for the convention then known as the All-Lithuanian Assembly, now referenced as the Grand Seimas, the nationalist movement began to coalesce into something far greater than fragmented pockets of political elites. The congress met in late November, with roughly 2,000 delegates covering topics from autonomy to education to agriculture, and eventually settling on a rather ambitions program for the unification and improvement of Lithuanian society. This event also ushered a greater number of common people into the political arena than ever before, forming a mass movement where only elites had agitated formerly. This drastic shift in participation found the people of Lithuania increasingly invested in the formation of a Lithuanian nation and brought them one step closer to a coherent national identity.

Although the Revolution of 1905 petered out without truly democratizing the empire, the establishment of the Duma, an empire-wide representative assembly announced by Nicholas II’s October Manifesto, sparked significant interest within Lithuania. The same concessions granted Lithuanians increased
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political freedoms, including the ability to publish in their native language for the first time in over forty years. These developments ushered in waves of new publications, cultural, political, and otherwise, in the Lithuanian language. Despite the Duma’s repeated dissolutions, Lithuanians actively engaged in that forum as long as they could, before ultimately returning their focus to Lithuanian people and lands. Lithuanian cultural work became the defining element of these years, leading to the development and refinement of a national culture long before the movement could propose the idea of an independent Lithuanian state. Music, dress, and writing flourished as distinct costumes and customs came to stand as emblems of the Lithuanian people, and spread through the cities like fire. This cultural coherency left Lithuania far more united than many of its nearest neighbors, eagerly awaiting the opportunities that war would soon bring.

**Growing Pains: War and Acceleration**

The coming of world war rapidly accelerated the development of national identity in Lithuania. Most scholars agree that despite (or perhaps because of) their own nationalist sentiments, when Germany declared war on Russia on August 1, 1914, Lithuanians rallied enthusiastically to the tsar’s cause. This enthusiasm, however, appears much more opportunistic than heartfelt; leaders in Vilna almost immediately submitted a declaration to the Russian government in favor of combining the two Lithuanian jurisdictions and granting them autonomous status within the empire. Lithuanian political leaders hoped that the context of war might allow them to gain political concessions from the empire that might have otherwise gone unaddressed. Their “Amber Declaration” met with a rapid, angry dismissal by the Russian government, but such sentiments only gained momentum in Lithuania as the war dragged on.

As these conversations unfolded, Russian and German hostilities quickly transformed Lithuania into a warzone. Much of the early fighting during the First World War took place not in France and Belgium, as the focus of many
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retellings seems to indicate, but in the east, where the Russian Empire and the Central Powers swept back and forth across Poland and Lithuania in their quests for supremacy. For those remaining in the region, the “terrible destruction caused by war” ensured that impoverishment, starvation, and displacement became the norm.\textsuperscript{22} Forests and vegetation disappeared in the wake of powerful new artillery raids, while cities and farms burned to the ground with an alarming frequency.\textsuperscript{23} Compounding this distress, many maps at this time, and consequently early relief efforts, categorized Lithuania as Northern Poland, assuming that Polish relief agencies would seek to alleviate the suffering of this region as a matter of course. Unsurprisingly, Polish relief agencies already struggling to address the needs of Polish war victims had little ability or desire to stretch their resources any thinner for non-Poles (especially not their rivals in Lithuania), leaving Lithuanians in a desperate state.\textsuperscript{24}

The coming of the German occupation quickly multiplied the intensity of suffering for the Lithuanian people, but this shift in power also ushered in new opportunities and risks for Lithuanians. By mid-1915, Germany had taken all of Lithuania, on into Latvia and Russia, forcing Russian officials and hundreds of thousands of refugees to flee deep into Russian territory. The German occupational government that replaced these officials proved exceedingly harsh, bringing inflation, a new currency, and compulsory labor to the already devastated land.\textsuperscript{25} Though bitterly oppressive, the occupation led Lithuanians to feel increasingly empowered to act on their own behalf, able to shape Germany’s perceptions and administration of the region in ways that the Russian Empire had long prevented. Stanley Page elaborates on this trade-off in \textit{The Formation of the Baltic States}, as he unravels the German thought process behind actions concerning the Eastern Front. By late 1916 and early 1917, Germany’s position in the war looked rather tenuous. Hoping to recruit desperately-needed soldiers from their newly conquered territories, German leaders proclaimed the Kingdom of Poland an autonomous region within German jurisdiction, allowing the Poles a level of local authority that had long been denied provided that they supplied soldiers for the German army.\textsuperscript{26} Such a move however, posed
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numerous risks to the Germans, namely that encouraging Polish nationalism significantly weakened Germany’s grip on the region. Page believes that the Germans’ only logical means to discourage nationalistic agitation in Poland lay in simultaneously promoting Lithuanian nationalism, which, due to the aforementioned disputes, frequently manifested itself as anti-Polish. Although they refrained from granting Lithuania autonomous standing as well, this strategy placed the two groups at odds with one another and distracted Lithuanians from formulating strong nationalist ideas or thoughts of independence.

While the decision to encourage two opposing nationalisms may have sprung from Germany’s dire need to recruit able-bodied men for the front lines, German leadership seems to have significantly underestimated the strength and will of both movements in their calculations. Far from keeping one another in check, the leeway granted by the German strategy quickly transformed into the justification for subsequent demands for even greater levels of autonomy within Lithuania. Meanwhile, Russia’s political turmoil began to take precedence over its war effort and its leaders began considering a separate peace with Germany. This dialogue centered primarily on the question of the German-occupied border regions, leading Lithuanians to fear immense losses of land and authority to the Poles in any settlement that might be reached. Poland had already (albeit prematurely) announced their annexation of Lithuania on May 24, 1917, spurring Lithuanians to cooperate with the Germans far more than they had ever intended. Lithuanians hoped that this cooperation would convince Germany to protect the integrity of Lithuania’s borders from unwelcome Polish incursions. In reality, German concessions stemmed far more from their own agendas than any real concern for the Lithuanians.

Attempts to define Lithuanian borders and identity faced further obstacles when the Bolsheviks rose to power in Russia in October of 1917. Seeking to remove themselves from the war as quickly as possible with as little loss of territory as it could negotiate, Russia’s Communist Party entered deliberations with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk. Through this process, the Bolsheviks clearly demonstrated that they possessed no desire to relinquish any of the territories belonging to the former Russian Empire. Alfred Senn notes that the Bolsheviks almost immediately established a Commissariat of Lithuanian Affairs and began
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suppressing nationalist agitation among Lithuanian refugees and refugee organizations based in Moscow and Petrograd.\textsuperscript{29} Moreover, neither the Bolsheviks nor the Germans permitted Lithuanians to join the delegations sent to the peace talks, forcing them to agree to German authority and the restriction of all but the most basic cultural autonomy in return for guarantees that Lithuania would remain intact and separate from Poland.\textsuperscript{30} While one nationalist finagled his way to the talks as an advisor to the Ukrainian delegation, the Lithuanians could do little to directly influence the nature of the discussion.\textsuperscript{31} They continued to meet with representatives of the German government to curry favor and gain more favorable terms for Lithuania, but their hands remained effectively tied throughout the conversation. This relative impotence proved short-lived, however, when continued military aggression forced the Bolsheviks to drop all demands and sign the Treaty of Brest Litovsk in early 1918, relinquishing their claims to all of its now German-occupied territories. Free from the uncertainties of the peace talks, Lithuanians immediately renewed their efforts to gain whatever autonomy the Germans would grant.

Even as they agitated within the parameters of German authority, Lithuanians began seeing the possibility of a truly independent Lithuania rising from the ashes of war. In January of 1918, the \textit{Lietuvos Aidas} (Echo of Lithuania), a four page daily sponsored by the \textit{Tarbya}, published several articles that testify to Lithuanian’s strong nationalist sentiments and reflect the development of Lithuanian’s hopes for the future. On New Year’s Day, 1918, a second-page article recalled the 1905 Revolution and the \textit{Seimas} that culminated in Lithuania’s first claim of political autonomy within the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{32} The author hearkens back to what he considers Lithuania’s “first public protest” of its status, lauding the fire and passion of the \textit{Seimas}, which he likens to a volcano of agitation in which the Lithuanian people finally voiced their determination to reclaim their long-lost political autonomy.\textsuperscript{33} The article pointedly credits the \textit{Seimas} with having “convinced [the Lithuanians] that it [was] time to take
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actions and show that Lithuania [had] a right to seek its freedom.”\textsuperscript{34} By underscoring the similarities between Lithuania’s situation in 1905 and 1918, the author indicates an avid hope to revive these sentiments within the Lithuanian population and reawaken a “real desire to walk the country out of misery.”\textsuperscript{35}

Just four days later, the front page of the \textit{Lietuvos Aidas} declared to all of Lithuania that “[an] independent and democratically organized country with ethnological boundaries [was] needed” for Lithuanians to continue developing as a people.\textsuperscript{36} The article referenced a 1917 conference in Vilnius in which two hundred and twenty-two delegates had secured a general consensus to that effect and reiterated their desire for independence to come swiftly.\textsuperscript{37} Describing these desires as the “voice and consciousness” of the people, the author publically incorporated statehood into the nationalist conception of Lithuanian identity.

