HiPo: The Langara Student Journal of History and Political Science

Vol. 9, March 2026

HiPo

The Langara Student Journal of History and Political Science

Volume 9 *March 2026*

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

ISSN 2561-6536

Submissions
Email: hipojournal@langara.ca

Langara.

ʔəl̓ƛ̓ xʷməθkʷəy̓əm | at Musqueam

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

Cover image: Woman Reading, by Édouard Manet, 1880 – 1882. Art Institute of Chicago.
Cover hippo logo designed by Jack Piskor

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS

ARTICLES

A LETTER FROM THE EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

We, the editors-in-chief, are honoured to present the ninth edition of HiPo: The Langara Student Journal of History and Political Science. For many of the students involved, this was their first experience with academic publishing. This process has been an informative educational experience in the editorial process for everyone involved and continues to provide a valuable experience for student authors from history, political science, art history, and classical studies. We saw a wide array of excellent submissions from many different perspectives and talented writers, bringing a wonderfully diverse set of voices to the journal. Though we could not include all the papers we wanted to, this journal represents a sample of the great research and exceptional writing being done by Langara students.

We would also like to deeply thank our hard-working editorial board, who committed their time and effort working with authors and engaging with the material. We are incredibly proud of their focus and diligence – taking on unexpected workloads and adhering to the high standards set by previous editions. The editorial board would also like to thank Erin Robb, Dr. Jessica Heming, Dr. Jennifer Knapp, and especially our faculty advisor Sean Maschmann, for their indispensable support.

ALANNAH KLASSEN, MALCOLM MCPHERSON, AND LUKE GUTTERIDGE

A LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

It is my pleasure to introduce readers to the 9th edition of the HiPo journal! When we began the journal nearly a decade ago, we wanted to create a space to profile the academic talents of our History, Latin, and Political Science undergraduate students while also providing an outlet where they could experience first-hand, at the department scale, the ins and outs of academic publishing. They took on this challenge with gusto and the result is another fine publication representing the outstanding academic work of our students.

This volume once again showcases the commitment our students hold to engaging with contemporary and historical texts and undertaking critical analysis. The articles take on topics relating to colonial and post-colonial history and politics, and address social, cultural, environmental, and scientific issues from both historical and contemporary perspectives. They represent a wonderful cross-section of academic work undertaken in our courses over the past year.

I'd like to express my sincere gratitude to student members of the HiPo editorial board for all their efforts to draw together this collection of writings and also to the many more students who sent submissions forward for consideration. Thanks also to Faculty Advisor Sean Maschmann along with Drs. Jennifer Knapp, Erin Robb, and Jessica Hemming for the training and guidance you provided to the student editorial board. Finally, we express thanks to the Langara College administration for their continued support of this journal.

TERRI EVANS
Department Chair
History, Latin, and Political Science

THE PRICE OF NATURE

MARIANA O'FARRIL

The centuries of industrialization raised concerns about the protection of the environment. Today, environmental protection is one of the most pressing needs of the century. However, environmental governance has taken on a market-based approach to conservation. This paper traces the historical evolutions of environmental governance in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries, and how it has changed from regulation to valuation and commodification of nature. It analyzes tools such as carbon markets, mitigation baking, payment for ecosystem services, and financial bonds, to explain the broader influence of neoliberalism and the influence of international institutions. Ultimately, the paper demonstrates how market-based environmental solutions concentrate power, reproduce Global inequalities, and undermine environmental justice, failing to address the structural causes of environmental crisis.

The rapid industrialization that has occurred over the course of the last centuries has raised concerns on the environment. Since the mid 20th century, however, there has been a shift in the way nature is viewed and treated, from its intrinsic, aesthetic, and spiritual value to its economic value, resulting in the commodification of nature. This transformation is characterized by the emergence of economic valuation of ecosystem services and market-based environmental governance. Through tools such as carbon markets, mitigation banking, and payments for ecosystem services, the market has gained great influence over environmental policies.

The purpose of this essay is to trace the historical evolutions of environmental strategies, analyzing how and why they shifted towards market-based tools throughout the years. It seeks to show that the commodification of nature is part of a neoliberal agenda that not only reshaped environmental policy but also hinders environmental justice, concentrating power in the hands of a few actors.

To understand this shift, it is necessary to begin with the postwar economic ideas and its consequences. In the aftermath of the World War II, the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 established a new international economic order and its institutions. The World Bank, initially the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, started with the purpose of lending money for the reconstruction of countries in the postwar era,[1] encouraging development and economic growth to become the main priority. Dowie described the economic ideas of the time as welfare capitalism: "the ecologically destructive system that gives the nation's resources away to any corporation with the desire and technology to develop them."[2] The consequences of the rapid development did not go unnoticed, and in fact the years after the war presented a great influence of environmentalists and government action towards the environment.

In the United States, the 1960s and 1970s marked a period where "the environmental movement became a political force."[3] Inspired by Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, environmental awareness culminated in the first Earth Day, and 23 federal environmental acts became law in the next years regulating pollution of land, air, and water.[4] On the other hand, during the 1970s Earth Day, Nobel Laureate George Wald warned about the future of environment industry: "anti pollution … [would] become a new multi billion dollar business."[5] In his words, the environmental hazards would become a profitable industry for corporations receiving massive governmental funds to repair the very damage they caused, redefining environmental progress.

Despite the government involvement in environmental concerns in the 1970's, the following decades marked a shift both in the United States and in Europe. The rise of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher into power started a new era that would shape global politics, economics, and environmental policies with neoliberal ideology. Neoliberalism advocates for privatization, deregulation, free markets, and minimal state intervention, directly opposing the government framework from the previous decade. This ideological shift started to redefine the approaches to conservation.

As Dowie notes, the Reagan years started a new wave in American environmental history, which in Reagan's own words "allow industry the regulatory flexibility and economic incentives to clean up pollution."[6] Concomitantly, in the 1980's there was an "environmental momentum in the world at large,"[7] which provided environmentalists in the United States opportunity to resist Reagan's policies. During his presidential campaign, Reagan made strong anti-environment

---

[1]Steger and Roy, *Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction*, 6.
[2]Dowie, *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the Close of the Twentieth Century,* 28.
[3]Dowie, 33.
[4]Dowie, 33.
[5]Dowie, 63
[6]Dowie, 106.
[7]Hays, *The Reagan Antienvironmental Revolution*, 512.

comments, but the evolution of environmental science manifested into institutional and citizen resistance to his administration's radical changes.[8]

Reagan's ideology called for a transfer of power from the federal arena to the states and commitment to the business community.[9] However, post materialistic values put special citizen concern in aspects such as recreation, that would be limited if land were transferred to private owners. Deregulation in pollution control was similarly not accepted by the nation. Therefore, the administration had to think of other ways to uphold its commitment to corporations. It did so by delaying action on matters of pollution rather than completely abandoning previously established programs, imposing major cuts in the Environmental Protection Agency, and managing land on behalf of development goals rather than environmental goals.[10]

Equally important to the spread of neoliberal ideology was the prime minister of Britain Margaret Thatcher. Although Thatcher was an avid free market advocate, she acknowledged the importance of environmental action. In a 1990 speech for the Better Environment Awards for Industry, she recognized the scientific knowledge of consequences of pollution and the necessity to conserve the environment. Nonetheless, she emphasized the need to think realistically and keep economic growth and development.[11] In fact, the focus on economic growth was not particular to the conservative party. The *Marxism Today*, an influential journal among British left wing during the late 1970s and early 1990s, published that "a deindustrialized society is a society of poverty," showing that economic growth was at the center of the discourse in Britain.[12]

In the 1990s, the rise of international institutions to regulate global environmental issues marked the advance of neoliberal environmental governance globally. Through international treaties, The World Bank, and the United Nations and its agencies, the natural environment became natural capital: natural resources important for economic production.[13] McAfee asserts that these international institutions are "sites for the production of 'global' environmental discourse."[14] In other words, these institutions became the dominant voice shaping environmental discussion and bringing solutions according to the neoliberal ideology. Moreover, these institutions reflect the upscaling feature of neoliberalism, that is, local, regional, and national regulations being transferred to international and global

[8]Hays, 515.
[9]Hays, 518.
[10]Hays, 521, 496 ,523.
[11]Thatcher, *Better Environment Awards for Industry 1989*, 393.
[12]Maccaferri, *From 'Old' To 'New' Politics: The Politicization of the Environment in Left-Wing British Intellectual Discourse (1970s–1980s)*, 411.
[13]Brown et al., *Defining, Valuing, and Providing Ecosystem Goods and Services*, 336.
[14]McAfee, *Selling Nature to Save It? Biodiversity And Green Developmentalism,* 133.

governance.[15] Coupled with the World Commission on Environment and Development, known as the Brundtland Commission, which coined the term sustainable development,[16] the “global environmental-economic paradigm enlists environmentalism in the service of the worldwide expansion of capitalism.”[17] Solidifying the ideas of the Brundtland Commission report, the 1992 Rio Earth Summit resulted in 170 countries officially adopting the goal of sustainable development.[18] Together, these changes paved the ground for the market-base alleged environmental solutions.

In the late 1990s the shift from regulation to valuation became clear. During a meeting of the Coalition for Clean Air in Los Angeles, a lawyer for the Natural Resources Defense Council described the situation: "Environmentalists used to be seen as people who try to get the toughest possible regulation legislated. [Now] we are saying 'let's be more flexible' and we are looking at market approaches.”[19] Naturally, to be part of a market, a commodity needs a price. It was with the work of Constanza in 1997 that the methods to estimate the economic value of nature started to emerge through the idea of ecosystem services.[20] Although the concept of ecosystem services already existed as a metaphor to reflect the benefits of ecosystems to every aspect of human life,[21] it was initially a way to bring awareness for conservation rather than described in currency. In 2005 however, ecosystem services became a framework for environmental-economic decision-making with the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (MA). Since then, global environmental problems have been discussed in economic terms and analyzed through cost-benefits.[22] Jay Hair, a prominent environmental leader asserted that environmentalism "must translate into profits, earnings, productivity, and economic incentives for industry."[23]

Valuing ecosystem services in monetary terms materialized into market-based tools such as carbon markets, mitigation banking and biodiversity offsetting, payments for ecosystem services, and more recently through financial bonds. One early experience with market-based mechanisms was through the US Clean Air Act in 1990. The environmental problem was acid rain. Therefore, Congress used a cap-and-trade system to limit sulphur dioxide emissions and issue tradable permits. It

---

[15]Castree, *Neoliberalising Nature: Processes, Effects, and Evaluations*, 161.
[16]Lele, 311.
[17]McAfee, 134.
[18]Lele, 311.
[19]Dowie, 105.
[20]Gómez-Baggethun et al. *The history of ecosystem services in economic theory and practice: From early notions to markets and payment schemes,* 1209.
[21]Gómez-Baggethun and Ruiz-Pérez, *Economic Valuation and the Commodification of Ecosystem Services*, 613.
[22]Gómez-Baggethun et al.. 1214.
[23]Dowie, 107-108.

then inspired the creation of carbon markets, which is one of the most well-established mechanisms of climate governance. An international market for carbon offset emerged in 1997 with the Kyoto Protocol.

Indeed, the Kyoto Protocol was the first time that an international environmental law "actively generates an environmental commodity through market."[24] Brown, Bergstrom, and Loomis observed that it "created scarcity for carbon emission permits when signatory countries agreed to reduce their emissions."[25] Unquestionably, scarcity is a key feature of neoliberalism, since the ideology promotes unconstrained competition. Through its Clean Development Mechanisms, industries in developed countries with high levels of carbon emissions can "price nature's services, assign property rights, and trade these services within a global market." [26] Moreover, because carbon emissions is a global issue, these industries can, and frequently do so, offset their emissions with projects in the developing world. Projects include transfer of green technology for developing countries, or investments in reforestation in developing countries to sequester carbon.

An increasing number of offsetting projects are now in developing countries. The mainstream idea is that developing countries are "less costly, and labor and land are generally less expensive."[27] In effect, carbon offsetting projects are a mean of exploitation of the global South by the global North actors. It reinforces colonial ideas of dependency. It also constructs power imbalances where a part of the globe obtains the control and influence, while the other serves their needs.

The World Bank, which in the 2000s had "channeled more than $180 million into emission-reduction offset projects,"[28] plays a significant role is this dynamic. Through its conditionalities and green developmentalism, the bank has sparked great criticism especially in developing countries. Although the World Bank preaches sustainable development, its conditions such as the Structural Adjustment Policies more than often regard economic development over environment or social issues. Conditions usually include economic and governance reforms, affecting developing countries' democracies. Moreover, it reinforces the narrative that progress, knowledge, and environmental solutions are a product of the global North, perpetuating unequal structures.

---

[24]Bumpus and Liverman, *Accumulation by Decarbonization and the Governance of Carbon Offsets,* 132.
[25]Brown et al., 372.
[26]Bumpus and Liverman, 132.
[27]Bumpus and Liverman, 133.
[28]Bumpus and Liverman, 133.

The logic of pricing and trading a part of nature extended to other ecosystems. In a similar manner, wetland mitigation banking emerged as a product of the 1970s US Clean Water Act.[29] Initially, if someone wished to fill a wetland, they must apply for a permit. The request was analyzed by the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency. The permit could be approved, denied, or approved with the condition that a wetland was created to compensate the loss of the natural one, known as compensatory mitigation.[30] The third option became increasingly popular. However, by the 1980s the reports were that the mitigation sites were either never constructed or were highly degraded,[31] frustrating environmentalists and the federal agencies alike. Furthermore, the housing industry was becoming frustrated with the permit system as well. Together, those pushed a series of policy proposals under President Bush's No Net Loss of Wetlands agenda. The president blamed the permit system and the administration of the Clean Water Act, promoting the adoption of market-based solutions to it.[32]

Under these circumstances, the first wetland mitigation banking emerged in 1991. In summary, a private firm purchases and restores a wetland area, which is the bank site, and then sells credits to a firm that needs to fulfil a compensatory mitigation. It is a win-win solution for private firms. The owners of the banks benefit from a free-market environment, where they can compete freely and set prices as they wish. Moreover, they can benefit from cheaper land to create the wetland offset. The firms required to mitigate the issue, who were previously required to create the wetland on the same expensive land of their projects, no longer will lose their profits. On the losing side, however, is the ecosystem.

While it is true that an ecosystem, in this case the wetland, is being created or restored, it is hard to say that it is equivalent to the one destroyed. First, that would mean that the two ecosystems have the exact same biodiversity, the same species and the same number on each of them, which is likely impossible. Second, it would mean that the biodiversity does not have any inherent value besides its utility. It does not matter if a wetland and its biodiversity is destroyed because they do not have any inalienable right to exist, providing we create a new one. If we were to look at it with human life it would mean to say it does not matter if one person's life ends, because a new person will be born to substitute it. Therefore, the wetland mitigation banking unquestionably distorts the value of nature as a living system.

Still on the framework of sustainable development, policies for poverty alleviation and environmental conservation emerged from payments for ecosystem services

[29]Robertson, *The neoliberalization of ecosystem services: wetland mitigation banking and problems in environmental governance*, 361.
[30]Robertson, 363.
[31]Robertson, 363.
[32]Robertson, 363.

(PES) policies. It is a broad concept that can include carbon markets such as Reducing Emissions from Forest Degradation and Deforestation (REDD). The principle is to pay for stewards that maintain and protect ecosystems. Stewards are usually farmers, landowners, or communities of rural areas. It is a conditioned and voluntary transaction between provider and beneficiary.[33] As the first carbon market, it was also influenced by the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol and various projects for PES have been funded by the World Bank.[34]

The market influence in PES is that payments are made by private donors rather than governments. Estefano Pagiola, an environmental economist of the World Bank contends that this way pressures accountability of stewards. If the service, that is the conservation, is not being met, then the buyers will stop paying. The problem is that neoliberal ideology made the principle flawed. In principle, the idea is that communities in rural areas are more likely to face poverty, and therefore PES would alleviate it. In practice, the poorest communities are the less likely to harm the environment and are rarely compensated. Because neoliberalism is informed by pragmatic economic decisions, the payments are made for those that are a bigger threat to the environment and therefore will have an incentive to stop it.[35] In addition, PES can further dispossession in rural communities through green grabbing, a new dimension of land grabbing. Because the communities must give up at least some control over the land or resources they manage, it is characterized as an appropriation, only this time it is with the purpose of sustainability and conservation.[36] In summary, PES reaffirms core characteristics of neoliberalism: appropriation, dispossession, awarding scarcity over justice, and maintain unbalanced power dynamics.