The author also stipulated that an independent Lithuanian state required its capital to remain in Vilnius, implicitly alluding to the city’s importance within the Lithuanian framework and foreshadowing the coming conflicts concerning it.\textsuperscript{38} These articles reflect the ever-growing agitation among Lithuanian leaders as the war dragged on, a sentiment that increasingly could be heard in all corners of Lithuania, at every level of society. While certain political groups maintained separate agendas, the general consensus continued to grow daily among the Lithuanian people, soon to culminate in their Declaration of Independence.\textsuperscript{39}

**Long Distance Relationship: Émigré Advocacy as Nationalism**

While Lithuania struggled to navigate the hardships of war and negotiate their tenuous position between Russia and Germany, people and events outside the Baltic took an active role in shaping Lithuania’s prospects. While scholars disagree as to which groups played the most vital roles in influencing the fledgling Lithuanian identity, expatriates, refugees, and others, particularly in the United
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States rallied together on behalf of the Lithuanian people so effectively that their significance cannot be overemphasized. Alfred Senn highlights the intellectuals and students of Western Europe as the centre of the national movement until 1917, led by Juozas Gabrys and other members of Lithuania’s expatriated intelligentsia.\(^{40}\) Tomas Balkelis, on the other hand, dismisses Senn’s perspective as too narrow, following the exploits of a few well-known leaders at the expense of the masses.\(^{41}\) Instead, Balkelis credits the oft-ignored émigré population in Russia with the highest levels of political agitation concerning Lithuanian nationalism prior to the birth of the new state. Unfortunately, this group frequently found itself silenced by their precarious existence as refugees in the last years of the Russian Empire.\(^{42}\) Heated debates in St. Petersburg at this time may have heavily influenced the perspectives of their participants, but the refugees failed to establish any unified platform concerning their homeland. Moreover, they dared not publically declare themselves in favor of a wholly independent state while receiving food and other forms of aid from a Russian government still clinging to its hopes of restoring the Baltic region to its borderlands by the end of the war.\(^{43}\) While both Senn and Balkelis make excellent points concerning the nature and value of each camp of advocates, neither Eastern nor Western European refugee groups could single-handedly dictate the Lithuania debate and hope to succeed. A third segment of the Lithuanian population, Lithuanian-Americans, pouring out their voices and resources on behalf of their homeland, unquestionably influenced the character of Lithuanian nationalism and proved vital in orchestrating the creation of a Lithuanian state. With their uniquely American flair, these efforts helped trigger relatively positive results where so many other national campaigns had failed (i.e. Czechoslovakia).

The Lithuanian Information Bureau underscores the significance of these populations in the development of Lithuanian national fervor and advocacy for a Lithuanian state. As Tomas Balkelis ironically points out, the first calls for full Lithuanian independence came not from Lithuania proper, but from a conference of émigrés in Bern, Switzerland in 1916.\(^{44}\) The conference itself stemmed from the rigorous efforts of an organization known as the Lithuanian
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Information Bureau, a Paris-based group founded in 1911 under the leadership of exiled Lithuanian politician Juozas Gabrys. Designed to educate the rest of the world on the history, culture, and present circumstances in Lithuania, the Bureau published prolifically, distributing over fifty works in French (still the diplomatic language of Europe) that describe Lithuanian language, customs, and historical significance.\(^{45}\) Though they transferred operations to Switzerland as war swept into France, the Bureau continued working tirelessly to draw attention to a region otherwise overlooked in an international arena dominated by multi-ethnic empires. In response to these efforts, Lithuanian populations across the globe took up the cause of their homeland with a fervor that could not yet express itself in Lithuania proper.

Heavily concerned with the state of affairs in their war-torn homeland, Lithuanians in America kept a watchful eye on the region as the war unfolded. As early as September 1914, the Lithuanian immigrant community called a conference, gathering representatives from as many existing Lithuanian-American organizations as possible to consider the war’s implications for their homeland and the appropriate course of action. The delegates rallied to the Lithuanian cause, publishing resolutions concerning increased autonomy for Lithuania, while establishing a National Fund for their cause, and pledging to actively solicit the US government to aid in the protection of Lithuanian interests.\(^{46}\) To further this endeavor, the conference voted to establish a branch of the Lithuanian Information Bureau within the United States to assist in the publication and distribution of information to support their cause. Though this gathering highlighted a number of practical and ideological differences among the various organizations, it galvanized the émigré population into a flurry of activity, hoping to call attention to Lithuania’s plight.

Perhaps the most vital and ongoing role filled by Lithuanian-Americans in the shaping Lithuanian identity lay in their thorough and persistent dissemination of information concerning their homeland and its aspirations. Their steady stream of publications over the course of the war focused intently on stories that provided background on the Lithuanian people or evidence with which to strengthen the Lithuanian cause. With titles like *A Plea for the Lithuanians*
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and Lithuanian Booster, journals and magazines sought to enlist the interest and assistance of as wide an audience as possible, whether that aid presented itself in military action, peace processes, agitation for independence, or any combination thereof. Under the guidance of the Lithuanian National Council, the Washington D. C.-based Information Bureau rallied the United States to the cause of independence, and counteracted any rival claims to the Lithuanian homeland. Thus Lithuanian-Americans rapidly became Lithuania’s loudest and most prolific defendants.47

These calls for autonomy abounded within Lithuanian-American society, but the majority of Lithuanian émigrés initially focused their efforts on more feasible projects addressing more immediate needs caused by the war. To that end, the American Relief Fund for Lithuanian War Sufferers began collecting funds to alleviate the suffering within the Lithuanian population. Already developing into Lithuania’s strongest advocates, Lithuanian-Americans flooded newspapers with articles calling attention to events along the Eastern Front. Many such articles point out that the German and Russian armies had swept through Lithuania six times by August 1916 in their struggle for dominance, but that international aid organizations had largely ignored the damage inflicted on the now-starving Lithuanian people.48 This ignorance stems at least in part from a widespread lack of understanding concerning the region and its people. One article blames the error on the fact that regions of Lithuania at this time found itself incorrectly labeled by military experts as Northern Poland, while Polish relief organizations felt they had little reason to concern themselves with Lithuanian refugees.49 Some Lithuanian-Americans found the misnomer highly offensive, as one letter to the editor indignantly reclaims these territories as distinctly Lithuanian, marked by a unique language and culture.50 Faced with such instances of ignorance, the Relief Fund doubled its efforts, even sending investigative teams into the Lithuanian war-zone to assess matters, and obtaining an audience with the Pope concerning the dire situation.51 This intensity of feeling in Lithuanian-American communities merely indicates a rapid growth of
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nationalist sentiments within the Lithuanian population abroad that massively contributed to the Lithuanian cause.

After months of urging, the Relief Fund and Lithuanian-Americans at large convinced Congress and President Wilson to declare November 1 as Lithuania Day, in which US citizens might “express their sympathy by contributing to the funds now being raised for the relief of Lithuanians in the war zone.” Jointly and independently, various Lithuanian-American societies raised hundreds of thousands of dollars dedicated to the Lithuanian cause over the course of the war. Even personal occasions like weddings became fundraising events, like one small Chicago wedding that raised $13.25 for the Fund ($296.5 in 2012). Some of these funds went directly to the front lines to ease the hardships of war, while the organizations dedicated various levels of funding to the fight for autonomy or independence, cultural education, and diplomatic endeavors. These numbers become significantly more impressive with the realization that the average Lithuanian-American family made a mere $638 per year prior to the war ($14,397.87 in 2012). Nor did Lithuanian-Americans’ giving end there; when the US finally entered the war in 1917, between 30,000 to 50,000 Lithuanian Americans rushed to fill the ranks of the military.

Financial aid and military service certainly advanced Lithuanian national endeavors, but Lithuanian-Americans had still more to say concerning the Lithuanian state and national identity. Realizing that Polish and Russian representatives with their own agendas for the territory had already begun spreading their beliefs across Washington, Lithuanian-Americans saw an urgent need to counteract any claims that did not align with their own agenda for a future Lithuanian state. In the steady stream of articles aimed directly at US government agencies, politicians, and the press, the Information Bureau compiled an extensive body of evidence in favor of Lithuanian sovereignty that came to represent the general consensus of most Lithuanian-Americans and their organizations.
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A prime example of this advocacy arises in the “American Lithuanian’s Declaration” that the Lithuanian National Council handed to President Wilson, the Pope’s representatives, and European ambassadors in early 1917. In this text, Lithuanian-Americans briefly outlined Lithuania’s history as a separate nation and powerful state in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, establishing Lithuania’s historical legitimacy on the global stage.\(^{58}\) The text goes on to speak of Lithuania’s unsubdued national sentiment and desire for independence as exemplified in peasant songs and literature, confirming that despite Russian occupation and repression, Lithuania lived on in cultural artifacts among intelligentsia and peasants alike. Moreover, the article emphasizes the Lithuanian’s role in the Revolution of 1905, perhaps embellishing the truth in order to win the admiration and support of American and international leaders.\(^{59}\) Ultimately, the declaration implies that granting Lithuanians their freedom would greatly assist the international endeavor to stop the bloodshed, a claim that, while not necessarily grounded in reality, certainly appealed to the Allied Powers’ desire to end the war in a tidy manner. The text reflects many tactics of Lithuanian-American advocacy that would find themselves repeated continuously in the coming years, as well as a willingness to bluntly address even the highest levels of leadership on behalf of a future Lithuanian state. Publications like this one flooded the press and provide crucial insight into the evolution of Lithuanian national identity in the eyes of Lithuanian-Americans. Moreover, these works reiterate the vast extent to which Lithuanian-Americans weighed in on the affairs of their homeland as war raged onward and Lithuanians pressed closer to their goal of independence.

**Obstacles to Recognition: Fighting for Acceptance in the Post-War World.**

When the *Tarbya* published its declaration of independence, the German occupation rendered the document ineffective in any practical sense. Lithuanians could neither form their own government, nor make their own decisions in the diplomatic arena, and daily life changed little. Despite this lack of tangible results, Lithuanian-Americans immediately jumped to the defense of the new state and began outlining their expectations for the direction this state should take.
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A convention of Lithuanians met in New York City in March 1918, echoing the words of the Tarbya’s declaration as they confirmed that Lithuania existed as a sovereign “ethnographic, cultural, economic, and political entity” based firmly upon President Wilson’s declaration concerning self-determination. Although technically Lithuanian-Americans had no legal right to dictate the requirements of the Lithuanian state, the convention went on to outline various rights and freedoms that “citizens of Lithuania […] shall enjoy,” as well as policies concerning the nationalization of resources and commercial enterprises, and the republican form of government to be established. On some level, it seems mildly absurd that an émigré population might dictate the formation of a new state, but the role played thus-far by the Lithuanian-American community gave them a significant amount of leverage. While the leaders and politicians in Lithuania certainly could have ignored these voices from across the sea, in reality, Lithuanian émigrés possessed a great deal more freedom at the time than Lithuanians still under the German Ober Ost. These politicians and activists owed and would continue to owe quite a debt to the work of the Lithuanian population abroad as they waited out the end of the war, trying to make their audacious declaration a reality. In the international arena moreover, these declarations proved absolutely necessary for any state that hoped to earn international recognition within the context of the war, reassuring all that they would subscribe to democratic principles and look out for the well-being of all their citizens so as to prevent future wars from occurring on such a horrendous scale. Such declarations from Lithuanian-Americans served to make the idea of an independent Lithuania as palatable as possible to the United States, which appeared to wield increasing amounts of influence over the course of the war and its eventual resolve.

As Lithuania’s politicians balanced precariously between the German occupation and their assertion of independence, the Lithuanian National Council in Washington D.C. began publishing “Facts Supporting Her Claim for Reestablishment as an Independent Nation” to convince the world of the validity of Lithuania’s declaration, and solicit the aid of the so-called Great Powers in this process. The pamphlet served as a template for many subsequent
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documents, briefly outlining the territories that Lithuanians intended to include in their new state and reiterating their linguistic distinctions, before delving into a shortened version of Lithuanian history from the thirteenth century onward. Interestingly, the pamphlet refers to the outbreak of war in 1914 as an untimely interruption of a Lithuanian national revival and the people’s efforts towards independence, despite more recent scholarship to the contrary.63 Prior to the war, Lithuanian nationalism had not yet achieved a level of coherency needed to consider statehood, much less view it as an inevitable reality. In fact, most scholars concur that the war played a vital role in accelerating the development of national identity in Lithuania. In light of this contradiction, the Lithuanian National Council’s claims reflect overconfidence at best, and utter delusion at worst, but this reflects just how fervent Lithuanian nationalism had become within the émigré population of the United States. After all the rallies, all the publications, and all their efforts on behalf of the homeland, Lithuanian-Americans genuinely believed that their brothers would have secured their liberty even sooner without the war. Present perspectives may discount such ideas, but the pamphlet’s approach still appears logical as the words of a national movement justifying its claims for an independent state. If Lithuania had made its way to the brink of liberation prior to the war, then how could anyone deny them their freedom after much suffering and delay? Although the council could not have predicted it, the text also handily preempts many complaints that smaller national groups greedily demanded far more than they could reasonably claim. If Lithuania could prevent itself from falling into such categories, then the Great Powers (and subsequently the League of Nations) might treat their national agenda with more care and respect.

As World War One petered towards the armistice in 1918 and German power waned, Lithuanians finally began developing an independent state for themselves and those minorities that chose to remain under their jurisdiction. The tasks of formulating their new government and continuing to appeal for international recognition of their infant state consumed their efforts. Lithuanians all over the world had struggled and petitioned for this moment for years, but the end of the war brought unprecedented opportunities for Lithuanians to define themselves and their homeland. With this freedom, however, came the massive responsibility of outlining a Lithuanian identity that the majority of
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the world both inside and outside Lithuania would also find acceptable. Faced with a seemingly insurmountable task, the Lithuanian leadership strove to form a government based on the principles of democracy that the new global leaders held as the standard (at least in Europe). As part of this process, the Tarbya established a provisional government headed by Augustinas Voldemaras as prime minister, and a Council and Cabinet of Ministers to serve as the executive branch until a Constituent Assembly could be called to hammer out the finer points of state. Moreover, Lithuania began sending out envoys to its nearest neighbors, and gathering delegations to attend the Paris Peace Conference, where they hoped to persuade the world to acknowledge their existence. As if to combine forces, delegations from the new Lithuanian government and from Lithuanian-Americans converged at the conference to convince the world of their legitimacy. While they failed to gain any direct acknowledgement, one paragraph of the resultant Treaty of Versailles did allow the provisional governments in all three of the Baltic States to take any necessary measures to defend against the spread of Bolshevism.64 This indirect sort of acquiescence, however, still denied Lithuania the official status of statehood, and restricted the forms of aid that other states could or would give.

Although Lithuanians may not have appreciated this struggle, the ongoing fight for recognition forced Lithuanians to really articulate their agenda, how they perceived themselves, and what they wanted as a long term political entity. Since much of Eastern Europe saw the end of the war as an opportunity to spring free of Russian dominion and German occupation in one fell swoop, the quest for recognition developed not just among Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans. In September, 1919, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and Ukrainians in the United States banded together in order to present their cases jointly. In this congress, the four nationalities argued that their children had helped the US in their fight to end autocratic governments and oppression, and that they, as representatives of three million Americans, desired their adopted country to extend a hand of warmth and friendship to their beloved homelands.65 The joint congress reiterated the similarity of ideals between their homelands and the US, while emphasizing the United States’ line that World

64 Kučas, 172.
War One had occurred so that these peoples too might enjoy the democracy and liberty that so embodied the war in American minds. This combined effort underscores that Lithuania by no means stood alone as a young nation begging for international blessings to progress with the formation of a new state. These fledgling movements profited greatly from such US-based alliances when addressing international leaders, either individually or as the League of Nations, despite the fact that such alliances did not often exist in the European sphere. While such efforts may have convinced other leaders however, it seems that in most cases, the United States refused to budge.

On September 25, 1919, Great Britain became the first of the Great Powers to recognize Lithuania as an independent state, while Lithuania’s nearest neighbors soon followed suit. For Britain, recognition came out of the practicalities of the post-war environment. Fearing the spread of Bolshevism outward from Russia’s borders, Britain saw the entire Baltic region as a potential barrier to further Bolshevik expansion. By recognizing Lithuania, the British could assist in the struggle against the Bolsheviks and thus protect the rest of Europe from the fearful specter of Communism. While perhaps more utilitarian than springing from conviction, this decision dramatically benefited the Lithuanian national cause. British recognition ignited a wave of other recognitions for an independent Lithuania, ranging from France to Sweden and even Argentina. The United States, however, continued to deny the legitimacy of a Lithuanian state for a significantly longer period, much to the dismay of Lithuanians on both sides of the Atlantic.