Contrary to the same old capitalist results of the commodification of nature, the market still finds new ways to innovate. In 2022 the World Bank launched the first wildlife conservation bond. The Rhino Bond is an investment in conservation of black rhinoceros. The amount of return of the investment is based on the conservation results of the species.[37] The critiques, however, remain the same, "policies and practices will inevitably be dominated by the interests of investors and firms, whereas any costs … will be experienced by local communities."[38] In the design of the Rhino Bond, that was certainly true, since all the decision making

[33]Gómez-Baggethun and Ruiz-Pérez, 618.
[34]McAfee and Shapiro, *Payments for Ecosystem Services in Mexico: Nature, Neoliberalism, Social Movements, and the Stat*e, 583.
[35]McAfee and Shapiro, 584.
[36]Fairhead et al., *Green Grabbing: a new appropriation of nature?,* 238.
[37]Medina and Scales, *Finance and biodiversity conservation: insights from rhinoceros conservation and the first wildlife conservation bond*, 90.
[38]Medina and Scales, 91.

was strictly made by financial actors.[39] Moreover, it entails a kind of speciesism, the discrimination of one species over another. Because the investors are focused on performance, and the public perceives megafauna as more charismatic, this kind of mechanism will further limitations to preserve species that are already overlooked.[40]

In the end, from air, to water, to land, and wildlife, nature has been sold to be saved, as McAfee puts it.[41] Wald's prophecy from the first Earth Day has incredibly become true to a level where conservation is only attractive if there are profits. The increasing market-based solutions have changed the course of environmental governance around the globe. Unfortunately, these tools fail in almost every purpose, except for the profits. The focus on economic performance fails to address, and indeed reinforces, the underlying cause of almost every problem in this planet: the unbalanced power relations and capital accumulation through exploitation. Furthermore, it distorts the value and meaning of nature. Nature is not just something out there, but it is also constructed from the social relationships with it. When this relationship can only be mediated through utility and profits, it becomes fundamentally damaged.

---

[39] Medina and Scales, 97.
[40] Medina and Scales, 98.
[41] McAfee, 146.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Margaret Thatcher's Green Thumb: Iron Lady Demanded Action on Climate Change." *International Business Times* (April 9, 2013). https://research.ebsco.com/linkprocessor/plink?id=a712ba75-5fc5-3cb7-aff6-00e506c8866f

BROWN, THOMAS C., JOHN C. BERGSTROM, AND JOHN B. LOOMIS. "Defining, Valuing, and Providing Ecosystem Goods and Services." *Natural Resources Journal* 47, No. 2 (Spring 2007): 329-376. www.jstor.org/stable/24889176

BUMPUS, ADAM G, and DIANA M. LIVERMAN. "Accumulation by Decarbonization and the Governance of Carbon Offsets." *Economic Geography* 84, No. 2 (Apr., 2008): 127-155. DOI:10.1111/j.1944-8287.2008.tb00401.x.

CASTREE, NOEL. "Neoliberalising nature: processes, effects, and evaluations." *Environment and Planning A* 40, (2008): 153-173. DOI:10.1068/a39100.

COSTANZA, ROBERT, and HERMAN E. DALY. "Natural Capital and Sustainable Development." *Conservation Biology* 6, No. 1 (Mar. 1992): 37-46. DOI:10.1046/j.1523-1739.1992.610037.x.

COSTANZA, ROBERT, RALPH D'ARGE, RUDOLF DE GROOT, et al. "The Value of the World's Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital." *Nature* 387, (1997): 253-260. DOI:10.1038/387253a0.

CROSBY, ALFRED W. "The Past and Present of Environmental History." *The American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (1995): 1177–89. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2168206.

DOWIE, MARK. *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the Close of the Twentieth Century*: The MIT Press, 1995.

FAIRHEAD, JAMES, MELISSA LEACH, and IAN SCOONES. "Green Grabbing: A New Appropriation of Nature?" *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 39, no. 2, (2012): 237–61. DOI:10.1080/03066150.2012.671770.

GÓMEZ-BAGGETHUN, ERIK, and MANUEL RUIZ-PÉREZ. "Economic Valuation and the Commodification of Ecosystem Services." *Progress in Physical Geography: Earth & Environment* 35, no. 5 (October 1, 2011): 613–28. DOI: 10.1177/0309133311421708.

GÓMEZ-BAGGETHUN, ERIK, RUDOLF DE GROOT, PEDRO L. LOMAS, and CARLOS MONTES. "The History of Ecosystem Services in Economic Theory and Practice: From Early Notions to Markets and Payment Schemes." *Ecological Economics* 69, no. 6 (April 1, 2010): 1209–18. DOI 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.11.007.

HAYS, SAMUEL P. "The Reagan Antienvironmental Revolution." *Beauty, Health & Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985* 1, no. 2 (January 2, 1987): 491–526. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511664106.017.

HEYNEN, NIK, and PAUL ROBBINS. "The neoliberalization of nature: Governance, privatization, enclosure and valuation" *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 16, no.1 (2005): 5-8. DOI: 10.1080/1045575052000335339.

IGOE, JIM, and DAN BROCKINGTON. "Neoliberal Conservation: A Brief Introduction" *Conservation & Society* 5, No. 4 (2007): 432-449. DOI:10.18574/nyu/9781479862689.003.0034.

LELE, SHARACHCHANDRA. "Rethinking Sustainable Development." *Current History* 112, No. 757. (November 2013): 311-316. DOI:10.1525/curh.2013.112.757.311.

MACCAFERRI, MARZIA. "From 'Old' to 'New' Politics: The Politicization of the Environment in Left-Wing British Intellectual Discourse (1970s–1980s)" *European History Quarterly* 52, no. 3 (2022): 401–417. DOI: 10.1177/02656914221103165

MCAFEE, KATHLEEN, and ELIZABETH N. SHAPIRO. "Payments for Ecosystem Services in Mexico: Nature, Neoliberalism, Social Movements, and the State." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 100, No. 3 (July 2010): 579-599. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00045601003794833.

MCAFEE, KATHLEEN. "Selling Nature to save It? Biodiversity and Green Developmentalism." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17, no. 2 (1999): 133-154. DOI:10.1080/00045601003794833.

MEDINA, CLAIRE, and IVAN R. SCALES. "Finance and Biodiversity Conservation: Insights from Rhinoceros Conservation and the First Wildlife Conservation Bond." *Oryx* 58 (January 1, 2024): 90–99. DOI:10.1017/S0030605322001648.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: A Framework for Assessment*. Island Press for the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board, 2005. www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.300.aspx.pdf.

MURADIAN R, ARSEL M, PELLEGRINI L, et al. "Payments for ecosystem services and the fatal attraction of win-win solutions." *Conservation letters* 6, no. 4, (2013): 274-279. DOI:10.1111/j.1755-263x.2012.00309.x.

STEGER, MANFRED B. and RAVIK K. ROY. *Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

ROBERTSON, MORGAN M. "The neoliberalization of ecosystem services: wetland mitigation banking and problems in environmental governance." *Geoforum* 35, no. 3 (2004): 361-373. DOI:10.1016/j.geoforum.2003.06.002.

THATCHER, MARGARET. "Better Environment Awards for Industry 1989." *RSA Journal* 138, no. 5406 (1990): 392–96. www.jstor.org/stable/41375196.

THATCHER, MARGARET. "Margaret Thatcher on Shaping a New Global Community." *Population and Development Review* 16, no. 3 (1990): 604–605. DOI:10.2307/1972852

POWER IN THE PRIMAVERA

CEILIDH HERRICK

This paper examines the modern gender roles applied to Botticelli's Primavera. The work of art is often deemed to be aligned with femininity, due to the mythical themes and figures present in the Artwork. These figures are classically described as the three muses, Chloris, Zephyrus and Mercury, all gathered around the central figure of Venus in a blooming garden. Using journal articles that analyze the significance of the figures in the frame and articles pertaining to gender studies. This paper explains and examines how adapting the central figure to male shifts the gendered identity of the painting. Not a painting of feminine harmony but instead rather a painting depicting masculine power.

The Renaissance, a period born from a long period of death, emphasized the rebirth of culture through education and artistic creation. One of the most prominent artistic figures we see throughout this period is Sandro Botticelli. As an Italian painter based in Florence, he was at the center of it all. One of his most famous works, Primavera, meaning spring, was commissioned by the Medici family for the marriage of Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici and Semiramide di'Appiano. The painting itself is an allegory for love, beauty, and fertility, depicting figures from Roman mythology, such as Venus and Flora, indicating the coming of spring. The painting's connotations to fertility and femininity can be gendered as female. After all, most of the figures within the frame are women, and spring itself is a time of fertility and rebirth. The subject matter in the context of the Medici marriage may have been a signifier for love and fertility for the couple, but most importantly for the bride. How would gender assumptions assigned to this painting shift if we changed the central figure of Venus to be male rather than female, and what kind of message would the painting deliver and to whom?

The female gendered assumptions in this painting are ideals associated with qualities that made a women feminine, and valuable in Renaissance Florence. Youth is regarded as the prime of life, particularly for women given its close association to increased female fertility. Fertility signifies the assurance that the familial line will continue, and beauty for good looking offspring. These are key features to consider in this work of art, as each figure within the frame represents these qualities through the mythology of each character. The representations deliver considerable context for why the *Primavera* was commissioned for the Medici marriage. Historian Nicolai Rubenstein, a past member of the Warburg Institute, argues in his article "Youth and Spring in Botticelli's *Primavera*," that the figure to the right of our central figure, Venus, is not Flora, goddess of Iuventas. She is the Roman goddess of youth and rejuvenation. Her presence comprises a similar interpretation to that of Venus but is more closely tied to vitality and the prime of life that is youth. Rubinstein argues that the interpretation of the figure to be Flora is not consistent with mythology the legend of Chloris. The legend describes how the nymph, Chloris, who is pursued by the west wind Zephyrus. When she is captured by Zephyrus, she is transformed into Flora, goddess of flowers and spring, after being taken by him. As the representation and the description of the figure do not align, Chloris appears right next to Iuventas as she is being pursued by Zephyrus.[1]

Rubinstein's interpretation of the figure as Iuventas is important because it contributes to understanding why this painting is deemed feminine. While youth is highly desirable for all genders, it has a special place with women. This is because a woman is more desirable to society in her youth due to her reproductive value, directly correlating to her fertility. Ideology such as this is connected to the classical woman's role to be a mother, bear, and raise children to continue the family line of succession. The season of spring, or Primavera, is defined by rebirth. Fertility is brought by the flowering of groves, instigating the regeneration and renewal of life. An allegory of fertility and birth.

Another way to grasp femininity within Primavera is through the context of the Medici marriage, for which it was commissioned. "A Lesson for the Bride*"* by art historian Lilian Zirpolo, PhD, argues that each figure within the painting is a lesson for the new bride, and suggests the painting be read from right to left.[2] Zirpolo, unlike Rubenstein, suggests that the figure to the right is Flora, Goddess of Spring, and that she is the transformation of Chloris after she is taken by Zephyrus. Though this differs from the last discussion, it is still significant evidence in constructing femininity within this painting. The figure of Flora is very put together, adorning a small smile, in contrast to her previous state as Chloris, suggesting that she has been "[t]amed and domesticated, Flora is explicitly contrasted with the wild and animal-like Chloris. Her smile shows her satisfaction not only with her new status as a bride but also with the prospect of motherhood, the primary role of the wife in marriage." [3]

The taming of Chloris is a parallel to the submission of a wife to her husband, thus constructing the woman's position to submit and be controlled. The Three Graces,

[1]Rubinstein, "Youth and Spring in Botticelli's Primavera," 250.
[2]Zirpolo, "Botticelli's Primavera: A Lesson for the Bride", 24.
[3]Zirpolo, 27.

who represent beauty, charm, and joy, demonstrate harmony within the painting. They can also be understood to represent the chastity and modesty of the Renaissance woman. Even though Mercury is right next to them, they pay no mind and continue their restrained yet dignified dance, highlighting women's modesty.[4] Lastly, Venus, the central figure, carries the authority within this frame. She surveys the harmonious scene in front of her, and with her head tilted, there is a sense of passivity and modesty within her figure. Though she is the figure with authority she seemingly has no power within the frame, but rather to remain equal among the rest of the women. Her presence symbolizes fertility and harmony, as opposed to control. This analysis of the painting continues to construct gender assumptions about the female roles. The roles clearly define the values and virtues of a proper Renaissance woman, and in this case, a proper Medici bride. This reflects the patriarchal view and male-dominated public sphere of the Renaissance, which is derived from the revival of classical antiquity.

To re-gender this piece from female to male, the central figure needs to be adapted. Because there is no form of Venus in mythology where she is represented as androgynous, a new deity would be assigned to assume the role in this painting to create some significance and change its meaning. This figure could possibly be interpreted as Jupiter, king of the gods, which would give him a large patriarchal power over the rest of the figures, who are still predominantly women, removing the original harmonious feminine version of the painting, which was intended to represent female virtues. Rather is now a description of men’s power, protection, and control.

In Joan Kelly’s article “*Did Women Have a Renaissance?”* she outlines changes in the role of the noble woman from feudal days to the Renaissance, highlighting that it put men in the forefront of society and women made a return to the household. Society began to push the significance of women’s chastity, devaluing and removing the courtly love of feudal days where women were perceived to have more freedom. To protect a woman’s chastity meant protecting the line of succession within wealthy families, who often would use their daughters and wives for dynastic purposes to further the family's power and influence. Kelly references Castiglione’s work, which claims “He set forth the relation of the sexes as one of dependency and domination, but he did so in order to express and deal with the political relation and its problems.” [5] This quote surrounding gender created a clear binary between the sexes. Though a metaphor, it’s a clear understanding of the functioning of society, relying on one having power and control. Now, with the central figure of Primavera being male, it displays these gender binaries. This painting could now be understood as a guide to a man's role to protect and control the chastity of women around him in securing legitimate lineage. This can be seen

[4]Zirpolo, 25.
[5]Kelly, “Did Women have a Renaissance?”, 46.

in the case of a male relative, father, or patriarch such as Lorenzo De' Medici, who was the one who orchestrated the wedding for which Primavera was commissioned.

Classical definitions of masculinity were reconstructed in the Renaissance from ideologies and philosophies that had initially emerged in antiquity, now influencing patriarchal values being implemented in society. Harry Brod's article, "Introduction Themes and Theses of Men's Studies," discusses the relevance and importance of men's studies in continuity with women's studies. Though based on modern ideology, Brod gives prominent examples of capitalist patriarchy, denoting masculinity to a man's role to provide.[6] This work is important to take into consideration when analyzing the dominance of the male figure now present in *Primavera*. Patriarchal capitalism is the idea that men are there to provide for and protect women, defining the man's role as the controller. If you are providing something, you are often also in control of the people to whom you are providing. To say that the central figure is Jupiter, king of the gods, would reflect his power over the figures within the frame as ruler and additionally, as provider to the gods. Jupiter assumes the classic masculine position within this patriarchal capitalistic context, only promoting his authority over the other figures within the frame.

The removal of a central female figure removes all aspects of feminine harmony and fertility that Primavera conveys. Instead, it now conveys masculine power and portrays gender binaries of male versus female. Now Primavera is no longer a guide for the bride, but now a guide for the groom. For him to exercise his patriarchal control over his family and specifically his bride, solidifying his role as a leader, controller, and provider. The ultimate patriarch.

---

[6] Brod, "Introduction Themes and Theses of Men's Studies.", 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BROD, HARRY. "Introduction: Themes and Theses of Men's Studies." In *The Making of Masculinities*, edited by Harry Brod. Routledge, 1987. Reprint, 2018.DOI:10.4324/9781315738505-1.

KELLY, JOAN. "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" In *Feminism And Renaissance Studies*, edited by Lorna Hutson. Oxford University Press, 1999. DOI:10.1093/oso/9780198782445.003.0002.

RUBINSTEIN, NICOLAI. "Youth and Spring in Botticelli's *Primavera*." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 60, no. 1 (January 1, 1997): 248–51. DOI: 10.2307/751233.

ZIRPOLO, LILIAN. "Botticelli's 'Primavera': A Lesson for the Bride." *Woman's Art Journal* 12, no. 2 (1991): 24–28. DOI: 10.2307/1358279.

ARGUMENT FOR CIVIL WAR MEDICINE AS THE PRECURSOR TO MODERN MEDICINE

SAM MAYSON-DOBSON

The role the U.S. Civil War played in the development of modern medicine is often overlooked when it comes to discussion of the history of medicine. Referencing retrospective academic analysis of medicine in the U.S. before, during, and after the Civil War, this paper endeavors to defend the efforts of mid-19th century practitioners and demonstrate how they laid the groundwork for the creation of modern medicine. Several important events occurring during the U.S. Civil War are used as evidence, including the allopathic takeover of the Army Medical Corps, the legitimization of the nursing profession, and the adaptation of the existing Miasma and Zymotic theories to fit changing understandings of disease. Many of the developments made over the course of the Civil War were praised by European physicians, widely considered to be the medical experts of the time. Some practices developed in the Civil War evolved over time and persist to this day.