**Obstacles Part II: Convincing the Americans**

Lithuanian efforts to obtain official American approval continued to construct and solidify the textures and appearances of the Lithuanian state and what it meant to be a Lithuanian, relying on a combination of history, ethnography, and constant comparisons of themselves and their new state with longstanding American principles and explicitly stated war aims. *The Lithuanian Review*, a publication of the Lithuanian Information Bureau, outlined “Three Reasons
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why Americans should Recognize Lithuania” that help illustrate the developing
Lithuanian identity. According to the article, the United States should recog-
nize Lithuanian sovereignty first and foremost because it falls in line with “the
declared American war aims of ethnic self-determination for racially distinct
groups.”70 The section firmly asserts Lithuania’s racial distinctness and chidingly
reminds readers that American opinion aligned with Lithuanian desires
and that ignoring racial differences in the Balkans helped spark the war in
the first place. By bluntly reminding their adopted country that these issues
played a role in dragging the world into war, Lithuanian-Americans cleverly
hinted that recognition would help prevent future conflict and allow the US
to return to its own affairs. Secondly, the article reminds Americans of their
own struggle for statehood, recalling their contribution to that cause in the
person of General Tadeusz Kosciuszko (despite Polish claims to the contrary),
and favorably comparing American liberties to those sought by Lithuanians in
the post-war world.71 How could the United States deny Lithuanians the right
to their own state when all they wanted were the freedoms and traditions that
the US had once fought so hard to gain and defended fiercely ever since? The
article’s third reason manipulates American and international desires to never
experience another war like the one that had just torn Europe apart, claiming
that an independent Lithuania would stand against Germany as it had already
done and that such efforts more than amply justified recognizing Lithuanian
independence.

Unfortunately for the Lithuanians, this last justification failed to hold
up under any level of scrutiny within the international situation in 1919. In
reality, Lithuania had collaborated closely with the Germans in the last years
of the war as other options had failed them and the new state still found itself
heavily dependent on Germany in the initial post-war era. As long as other
powers refused to acknowledge Lithuania’s existence, Germany became one of
the few venues through which Lithuanians could voice their opinions in an
international forum, and German troops remained in Lithuania long after the
war’s end. Moreover, international politics had shifted greatly with the rise of
the Bolsheviks, transforming Russia into a greater source of anxiety than the
heavily punished Germans. As long as the threat of socialism hung over Europe,

the United States in particular seemed willing to support Germany so long as it held back the Bolsheviks, while Lithuania mattered little either way. This error in calculation reveals that despite his fervor, the aforementioned article’s author could not quite grasp the new international balance of power, particularly concerning Germany and Russia.

Advocates of Lithuanian recognition in the US repeatedly relied on American policies and historical traditions in order to persuade US officials to grant their blessing to the Lithuanian experiment of statehood. One memo pulls quotes from James Buchanan, Woodrow Wilson, and Secretary of State Lansing that remind US leaders of the long-standing US policy of support for self-determination. A 1921 letter to then-Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby, blames US policies, refusing to acknowledge the fall of the Russian Empire for the delay in recognition. As long as the US held out hope that the tsars would return, its diplomatic branch refused to consider any changes to Russia’s former territories, a move that certain American lawyers, statesmen, and experts considered extremely counterproductive. As William McAdoo, Herbert Adams Gibbons, and Walter M. Chandler cautioned in their letter, doing nothing in hopes that the former Russian Empire would reemerge left non-Russian borderlands such as Lithuania vulnerable to the spread of Bolshevism, a move that certainly could not benefit the United States long term. These gentlemen also warned that tensions between the Poles and Lithuanians over Vilna and other border disputes might lead Europe into war again, a dismal prospect for anyone hoping that World War One had literally been the war to end all wars. The fact that the League of Nations refused to allow Lithuania to join due to the US attitude toward the young nation only fortified these fears, since this meant that no major power would actively interfere in the event of Polish-Lithuanian aggression. Lithuanian-Americans and their allies actively pointed out such problems in hopes of convincing the United States of what they considered a dire need for action concerning their homeland. They bombarded US officials
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with proof of other countries that had already granted recognition to Lithuania as if the sheer volume of these memos would convince them to change their minds. Another approach included a detailed analysis of Lithuania’s economic status in which the author presented various statistics for education, agriculture, industry, and the financial sector, as if proving Lithuania’s economic viability would convince the United States to actually recognize its independence.  

Even after the League of Nations admitted Lithuania as a member, the United States continued to stall, as if waiting would somehow force the issue to disappear. While one might speculate that America’s Red Scare and rampant phobia of Bolshevism forced the United States to insist on the sovereignty of a dead Russian empire, a realistic analysis of the situation reveals very little in the way of logic that justifies US action or rather inaction in this situation. When Secretary of State Hughes finally announced US recognition for Lithuania on July 25, 1922, he provided no substantial reasons for his delay outside of the Russian factor, and seemed resigned only because so many other nations had already done so. With this announcement, Lithuania finally attained a measure of security in knowing that none of the Great Powers questioned their right to existence any longer.

On the Map: Defining and Defending Lithuania’s Borders

In striving to prove Lithuania’s historical and cultural rights to the land in such a way that neither Russia, Germany, Poland, nor anyone else could contradict, Lithuanians on both sides of the Atlantic faced the enormous problem of drawing territorial boundaries that would prove acceptable to both the Lithuanian population and the greatest number of European states possible. In a Lithuania that had existed under foreign occupation for more than a century, borders had been drawn and redrawn according to the policies of the Russian Empire and the fortunes of war. Alfonsas Eidintas, Vytautas Žalys, and Alfred Erich Senn illustrate that when Lithuanians everywhere found themselves faced with the sudden potential to outline their own borders, they lacked any definite blueprint


from which to begin. In undertaking the design of a new state, Lithuanians struggled to choose between the lands once ruled by their ancestors, all the lands Lithuanians had ever inhabited, or lands where Lithuanians lived in the present. This choice between the historic and variations on the ethnographic became even further complicated by the reality that other states, as well as internal nationalities might dispute any of these claims. A somewhat vague and unhelpful answer to this problem came about when President Wilson agreed to form a committee for the sole purpose of investigating the Lithuanian question in May 1918. “Ask for the most, but always have proof that it truly belongs to you,” advised the committee’s chairman, Harvard professor Frank A. Golder. Although Golder went on to detail certain regions and ethno-religious backgrounds that could logically be included, this statement underscores the complexity of the task facing the Lithuanians. Exactly where and how much land could they carve out of Europe to meet the needs of a Lithuanian state, while maintaining the legitimacy of those claims?

Even as Lithuanians wrestled with these questions, external forces began to impose their own interpretations upon the region, challenging not only specific aspects of the process, but the entire legitimacy of a Lithuanian state. Foremost of these challenges came from Bolshevik Russia, which despite being enveloped in its own civil war, increasingly desired to retain the borders of the former Russian Empire as its own. Almost immediately after the armistice took effect across Europe, the Bolsheviks reneged on the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and launched a full scale invasion of the still army-less infant republic. Though some German troops remained in the region at the time, they and their Lithuanian counterparts proved unable to ward off the invasion, sending Lithuanian leaders fleeing the capital in order to preserve their young government. Local socialists welcomed this invasion with open arms, and in February 1919, the Bolsheviks set up their own government in Vilna under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Republic of Litbel, a quasi-state that combined both the names and territories of Lithuania and Belorussia. Meanwhile, most Lithuanians rallied to defend their republic, bolstered by high hopes and the
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new government’s promises of land reform to a population dominated by peasants.\textsuperscript{82} A clever diplomatic move by Lithuania’s new leaders, this promise ushered in droves of peasant volunteers, giving them a tangible reason to invest in the future of the young state and fight in its defense. By the summer of 1919, a combination of German, Lithuanian, and Polish armies had neutralized the government of Litbel, forcing the Soviets to negotiate peace. The treaty signed in July 1920 reestablished desirable Lithuanian borders (for the Lithuanians) and relinquished all Soviet claims on Lithuania’s people or resources.\textsuperscript{83} Overstretched by civil war and a badly damaged economy, the Soviets proved unable to enforce their version of Lithuania upon the region, while their failure only seemed to validate the existence of a Lithuanian state and inject Lithuanian nationalism with even greater enthusiasm.

**The Vilna Conflict**

As the Lithuanians successfully fought off the Soviets and rogue German forces known as the Bermondtists, their long-standing conflicts with the Poles came to a head under the pressures of the two groups’ diverging conceptions for the future of the region, and posed serious setbacks to Lithuanian nationalism and its definitions. As previously discussed, Russian policies had fostered opposing nationalisms in the region as a means of keeping Polish ambitions in check, but neither people agreed to Russian perceptions of nationality or territory. The same issues that had undermined the 1863 Uprising only grew more pressing as Polish troops under the command of Józef Piłsudski crossed into Lithuanian lands under the pretext of fighting off the Soviets. The Russo-Polish War, supported by Western powers as a challenge to the spread of Bolshevism, bought Lithuanians time to muster their own armies against the Soviets, but also nullified many stipulations of the Soviet-Lithuanian peace treaty before the ink had even dried. The Poles, not the Lithuanians, forced the Soviets from Vilna before settling in, reclaiming the city as their historic right, with the intention of using it as a jumping off point to reclaim territory that they perceived as rightfully Polish. The ensuing conflict sheds light on the processes through which both groups presented their definitions of Lithuania and how Lithuanians dealt with

\textsuperscript{82} Eidintas, Žalys, and Senn, 36-37.

the these developments in the international arena.

Incensed over the loss of their capital, but militarily too weak to launch a counterattack, Lithuanians’ vocal complaints dragged the League of Nations into the issue, forcing both parties to defend their claims to the city. To this end, the Lithuanian Delegation published a book concerning the “Lithuanian-Polish Dispute” complete with maps, drafts of protocols and agreements between the two parties, presenting the same historical narrative used during the independence and recognition debates. While initially factual, the documents quickly escalated to accusations of carefully planned deception on the part of the Poles. One section blasts the Poles for negotiating a peace agreement in 1920 only to move troops into Vilna a mere two days later.84 Another section claims that the League of Nations only involved itself in the issue after Polish leaders falsely accused the Lithuanians of cooperating with the Bolsheviks and instigating the aggression between the two peoples.85 In reality, Lithuanians lacked solid factual support for their claims to the city, but Poland’s blatant dishonesty and naked aggression in war-weary Europe pushed the League to protect Lithuania from further incursions. To this end, the League established a new border between Poland and Lithuania called the Curzon Line, which Piłsudski promptly defied by moving his troops into territory that the League had just explicitly recognized as Lithuanian. Unfortunately for Lithuanians, the League preferred to preserve more widespread peace than try to physically enforce their decisions and risk another massive war.

Once again, Lithuanian-Americans led the way in defending their homeland’s burgeoning identity, going to great lengths to persuade their new country to stand against Polish aggression. In the Lithuanian National Council’s pamphlet Lithuania Against Poland: Appeal for Justice, they couched their requests in language both flattering and familiar to the United States, drawing subtle parallels between Lithuania’s situation and US history while relying on lofty ideals to which they believe the US has long subscribed. The pamphlet established Lithuania as the underdog in the situation, set upon by the “numerically stronger power” of Polish forces, and favorably compared Lithuania to the United States’ own early history.86 The authors further relied on US sympathies
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when they reminded the president that they had only fled Lithuania to escape Russian despotism, now replaced by Polish despotism in their minds. Given the US entanglement in its own Red Scare at the time, they tactfully reminded the US government that Lithuanian had taken up arms against Bolshevik forces, thus creating a sense of political solidarity between the two states and strengthening their plea for aid. Moreover, they expressed their appeal in terms of what “American citizens believe,” implying that their requests stem from the sense of justice instilled in them by their ties to the United States.\footnote{Ibid., 1.} They claimed that a US failure to get involved would constitute a failure to live up to its own principles of justice and fair play. Ignoring the fact that the US had neglected to even acknowledge Lithuanian sovereignty almost two years after they declared independence, Lithuanian Americans felt that their new nation had a moral obligation to come to the aid of their homeland and had no qualms about saying so.

The Poles, however, did not merely entrench themselves within the disputed capital and dare Lithuania to come unseat them. They too compiled evidence to justify their actions, often directly contradicting the Lithuanian account. A Polish historical journal compiled its own collection of articles geared toward what it terms “The Question of Wilno.”\footnote{Poland and Lithuania: The Question of Wilno, edited by the Society “Straż Kresowa,” (Warsaw: IMPR Galewski and Dau, 1921).} The first article traces Polish influence within Lithuanian culture, from religion, literature, language, and the nobility. Its author claims that Lithuanians owe the Poles for Catholicism, for the educated members of its population, and a plethora of cultural developments, thereby concluding that all of Lithuania should fall under Polish jurisdiction. The second article, however, directly engages the questions surrounding the city of Vilna, claimed by Lithuania as its historic capital, and by Poland as a vital cultural center. Reciting the same tale of the Lithuanian-Polish Union used by Lithuanians to field their complaints, their rendition’s subtle changes transform the same narrative into a fairly convincing case on behalf of the Poles. Where Lithuanians claim strict distinctions between their people and the Poles, the Polish account finds Russian nationalization policies to blame for the lessening of Polish influence by death, imprisonment, or deportation.\footnote{Ibid., 20.} Moreover, it cites the German census to claim that Poles indeed held a majority within the limits
of Vilna. Such contradictory narratives coming from both parties called into question both versions of history, while making it exceedingly problematic for the League to act decisively on the matter.

As the League of Nations turned their attention to larger concerns and the Poles settled more permanently into Vilna, everyone but the Lithuanians accepted the *de facto* situation. They never once relinquished their claims to the city, and vocalized their grievances long after the matter had dropped from the international scene. The simplest explanation for this lies in significance of the capital city to national identity, and by extension, Vilna’s significance to the Lithuanian narrative. Capital cities often represent a nation and its ideals, while also standing as a center of government and culture. Much like the burning of Washington D.C. in the War of 1812, the loss of Vilna struck a heavy blow to Lithuanian morale, perhaps all the heavier for its richer history. The city, from which their forefathers had ruled what had formerly been the largest contiguous empire in Europe, appeared time after time in the Lithuanian narrative—as the home of the great Duke Gediminas, the place where Lithuanians were first baptized into Christianity, and where educated nationalists had moved to share ideas and foment on behalf of a Lithuanian nation. Despite its relatively small Lithuanian population, Vilna represented the heart and soul of the Lithuanian nation. The Lithuanians could not forgive the Poles for snatching Vilna from their grasp; indeed, their anger over the lost city and its surrounding territory kept them locked in a state of war with Poland until 1938.

From their precarious and less-recognized position, however, Lithuanian leaders lacked the manpower and international support to take the city back by force, so it remained part of Poland until the Second World War. The conflict, however, helped invest Lithuanians on both sides of the Atlantic in the fate of their homeland. Although a setback in the Lithuanian narrative, the loss of Vilna only solidified the nation’s borders in the collective Lithuanian imagination, borders that many hoped to one day restore even as they began addressing more immediate problems. It strengthened ties between Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuania so much that many returned to Lithuania—to raise families, start businesses, and otherwise rebuild the region—while others dedicated their efforts to travelling between the two communities and building up strong
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connections. Thus the Vilna Conflict, though a negative event in the process of outlining a Lithuanian nation-state, bolstered Lithuanian national identity in a way the Poles could not have foreseen. The Soviet Union quasi-restored such imaginings, along with Vilna, after the Second World War, while the second Lithuanian Republic solidified them in the early 1990’s.

The Memel Question
A more successful attempt by the Lithuanians to dictate the limits of their identity arose from their fight for the port city of Memel (present day Klaipėda) and the surrounding territory known as the Memel strip. Although the territory contained a significant population of Lithuanians, the German administration had placed the region within the jurisdiction of Lithuania Minor, the smaller, Prussian-ruled entity until the end of the war. Unlike Vilna, whose significance remained purely nostalgic in even Lithuanian minds, Memel held the promise of prosperity for the young nation. Lacking any major port cities, Lithuanian leaders had entered into discussions with the Germans concerning Memel as early as 1916.93 By war’s end, Germany, and even Poland had, for various reasons, agreed to turn over the district to the Lithuanians. Despite this, the international community turned the territory over to Allied administration, with plans to internationalize the city and grant Allied Powers a foothold in an otherwise removed Eastern Europe.94 Lithuanians objected to handing Memel over to the French and passed a resolution to join all of Lithuania Minor (including the area surrounding Konigsberg), with the Lithuanian state. Adding to the confusion, the territory’s population divided almost evenly into Germans and Lithuanians, who worried about Lithuania’s economic prospects and being cut off from Germany.

1922 found Lithuania caught in an untenable position concerning Memel. Hoping to settle the region and guard against German and Russian ambitions, the British offered to give Memel to Lithuania along with de jure recognition and economic aid. In return, they expected Lithuanians to surrender Vilna to the Poles and let the matter drop.95 As Vytautas Žalys points out, however, the
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Lithuanian government could not bend on the Vilna issue without angering the Lithuanian people, citing an assassination attempt of an official who had suggested negotiations with Poland previously. Unwilling to let the region slip from their grasp, and spurred on by the occupation of Vilna, Lithuanian leaders organized an uprising dominated by Memel Lithuanians, and seized the district in December of 1922.

The Allied Powers objected strongly to such flagrant aggression, and quickly blockaded the harbor to force the Lithuanians to back down. In the face of the strong Allied response, the Lithuanians had no choice but to remove their troops, but only with the promise of a renewed discussion over the fate of the territory. Throughout the ensuing, yearlong diplomatic impasse, the Lithuanian Information Bureau continued to play a vital role, gathering and publishing correspondence that contextualized the issue and provided favorable evidence supporting Lithuania’s claims and actions. In one such volume, the Bureau claimed that Memel territory possessed a significantly higher Lithuanian population than the Germans claimed, that the port served as a vital aspect of Lithuania’s economic viability, and that Memel also needed Lithuanian commerce to survive. The Bureau also includes documents from Prussian Lithuanians in the district warning that Memel would be far too small to form an economically viable free state and the people of the territory preferred a union with Lithuania.