The U.S. Civil War played a key role in the transition of the United States to modern medical practice, providing physicians of the young nation with the opportunity to put existing as well as novel practices to the test on a scale heretofore not seen on the continent. Through the course of the war and in the years immediately after, the United States shook the archaic practices that defined the field of medicine in the colonies before that point, making several changes to the military healthcare system that would eventually be taken up by the civilian world. This paper will illustrate several developments of the Civil War that paved the way to the establishment of modern medicine, including the following: The Civil War served as a catalyst for the recognition of university-educated physicians as the preferred class of medical practitioner, destroying the previous system of employment through appointment in favour of a merit-based hiring process, casting pseudoscience and quackery to the sidelines. Through this allopathic domination of the field, existing understandings of disease and infection deepened as the war went on, resulting in unintentionally aseptic practices being adopted in hospitals a decade or more before the germ theory of disease became popularly accepted. In addition to aseptic practices within hospital construction, raging infection rates prompted government-backed research into gangrene, producing evidence in favour of certain antimicrobial agents and seeing their adoption in wound care long before the mechanisms of success were known to physicians. With surgeons overwhelmed by the bloody nature of Civil War battles, nurses were employed *en masse* within military roles for the first time, finally allowing field hospitals to provide a higher quality of care for the injured. This earned the field of nursing much-deserved recognition, helping it to become a mainstay in the medical field and integrating nurses into hospital care. Finally, the European medical community's praise of Civil War medical advancements offers evidence that the American physician's war-within-the-war was more refined than the butchery it is commonly made out to be.

At the dawn of the Revolutionary War, American medical practice and the national medical system (or lack thereof) seemed doomed to failure. Its main method of education, an apprenticeship system – though commonplace and not unique to America – was incredibly archaic even for the standards of the day,[1] having been adopted from an existing British system that dated back to the Late Middle Ages.[2] These apprenticeships were highly unregulated, featuring no universally agreed upon curriculum or literature. Students were taught the material their instructors deemed most important, learning to practice medicine within the bubble of an individual's opinions rather than based on the study of curriculum emerging from larger scientific consensus.[3] Some students complained that they were not taught at all and had no access to libraries; others complained that they were not being examined.[4] In spite of the rise of formal medical education after the American Revolution, the landscape had significantly worsened by the dawn of the American Civil War nearly one hundred years later. The field of medicine was split into several camps, each featuring their own schools[5] and medical societies.[6] Allopathic practitioners were unable to receive any special recognition for their methods, as scientific understandings of the day were based on a wide array of observations.[7] In the eyes of the public, any one physician's method of practice was just as valid as any other's.[8] The Union Army's medical corps was already far too small at the start of the Civil War, taking a further weakening blow as several physicians took off for the Confederate States of America or resigned, refusing to fight on any side.[9] This created an urgent need to fill the ranks of the floundering corps, for which new

[1]Frank, "A Tale of Two Tomes: Providence, Provenance and Medical Education at the Dawn of the American Revolution," 54.
[2]Ackerknecht, "From Barber-Surgeon to Modern Doctor," 545–53.
[3]Frank, 54.
[4]Frank, 54.
[5]Flannery, "Another House Divided: Union Medical Service and Sectarians During the Civil War," 483.
[6]Flannery, "Another House Divided," 498.
[7]Flannery, "Another House Divided," 482.
[8]Flannery, "Civil War Pharmacy and Medicine: Comparisons and Contexts," 72.
[9]Flannery, "Civil War Pharmacy and Medicine," 71-72.

hiring processes had to be devised. Historically, physicians of the U.S. Army would have been brought on by appointment or at the recommendation of politicians or currently-employed army physicians,[10] resulting in a significant number of substandard practitioners being hired regardless of their medical proficiency.[11] The need for a new system allowed its creators, under the leadership of Surgeon General William A. Hammond, to expand the depth of board examinations: Applicants were now required to present evidence of professional medical practice, such as study at a "respectable medical school."[12] With the Surgeon General being of the allopathic field, a consolidation of power began, eventually resulting in a total refusal of the U.S. Army to employ any alternative medical practitioners.[13] This drew a clear boundary between allopathy, a conventional style of medicine based upon empirical evidence, and other methods of practice.

Allopathic physicians were not the only medical practitioners to earn much-deserved recognition for their service in the Civil War. At the war's outset, nursing was struggling for respect, seen by most in the U.S. as a profession unsuited for "proper ladies."[14] In fact, in the eyes of the U.S. army, nursing was not seen as a profession at all. The role was nevertheless essential, and physicians had to appoint to it mostly inexperienced convalescent patients who were entirely unfit to the taxing assignment.[15] No other path to the field of military nursing existed. As the Civil War broke out, reports written by the newly-founded U.S. Sanitary Commission exposed the existing system's inefficiencies, expressing the need for dedicated and trained nurses to provide proper patient care.[16] Sister organisations such as the Indiana Sanitary Commission went so far as to hire their own nurses and appoint them to regiments unilaterally.[17] It was often the case that these early-war military assignments of nurses were motivated by a lack of what was then referred to as manpower,[18] a trend that would continue into the war's later years where, in the aftermath of battles, physicians frequently found themselves overwhelmed by the sheer number of wounded that had to be treated.[19] It was nurses who stepped up to take over the task of caring for these soldiers in nearly every capacity beyond their surgeries, working in horrific conditions to provide all manner of services from ensuring proper nutrition to psychiatric help. At the end of

[10]Frank, 57.
[11]Frank, 58.
[12]Flannery, "Another House Divided," 485-86.
[13]Flannery, "Civil War Pharmacy and Medicine," 72.
[14]Culpepper and Adams, "Nursing in the Civil War," 981.
[15]Shryock, "A Medical Perspective on the Civil War," 170.
[16]Shryock, 170.
[17]Seigel, "She Went to War: Indiana Women Nurses in the Civil War," 2.
[18]Seigel, 16.
[19]Shryock, 170.

the Civil War, returning soldiers who had been treated by nurses swayed the court of public opinion to acknowledge the importance of nurses.[20]

The horrific conditions that nurses faced also posed a threat to their patients, a vast majority of whom would die from infection and disease rather than from wounds inflicted in battle.[21] This aspect of the war came as no surprise to Americans of the period, who already suffered significantly under disease in the peacetime status quo.[22] As the war began, the unhealthy conditions to which people were exposed were exacerbated on battlefields, the problem of infection and other diseases becoming so widespread that the role of a physician within the Union Army – even put before their duty of tending to traumatic wounds – became the maintenance of hygiene at their post.[23] The leading theory for the spread of disease at this time was that of miasma, rooted in the idea that the nature of illness, injury and death created an environment that was hazardous for one to breathe in.[24] The most popular way to combat this miasmatic threat became open-concept, "pavilion-plan"[25] field hospitals that placed an emphasis on airflow.[26] Though the mechanism behind the pavilion-plan's success would remain unknown to those who utilised it for quite some time, it's understood today that proper ventilation is exceedingly helpful in preventing the spread of respiratory illnesses,[27] making it likely that its positive benefits were reaped during the Civil War.

Some attempts to "deodorise" the air and fight miasma, coupled with a growing amount of literature on wounds, changed the way in which physicians fought infection. As it became readily apparent to practitioners that their methods of preventing infection through environmental changes alone were insufficient, experimentation in alternative methods began. One of the more organised initiatives was sponsored by U.S. Surgeon General William Hammond, who sought to uncover the pathology and treatment of gangrene, a necrotic condition that was common in Civil War hospitals due to high rates of infection.[28] In one case from 1863, a patient presented to a field hospital with a shrapnel wound on his leg. Despite the efforts of physicians, the wound became infected and then gangrenous. The regimental surgeon, referencing this new literature, endeavoured to treat the

[20]Culpepper and Adams, 984.
[21]Gilchrist, "Disease & Infection in the American Civil War," 258.
[22]Marshall, "The Great Exaggeration: Death and the Civil War," 15.
[23]Flannery, "Another House Divided," 484.
[24]Flannery, "Civil War Pharmacy and Medicine," 71–80.
[25]Shryock, 170.
[26]Gilchrist, 258.
[27]Hobday and Collignon, "An Old Defence against New Infections: The Open-Air Factor and Covid-19," 1.
[28]Devine, "'To Make Something Out of the Dying in This War': The Civil War and the Rise of American Medical Science," 150.

patient with topical application of Bromine.[29] Bromine had risen to popularity in the medical field through the use of the compound Potassium bromide, a salt that was lauded mostly for its anti-epileptic properties, though a capacity to fight skin infections had also been noted in North American literature.[30] In the Civil War, it was assumed that use of Bromine as an odorant would fight the miasmatic threat in field hospitals, and thus it would likely have been readily available to the regimental surgeon.[31] The surgeon applied the chemical to dressings before their application to the wound, causing the infection to disappear rapidly. The patient went on to recover within ten day's time. The surgeon's colleagues were so impressed they suggested the case be entered into the Army Medical Museum.[32] It become just one of many pieces of evidence that would elevate Bromine to its more widespread use as an antimicrobial by the war's end.[33]

Before the Civil War, North American medical practice was frequently behind that of Europe's. Revisiting Potassium bromide as an example, widespread use of the anti-epileptic did not begin in America until nearly a decade after it had become popular in Europe: It was too expensive for American physicians to acquire until a local source was discovered in Pittsburgh.[34] This game of catch-up extended beyond possession of the latest medicines and could equally be observed in export of popular theories from one side of the Atlantic to the other. It was an English physician, William Farr, who coined the Zymotic theory of disease in 1842, a theory that would dominate the medical field until the adoption of the germ theory of disease, and one that was essentially exported to America.[35] This historical status quo comes in stark contrast to the situation at the end of the Civil War, when literature and technology related to American wartime advancements began to cross the Atlantic in bulk. European physicians, observing these developments for themselves, regarded the body of work collected by the Americans over the course of the Civil War as being extremely important to the development of modern medicine.[36]

This paper has demonstrated that despite adverse conditions, several important advancements were made by medical practitioners over the course of the Civil War. After shaky beginnings for a field reliant on an unregulated education system and no universal method of practice, the Civil War served as the catalyst for the

---

[29]Devine, 149-51.
[30]Lamb, "(Not) A Bromide Story: Myth-Busting Bromide of Potassium to Create a Case Study of Change and Continuity in Nineteenth-Century Medicine," 113.
[31]Gilchrist, 259.
[32]Devine, 149-51.
[33]Gilchrist, 259.
[34]Lamb, 113.
[35]Flannery, "Civil War Pharmacy and Medicine," 73–74.
[36]Shryock, 168-69.

establishment of modern medicine. Seizing the opportunity presented by a gutted U.S. Army Medical Corps, the allopathic approach finally triumphed in a war that had been raging in hospitals and schools across the nation since the revolution. Physicians exited the war knowing first-hand the dangers of unhygienic spaces and possessing basic knowledge that the aseptic technique would be built upon. The need for closer examination of prominent diseases resulted in greater utilisation of antimicrobials in first-line wound care and a large body of evidence that would support the ideas presented by germ theory. The field of nursing, previously overlooked if not regarded as being a lesser form of employment, would grow to be an invaluable part of the medical profession and be widely respected by the public. And finally, in reviews of Civil War medical literature and equipment, European physicians praised the excellent body of research presented by the Americans and the advancements they had made over the course of the Civil War.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACKERKNECHT, ERWIN H. "From Barber-Surgeon to Modern Doctor." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 58, no. 4 (1984): 545–53. www.jstor.org/stable/44441795.

CULPEPPER, MARILYN MAYER, and PAULINE GORDON ADAMS. "Nursing in the Civil War." *The American Journal of Nursing* 88, no. 7 (1988): 981–84. DOI: 10.2307/3425867.

DEVINE, SHAUNA. "'To Make Something Out of the Dying in This War': The Civil War and the Rise of American Medical Science." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 6, no. 2 (2016): 149–63. www.jstor.org/stable/26070401.

FLANNERY, MICHAEL A. "Another House Divided: Union Medical Service and Sectarians During the Civil War." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 54, no. 4 (1999): 478–510. www.jstor.org/stable/24623403.

FLANNERY, MICHAEL A. "Civil War Pharmacy and Medicine: Comparisons and Contexts." *Pharmacy in History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 71–80. www.jstor.org/stable/41112722.

FRANK, THOMAS W. "A Tale of Two Tomes: Providence, Provenance and Medical Education at the Dawn of the American Revolution." *Medical Journal, US Army Medical Center of Excellence (MEDCoE)*, (April - June 2025): 53–61. MEDCoE Archive.

GILCHRIST, MICHAEL R. "Disease & Infection in the American Civil War." *The American Biology Teacher* 60, no. 4 (1998): 258–62. DOI:10.2307/4450468.

HOBDAY, RICHARD, and PETER COLLIGNON. "An Old Defence against New Infections: The Open-Air Factor and Covid-19." *Cureus*, June 20, 2022, 1. DOI:10.7759/cureus.26133.

LAMB, SUSAN. "(Not) A Bromide Story: Myth-Busting Bromide of Potassium to Create a Case Study of Change and Continuity in Nineteenth-Century Medicine." *Pharmacy in History* 60, no. 4 (2018): 108 – 123. DOI: 10.26506/pharmhist.60.4.0108

MARSHALL, NICHOLAS. "The Great Exaggeration: Death and the Civil War." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 4, no. 1 (2014): 3–27. www.jstor.org/stable/26062122.

SEIGEL, PEGGY BRASE. "She Went to War: Indiana Women Nurses in the Civil War." *Indiana Magazine of History* 86, no. 1 (1990): 1–27. www.jstor.org/stable/27791351.

SHRYOCK, RICHARD H. "A Medical Perspective on the Civil War." *American Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (1962): 161–73. DOI:10.2307/2710639.

CONNIVING COLONISTS: EXPANDING ON ABBOTT, REGARDING THE LEGACIES OF JOSEPH TRUTCH AND JAMES DOUGLAS

DEREK WEIR

In "The Persistence of Colonial Prejudice and Policy in British Columbia's Indigenous Relations," George Abbott examines the Indigenous policies of Joseph Trutch which, informed by the racist attitudes of his time, led to the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples by the provincial government of British Columbia throughout the twentieth century. While secondary sources support many of Abbott's claims, they also call into question his portrayal of former colonial governor James Douglas, whom Abbott presents as a figure in contrast to Trutch. This essay argues that Trutch and Douglas were more alike than Abbott acknowledges and thus share some responsibility for the treatment of First Nations in twentieth century British Columbia. Their policies, both subject to the British colonial system, were not different enough to assign blame for the subsequent treatment of the Indigenous peoples of British Columbia to one man over the other.

In his article, "The Persistence of Colonial Prejudice and Policy in British Columbia's Indigenous Relations," George Abbott responds to a statement made by Lieutenant-Governor Iona Campagnolo. He does not object to her assertion that the policies of Joseph Trutch were responsible for how the province of British Columbia would go on to deal with Indigenous consultation and land decisions,[1] especially regarding resource development in the twentieth century. Abbott gives a compelling and well-supported account of the adversarial approach taken by the province toward Indigenous groups during this time, as well as the hardships endured by the bands displaced by these projects. However, he does qualify Campagnolo's conclusion, arguing that her focus is too narrow. In Abbott's view, Campagnolo fails to identify how broader attitudes of the time influenced Trutch's policies.[2] This essay applies a similar critique to Abbott's argument. His focus on Trutch and the prevalent racism of his time neglects the role played by other

[1]Abbott, "Persistence of Colonial Prejudice and Policy in British Columbia's Indigenous Relations: Did the spirit of Joseph Trutch haunt the twentieth-century resource development?" 39.
[2]Abbott, 63.

colonial figures, and by colonialism itself, in British Columbia's legacy of Indigenous relations.

Following an examination of the ways in which the historical accounts provided by Abbott are supported, we address his deterministic misapprehension that the racism exhibited by Trutch was merely a product of his time. We will then turn our attention to colonial governor James Douglas, who Abbott presents in stark contrast to Trutch. While they differ in substantive ways, we will see that they held a mutual belief in the supremacy of the British Empire and its entitlement to the colony of British Columbia. Their collective support for the colonial system has earned both Trutch and Douglas a share of the blame for the mistreatment of the Indigenous population which followed.