The Allied Powers, predominately Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States, proved much more flexible concerning Memel than the League of Nations had with Poland, especially since many believed that giving Lithuania Memel would make up for the as yet unresolved issue of Vilna. Even so, ironing out an agreement that both parties deemed acceptable proved exceedingly difficult. The Lithuanian Information Bureau emphasizes the difficulties of this process by displaying the proposed versions of the convention side by side. The Lithuanian draft of the agreement rewrote more than half its articles, making changes down to the smallest, seemingly insignificant details and phrasings. While even the smallest changes met with disapproval from the Allied Powers, the Lithuanians clung stubbornly to the port city as rightfully their own, fighting
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tooth and nail for as many of their stipulations concerning the composition and jurisdiction of the region as possible.\footnote{Poincaré, “Note,” \textit{The Memel Convention}, 28.}

The Lithuanians’ aggressive behavior, while seemingly abrupt and dramatic, pointedly reflects Lithuanian leaders’ chagrin over their failure to recover Vilna, and their stubborn refusal to lose another inch of perceived Lithuanian ground. After two years of futilely trying to unseat the Polish presence, Lithuanians had no intention of letting another region, one more economically vital at that, slip from their grasp. The seizure of Memel reflects a Lithuanian adaptability to the challenges confronting their chosen narrative. Lithuanian leaders, already precariously balanced at the head of the new state, and under fire for the loss of Vilna, could not afford another failure of this nature if they wished to maintain the people’s faith in their leadership, an urgency testified to by their sudden shift in tactics. While they had observed acceptable protocols with Vilna, and clearly failed, Lithuanians hoped that more decisive action would force the Allies to accept Lithuania’s version, as it had with Poland and Vilna.\footnote{Kiaupa, 256.} Indeed, this route proved much more successful in obtaining the Lithuanians’ desired results. After a year of deliberations, the 1924 Memel Convention officially recognized the region as part of the Lithuanian State. Following another four years of negotiations with Germany over the exact boundaries, Lithuania’s borders remained intact, encompassing Memel, lacking Vilna and the easternmost portions of the desired territory, until the next world war rearranged Europe’s borders once again.

\section*{Final Thoughts}

In his book, \textit{Imagined Communities}, Benedict Anderson defines a nation as an imagined political entity based on a perceived “deep, horizontal comradeship” between its members.\footnote{Benedict Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities}, (London: Verso, 2006), 6-7.} For Lithuania, this comradeship evolved slowly, from a mere juxtaposition of language and geography to covert groups of disgruntled intellectuals, and eventually, to a Lithuanian Republic. At every step of this development, Lithuanians struggled to define themselves and gain recognition as a unique society and culture, while competing narratives thoroughly challenged them to defend these conceptions both intellectually and militarily. The First World War brought unprecedented opportunities to imagine a sovereign
Lithuanian identity, bolstered by western promises for self-determination for all peoples. Meanwhile, the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence necessitated a firm, vocal defense of this identity in the international arena, a process that invested Lithuanians near and far in promoting the welfare of their new national identity and its associated state.

More importantly, these processes reveal an abundance of ways in which national identity is not only forged over imagined ties between community members as Anderson proposes, but also through external factors and challenges not inherently found within that community. Polish, Russian, and German antagonisms following independence forced Lithuanians to defend a still-forming identity, adapting words and weapons to suit their needs with equal vigor and enthusiasm. Urgently needing to articulate the essences of Lithuanian identity and justify their claims to the Entente and the League of Nations, Lithuanians vocalized those things that they perceived as most important in defining what made someone Lithuanian, and just where Lithuania referred to. The debt owed to Lithuanian-Americans cannot be overstated, both in the manner in which they besieged the U. S. government with pleas and proposals, and in their efforts to fund refugee aid and finance the nascent state. These factors forced Lithuanians to reimage their history and their nation in ways and on a scale that no prior experience had required of them. Although the first Lithuanian Republic lasted a mere twenty-two years, the Lithuanian identity went on to survive another world war and nearly fifty years of Soviet occupation and deportation. It served as the foundation for the longest standing resistance movement against the Soviets after World War Two, and again when Lithuanians began to openly question the long-standing Soviet hegemony in 1990-91. Within a region of previously ambiguous identities, Lithuanians rallied to form a lasting identity based on real and imagined history and culture. In a fascinating study on the formation of national identity, the Lithuanian narrative reiterates the power of Anderson’s imagined communities in shaping the nation and its identity, but also raises questions of exactly how such communities form and what external factors must also be taken into account.
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As part of its commitment to the university’s “Learn By Doing” philosophy, the Cal Poly History Department offers an introductory seminar (History 100) that gives students entering the major the opportunity to conduct original archival research. Using the University Archives and Special Collections, students formulate a research question on a topic of Cal Poly history, select one or more relevant primary sources from the collections, analyze these sources, and write a five to six page research paper based on this analysis. In the process, students gain insight into historical methods and questions, experience firsthand the challenges of professional research, and contribute to the university community by helping to tell its story. We thank the University Archives and Special Collections Department of Kennedy Library for their support of this project. We look forward to including essays by these new history students as a regular feature of The Forum.
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In the seventies, Cal Poly was granted the title of university, rather than that of college, which it had previously held. Cal Poly had always been, first and foremost, and, arguably, still is a technical school. However, as time has progressed Cal Poly has become significantly less focused on vocation training in the fields of agriculture and engineering. The university title that was bequeathed to Cal Poly was a result of Cal Poly’s focus widening from its more vocational roots. When Cal Poly was becoming a university, it began to more thoroughly build its collection of colleges—one of the colleges to greatly develop during this transitory phase was the College of Science and Mathematics. More specifically, the development of the biochemistry major into a more rigorous, individualized program gives concrete evidence that the seventies were the decade in which Cal Poly began to more greatly expand its horizons at the expense of its founding colleges.

This paper will specifically deal with the analysis of the biochemistry course catalogs published by Cal Poly in the terms of 1967–1968 and 1977–1979, with small mention of the catalogs in between. I have chosen to focus on biochemistry for its relatively unique position as a field of study. Biochemistry is a...
synthesis subject, combining aspects of chemistry—a more “pure” science—and biology—a science with an enormous number of applications to the agricultural world. By observing how the required classes of biochemistry developed, in comparison to that of the chemistry major, the most similar major, a general expansion of the Chemistry department that can’t be explained by the growth of the school is seen. Thus, the school’s development away from its more technical aspects can be found. To illustrate this point, I will first compare and contrast the two majors in the term of 1967–1968, the first year that the Chemistry and Biochemistry department existed as its own entity.

In the term of 1967–1968, the required courses of the two majors were remarkably similar. The two majors were nearly identical, less a few small, albeit, key differences. Both majors required that the students take the whole General Chemistry series, Quantative Analysis, the first and second parts of the Organic Chemistry series, Laboratory Glass Blowing, the first part of the Biochemistry series, the Physical Chemistry series, Qualitative Organic Analysis, and the Senior Project. These classes represented the bulk of the classes that majors of biochemistry and chemistry took in the term of 1967–1968. The huge similarities of the two majors are indicative of the school’s continued focus on its founding fields. There were not many differences between the two majors likely because Cal Poly lacked the resources (monetary, personnel, etc.) and drive necessary to shift the school’s focus more than it already had. Some differences did exist, however this difference is indicative of Cal Poly’s position as a more technical school. The primary difference between the two majors manifested in the senior year when chemistry majors were required to take Advanced Organic Chemistry and Inorganic Chemistry, while the biochemistry students were required to take Advanced Biochemistry, Food Analysis and Agricultural chemicals. This split represents the difference between the two fields of studies. What’s notable is that Biochemistry’s senior courses are extremely related to technical aspects of agriculture. This implies that biochemistry (and chemistry by association) was still seen as a field to prepare a student specifically for a job in agricultural vocations. This reveals the Chemistry department to be supplemental to the college, rather than anything close to fundamental.
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By 1977, the situation involving the two majors had changed drastically. In 1972, Cal Poly was granted the title of University. In the five years that followed, the school proved that it was worthy of the title, and by the time 1977 rolled around, its Chemistry department, specifically, was far more greatly expanded than it was previously. In the terms of 1977–1979 the two majors were only similar in the first two years of courses, and even then there were still differences. Both majors required the entire General Chemistry series, Quantative Analysis, and the first two parts of the Organic Chemistry Series. Despite these being the only similarities between the two majors, they both still had a similar number of chemistry courses required to be taken in total. That the total number of chemistry department classes remained the same, while the two majors were not particularly similar, implies that by 1977 the Chemistry department had grown greatly; further evidence of this growth lies in the differences between the majors. In the same year it can be seen that Chemistry majors were required to take more math and physics classes, the entire Physical Chemistry series, and Instrumental analysis. Biochemistry majors, on the other hand, were required to take more life science classes, the entire General Biochemistry series (to be addressed later), and the Biophysical chemistry Series (electively, Physical Chemistry could substitute these two classes). These differences, first, represent the slight gap that was able to grow between chemistry and biochemistry between 1967 and 1977. That this gap was able to form at all more greatly cements the assertion that the Chemistry department, specifically, grew larger in those years, likely indicating that the school was focusing on more colleges than those of Engineering and Agriculture at this point. The major of Biochemistry, furthermore, no longer required specifically agricultural classes to be taken. This further implies that the school had drifted from its original focuses by 1977. A revealing loss for both the majors was the removal of Laboratory Glass Blowing as a required course. Laboratory Glass blowing taught, “Techniques of glassblowing…simple laboratory apparatus.” An extremely applied and technical class, it is (it still exists today) likely a
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vestige of when Cal Poly was a far more technical school. Its original addition to the two chemistry majors was likely due, both, to a general lack of classes, as well as Cal Poly’s focus on more vocational areas. The loss of Laboratory Glass Blowing indicates, by 1977, the overall growth of the Chemistry department and the school’s lessening focus on vocational and technical preparations.