The strongest support for Abbott's article comes from J. E. Windsor and J. A. McVey's "Annihilation of Both Place and Sense of Place," in their account of the Alcan-Kemano project and the resulting displacement of the *Cheslatta* First Nation. They identify the attitude of the province toward its Indigenous peoples as one of paternalism,[3] reinforcing Abbott's characterization of the government's view that they knew best what was good for Indigenous population.[4] Abbott's account of the *Cheslatta*'s experience following relocation is also corroborated by Windsor and McVey. Abbott goes into more detail as to the procedural ordeal endured by the band, while their material circumstances following displacement are described in similar fashion by both articles. They were left without access to land sufficient for hunting and subsistence,[5] living in "shacks and tents"[6] at the new reserve at Grassy Plains, which was located within the traditional territory of the Wet'suwet'en First Nation.[7]

Both articles address the isolation and self-sufficiency of the *Cheslatta* First Nation prior to the 1952 project.[8] Windsor and McVey note that the band was largely unaware of the government until they were first informed of the urgent need to leave their lands on April 3rd, 1952.[9] It is Abbott's view that this abrupt notice was a tactic to force the band to accept relocation to an as-yet-undetermined site with minimal opportunity to object or negotiate.[10] Windsor and McVey, however, go

---

[3]Windsor and McVey, "Annihilation of both place and sense of place: the experience of the Cheslatta T'En Canadian First Nation within the context of large-scale environmental projects," 146.
[4]Abbott, 41, 50.
[5]Windsor and McVey, 156.
[6]Abbott,54.
[7]Windsor and McVey, 154.
[8]Abbott, 49-50.
[9]Windsor and McVey, 154.
[10]Abbott, 51.

further in suggesting that it was part of a deliberate effort to increase their dependence on the state, thereby resigning them to accept poor wages in British Columbia's resource economy.[11]

This hesitancy to assign blame is repeated in Abbott's appraisal of Trutch. While he admits that Trutch holds responsibility given his ability to impose policy, he rationalizes the beliefs held by Trutch as a "fragment" of the prevailing views of Victorian Britain.[12] Abbott contrasts these views with those held by James Douglas, the former colonial governor. Interestingly, in his article "The Native Land Policies of Governor James Douglas," Cole Harris attributes Douglas' views to the liberal humanism of his day, which assumes that all people are essentially similar.[13] This way of thinking stands in contrast to the assumption of biological racism that certain races are inherently more capable than others. Despite acknowledging the influence liberal humanism may have had on Douglas, Harris notes that way of thinking had fallen out of favour in colonial offices in the latter half of the nineteenth century,[14] making Douglas an exception. If we are to credit Douglas with a willful enaction of this worldview, we must extend the same agency to Trutch. Rather than being excused as merely symptomatic of his cultural context, Trutch's racism was an assumed position opposed to other prominent, if less fashionable, ways of thinking about non-European peoples.

As such, Abbott uses Douglas as a contrasting figure, whose views toward the Indigenous population seem benevolent compared to those of Trutch.[15] Though it is true that Douglas exhibited a much more generous approach to land allotments than his successors, he and Trutch shared the same paternalistic mindset toward the Indigenous population.[16] Abbott acknowledges that while Douglas was not a biological racist, he operated under the assumption of European supremacy and firmly believed in the British colonial mission.[17] Harris presents an even more complicated portrait of Douglas, as a governor who was not afraid to display coercive force to maintain order and compliance among the Indigenous population.[18]

Another important similarity between the two men was their mandate from the British colonial secretary, that Indigenous land claims were to be subordinate to policies which advance the (white) settlement of the country as an "important and

---

[11]Windsor and McVey, 156.
[12]Abbott, 40.
[13]Harris, "The Native Land Policies of Governor James Douglas," 104.
[14]Harris, 104.
[15]Abbott, 42-43.
[16]Harris, 102-103.
[17]Abbott, 43.
[18]Harris, 103.

integral part of the British Empire."[19] Trutch was sent to the British Columbia colony with a letter of recommendation from the same colonial office which gave Douglas his assignment.[20] The fact is, Trutch and Douglas had common orders to establish land allotments that would prioritize the interests of colonists over the needs of the Indigenous population; the difference made by one man's relative generosity would not be enough to counteract the harm of the system which they both served.

It is true that Douglas enjoys a more favourable record regarding his generosity to the Indigenous peoples. However, his allegiance to the colonial project led him to claim to the Legislative Council that the Indigenous land allotments he approved had never exceeded ten acres. This statement was later taken to mean that ten acres was an acceptable upper limit to land allotments, paving the way for reductions in reserve size after the end of his term.[21] Abbott and Harris both emphasize this as a pivotal moment which Trutch and his successors would take advantage of, but Harris goes further in his explanation. He describes Douglas as a "shrewd politician" who would modify his message regarding Indigenous land claims depending on his audience.[22] It follows, then, that Douglas made the infamous statement in response to criticism of his relatively large land allotments, despite knowing it was not true. Referring to the Okanagan and Thompson valley reserves, he later admitted as much.[23]

In his article, George Abbott accurately catalogues the various positions of colonial officials on Indigenous land claims and reserve creation prior to confederation, tying those policies to resource development as exemplified by the Alcan-Kemano and W.A.C. Bennett Dam projects. He does a good deal of justice to the experience of First Nations displaced by industry and the provincial government; a legacy we must reckon with and make every effort not to repeat. However, in attributing this legacy to Trutch and the racist attitudes of his time, he neglects the impact of the British colonial mission itself. We have seen how this manifested, albeit differently, in the actions of both James Douglas and Joseph Trutch. Both men had a hand in the way provincial-Indigenous relations played out in the ensuing years, but their agency as individual policymakers was limited by the system in which they both were embedded. While Abott correctly characterizes Lieutenant-Governor Campagnolo's statement as too narrow, his own conclusion suffers from the same flaw.

---

[19]Harris, 104.
[20]Harris, 117.
[21]Abbott, 43.
[22]Harris, 114.
[23]Harris, 115.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBOTT, GEORGE. "Persistence of Colonial Prejudice and Policy in British Columbia's Indigenous Relations: Did the Spirit of Joseph Trutch Haunt Twentieth-Century Resource Development?" *BC Studies*, no. 194 (2017): 39–64. DOI:10.14288/bcs.v0i194.188652

HARRIS, COLE. "The Native Land Policies of Governor James Douglas." *BC Studies*, no. 174 (2012): 101–22. DOI:10.14288/bcs.v0i174.182681

WINDSOR, J. E., and J. A. MCVEY. "Annihilation of Both Place and Sense of Place: The Experience of the *Cheslatta* T'En Canadian First Nation within the Context of Large-Scale Environmental Projects." *The Geographical Journal* 171, no. 2 (2005): 146–65. DOI:10.1111/j.1475-4959.2005.00156.x

ROMANCE AND VIOLENCE: DELACROIX, ORIENTALISM, AND THE MISREPRESENTATION OF ARAB SUBJECTS

Jenny Li

This essay aims to examine the relationship between art history and its influence on modern culture, particularly on how Eugene Delacroix's artwork impacts modern day racial power systems. In doing this study, I found that art history is a subject which involves not merely the discussion of art's past, but also how art has influenced facets of culture and society. Through this, I was able to understand in more detail the importance of art's power while focusing on fascinating historical events such as Delacroix's journey to Morocco. The essay will examine the relationship between social power structures through a lens of art history. Delacroix's worldview - filtered through his Eurocentric culture - effectively dominates modern narratives of art history despite being recognized as problematic. This effect is examined in further detail to explore how the remaining discourse around his work impacts racial dynamics in the modern day, and one's perception of cultural others.

19th century European art often imagined non-European cultures through the distorting lens of Orientalism—a visual language shaped by colonial power, fantasy, and racial hierarchy. Yet, disciplines and fields such as language, mass media, and culture continue to be dominated by Eurocentrism in the modern age. Such issues seem to be embedded in the systemic construction of society, yet the root of this imbalance is not readily distinguishable. In exploring 19th century art, colonization of Eastern lands, such as Morocco, is seen as fuel to the minds of many great artistic talents. Eugene Delacroix, an artist crucial to the French Romantic period in 19th century was influenced by such events, as seen through his infamous painting *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains;* his art captures innovative brilliance and passion but features disturbing content which is hard to reconcile. Implications to modern day dynamics can be observed by examining these artworks and exploring the nuances of colonial power and racism. Eugène Delacroix portrays Arab fighters as violent, exoticized, and chaotic figures in the style of 19th century Orientalism in *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains*, which arguably functions through the painting's cultural prominence and legacy to bury the original talents, agency, and voices of the Arab people it represents.

19th century Orientalism is defined as a view on the Eastern world by Europeans, which devalues its true qualities in favor of Eurocentric views; the West constructs the East as its opposite and creates systems that position the East to be of lower status in comparison.[1] Delacroix viewed Orientalism as a form of escape from the banalities of European civilization—he was drawn to the Orient, which he saw as an exotic foreign land to fulfill his fantasies. During the 19th century, understanding of the East was largely based on Orientalist ideologies. Delacroix approached the culture of the East through a lens of violence, primitiveness, and passion; he was particularly drawn to the idea that violence was an important aspect of the human experience.[2] In the modern day, reflections on the racist and morally corrupt qualities of Orientalism are naturally called into question. Oftentimes, artists who create work inspired by the movement, such as Delacroix, are exposed to scrutiny for misrepresenting cultural minorities under bigoted lenses.

Yet, the impact of Orientalism on artists of the 19th century during European colonization remains a major force in creating great artworks during this influential period. This background is crucial to understanding how the painting *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains* participates in a visual language that erases the agency and lived realities of the people it depicts.

In style of Orientalist art, *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains* depicts a scene of Arabs in Morocco from the perspective of a European; the Arabs are depicted in a brawl characteristic of less sophisticated and intellectual behavior. The painting makes use of loose lines and earthy colors to create an almost dreamy mood, yet the work is accentuated by the warring scene of Arabs and cavalry. The top half of the composition features mountains and the sky, which openly occupies space, as it creates an illusion of large volume between the background and the subjects in the foreground. This works together with the loose and swirling linework to create an effect of wonder and adventure. The color palette is not overly bright nor dull, but in between, which captures an almost bittersweet melancholic tone to the painting. The overall scene expresses exploration and witnessing the ruggedness of foreign people in a new land.

Delacroix exhibited fundamental dissatisfaction with European society, and thus, viewed his travels to Morocco as an escape from the unproductive conventions of his homeland.[3] In consequence, his construction of the foreign lands, as

[1] Said, *Orientalism*, 3.
[2] O'Brien, *Exiled in Modernity: Delacroix, Civilization, and Barbarism,* 1.
[3] O'Brien, 75.

exemplified in *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains,* shows that of a wild and exciting adventure. By depicting Arabs only as violent figures within a European fantasy landscape, the painting replaces real individuals with stereotypes, preventing viewers from seeing them in the way of the subjects' own identity and choice of portrayal. By creating work that imagined the Orient as a construction of imagination to fulfill Orientalist fantasies, Orientalist artwork conveys passionate messages while spreading its problematic Eurocentrism views. Further, Orientalist stereotypes persist into modern times, which actively reinforces the image of cultural others, as submissive to Western culture. Under this oppressive system, Arab voices and perspectives are diminished under the narratives that Western culture continues to dominate.[4] This functions to change how Arab culture is interpreted and fundamentally damages the collective perception in which Arabs are viewed. Before Arabs could advocate their own culture to the Western and other foreign audiences, Orientalist artwork portrayed them from a solely European lens; one that obscures their own identity. The spotlight that Delacroix's artwork gains in history, while perceiving cultural minorities through Orientalism, actively publicizes Arabs in a degrading way; although it is widely recognized as unjust, the stage and narrative of Arab portrayal are already set. As a result, systemic imbalance is created, where Delacroix's artwork functions to reinforce a broader perception of cultural "others" that are perceived as lower in status when compared to the Europeans.

Although Delacroix primarily focused on self-expression rather than using Orientalism as a tool to control the East, O'Brien implies in *The Primitive and the Civilized*, that the emotion and messaging conveyed through his artworks continue to further the damage done to the depiction of cultural others.[5]

Delacroix's work and influence transitioned artistic practices into a new era of Impressionism. While the technique and innovation demonstrated are undeniable and a crucial contribution to the development of new artistic understandings, his view on his subjects actively imparts vulnerable, resonant, and evocative sentiments onto a group who are not consenting to partake in such projects. Linda Nochlin writes on Delacroix, "the Orientalizing setting of Delacroix's painting both signify an extreme state of psychic intensity and formalizes that state through various conventions of representation. But it allows only so much and no more." [6] Delacroix's Orientalist work conveys intense, meaningful emotion, yet presents these emotions using racist strategies. The romantic, imaginative, and seductive qualities of *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains* continue to resonate broadly within

[4]Said, 7.
[5]O'Brien, 75.
[6]Nochlin, "The Imaginary Orient," 42.

modern art critiques, aiding in the continued disrespect of the vehicles in which this artwork used to have such power.

In opposition to the negative effects that his work has on Arab culture, the justification is that, although racially bigoted, Orientalist artwork was a product of 19th century society and general societal misunderstanding must be considered; the talents of such artwork can be appreciated while acknowledging the root of the problematic racism. Delacroix personally viewed Arabs through an esteemed lens, as described in his travel journals.[7] In a letter to his friend Jean-Baptiste Pierret during his 1832 journey to Morocco, Delacroix famously remarked that Arabs were "Roman consuls, like Cato or Brutus," and wrapping themselves in blankets "like Roman senators or Greeks at the Panathenaean festival."[8] It would be fair to say that Delacroix worked from what he understood of Arabs in a non-hostile way and represented them according to his understanding.

Applying postcolonial theory, articulated by Robert Young, allows us to see how Delacroix's *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains* participates in a broader system of cultural domination that extends beyond 19th century European society. Young emphasizes that colonial power operates not only through political control, but through the production of knowledge and representation, shaping how colonized peoples are perceived and understood.[9] In this framework, Delacroix's artistic choices—portraying Arabs as violent, exotic, and chaotic—are not neutral observations, but part of a discourse that constructs the East as inferior to the West. Even if Delacroix personally admired Arab culture, as suggested in his journals, the work contributes to systemic erasure: it privileges European imagination over the lived realities, talents, and voices of the people depicted. From a postcolonial perspective, this demonstrates that intention does not negate impact; the painting reinforces stereotypes and legitimizes Eurocentric authority over knowledge and representation. By situating Delacroix within these structures, we see that Orientalist art cannot be fully appreciated in isolation from its cultural and political consequences.

19th century art plays a central role in shaping the cultural, social, and political landscape that we inhabit. Eugène Delacroix's *Arabs Skirmishing in the Mountains* demonstrates how artworks of the Orientalism genre function to damage the voice of Arab culture through the problematic background of Orientalism in which it was created, the enduring representation it has among art history, and the manner of depiction in which it shows its subjects. Such choices participate in a broader system of representation that privileges European imagination over lived

[7]Delacroix, *The Journal of Eugene Delacroix*, 117.
[8]Delacroix, *Selected Letters*, 187 – 188.
[9]Young, *Postcolonialism*, 57-60.

realities, erasing the agency and voices of those portrayed. Intention does not negate impact: the painting reinforces Eurocentric power structures and contributes to the enduring misrepresentation of the East. Ultimately, analyzing Delacroix through both art historical and postcolonial lenses underscores how 19th century European art, while celebrated for its aesthetic achievements, is inseparable from its cultural and political consequences—a reminder that the legacy of Orientalism continues to shape perceptions of non-European peoples today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DELACROIX, EUGÈNE. *The Journal of Eugene Delacroix.* Translated by Walter Pach. Covici Freide,1937. Reissue, Hacker Art Books, 1980.

DELACROIX, EUGÈNE. *Selected Letters, 1813–1863*. Edited and translated by Jean Stewart. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1971.

NOCHLIN, LINDA. "The Imaginary Orient." In *The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth Century Art and Society*, 33–59. Harper & Row, 1989.

O'BRIEN, DAVID. *Exiled in Modernity: Delacroix, Civilization, and Barbarism.* Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018.

SAID, EDWARD. *Orientalism.* Pantheon Books, 1978.

YOUNG, ROBERT. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction.* Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

EDOUARD MANET'S DEPICTIONS OF PROSTITUTION AND HOW HE CHALLENGED SOCIETAL NORMS REGARDING SEX AND GENDER

CATRIONA MACKENZIE

This essay was written under a prompt to discuss how Edouard Manet and how his 1865 painting, Olympia, relates to T.J. Clark's "Olympia's Choice" The Painting of Modern Life. The angle that I took with this topic was to discuss how Edouard Manet challenged societal norms through art and the public reactions to him doing so. Additionally, this essay covers a formal description of the art that is discussed, along with comparing Olympia to Manet's 1863 painting, Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe, and Titian's 1538 painting, Venus of Urbino. When analyzing and comparing these artworks, I discuss both contemporary and new modern views on female sexuality, prostitution, and the roles and expectations for women in 19th century France, particularly how these topics relate to and play out in the art world.

In 1865, Edouard Manet shocked the art world with the controversial painting he submitted to the 1865 Annual Salon, *Olympia*.[1] What he did not know at the time was that this painting would forever change how he would be perceived within the art world and remembered in art history. The immense controversy that this painting sparked altered the reputation of Manet as well, labelling him as a radical artist and unintentionally creating a film over his name so that he was remembered for this painting more than any other work within his career. Manet challenged the social conditions of Second Empire Paris through the paintings of *Olympia* and *Les Dejeuner sur l'herbe*. Through painting modern and radical depictions of sex workers who appeared to be in control of themselves and their work, Manet challenged ideas around female sexuality and pleasure, and how it was regarded in contemporary French society.

This painting depicts a naked woman, wearing only shoes, jewelry, and a flower in her hair, lying on her side and looking directly at the viewer. In the background, a woman of colour brings flowers to the woman in the foreground, insinuating that there is a man nearby who has brought her those flowers. At the foot of the bed,

[1]Clark, "Olympia's Choice," 83.

there is a black cat that is puffed up and arching its back, in an almost defensive pose. It is widely known that black cats are a symbol for bad luck, possibly implying that this woman in the painting is 'bad news.' Like most of Manet's work, the painting features dark outlines and a lack of shadows. Manet was critiqued in this painting – and many others for his methods of painting. His bold brushstrokes and lack of depth stirred much criticism for his work, especially in his earlier works such as *Olympia*. The flat lighting in this painting provided what appeared to be a spotlight on the central woman, as if she were there for the pleasure of the viewer. It was understood at the time that this woman was a sex worker, and this scene depicts her during her working hours.[2] Among this painting's submission and acceptance to the salon, one of the most critiqued details of this painting is the positioning of her hand. The positioning of the woman's hand implies that there is no sense of shame about her work. It implied that she was in control and not bound by the same conventions that contemporary France had on sex workers; Manet is making a statement about women in the 'new world.' Many of the critics of this painting were convinced that the figure in Olympia was a prostitute, while many others were "content" with the idea that she was, in fact, not a prostitute, but a courtesan.[3] However, it was not her profession that got a rise out of critics, and it had much more to do with her implied place in society than what specific classification of sex worker she was. The idea that a sex worker was "[not] supposed to belong at all to the world of class and money; she [was supposed to float] above or below it".[4] The critiques of his work landed Manet with the title of being a 'radical artist.'

Edouard Manet had a close relationship with and took much inspiration from Charles Baudelaire. Manet wrote to Baudelaire often, as he was in Belgium, and expressed his emotions regarding the heavy criticism he was facing for his work in the 1865 salon. Manet tells Baudelaire that he was feeling "on edge" and that they had been "raining insults on [him]".[5] Baudelaire responded not with pity, but with kind and encouraging words, telling Manet that he needed to pick himself up by the bootstraps, and that he intended this to be said with the knowledge of "the friendship I feel for you".[6] In Manet's 1863 painting *Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe,* it is evident that Manet took inspiration from Baudelaire's writing and attempted to work through it.

One of the strongest messages in Manet's *Olympia* was to do with the contemporary context of the problem with venereal diseases in France at the time; the forced categorizing and testing of female sex workers for venereal diseases. If prostitutes

[2]Clark, 80.
[3]Clark, 86.
[4]Clark, 87.
[5]Clark, 82.
[6]Clark, 82.

were found to be positive, they would then be sent to a hospital and treated with horrific methods such as burning, mercury, or arsenic, until they no longer presented symptoms. With that context, Manet's *Olympia* draws attention to the conventions of contemporary French society and holds a mirror up to them. After the heavy criticism of Manet in 1865, he became known to many as "The Painter of *Olympia*".[7]

But why did this specific topic upset the men of 19th-century Paris? Some have suspected that it was a matter of keeping their private lives private. Because the culture of prostitution and sex work was so prevalent in Paris during this time, it is not outlandish to suspect that these men were uncomfortable with the idea that paintings that embraced the modern sex worker would spark a scandal, as it may have felt like a threat to the societal boundaries that were set regarding female pleasure. In 1868, the *Westminster Review* wrote on the topic of prostitution. The writer expressed that he felt the "need for guarantees of female chastity".[8] This shows how there was, in fact, a widespread fear of women becoming comfortable with their sexuality or enjoying sex. Manet held up a mirror to the hypocrisy that many Parisian men held within themselves. He allowed them to show their true colours through their critiques of such paintings, the hypocrisy they held towards sex workers, and who should and should not be allowed to freely explore their sexuality and sexual autonomy.[9]

Many people compared Manet's *Olympia* to Titian's 1538 painting *Venus of Urbino*, which Manet had actually copied while he was in the Uffizi Gallery in his 20s while studying art.[10] However, *Olympia* seemed to depict the opposite. In Titian's painting, *Venus of Urbino,* he depicts a woman, likely about to be married, as this painting was known to have been painted as a commemoration of a wedding.[11] The woman is lying in bed with a dog, with her hand delicately across her midsection and migrating toward her genitals. At the time, it was widely believed that female masturbation would improve consummation. She is delicate, feminine, submissive, and beautiful, all features that the stiff, dominant, and provocative figure in *Olympia* did not possess. The depiction of this woman and her physical appearance was offensive to critics. They did not find her attractive; it was the colour of her skin, the lack of pigment in it, her stone-like expression, saying that "she [did] not have a human form".[12] Simply stating, this is not an attractive woman, and she hardly looks alive. Some critics of Manet's *Olympia*

[7]Clark, 82.
[8]Clark, 108.
[9]Clark, 109-110.
[10]Clark, 94.
[11]Clark, 94.
[12]Clark, 92.

even noted that it seemed as if the woman in *Olympia* was "making fun of the pose and the movement of Titian's *Venus*, with one hand shamelessly flexed".[13]

Manet's depictions of prostitution in his 1863 painting *Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe* sparked similar controversies. Although this painting, unlike *Olympia*, was rejected from the salon, it was later shown at an exhibition of salon rejections. This painting depicts a naked woman sitting in the grass with two fully clothed men, while her clothing appears to be lying in a nearby heap. Another woman in the background appears to be bathing or washing something in the water. One critique of this painting had to do with the differences between a nude and a painting of a naked person. A nude was typically an expression of natural beauty; usually, goddesses such as Aphrodite and Venus were painted as nudes, whereas anybody can be naked, and nakedness had a much different stigma around it within the art world when compared to nudes. Another critique of the painting was the awkward composition and the overall flatness of it. This painting lacks depth perception and confuses the viewer when attempting to make sense of the space and where the subjects are in relation to one another and the environment around them. The woman in the background is the same size as the three figures in the foreground, which implies that she is a giant; once again, this leads to confusion and backlash.

While Manet's *Olympia* sparked mass controversy at the time, it has become, in modern years, a rallying point for art and art history. The critiques of this painting provide insight into how the contemporary French public viewed the sexuality of women, sex workers, and the widespread fear of a woman who is in control of her body and her sexuality. With this painting, Manet raised questions of modernity and how it relates to female sexuality. The controversy that his paintings sparked was hardly to do with the woman in *Olympia* herself or the woman in *Les Dejeuner sur l'herbe*, but the fear of the emergence of normality regarding the autonomy of sex workers and the individuality within women's sexuality and female pleasure. Manet painted these subjects as a challenge to contemporary society and to place emphasis on the growing and changing modernity in relation to women and sex work.

---

[13]Clark, 94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, T.J. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.

AN INFINITE QUANTITY OF INTERMEDIATE SEXES: THE INSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF QUEER PEOPLE IN THE EARLY SOVIET UNION

RHI MCGRATH

Popular histories of LGBT+ people in the Soviet Union often begin with the recriminalization of homosexuality under Joseph Stalin in 1934, ignoring the radical approaches to the questions of sex and gender taken by the USSR immediately following the October Revolution. This paper argues that the early years of the Soviet Union saw an active engagement with the developing field of sexology led by Magnus Hirschfeld, as well as an internal understanding of the liberation of sexual minorities. Between 1917 and 1934 psychological inquiry into the root causes of homosexuality and "transvestism" were approached with curiosity and desire for understanding, rather than a drive for the elimination of deviancy. By highlighting the work of past historians on the matter, as well as the reading of primary documents from the time, this paper fills in the gap of general understanding in the USSR's place in the sexual revolution, supporting the argument that the decriminalization of homosexuality under Lenin was an intentional act.

Most popular histories of queer people in the Soviet Union begin in earnest at the recriminalization of homosexuality under Joseph Stalin in 1934, with only a brief introduction referencing the decriminalization of same-sex relations under Lenin treated as a happy accident. While the day to day lives of queer citizens in the early Soviet Union remain shrouded in obscurity, the actions of those who drafted the laws that liberated queer Soviets following the October revolution are no mystery. The presence and situation of queer people was somewhat unique in Russia when compared with the rest of Europe, and the drafters of the new Soviet penal code explicitly considered homosexuality when deciding what to include and not include. The first Commissars of the Bolshevik government engaged with scientific and psychological developments around sex and gender of the time, new ideas eagerly taken up by Soviet psychologists and biologists who applied the iconoclastic attitudes of the revolution to reach conclusions not reached in the developed world for decades to come. The state oppression of queer people in the former Russian empire returned only during the conservative turn of the mid-30s, causing many ordinary queer Soviet citizens to be swept up by the broad, paranoid persecution of the Great Terror. It is undeniable that the decriminalisation of homosexuality was done so in the spirit of the October Revolution, and the recriminalization under Stalin was nothing if not a betrayal of that revolution.

In the former Russian Empire, attitudes towards homosexuality were surprisingly relaxed[1], observed by outsiders as being tacitly allowed by the Orthodox Church despite official religious condemnation. Same sex relations were not legislated on until 1716, when Peter the Great instituted a ban among soldiers as part of his reforms to the military code. This law was adapted for the civilian population in 1835 by Tsar Nicholas I, who instituted separate laws for consensual same sex relations (article 995) and non-consensual relations (article 996).[2] Troublingly, consensual homosexuality and pederasty were seen through the same lens through much of history, placing a filter over our view of the past. For example, in the Central Asian regions of the Russian Empire, a system of prostitution of feminised young males called bachchabozlik was common, leading to anti-sodomy laws that persecuted same-sex relations to remain the law following the revolution[3]. This would go on to affect the understanding of sexuality as seen by future Russian researchers, seeing homosexuality in "civilized" regions such as western Europe as something congenital, and its occurrence in "uncivilized" regions as the result of backwards cultural habits.[4] On its way into the 20th century, Russia's relationship with its queer citizens was markedly different than that of the rest of Europe.

In the aftermath of the February Revolution of 1917, the liberal Constitutional Democratic Party, called the Cadets, became the first in Russia to propose the revocation of anti-homosexuality legislation, inspired by libertine Enlightenment philosophy. Following the October Revolution, the old Tsarist penal code was thrown out, and while the new Soviet penal code would not be finalised until June of 1922, it came into effect with no mention of a prohibition on consensual same-sex relations. In the initial draft of the penal code written during the coalition government between the Bolsheviks and the Left-SRs of 1918, People's Commissar for Justice Isaak Steinberg explicitly legalised consensual homosexual relations.[5] This wording did not make it into the final draft, but during a visit to Berlin in January 1923, the first People's Commissar for Public Health Nikolai Semashko told German sexual reformers that "the Soviet legalisation of homosexual relations between men was a [deliberate] emancipatory measure," with no notable backlash or negative consequences.[6] Feelings on the matter were relaxed enough that known

[1]Kon and Riordan, *Sex and Russian Society*, 89.
[2]Gaido, "Marxism and Homosexual Liberation," 70.
[3]Gaido, 75-76.
[4]Healey, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia*.
[5]Gaido, 70-71.
[6]Gaido, 82-83.

homosexual Georgy Chicherin was able to succeed Leon Trotsky as Commissar of Foreign Affairs in 1918 without issue.[7] In a pamphlet written in favour of sexual reform in 1925, Russian social hygienist Grigory Batkis stated that Soviet legislation "makes no difference between homosexuality and so-called 'natural' intercourse," recognizing the issue as one of private concern.[8] While anti-homosexuality laws remained on the books in some of the Central Asian and Caucasian republics due opposition to the bachchabozlik system, the acknowledgment of the state having no place governing people's sexual life would take the better part of a century to become law in the western world.

The decriminalisation of homosexuality united with the progressive scientific attitudes of the Soviet Cultural Revolution would open new avenues of discussion around the nature of queer people. The handling of queer people by the state, previously in the domain of the penal system, was moved to the realm of healthcare. Conversations around the place of transvestites, a catch all term for those described as being of "intermediate gender", led to deliberations around the case-by-case acceptance of same-sex unions—something explicitly outlawed in Russia today.[9] Investigation into a transvestistka—an assigned-female-at-birth transvestite—revealed a number of women dressed as men within the Red Army, some holding relatively high positions of command, revealing a notable population of Russians challenging gender norms.[10] Correspondence between psychiatrists within the Health Commissariats Expert Medical Council revealed a large number of people requesting sex changes, with an instance of a doctor in Moscow performing primitive sexual reassignment surgeries.[11] Debate over the origins of homosexuality and transvestism explored the argument of nature versus nurture, with psychiatrist M. I. Sereiskii writing an article in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia of 1930 that reflected the biological origin of same sex attraction held by Hirschfeld, and argued for the integration of homosexuals into "the new collective".[12] In his analysis of those of "intermediate sex," biologist Koltsov acknowledged that variation in gender expression was common in both the human and animal world, stating that "there is no intermediate sex, but rather an infinite quantity of intermediate sexes".[13] This dialogue at the top of the Soviet healthcare system, while somewhat primitive, shows a willingness to engage with the topic of queer people that would not be seen again in the developed world for decades.
The alignment between Marxism and the movement for sexual reform had already begun under German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld, whose Scientific-

[7]Dawsey, "A Double Defeat."
[8]Batkis, *The Sexual Revolution in Russia*, 22.
[9]Healey, 153, 165, 168.
[10]Healey, 166, 169.
[11]Healey, 169.
[12]Healey, 170-171.
[13]Healey, 166.

Humanitarian Committee took up the cause of the decriminalization in 1897, working with Marxists such as August Bebel and the Social Democratic Party (SPD) to change the laws of Germany around consensual same-sex relations. Despite the ideological break between the Bolsheviks and the SPD during the First World War, conversations between Soviet psychologists and biologists and Hirschfeld opened up immediately after the October Revolution. Commissar of Education Lunacharsky visited the Institute for Sexual Science in 1927, while Alexandra Kollontai joined the International committee of directors for Hirschfeld's World League of Sexual Reform.[14] Unfortunately, this collaboration came to an end when, in May 1933, the Nazis stormed and looted the Institute, destroying countless pieces of research in the first great book burning of Hitler's reign of terror. While not reaching the same extremes as those seen in Nazi Germany, the situation for queer people in the USSR soured soon after.

The ascension of Joseph Stalin and his supporters to power marked the end of this progressive period for queer people in the Soviet Union, as it did for many other progressive elements of the Russian Revolution. This was part of a broad conservative turn in the Soviet Union starting in the early 1930s, that would include the recriminalization of abortion and greater restrictions on divorce. On March 7th of 1934, the law was changed to explicitly forbid homosexuality. In the lead up to the Great Terror, in a time when any difference from the norm could signal oneself as a potential traitor, homosexuality became an easy signifier with which to target an individual one might be. In August 1933, OGPU (the Soviet secret police) officers raided an apartment full of "men dressed as women," and after a series of brutal interrogations, Chief Yagoda tasked the police with cracking down on similar "brothels" across the Soviet Union.[15] Yagoda made the case to Stalin that dens of sexual deviants could be centers of foreign espionage activities, and that homosexuality should be recriminalized to counter it. To add insult to injury, Yagoda would be purged after evidence of homosexuality was found in his residences, and his successor Yezhov would confess to "sodomy" after being taken down by his successor, Lavrentiy Beria.[16]

The shift in policy caught many Soviet public figures unaware, with many previously able to live openly suddenly forced back into the closet. Soviet poets Mikhail Kuzmin and Nikolai Klieuv were both targeted by the OGPU, the latter being executed in 1937 for "sedition."[17] Famously, the Scottish Communist based in the USSR, Harry Whyte, wrote to Stalin following the disappearance of his boyfriend and his discovery of the new laws. In his letter, Whyte made a

[14]Gaido, 84-85.
[15]Alexander, *Red Closet*, 6.
[16]Alexander, 11-12.
[17]Alexander, 8-9.

sophisticated and impassioned appeal, arguing that homosexuals held a similar place of oppression as women and other minorities. He observed that his editor at Moscow Daily News explicitly acknowledged and accepted his sexual orientation, assuring Whyte that history was full of homosexuals who had contributed greatly to society. Whyte observed that the modern communist movement supported homosexuals like French anti-fascist Andre Gide, and that Stalin himself had said that good Leninists could have any kind of personal life.[18] Stalin did not reply but simply wrote in the margins: "Archive. An idiot and a degenerate. J. Stalin."[19]

Following the death of Stalin came a relaxation of the situation of queer people, but by no means a return to the emancipatory road of the early days of the Revolution. Homosexuality and gender divergence returned to the realm of healthcare, and conversion therapy became the order of the day. While it became comparable to, and generally more merciful than treatment in the rest of the developed world, it still lacked the progressive character of the pre-Stalin Soviet Union. As time passed, homosexuality would be decriminalized in Czechoslovakia in 1961, with East Germany and Bulgaria following suit in 1968. Russia would hold on to the law until it was repealed by Boris Yeltsin in 1993. But in 2013, the "promotion of LGBT identity" became illegal in Russia. The centrality of queer liberation in the Marxist movement would be lost until taken up again by the likes of British Communist Mark Ashton, leader of the "Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners" movement. In a defense of Stalin's policy towards homosexuals, National Chair of the American Party of Labor Alfonso Casal argued that Stalin died before the advent of the sexual revolution and couldn't have known any better.[20] However, the explicit statements and actions of Stalin's fellow commissars contradict this, indicating a personal conservatism and willingness to weaponize sexual identity against his political opponents.