In the years between 1967 and 1977, several significant changes were made to the classes that were offered within the Chemistry department. New classes came into existence, some old ones withered away, but, the majority of classes were either retooled slightly or expanded/contracted into a different form. An interesting note is that most of the Chemistry major specific courses were left unchanged; it was the courses related to the Biochemistry major that changed the most. The most significant alteration to the Biochemistry major was the change in the General Biochemistry series. In the 1967–1968 catalogs there are a total of 3 dedicated biochemistry classes: Agricultural Biochemistry (CHEM 328), Biochemistry (CHEM 329), and Advanced Biochemistry (CHEM 434). Both CHEM 328 and CHEM 329 make heavy reference to their agricultural value—they each make special reference to the manufacture of animal feed and other agricultural products. The description of Advanced Biochemistry contains, “…and their relation to agricultural production.” These descriptions imply that, in 1967, Biochemistry was a far more agriculturally based major, made to prepare the student in the field agricultural vocations. By 1977, several new biochemistry classes are present and required for the major—a total of 5, specifically, biochemistry classes. The classes required for the major were Biophysical chemistry (CHEM 301,302) and the General Biochemistry series (CHEM 371,372,373). There were several more electives as well. Most significantly, of the required courses, none of them mention anything relating to agricultural techniques or production. Of the remaining optional biochemical classes only Food Analysis (CHEM 435), Agricultural Chemicals (CHEM 436), and Biochemistry (CHEM 328) make any reference to agricultural techniques. Of those three CHEM 328 is the most significant and its mention of agriculture (near identically to the description of CHEM 329 in 1967) implies even more of a separation from the schools founding colleges. By examining
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7 California State Polytechnic College Catalog, 1967-1968, 261-263.
8 Ibid., 262.
9 California State Polytechnic University Catalog, 1977-1979, 260-264.
10 Ibid., 260-263.
the pre-requisites of the course, and the wording of its description, it becomes apparent that the once primary class for Biochemistry majors had drifted into being a survey of biochemistry for non-Biochemistry/Chemistry majors. That the once primary class for the major had drifted into the place of the non-major class indicates just how much the Chemistry and Biochemistry department had expanded in those 10 years. The presence of this class’ change reveals without a doubt that by 1977, Biochemistry was no longer “agricultural chemistry,” but was rather considered a distinct field in its own right.

This shift of Biochemistry, and the whole Chemistry department, away from agriculture indicates a lessening focus of the school on agriculture; furthermore the great growth of specifically biochemistry classes indicates that the Chemistry department had grown greatly. If the Chemistry department had grown so much, it is not a difficult step to take to say that the whole College of Science and Mathematics had grown by similar magnitudes. The overall large growth of the colleges other than Agriculture and Engineering in the 1970s reveals that Cal Poly was taking its new title as University seriously.
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From 1955 to 1968, racial tensions and African Americans’ fight for more equality reached a new height in much of the United States. African Americans fought discrimination in a variety of forms from bus boycotts to the March on Washington in 1963. At times during the Civil Rights Movement, some educational institutions fiercely resented integration. Some instances of permitting and accepting non-Whites into higher education resulted in fatally violent outcomes, as with the case of James Meredith. In 1962, James Meredith, an African American, had to win a lawsuit to gain admission into the previously segregated University of Mississippi. Two people were killed and about 300 suffered injuries at the riot that tried to prevent Meredith from entering the campus on his first day of school. Although some parts of the country and some colleges were particularly adamant in vocalizing their disapproval of integration and allowing discrimination to persist, the civil rights atmosphere at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo appeared considerably less racially charged than it had the potential to be. During the Civil Rights Movement, the student reporters of Cal Poly’s newspaper, the Mustang Daily,
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illustrated the relatively calm but trying efforts of the Black Student Union to expand equality for African Americans on campus. The Mustang Daily chronicled how African American students sought to reduce discrimination and have an expanded curriculum to reflect the increasingly diverse student body at Cal Poly. Although Cal Poly was, and still is, a predominately White university, the efforts of students, principally those of the African Americans who were a part of the Black Student Union during the late 1960s, catalyzed a change in Cal Poly that would bring awareness to racial tension and discrimination.

While African Americans only made up about one percent of Cal Poly’s student body throughout the Civil Rights Movement, the student population did take an active role in bringing progressive changes to the campus.² African Americans participated in bringing the Civil Rights Movement to campus largely through the efforts of the Black Student Union (BSU), which was founded at Cal Poly in the fall of 1968.

Throughout the Civil Rights movement the Black Student Union worked on bringing more diversity to campus. The main goals and requests the BSU asked for were an African American centered major, more African American students as well as professors, recruitment of more African American females, special classes for African Americans only, and an African American only dormitory.³ The BSU tried to accomplish bringing diversity to Cal Poly largely by working with administrators, specifically Cal Poly president, Robert E. Kennedy and the dean of students, Everett Chandler. Most of the BSU’s appeals were heard by the administration, but the majority of their requests either did not become approved by Cal Poly or were slightly altered from the original idea the BSU presented.

Out of the suggestions the BSU presented, President Kennedy rejected the idea for segregated dormitories saying, “I find it hard to believe that you actually want separate dormitories for black students” and that “we do not segregate at this college.”⁴ Kennedy’s response was critical of the BSU’s requests, especially since Kennedy told the BSU he did not even “believe” that African Americans wanted to be segregated into different dormitories. Although Kennedy’s reaction was not very compassionate, he did provide an understandable reasoning.
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³ C.E. Jackson, “BSU, administration discuss black issues,” Mustang Daily, April 2, 1969.
⁴ Ibid.
in his rejection of the BSU’s ideas to diversify Cal Poly. If African American dormitories were allowed, it would appear that Cal Poly was discriminating against African Americans by segregating them into separate quarters from Whites. President Kennedy also rejected implementing an African American Studies major, particularly because he “could not see the value of a degree in black studies.” Even though it seems somewhat inflexible of Kennedy to disregard an African American Studies major, it may not have been a viable option for a president of a polytechnic university to add another liberal arts program. In addition, it took until 1994 for Cal Poly to offer an Ethnic Studies degree and it still does not have African American Studies. However, President Kennedy did try to hire more African American professors, although it may have been just a gesture. At first he said he “would welcome any black instructors who were qualified” but then stated he could not find any qualified African American instructors during his recruitment tour.

Despite the fact that the BSU was not able to obtain all of the changes they vocalized, they continued to work collaboratively with the administration to help reduce discrimination. Richard Jenkins, member of the executive committee of the BSU, commented in a letter to the editor of the Mustang Daily that the BSU has “never come to the administration with clenched fists, but with creative and productive ideas to improve race relations at Cal Poly, and to eradicate the inequalities of the race relations that prevail on this campus.” Jenkins’s letter highlights the use of nonviolent means to promote a progressive education that worked towards equality. The nonviolent methods of Cal Poly’s BSU also reflect the same nonviolent values and tactics promoted by Martin Luther King Jr.’s philosophy for the Civil Rights Movement. The newspaper letter also underscores how there was a sense of racism that could be felt on campus. Through the BSU’s efforts they signaled the lack of diversity on campus and worked towards building more equality on campus.

Although strides were made in bringing diversity to Cal Poly during the Civil Rights Movement, the Mustang Daily’s articles help reveal the social culture and sentiments regarding racism on campus. The Mustang Daily’s article
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7 Jackson, “BSU”.
“Are you Negro or Afro-American?” chronicled how incoming students in the Class of 1968 were asked to indicate if they were African-American, Caucasian, Mexican, Negro, etc. on their registration papers. 32 students answered African American while 19 answered Negro. Darryl Brady, an electronic engineering major and BSU Information Minister, voiced out to the Cal Poly newspaper about the split in the proper term for racial identification. Brady stated, “White men use the word Negro in a derogatory manner” and “it is only their polite way of calling us niggers!” The article reveals not only the internal identity conflict African Americans faced, but also depicts how others regarded African Americans. The title’s usage of “Negro” highlights how it was still an acceptable term to use; however, as Brady commented, the word Negro bared a negative connotation with it being associated with roots to the pejorative term “nigger.”