In the words of historian Daniel Gaido, "decriminalisation of homosexuality by the Bolshevik government in 1922 was neither a casual nor a specifically Russian event, but a product of the positions adopted by the Marxists in this regard already at the time of the Second International."[21] The drafters of the Soviet penal code understood this, and while they did not go as far as they may have wanted, they still considerably surpassed what was happening in the rest of the world. The engagement by high level Soviet officials with Hirschfeld's movement for sexual reform, and the internal conversations about the nature of queer relations represented a broad understanding of and willingness to develop the state's relationship to queer Soviet citizens. Stalin's counter-revolution was not a

[18]Whyte, "Can a Homosexual Be in the Communist Party?"
[19]Whyte.
[20]Casal, "Homosexuality in the USSR."
[21]Gaido, 69.

culmination of that road, but rather a reaction surpassing anything that came before it, inexcusable even given the conditions of the time. The history of the Soviet Union is one of false starts and compromised successes, and the conditions of queer people are no exception. In this time of reaction and rollback to all public elements of queer liberation, one fears history repeating itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALEXANDER, RUSTAM. *Red Closet: The Hidden History of Gay Oppression in the USSR*. Manchester University Press, 2023.

BATKIS, GRIGORY. *The Sexual Revolution in Russia*. Verlag Der Syndikalist, 1925.

CASAL, ALFONSO. "Homosexuality in the USSR." The Stalin Society of North America, May 8, 2023. https://redphoenix.news/2023/05/on-homosexuality-in-the-ussr/

DAWSEY, JASON. "A Double Defeat: Catastrophe for Gay Emancipation in Germany and the USSR." The National WWII Museum, June 16, 2021. www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/gay-rights-1933-germany-and-ussr.

GAIDO, DANIEL. "Marxism and Homosexual Liberation: Magnus Hirschfeld's Relations with the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and the Early Soviet Government." *Historical Materialism* 32, no. 1 (2023): 297-396. DOI: 10.1163/1569206x-bja10006.

HEALEY, DAN. *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent*. University of Chicago Press, 2001.

KON, IGOR' SEMENOVICH, and JAMES RIORDAN. *Sex and Russian Society*. Indiana University Press, 1993.

WHYTE, HARRY. "Can a Homosexual Be in the Communist Party?" May 1934. Translation by Tom Campbell, reproduced on https://marxist.com/letter-to-stalin-can-a-homosexual-be-in-the-communist-party.htm.

BERTHE MORISOT'S *LA PSYCHE*: PAINTING NEW ASPECTS OF MODERN LIFE

MAXWELL E. FOSTER

The efforts of the French Impressionists to create a modern style of painting which reflected modern life was epitomized in the circle's inclusion of women artists as a way to showcase feminine interpretations of modern subjects in painting. This paper analyzes Berthe Morisot's Le Psyché through both socio-historical and psychological contexts in an attempt to argue that the artist had created a highly informed work of art about an important modern subject. Le Psyché is compared with a similarly-themed painting from a male interpretation, that being Édouard Manet's Nana, as a contrast to the feminine perspective and narration of the toilette subject. In addition, this paper utilizes the Lacan Mirror Stage theory, which allows the meaning of the artwork to go beyond concepts of vanity, voyeurism, and beauty, and instead, focus on the development of the human psyche and awareness of self. These comparisons unlock a more nuanced understanding of Morisot's art, which furthermore opens up the possibility to give more intellectual credit to feminist artists in general.

Berthe Morisot's *Le Psyché* depicts a complex message on the artist's daughter's rising awareness of her body image and sexual appeal through the depiction of her reflection as being a wishful image rather than her real self, reflecting on bourgeois societal expectations in 19th century Paris. The title of the work, while primarily referring to the mirror in the composition, alludes to deeper psychological messages on the growing maturity of a young woman and her newfound place in society as an object of desire, and how these begin to distort her perception of herself. Moreover, Morisot's activity as a painter highlights the importance of diverse representation in art production and human culture.

Often, a work of art, especially an impressionist one, is dismissed as a pretty picture. A Viewing Berthe Morisot's *La Psyché* reveals that it does not fall under this category. Rather, it immediately speaks to a higher and more thoughtful degree of meaning, which requires both formal analysis and socio-historical context to decipher. Morisot was a pivotal figure in the Impressionist circle of artists and stands as an early feminist who embraced her position as a woman and mother rather than working against them. Like many bourgeois women in 19th-century Western Europe, Morisot was confined by societal norms that restricted her freedom. Instead of fighting against her situation, Morisot explored themes of childhood, dawning adulthood, and female emotions that had never quite been depicted or explored so exactly in painting before.[1] Painters and artists in general otherwise overlooked such aspects of humanity as the ones focused on by Morisot, which allowed her to enter untouched territory, and to interpret these subjects, motifs, and themes in new ways, especially in *La Psyché*. The subject of this *toilette* painting is the artist's daughter Julie, dressed only in her chemise, who regards herself in a full-length (also called a "psyche") mirror in her boudoir. The scene is soft, innocent and bathed in light, with a sort of hushed serenity similar to fresh snowfall. Anchoring the composition is a crimson oriental carpet stretching horizontally across the base of the canvas, upholding the vertical elements, such as the mirror, the drapes, and Julie herself, who is dwarfed by the huge mirror. She appears small and doll-like, an effect achieved by her scale in relation to the area around her in the composition. Floral textiles, soft brushwork, an abundance of white, daylight filtered through gauzy drapes, and plump upholstery all assist in creating a comforting and mellow atmosphere. With all of these elements taken into consideration, an understanding of what the formal composition alone tells the viewer can be reached.

Primarily, the visual elements of the painting establish the theme, which is childish innocence falling away to womanhood. Contrasting this boudoir scene to others of the period, too, reveals a certain significance in the work. In comparison with Édouard Manet's *Nana*, a *toilette* painting of a courtesan dressing herself, the "saucy pride" of the subject "contrasts sharply" with "the quiet, private meditations" of *La Psyché*.[2] This distinction between the two works may boil down to a difference in subject matter, one being of an adolescent girl and the other a courtesan, however it is the interpretation of the *toilette* theme which is especially interesting. According to American art historian Carol Armstrong, Morisot's *toilette* paintings act as a reflection on the artist's interest in rendering a purely feminine theme, focusing on the act of self-dressing and a woman's place in Parisian and general Western society.[3] Whereas *Nana* is a painting from a man's perspective about vanity and the commodification of women in 19th century Paris, Morisot's *La Psyché* is a feminine view on the *state* of women in 19th century Paris.[4] Unlike other *toilette* paintings, such as Manet's *Nana*, Morisot's goes beyond themes of vanity, voyeurism, and beauty by instead exploring "the concept of self-looking and the act of mirroring: the mirroring of self [and] the mirroring

[1] Stuckey et al., "Berthe Morisot, Impressionist," 88.
[2] Lerner and Antaki, "Berthe Morisot, Mary Cassat, & the Affluent Woman's World," 74.
[3] Armstrong, "Fracturing Femininity: Manet's 'Before the Mirror'," 89.
[4] Armstrong, 84.

of the gaze".[5] As such, instead of simply regarding her reflection, she is rather perceiving herself as an outsider would, seeing how to improve her looks through various means of alteration. To the viewer, of whom the subject is not aware of, this apparent insecurity adds a touch of sadness to this lush, quiet scene. With this understanding, *La Psyché* can be understood as a more in-depth exploration into the nature of womanhood, rather than a face-value boudoir scene. Julie is seen pinching her chemise around her waist: she has put on fashionable heeled slippers, and tied a chic black ribbon around her neck. She then takes note of how this makes her look in the large gilt mirror. She tries to see herself in the way that a man might; she has become aware of herself as an object of desire, and is both mentally disturbed and forever changed.

Why would the artist portray her own daughter in this highly vulnerable way? The answer to this question cannot be found solely in the visual aspects of the painting, but rather must be understood through the history of the theme, and the context in which the painting was made. While the title of the work refers to the dominating presence of the psyche mirror in the composition, it also refers to an ancient Greek myth. Psyche, a mortal princess, is hailed as the most beautiful being in the world, and attracts the jealousy of Venus, whose son Cupid has fallen in love with her.[6] Psyche is tricked into undergoing several trials in order to prove her love, and upon succeeding is blessed with immortality, marriage with Cupid, and a daughter named Voluptas, or "Pleasure". Psyche, meaning "soul", is representative of the human spirit and the difficulties and growth required for individuals to emerge as better versions of themselves.[7] This story then plays an important role in supporting Morisot's theme of rising womanhood: her daughter Julie is undergoing human experiences, in this case, rising self-awareness and subsequent insecurity, which will assist in her transition from childhood to adulthood. Furthermore, one could consider the title of the work to allude to psychological aspects: is not the image in the mirror different than the beholder? Is Julie's reflection perhaps a wishful image, the way she wished she looked, rather than her actual appearance? She, a timid girl, is longingly admiring the image of a *femme du monde*, while she is dejectedly embarrassed by herself, an experience so common around her age. Another aspect of the artwork which will assist in explaining the artist's intentions is the actual history of the painting. According to Tom Gurney, an English art historian, *La Psyché* was chosen by Morisot to be exhibited at the Third Impressionist Exhibition in 1877, showcasing her pride in the artwork, and an intent on highlighting an otherwise overlooked aspect of modern life.[8] By painting her own daughter in this way, Berthe Morisot is attempting to convey to viewers

[5] Lerner and Antaki, 369.
[6] Diessner and Burke, "The Beauty of the Psyche and Eros Myth: Integrating Aesthetics into Introduction of Psychology," 100.
[7] Diessner and Burke, "Psyche and Eros Myth", 101.
[8] Gurney, "The Psyche Mirror by Berthe Morisot".

the deep psychological nature of young women and their disregarded experiences: she is showing modern life in the city, or more specifically, the effects that 19th-century metropolitan society has on young *demoiselles*. This is an experience that many women are subjected to, and is thus worthy of painting as a record of a shared human experience.

The mirror as a theme, motif, and subject, reveals another layer of meaning to the artwork. To better understand the complexity of the mirror motif, the comparison between Manet's *Nana* and Morisot's *La Psyché* will once again be implemented. In *Nana*, the mirror takes on an allegorical symbolism common to the *vanitas* genre, where it symbolizes "the nugatory nature of youth, beauty, and earthly pleasures"; the sinful nature of vanity.[9] While the psyche mirror in *La Psyché* somewhat alludes to this nature of admiring oneself, Morisot transforms its meaning to her own purpose: to reflect the psychological nature of the beholder. Interestingly, more recent studies in the field of psychology have revealed the mirror to be instrumental in the development of the human psyche and the awareness of self. French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan describes the dawn of the awareness of the *I*, or "the transformation that takes place in the subject when [they assume] an image" as a pivotal point in the development of a child and their apperception, which will remain with them for the duration of their life.[10] This phenomenon was captured over a century ago by a mother painting her adolescent daughter, attempting to represent a pivotal point in the life of a human being where one's appearance becomes of great importance in order to belong and thrive in society, or more primitively, to not be outcasted from the tribe, and thus survive.

Berthe Morisot captured the essence of modern life, and thus the objective of Impressionism, by painting an aspect of human life which was often overlooked, marking her as ahead of her time. She exemplified the importance of inclusion in the art world, and how diversity in this sphere can create new perspectives, and thus create a more complete image of human culture and art production. *La Psyché* focuses on human development, the fall of innocence, insecurities, and realizing one's place in a time which values women primarily for their beauty and as ornaments to society. It is a timeless piece which speaks to generations of viewers, regardless of place or identity.

[9] Goscilo, "The Mirror in Art: Vanitas, Veritas, and Vision", 291.
[10] Lacan, "The Mirror Stages as Formative of the Function of the I", 76.

Figure 1: *La Psyché*
Berthe Morisot; Oil on canvas, 1876

https://www.museothyssen.org/en/collection/artists/morisot-berthe/psyche-mirror

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARMSTRONG, CAROL. "Fracturing Femininity: Manet's 'Before the Mirror.'" *October* 74, no. 1 (1995): 74 – 104. DOI:10.2307/778821.

DIESSNER, RHETT and KAYLA BURKE. "The Beauty of the Psyche and Eros Myth: Integrating Aesthetics into Introduction to Psychology." *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 45, no. 4 (2011): 97–108. DOI:10.5406/jaesteduc.45.4.0097.

GOSCILO, HELENA. "The Mirror in Art: Vanitas, Veritas, and Vision." *Studies in 20th and 21st Century Literature* 34, no. 2 (2010): 282 – 319. DOI:10.4148/2334-4415.1733.

GURNEY, TOM. "The Psyche Mirror by Berthe Morisot." *TheHistoryOfArt.org*. June 19, 2020, updated October 14, 2023. www.thehistoryofart.org/berthe-morisot/psyche-mirror/

LACAN, JACQUES. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the *I*." In *Écrits*, translated by Bruce Fink. W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.

LERNER, LOREN RUTH and KARINE ANTAKI. "Berthe Morisot, Mary Cassat, & the Affluent Woman's World." In *Creating the Modern: Intersections of Art and Society in the Nineteenth Century*. Concordia University Library, 2024. https://opentextbooks.concordia.ca/creating-the-modern/front-matter/cover/.

STUCKEY, CHARLES F., WILLIAM P. SCOTT, and SUZANNE G. LINDSAY. *Berthe Morisot, Impressionist*. Hudson Hills Press, 1987.

THE FRAMING OF SOCIALIST SYMBOLOGY AND RHETORIC WITHIN FASCISM

MARC BOLEN

The early 20th century marked a time of extremism both on the political right and political left. While they were opposed in their policy and ideology, both fascists and socialists recognized the resonance of symbolism and rhetoric to appeal to the disillusioned working class at the time. This essay aims to explore the link between fascist and socialist symbolism and language, specifically how fascists adopted the symbols and rhetoric of socialist movements that preceded them. Fascists—sometimes subtly but often explicitly—took the symbols and rhetoric of their counterparts and reframed them away from class struggle, towards their own ideas of racial struggle, antisemitism, and corporatism. In doing so, much of the symbolism and rhetoric that was once associated with socialism is now ubiquitous with fascism.

Shortly after World War I, early European fascist movements made efforts to engage with the increasingly contemptuous working class in their respective countries. To broaden their appeal, the fascist movements in Italy, Germany, and Spain pulled from the ideologically opposing socialist movements that preceded them. The *fasces* of the Italian Fascist flag and the red and black of the National Socialist flag exemplify the adoption of specific socialist symbolism. In addition, the written doctrines of Benito Mussolini and José Antonio Primo de Rivera adopt socialist ideas but vehemently reject Marxism. Finally, the leftist Strasserist faction in the National Socialist Party in Germany represents the political value of implementing socialist symbolism and rhetoric and how its ideological rejection was often violent. All these symbols and rhetoric originated in socialist movements but were co-opted and reworked to fit within extremist fascist ideology. Whereas the symbolism and rhetoric of socialism represented class struggle and anti-capitalism, fascism took the same forms of expression and used them to express their ideology of nationalism and racial struggle. Taken together, the Italian Fascist Party, the National Socialist Party, and the Falange Española all adopted socialist symbolism and rhetoric but reframed it within the confines of their fascist movements and ideology.

The Italian Fascists were the first major fascist movement in Europe and were also the first to show the value of taking and reinterpreting socialist symbolism. The Italian Fascist flag incorporated strong imagery that evoked both the Holy Roman Empire, but more importantly, the growing sentiment to labour and class solidarity that was expanding during the end of the 18th century.[1] The party emblem and party flag of the National Fascist party in Italy had a bundle of rods wrapped tightly together, also known as a fasces.[2] Decades before Mussolini adopted the fasces as a name and symbol, it was first used as a political emblem to represent worker and artisan solidarity in the first mainstream socialist movement in Italy: Fasci Siciliani.[3] Mussolini used the widely recognized socialist symbol to associate its meaning of "strength through unity and discipline" with his own fascist movement.[4] Over the course of two decades, Mussolini used the evocative power of the fasces to define his movement. Ultimately, the fasces became enmeshed in the fabric of Italian culture due to its symbolic power and through state-sponsored mandate. The fasces symbol could be seen in pieces of grand architecture down to placement in small lighting fixtures.[5] By appropriating the fasces symbol, Mussolini removed almost all of its association with labour solidarity and oriented it towards racial and national solidarity. According to nationalism historian George Mosse, "fascism [was] a civil religion" and "fascists were urged to immerse themselves in symbols."[6] With the understanding that Mussolini emphasized symbolism to a religious degree, it's clear that the fasces symbol—which was once associated with Italian socialism—was framed within the banner of Italian nationalism. Mussolini incorporated the fasces symbol to such an extent that it became ubiquitous with fascism—hence the name.

Bennito Mussolini, who began his career as a socialist, employed its symbolic and rhetorical appeal to foster his growing fascist movements. However, in his seminal writing on fascism, Mussolini was unambiguous that the adoption of socialist messaging towards labour and workers existed only within the confines of nationalism. Mussolini wrote in "The Doctrine of Fascism" that "Fascism is likewise opposed to trade unionism as a class weapon. But when brought within the orbit of the state, Fascism recognizes the real needs which gave rise to socialism and trade unionism."[7] Mussolini is only able to 'recognize', not actually materially address, the substantive inequality that led to the rise of labour movements in Italy. Even then, the recognition of socialism is only able to exist within the confines of

[1]Brennan, "The Radical Reinterpretation of the Fasces in Mussolini's Italy."
[2]An SVG version of the flag of the National Fascist Party used in the 1920s can be viewed on Wikimedia Commons: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Flag_of_Italian_Fascism.svg.
[3]Paxton, "The Five Stages of Fascism," 9.
[4]Doordan, "In the Shadow of the Fasces," 42.
[5]Doordan, 43.
[6] Mosse, "Fascist Aesthetics and Society," 246.
[7]Mussolini, *The Doctrine of Fascism*, 5.

the state. Mussolini used socialist rhetoric but reconfigured the hierarchy, encompassing Marxist critique but within fascist ideology: "Grouped according to their several interests, individuals form classes; they form trade-unions when organized according to their several economic activities; but first and foremost they form the State."[8] The hierarchy is clearly the nation over any other form of identity, specifically leftist forms of identification, like class. Taken together, Mussolini shows he is able to appeal to the working class but clarifying that his engagement is conditional that their place in the nation trumps their place in a union or job. Mussolini writes: "In the great river of Fascism one can trace currents...in Sorel, Peguy, Lagardelle of the Movement Socialists."[9] Mussolini's analogy of fascism as a river can act as a broader metaphor for how fascism disguised elements of socialism and reshaped them in the large, aggressive rhetoric and policy of their fascist ideology. Similar to how it is impossible to track a single molecule of water in a rapidly moving river, fascism took specific elements of socialism and seamlessly implemented them into their growing movements. Less than a decade later, the fascist movement in Germany would continue the pattern of fascist stealing from socialism in their rise to power.

From the flag of the Paris Communes to the flag that represented Vladimir Lenin and his Russian Social Democratic Party, decades before the Nazis rose to prominence, the color red was used to evoke socialism and class struggle.[10] In his design of the National Socialist flag, Adolf Hitler borrowed from socialism in two forms: its red evokes the color that was commonly associated with socialism and communism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries while the black swastika associates images of labour but recontextualizes it to fit within the Nazi ideology. Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*: "We chose red for our flag to express the social idea of the movement, white for the nationalistic idea, and the swastika to represent the mission of the struggle for the victory of the Aryan man and, by the same token, the victory of the idea of creative work."[11] By "social idea" Hitler builds an image of socialist ideology in a fascist framework. The "creative work" that Hitler writes about and presents as the Swastika in his flag is intended to reframe the idea of labour and social struggle away from class conflict and within racial conflict.[12] In other words, Hitler adopted some elements of socialism that fit within his fascist ideology and reframed them away from class struggle and towards a perceived racial struggle. If the black of the swastika represents labour, and the red is an expression of socialist ideals, then the white circle, which represents nationalism, is a bridge that connects the two. Within National Socialism, neither labour

[8]Mussolini, 5.
[9]Mussolini, 7.
[10]Balz, "Hostile Take-Over," 20.
[11]Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 497.
[12]Kasher, "The Art of Hitler," 3.

solidarity or "social thinking" could exist outside the context of race or nationalism. Just like his predecessor and later contemporary in Italy, Hitler endowed his flag in a type of religious symbolism and made it ubiquitous throughout German society.[13] In doing so, Hitler reinforces efforts to reframe socialist symbolism and rhetoric in German society through the flags design, but also in the aggressive way it was presented to the German people. While the distinct colours of the National Socialist flag and Hitler's dogma presented a clear understanding of socialism's place in fascism, its physical manifestation within the party apparatus was more opaque.

While National Socialism is remembered for its extreme right politics, its adoption of a left-wing image was integral to the party and Hitler's rise to power. Just as Benito Mussolini explicitly wrote in his doctrine, that any appeal to socialism would exist only within the confines of Nationalism, Hitler's utilization and purging of the left-wing faction of the National Socialist Party represent the same hierarchy. The socialist faction of the party, headed by Gregor Strasser, was important for the party's appeal to working class Germans, specifically after 1924.[14] Strasser's faction in the National Socialist Party, and its eventual purge in 1934, represents the image of socialism within the National Socialist Party and its subservience to nationalism. Joseph Goebbels wrote about a tension in the party where either socialism could provide a base for nationalism or where the "worker" must be convinced of the "National Idea".[15] Inevitably, nationalism took precedent over any concession to socialism, to an extreme degree. In his study of Nazi Party factionalism, Joseph L. Nyomarkay writes: "The attempt to define National Socialism programmatically would have challenged the charismatic nature of its legitimacy and *ipso facto* Hitler's absolute leadership. The ideology of a charismatic movement has to remain sufficiently vague so as not to become the basis of legitimacy."[16] In other words, any appeal to National Socialism made towards class struggle and labour could not overshadow Hitler's persona and his nationalist and racist sentiment. Hiter was ideologically opposed to socialism and did not care about the working class in Germany.[17] As a result, any presentation or rhetorical expression of socialism, whether it was the red of the Nazi flag or the tangible Strasser faction of the party, was primarily an allusion. Once in power, appealing to working class and labour factions of Germany was no longer useful.

Just as Italian and German fascists had done before him, José Antonio Primo de Rivera, during the formation of Falange Española, was explicit in his allusions to socialist rhetoric and ideology while objecting to its Marxist elements. In the

[13]Taylor, "Symbol and Ritual under National Socialism," 510.
[14]Stachura, "The Political Strategy of the Nazi Party," 275–276.
[15]Nyomarkay, "Factionalism in the National Socialist German Workers' Party," 42.
[16]Nyomarkay, 47.
[17]Stachura, 274.

"Twenty-Six Point Program" of the Falange, Primo de Rivera makes two specific allusions to socialist policy and ideology.[18] He mentions syndicalism—a rejection of the capitalist system and wealth disparity—in point eleven, writing that "The National-Syndicalist State will [not] watch impassively while the strongest class dominates the weakest." However, on point ten he subverts the Marxist expectation by writing "Our spiritual and national conception of life also repudiates Marxism." In one breath Primo de Rivera expresses one of socialism's most important components—wealth disparity and class struggle—and on another point refutes one of the very ideological points of references it comes from, Marxism. In doing so, Primo de Rivera shaped the growing Spanish fascist movement in a way that adopts rhetoric elements of socialism without the aspects that would get in the way of the nationalist components of the movement. The tendency to inject Spanish fascism with socialism goes beyond policy and extends to the face that represents it as well. Some intellectuals thought that an ideal leader of the party would have been a socialist, as they are "a man of the people."[19] A socialist leader, acting symbolically as a socialist while truly embodying fascist policy and ideology is the essence of the fascist tendency to borrow from socialism purely through its popular appeal.

Whether it was for creating broad appeal or to offer alternatives to the growing leftist and communist movements that were growing around the same time, fascism clearly adopted much of the symbolism and rhetoric of the socialist movements that preceded them. While the level of adoption varied depending on the fascist regime, it is clear that acquisition never went as far as a true implementation of what the socialist symbolism and rhetoric represented. In other words, most of the acquisition was purely aesthetic, or existed within a nationalistic framework that detached it from its true meaning. When the policies of their rhetoric or symbolism were implemented, they were often centered around race or nationalist dynamics that ignored the pure class-based framework of the socialism they were pulling from. Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, and José Antonio Primo de Rivera all saw the value of adopting symbolic and rhetorical elements of socialism. All three were some of the first to introduce and popularize fascism in their respective countries and their appropriation of socialist symbolism and rhetoric in the emergence of their fascist movements has made some of the iconography that was once associated with unions, labour, and class struggle entirely absorbed by fascist history.

[18]Primo de Rivera, *The Twenty-Six Point Program of the Falange*, 2.
[19]Ellwood, "Not so Much a Programme More a Way of Life," 59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BALZ, HANNO. “'Hostile Take-Over': A Political History of the Red Flag.” *Socialist History* 59, (2020): 8-30.

BRENNAN, COREY. *The Radical Reinterpretation of the Fasces in Mussolini's Italy.* Oxford University Press, 2022.

DOORDAN, DENNIS P. “In the Shadow of the Fasces: Political Design in Fascist Italy.” *Design Issues* 13, no. 1 (1997): 39-52. www.jstor.org/stable/1511586.

ELLWOOD, SHEELAGH M. “Not so Much a Programme More a Way of Life: Oral History and Spanish Fascism.” *Oral History* 16, no. 2 (1988): 57-66. www.jstor.org/stable/40179012.

HITLER, ADOLF. *Mein Kampf.* Translated by Ralph Manheim. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943. Reprint, First Mariner Books edition, 1999.

KASHER, STEVEN. “The Art of Hitler.” *October* 59 (1992): 49-85. www.jstor.org/stable/778831.

MOSSE, GEORGE L. “Fascist Aesthetics and Society: Some Considerations.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 31, no. 2 (1996): 245-252. DOI: 10.1177/002200949603100202.

MUSSOLINI, BENITO. *The Doctrine of Fascism.* Vallecchi, 1935.

NYOMARKAY, JOSEPH L. “Factionalism in the National Socialist German Workers' Party, 1925–26: The Myth and Reality of the “Northern Faction”.” *Political Science Quarterly* 80, no. 1 (1965): 22-47. DOI: 10.2307/2147182.

PAXTON, ROBERT O. “The Five Stages of Fascism.” *The Journal of Modern History* 70, no. 1 (1998): 1-23. DOI: 10.1086/235001.

PRIMO DE RIVERA, JOSÉ ANTONIO. *The Twenty-Six Point Program of the Falange.* Falange Española, 1934.

STACHURA, PETER D. “The Political Strategy of the Nazi Party, 1919–1933.” *German Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (1980): 261-288. DOI: 10.2307/1429723.

TAYLOR, SIMON. “Symbol and Ritual under National Socialism.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 32, no. 4 (1981): 504-520. DOI: 10.2307/590130.

FROM EMPIRE TO REPUBLIC: HOW LAIKLIK RESHAPED ISLAMIC LIFE IN TURKEY

AMIN KIA

This essay explores how laiklik, Turkey's distinctive form of secularism, transformed Islamic life after the Republic's founding in 1923. Unlike Western models that separate religion from state, Turkish laiklik demanded active state control over Islam, given its deep historical integration of faith, law, and governance. The Kemalist regime achieved this through four key mechanisms: (1) the Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, which bureaucratized religion by employing imams as civil servants and centrally approving sermons and texts; (2) the 1924 Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu, unifying education under secular nationalist principles and closing independent medreses; (3) cultural-symbolic reforms—such as adopting the Latin alphabet, Western clothing laws, calendar changes, and promoting Atatürk imagery—to displace religious symbols from public life; and (4) the military's enduring role as guardian of the secular order against religious resurgence. Drawing on historian Niyazi Berkes, anthropologist Talal Asad, legal historian Wael Hallaq, and legal scholar Abdullahi Ahmed An-Naʿim, the essay contends that laiklik was not neutral separation but assertive governance of religion. By reorganizing Islam administratively and confining it to private belief, the Republic substituted civic rationality and national loyalty for divine authority in shaping public morality and identity.

When the Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923, its leaders faced a unique problem: how to modernize a state in which religion and sovereignty had always been fused. In contrast to Christian Europe, where secularism emerged from centuries of struggle between church and state, Islam in the Ottoman world had no separate ecclesiastical hierarchy that could be divided from government. Turkish reformers therefore could not simply separate religion from politics; they had to rebuild it under state authority. The pages that follow trace this project through four arenas: the Republic's legal and bureaucratic control of Islam, the unification of education, the cultural and symbolic remaking of everyday life, and the army's role in enforcing the secular order. Laiklik was not merely "separation" of religion and state; it was an activist program to govern Islam and remake public life so that citizenship—not revelation—anchored national identity. Through state control, education reform, symbolic reordering, and military guardianship, the Republic sought to confine religion to private belief and keep it out of state power.

The Young Turks—a reformist Ottoman political movement of officers and intellectuals that helped drive the 1908 constitutional revolution—were exposed to French laïcité, shaping the early vocabulary of laiklik, yet they reworked it into an assertive state project rather than a borrowed model.[1] The ones who had fled to Paris before 1908, encountered laïcité in the French republican tradition and reinterpreted it through Ottoman political vocabulary.[2] They coined the word laiklik—from the French laïque, "of the laity"—to signal that public authority would rest in citizens and civil law, rather than in clerics. Borrowing a French republican term also revealed the model they admired: not a simple "hands-off" separation, but an activist state that could reorganize religion's public role. In that sense, laiklik did not mean religion vanished: it meant Islam would be reframed as a social domain the state could regulate rather than a rival source of sovereignty. In practice, the term framed Islam not as a rival source of sovereignty but as a social domain the state could reorganize and regulate through schools, sermons, and religious offices, all under bureaucratic control.[3] Exiled reformers "imported the vocabulary of the French Revolution into Ottoman political discourse" to legitimize limiting clerical authority in the name of national citizenship.[4] Adopting the French term reflected a will to dominate religion administratively, not merely tolerate it privately.[5] Hence, laiklik was born not as neutrality but as an assertion of state guardianship over faith.[6] It marked the first symbolic act in a broader plan to replace the authority of the ulema (Islamic clerics) with civic rationality anchored in law, a shift that naturally led the Republic to reorganize Islam through new institutional forms.[7] Moreover, in practice, this republican rationalism directed the early Kemalist cadre—Atatürk's reformist ruling elite within the new Republic—in its state-building choices, and produced a distinctly activist model of secularism.[8] These reforms reorganized Islam under positive law rather than merely expelling it from government affairs.[9] As legal scholar Abdullahi Ahmed An-Naʿim argues: Muslims need a secular state that is "neutral regarding religious doctrine" and unwilling to claim it, so it can enforce Islamic sacred law or Shariʿa. Because once the state enforces Shariʿa, the result is simply the political will of the state, not the

---

[1]Berkes, *Development of Secularism in* Turkey, 306.
[2]Berkes, 307.
[3]Çelik, "From Secularism to Laïcité," 190.
[4]Berkes, 154.
[5]Berkes, 479.
[6]Berkes, 480.
[7]Gözaydın, "Diyanet and Politics," 216–217.
[8]Berkes, 480.
[9]Berkes, 479; Gözaydın, 216–217.

religious law of Islam.[10] Having redefined the relationship between faith and sovereignty, the Republic now had to construct the bureaucratic machinery to make that redefinition effective.[11]

Institutionalization turned principle into practice, and the newly created Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı (Directorate of Religious Affairs) did not stand outside religion: it administered it.[12] Imams became salaried civil servants, and Friday sermons were written and distributed from Ankara as centrally approved texts.[13] Even prayer manuals and Qur'an commentaries were reviewed by the Diyanet to ensure conformity with the state's moral vision.[14] This system embodied what Turkish legal scholar İştar Gözaydın later called "administrative secularism," in which the state regulates belief, so that belief cannot regulate the state.[15] Historian Niyazi Berkes described this arrangement as a "rationalization of faith," where religion was disciplined by law and routine rather than expelled from society.[16] It was not a separation, like that found in the United States or even France, but a state-domestication of Islam, turning religious practice not only into a branch of the bureaucracy but also into an organization of policing and monitoring. Seen comparatively, this domestication marked Turkish laiklik off from French laïcité, which confines church institutions to the private sphere, and instead created secularism as governance—an order that ruled through religion rather than beside it.[17] Turkey's laiklik did not remove Islam from state power: it subordinated religion to a centralized bureaucracy—the Diyanet—which became the Republic's chief instrument for bringing the religious sphere under state control. As Martin van Bruinessen notes, Turkey (alongside Indonesia) is unusual in building such a huge, pervasive apparatus for administering Islam—one that even exceeds the sermon-control capacity found in many states that formally recognize Islamic law.[18] However, bureaucratic control alone could not secure the secular nation's future. Having mastered ritual and authority through the Diyanet, the regime now sought to reform consciousness itself, extending laiklik from institutions to minds.[19]

[10]An-Naʿim, *Islam and the Secular State*, 1.
[11]Gözaydın, 216.
[12]Gözaydın, 216.
[13]Pope and Pope, *Turkey Unveiled*, 317.
[14]Azak, "Secularism in Turkey," 164.
[15]Gözaydın, 218.
[16]Berkes, 486.
[17]Azak, 162.
[18]van Bruinessen, "Governance of Islam in Two Secular Polities," 1–3, 5.
[19]Kanbolat, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Eğitim Kurumlarında," 986.