The Mustang Daily also captured students’ sentiments regarding racism as well. In a survey conducted by the Mustang Daily in 1969, about 50% of surveyed students contacted “admittedly discriminate because of race, religion, and national origin.” It is also interesting to note that there was still a large percentage of students admitting to racism after Cal Poly President Robert E. Kennedy implemented the Discrimination Committee a year earlier in 1968 to combat discrimination on campus. Subtle backlash against the BSU was also evident from some of the Mustang Daily writers. In one article, the newspaper reported how the BSU might better obtain its objectives by stating, “The Mustang Daily believes…the BSU must realize Poly is not subject to urban solutions. Since this college is rural oriented, it seems logical that the BSU may have to be more flexible in its approach. If it isn’t, the administration may be forced by the conservative elements to take a more hard line stand, which is favored by Governor Ronald Reagan.” The article cites how Cal Poly is a rural campus as a way to justify the lack of equality at Cal Poly and cannot be as accommodating to the BSU’s requests since it is not a college in the city with progressive ideals. The article continues with an indirect statement to African Americans that they should appreciate what they have now at Cal Poly because if they are not flexible in what they are asking for from the administration, Cal Poly might be “forced” to “take a more hard line stand.”

10 Jackson, “BSU”.
12 Ibid.
editorial’s suggestions towards the BSU appear somewhat unsympathetic towards African American students’ work towards equality, the writer of this editorial was George Ramos. George Ramos was the first Latino editor-in-chief of the Mustang Daily and would later be awarded three Pulitzer Prizes, one of which was for an article covering the Rodney King riots in Los Angeles.\footnote{Victoria Billings, “Mourning the loss of journalism legacy,” Mustang Daily, July 28, 2011.} Although Cal Poly had a majority of White students, the Mustang Daily provided a source that also captured a Latino’s perspective regarding how African Americans were working towards equality.

During the Civil Rights Movement African Americans at Cal Poly were able to address discrimination on campus and were able to help institute more ethnically inclusive changes to Cal Poly. The Black Student Union facilitated most of the work in bringing about these changes, such as their meeting with administration. Throughout the transitions Cal Poly experienced, the student reporters of the Mustang Daily chronicled the progress of the BSU and also provided insight into the discriminatory sentiments on campus.
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In the late 1940’s the Cal Poly newspaper the Mustang Daily and the annual yearbook, the El Rodeo, attempted to chronicle the married veterans’ housing project. The Cal Poly University Archives and Special Collections have in their possession both the collection of the Mustang Daily from 1947 on, as well as the yearbooks from these years (minus 1945). At a glance, these collections look to be quite full of in-depth and well-balanced information about the Cal Poly Veteran Village. But as you looker closer at these collections, certain questions begin to arise. Did it really help economically to have this on-campus housing for veterans? Did it help the housing shortage? Why did it take almost two whole years for the project to be completed? How did the families adjust to on-campus living in such close quarters with their neighbors? These are all questions that both the Mustang Daily and the yearbooks allude to but do not answer. Why? I argue that it was because the Mustang Daily and the El Rodeo yearbooks were campus publications and being so, wanted to focus on only the positive aspects of campus life.

At the end of World War II in 1945, millions of American men and women came home from military service to find that many changes had taken place throughout the country, both culturally and economically. Yet despite all the
changes that occurred over the four and a half years of war, one thing remained the same: the value of education. American veterans came home to a country that was still offering great opportunities in continuing college education. California Polytechnic State University was no exception. In 1946-47, Cal Poly became the first college on the west coast to offer on-campus housing for married veteran students and their families.\textsuperscript{1}

The yearbooks and the newspaper of Cal Poly did a wonderful job of bringing forth numerical facts and statistics of this project, which was a very smart move. It gave assurance to students that something was being done about the housing shortage and that there would be housing for married veterans. For example, in the 1946 \textit{El Rodeo} yearbook under the section entitled “Veterans”, the basic facts of the units and house-trailers which were military surplus from Port Hueneme, were laid out quite nicely, giving the total cost of the project, which was estimated to be $43,195.00 as well as what the rent per month would be for different types of housing. They were settled in neighborhoods, called Vetville, Poly View and Poly Crest. The larger houses in Vetville could be rented for thirty-two dollars a month, the smaller houses for twenty-eight dollars a month and trailer-houses for twenty-four dollars a month, all utilities included.\textsuperscript{2} The yearbook section concluded that “ex-soldiers and former Navy men enrolled at Poly hailed the project as convenient and economical.”\textsuperscript{3}

While this information was certainly valuable and important, it’s almost too simple and minimal. There was nothing said in great length as to how or why this project was economical and convenient. Did it ease the housing shortage? How many married veteran students were not able to live on campus? There is no answer to be found in the yearbooks and unfortunately, the \textit{Mustang Daily} is of no help with these questions either.

In 1947 enrollment at the university was expected to triple the pre-war registration record of 900 students with almost 2,500 students enrolled for the fall quarter. The September 4\textsuperscript{th} 1947 edition of the \textit{Mustang Daily} confirmed this speculation by reporting that a new high of 1,150 new students had completed applications for admission.\textsuperscript{4} In that same edition in a different article

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{El Rodeo Yearbook: Veterans}. University Archives, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, 1946, without numbers.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.

entitled, “More Trailers Here for Married Vets” the campus newspaper revealed that 188 additional house-trailers (which was the nice way of saying a small, cramped camping trailers) had begun arriving on campus and that they were being installed at site that had been designated and prepared for over six months. “Delayed because of difficulties which arose after the federal government called a halt to financing housing for veterans, the problems were finally ironed out, but probably not soon enough to enable all the married veterans who will arrive for the fall quarter to get on-campus housing until sometime in October.”

Again, this is great basic information but it is also much too vague and does not offer a view of the whole picture. When and why was the housing project for veterans halted? Was it halted statewide, nationwide, or was it an isolated event at Cal Poly? What “problems were ironed out?” This is something that readers would definitely be interested in knowing about, especially being that this was an article in a newspaper; I would think that the halting of a project and the reasons why would qualify as news. And what happened to the married students and their families who were waiting for their housing? If it was not going to be ready until October, then where were they expected to stay and at whose expense? These are all questions and critiques readers must have had, especially the married veteran students themselves.

The picture of perfect domesticity was a perception that the 1940’s and 1950’s idolized and encouraged. The El Rodeo yearbooks were no exception. They were very successful at showing the domesticity of the Veteran Village neighborhoods and families. In each veteran section of the yearbooks, pictures accompanied the texts showing husbands, their wives and their children in and around the home, working on “honey do” lists, mothers and children walking to the milk office and children playing in and around the neighborhood. Everyone had a smile and seemed content. Being that these were photo ops for a publication, it is presumable that the families in these photographs were poised for perfection as to persuade its viewers that married life at Cal Poly’s Veteran Village was “hunky dory”. It was meant to be a snap shot into veterans’ lives and to ultimately be an advertisement to promote on-campus married living to current and future students. A good example of this can be found in the 1947 El Rodeo under the section “Married Veterans” where a photograph is displayed of a couple happily doing the dishes together in one of the small
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units with the caption, “Helpful Bob Miley, he came home from school early and had to pitch in.”

It was a selling point that seems to have worked. By 1948 it was the goal of almost every veteran student and family to move out of the house-trailers and into one of the Vetville houses. Because the waiting list for these homes became extremely long, most veterans and their families were first given the opportunity to move into the Poly View or Poly Crest house-trailers, and then eventually into a Vetville home. And yet there was no solid information offered about this process of selection. And there was definitely not any information about married students’ lives and their possible struggles with on-campus living. What was it like living in small houses and house-trailers with super close neighbors? The buildings were military surplus and were described as roomy and “simulate small cottages with green lawns and bright gardens around each…” So they were somewhat similar to real homes, but ultimately, not the real deal. What was it like not to have modern in-home conveniences? They had access to these things, but they were several minutes’ walk away in the middle of the village. Was it easier or harder for students to have their family lives centered where their school lives were?

Though both the El Rodeo and the Mustang Daily were great with numerical and statistical facts, the majority of the information given was too perfect. It was all one-sided and not balanced. There was not any analysis or even a pros and cons list given. And as you can see, each positive point demonstrated raises question upon question about its credibility and the elusive negative side. Unfortunately the answers to these questions are not found in either collection. Why is that? My argument, as stated earlier, is that being campus publications, the Mustang Daily and the El Rodeo wanted only positive reflections of campus life to be published. I also believe that it is not through the fault of the writers of the newspaper and yearbook articles that one-sided information was presented. It’s most likely that these authors, who most assuredly were Cal Poly students, were not given the whole truth by superiors when researching for these articles. Or perhaps, they did have the whole truth but did not have

---

8 Ibid.
the support or approval to publish it. What was approved and published was intended to be an advertisement and it is that information which we find in both collections. This is something that was indicative of the time period with the “ad men” era and the picture perfect advertising phenomenon.
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