Eliminating independent religious schooling was the Republic's first major educational move for laiklik.[20] The Tevhid-i Tedrisat Kanunu (Law No. 430, 1924) closed the medrese—Islamic religious school—system and subordinated all instruction to the Ministry of National Education.[21] This was not the Anglo-American model, which removed theology from public schooling but tolerated denominational schools in parallel.[22] Instead, it was a total integration of learning and government—what Berkes called "the unification of thought" within a single administrative hierarchy.[23] This administrative takeover mattered because it gave the state the power not only to close religious schools, but to redesign the content of education itself.

Once schooling was centralized, the Republic could secularize what students learned and retrain teachers to produce citizens loyal to the nation rather than to divine law. Teachers were transformed to servants of civic ideology,[24] and textbooks replaced religious references with nationalist morality.[25] In this way, education became the Republic's tool for cultivating a new moral citizen, one whose cultural virtues were anchored in loyalty to the nation rather than obedience to divine law.

The next stage of reform extended laiklik beyond the classroom into the realm of culture and symbols.[33] Alphabet reform in 1928 not only simplified literacy but also cut linguistic ties with the Arabic script of the Qur'an, reducing the ordinary citizen's contact with religious texts.[26] Clothing laws,[27] calendar reform,[28] and the abolition of Islamic law courts[29] all reinforced the same separation of daily life from the religious order. Public ritual and commemoration replaced sacred festivals,[30] and the national anthem, flag, and portrait of Atatürk became the new civic liturgy.[31] The massive rock-cut likeness of Atatürk (Figure 1) demonstrates how the regime projected its founding figure into the natural environment itself, effectively masking the mountain with the secular iconography through which Kemalism reshaped public space. Taken together, these reforms turned laiklik from a legal principle into a social pedagogy by reshaping the everyday habits through

---

[20]Berkes, 461.
[21]Kanbolat, 986–987.
[22]Kadıoğlu, "Pathologies of Turkish Republican Laicism," 499–500; Witte and Kaufman, "Law and Religion in American Education," 236.
[23]Berkes, 485.
[24]Aycan, "Process of Getting Identity in Turkish Society," 138–139.
[25]Doğan, "An Analysis of the Idea of State," 2,089.
[26]Çelik, 198.
[27]Doğaner, "Law on Headdress." 41.
[28]Berkes, 419.
[29]Berkes, 466.
[30]Sevinç et al., "Secularism in Turkey," 161–162.
[31]Cohen Yanarocak, "Role of the Official Ceremonies," 41.

which people lived in public. By changing how citizens read (alphabet reform), dress (clothing laws), mark time (calendar reform), and participate in public rituals (anthem, flag, and Atatürk iconography), the state trained them to *perform* secular-national citizenship even when private belief remained religious. Having remade the mind and reordered the public world of symbols, the Republic then sought an institutional guardian to secure its new moral order.[32] For the Kemalist revolutionary vanguard—a small ruling cadre around Mustafa Kemal committed to rapid, top-down modernization—cultural reform could only stick if it was protected and enforced, a logic that helped elevate the military into the Republic's long-term guardian of laiklik.

Laiklik did not survive on persuasion alone: the Republic ultimately militarized its enforcement by making the armed forces the institutional guardian of the secular order.[33] The Republic therefore required an institution powerful enough to defend the secular order against religious revival or political dissent.[34] Thus, the Kemalist centre relied on permanent custodians—especially the armed forces—to maintain its cultural dominance over the religious periphery.[35] Within the military, the officer corps—the commissioned leadership of the armed forces—came to see itself as the heir of the revolutionary vanguard and the guardian of the Republic's rational faith.[36] Its mission was not merely political but moral, safeguarding the secular nation from the return of revelation as public authority.[37] In this sense, laiklik evolved from an ideology of reform into a structure of command. Nevertheless, this vanguardist model of protecting secular authority becomes more intelligible once we consider the theological structure of the religion it sought to contain.

The intensity of Kemalism's secularism cannot be explained solely by politics; it also rests on the theological structure of Islam itself. Unlike Christianity, which long separated the sacred from the temporal, Islam binds faith to law and governance.[38] Christ's command "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and unto God what is God's" (Matthew 22:21) introduced a duality absent from the Qur'an, where divine authority encompasses all aspects of life: "O you who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those in authority among you" (Q 4:59). In Islamic doctrine, this authority is not merely administrative but divine (ḥukm ilāhī), and this divine right to govern must align with revealed law: Sharīʿa.[39] Therefore, after the death of the Prophet of Islam, political legitimacy traditionally required

[32] Çelik, 203.
[33] Çelik, 203–204.
[34] Doğaner, 41.
[35] Burak, "Role of the Military," 144-145.
[36] Mardin, "Center–Periphery Relations," 182–183.
[37] Berkes, 61–63.
[38] Mandaville, *Islam and Politics*, 14.
[39] An-Naʿim, 12.

validation from a faqīh (Islamic jurist) or a scholar trained in the Qur'an and the Sunnah (Prophetic tradition).[40] Muhammad's own career unified these domains: he was both messenger and ruler, and his example—"Indeed, in the Messenger of Allah you have a perfect example" (Q 33:21)—established this Islamic mandate that the only lawful governance must, by definition, be Islamic governance. Therefore, if the Prophet's Sunnah models the unity of faith and governance, then Muslims—wherever they live—inherit a religious obligation to pursue an order that harmonizes moral and public authority under Islamic rule.[41]

Islam historically presents itself as a comprehensive moral-legal order that reaches into public authority and everyday conduct—including clothing norms, ritual practice, and social rules. Legal historian Wael B. Hallaq argues that Islamic law was never merely legal code but a moral-political order encompassing all aspects of life.[42] As a result, Kemalism faced this unity as an administrative challenge: it had to modernize a society built on revealed law, and to invent a secular substitute for divine command.[43] The secular Republic was consolidated out of the remnants of an Islamic empire in which rulers had gained legitimacy from religion, so replacing that legitimacy required a new source of moral authority—scientific rationality sanctified by the state. This was typical of modern Muslim polities; religion was organized through state-affiliated institutions rather than by independent faith.[44] Anthropologist Talal Asad similarly argues that modern secularism is not simple separation but governance—a project that manages religion's public expression while claiming neutrality.[45] In the Turkish case, laiklik became precisely that: a continuous governance over belief, transforming public life until religion survived chiefly as private conviction.

Kemalism's laiklik was not, therefore, simply a constitutional principle but a system of governance that redefined belief and authority. Through education, symbolism, and bureaucratic regulation, the Republic turned faith into an object of administration and civic morality into its substitute. Even the alphabet reform, by severing access to the old Arabic script, ensured that the sacred language of Islam would fade from daily literacy, further limiting religion's role in public consciousness. Because Islam united revelation and power, neutrality was impossible; only control could guarantee the secular nation's survival. In this way, laiklik functioned not as a measure of religious freedom but as a vision of civic

[40]Hallaq, *Impossible State*, 80–81.
[41]Qutb, *Social Justice in Islam*, 26.
[42]Hallaq, 117–118.
[43]Asad, *Formations of the Secular*, 191.
[44]Kaya, "Engineering a National Islam," under "Comparisons with Other Countries".
[45]Hallaq, 117–118.

secular progress—a continuing project to transform public life until religion itself was confined to private conviction.

Figure 1: *Ataturk in Izmir*
Ed Kohler; photograph; 2010

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AN-NAʿIM, ABDULLAHI AHMED. *Islam and the Secular State: Negotiating the Future of Shariʿa*. Harvard University Press, 2008.

ASAD, TALAL. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford University Press, 2003.

AYCAN, NIHAT. "The Process of Getting Identity in Turkish Society: Kemalist Education." *Journal of Social Sciences* 1, no. 3 (2005): 136–140. DOI:10.3844/jssp.2005.136.140.

AZAK, UMUT. "Secularism in Turkey as a Nationalist Search for Vernacular Islam: The Ban on the Call to Prayer in Arabic (1932–1950)." *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 124 (2008): 161–179. DOI:10.4000/remmm.6025.

BERKES, NIYAZI. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. McGill University Press, 1964.

BURAK, BEGÜM. "The Role of the Military in Turkish Politics: To Guard Whom and From What?" *European Journal of Economic and Political Studies* 4, no. 1 (2011): 143–169, esp. 144–145. https://shorturl.at/50JVw

ÇELIK, NEVZET. "From Secularism to Laïcité and Analyzing Turkish Authoritarian Laiklik." *Insight Turkey* 20, no. 1 (2018): 189–208. www.jstor.org/stable/26301074.

COHEN YANAROCAK, HAY EYTAN. "The Role of the Official Ceremonies and Hidden Curriculum on Atatürkism's Socialization and Indoctrination in Turkish Schools (1980–2002)." *Turkish Studies* 25, no. 5 (2024): 937–961. DOI:10.1080/14683849.2024.2374327.

DOĞAN, NECMETTIN. "An Analysis of the Idea of State in Textbooks from Ottoman Empire to the Republic in Terms of the Relation between Education and Power." *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice* 11, no. 4 (2011): 2,084–2,090. https://research.ebsco.com/c/blyu2p/viewer/pdf/au6ayycjpb.

DOĞANER, YASEMIN. "Türk Modernleşmesinde Şapka Kanunu ve Kılık Kıyafete İlişkin Düzenlemeler" ["The Law on Headdress and Regulations on Dressing in the Turkish Modernization"]. Bilig 51 (2009): 33–54. Accessed March 30, 2026. www.ajindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423873168.pdf.

GÖZAYDIN, İŞTAR B. "Diyanet and Politics." *The Muslim World* 98, no. 2–3 (2008): 216–227. DOI:10.1111/j.1478-1913.2008.00220.x.

HALLAQ, WAEL B. *The Impossible State: Islam, Politics, and Modernity's Moral Predicament*. Columbia University Press, 2013.

KADIOĞLU, AYŞE GÜLDEN. "The Pathologies of Turkish Republican Laicism." *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 36, no. 3–4 (2010): 489–504. DOI:10.1177/0191453709358835.

KANBOLAT, ERKAN. "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Eğitim Kurumlarında Laikleşme Süreci ve Ahlâk Eğitimine Dair Tartışmalar" ["Discussions on Secularization Process in Education and Moral Education in Republic Period"]. *Kastamonu Education Journal* 26, no. 3 (2018): 985–994. DOI:10.24106/kefdergi.421690.

KAYA, EMIR. "Engineering a National Islam: The Kemalist Making of the Diyanet." Ummatics Institute, September 15, 2025. Under "Comparisons with Other Countries." Accessed March 30, 2026. https://ummatics.org/caliphate-to-diyanet/

KURU, AHMET T. *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

MANDAVILLE, PETER. *Islam and Politics*. 3rd ed. Routledge, 2020.

MARDIN, ŞERIF. "Center-Periphery Relations: A Key to Turkish Politics?" *Daedalus* 102, no. 1 (1973): 169–190. www.jstor.org/stable/20024114.

POPE, NICOLE, and HUGH POPE. *Turkey Unveiled: A History of Modern Turkey*. The Overlook Press, 1998.

QUTB, SAYYID. *Social Justice in Islam*. Translated by John B. Hardie and Hamid Algar. Islamic Publications International, 2000.

SEVINÇ, KENAN, RALPH W. HOOD JR., and THOMAS J. COLEMAN III. "Secularism in Turkey." In *The Oxford Handbook of Secularism*, edited by Phil Zuckerman and John R. Shook, 155–171. Oxford University Press, 2017. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199988457.013.10.

VAN BRUINESSEN, MARTIN. "The Governance of Islam in Two Secular Polities: Turkey's Diyanet and Indonesia's Ministry of Religious Affairs," *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 27 (2018): 1–3, 5. DOI:10.4000/ejts.5964.

WITTE, JOHN, JR., and BRIAN KAUFMAN. "Law and Religion in American Education." In *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American Education*, edited by Michael D. Waggoner and Nathan C. Walker, 229–243. Oxford University Press, 2018. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199386819.013.21.

ZÜRCHER, ERIK J. *Turkey: A Modern History*. 3rd ed. I.B. Tauris, 2004.

RECONCILIATION HAS A MOTHER TONGUE: CANADA'S EFFORTS TOWARD THE RECOGNITION AND REVITALIZATION OF INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

CHELSEA DENDE

As stated in Calls to Action 13-17 by Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission of (TRC), revitalizing Indigenous language and culture is a vital component of achieving true reconciliation. This paper examines how colonial assimilation has had a devastating impact on Indigenous peoples' ability to pass down their linguistic traditions and inter-generational knowledge. While legislation milestones, such as the 2019 Indigenous Languages Act and the Commissioner's Office, represent progress, there remain many systemic barriers to implementing this legislation and persistent fiscal neglect that continues to hinder these efforts. The extent to which Canada achieves a level of "positive peace" relies on its ability to move away from mere symbolic gestures and instead, prioritize sincere structural justice and progress. Currently, Canada's legislative framework does not include adequate funding to dismantle the colonial structures and systems established to diminish the use of Indigenous language, highlighting the necessity of continued long-term support for the development, advancement, and resurgence of Indigenous cultures and communities.

Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action (TRC) exhibit a vision of Canada in which Indigenous peoples can regain dignity and reconnect with their culture, following countless generations of colonization and assimilation. The varied progress made toward implementing the Calls to Action has led to a question of whose priorities are guiding Canadian reconciliation efforts, and in what ways government-led frameworks are limiting or facilitating the resurgence and revitalization of language and culture in Indigenous communities and throughout Canada. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action 13-17 provide significant context in supporting Canada's progress toward full reconciliation as opposed to mere coexistence. As expressed in Call 13, a major part of Indigenous dignity restoration begins with a substantial shift in how the law views Indigenous rights as irrevocably connected to language rights. Furthermore, Call 14 demands an Indigenous Languages Act, which would represent a foundational legislative structure to recognize the importance of these languages, honour treaty obligations, and emphasize that revitalization efforts must be led and supported by Indigenous communities through long-term federal investment. Call 15 seeks an Aboriginal Languages Commissioner to help promote and preserve Indigenous languages, whilst Call 16 requests for the provision of greater Indigenous language mediums of instruction in post-secondary programs. Lastly, in supporting Indigenous identity reclamation, Call 17 articulates that Canada must eliminate administrative burdens and financial barriers for residential school survivors and families seeking to restore traditional names on official state documentation. While there have been symbolic actions by Canada in response to preserving and revitalizing Indigenous language and culture, the Canada's inadequate funding and promotion of Indigenous-led programs has limited the ability for these initiatives to move toward positive peace as a result of significant structural barriers that continue to support culturally-based inequalities. Given this, positive peace is not merely the absence of open conflict; it is the presence of social and structural justice that allows language and culture to grow and flourish. This essay will discuss the effects of language and cultural loss and what measures can be taken toward reconciliation. Ultimately, Canada cannot achieve the metamorphic commitments necessary to foster a true resurgence of Indigenous identity and language until the state places priority on Indigenous-led frameworks and eliminates barriers created through systemic structures.

Language and culture loss have had severe effects on Indigenous peoples and communities. For over a century, residential schools abused and acculturated Indigenous children, disrupting ties with their language and culture. Onowa McIvor and Jessica Ball, researchers from the University of Victoria in Indigenous revitalization and education, asserted that the prohibition of Indigenous language and culture in residential schools generated and exacerbated the near extinction of many languages and traditions.[1] The loss of a language is not simply the loss of communication: it is the loss of indispensable Indigenous traditions that have lasted for thousands of years. The inability of Indigenous Elders to communicate and pass on traditional knowledge to their grandchildren in their ancestral language has resulted in the dilution of centuries of folklore and inter-generational traditions.[2] Unlike other languages within Canada, Indigenous peoples cannot rely on new immigrants or other states to maintain and preserve their language and culture.[3] The federal government's enactment of the Indigenous Languages Act in 2019 in response to the Calls to Action helped to fulfill Call 14. The TRC recognizes language restoration as indispensable to rebuilding Indigenous cultural continuity and collective identity after years of structural violence.

---

[1]McIvor and Ball, "Language-in-Education Policies and Indigenous Language Revitalization Efforts in Canada," 15.
[2]Khawaja, "Consequences and Remedies of Indigenous Language Loss in Canada," 4-5.
[3]McIvor et al., "Language and Culture as Protective Factors for At-Risk Communities," 7.

The acknowledgement of Indigenous language and culture rights are fundamental to maintaining collective identity and cultural autonomy within Indigenous peoples in Canada. There will need to be structural changes made to preserve the continuous practice of Indigenous language and culture. Onowa McIvor, Art Napoleon, and Kerissa M. Dickie stated that for language programs to be successful, the programs must go past mere gestures to provide community-based support of language programs that incorporate language use into the daily lives of their participants.[4] Currently, many Indigenous language programs remain marginalized from the curriculum and independent from the government.[5] The government must take action by enacting new programs, policies, and accommodations for Indigenous learners. Masud Khawaja, an Associate Professor and specialist in Human Resources from the University of the Fraser Valley, proposed a solution of lower admission requirements for Indigenous students and rewards or paid positions within institutions for passing language and culture courses to rectify high dropout rates within Indigenous communities and incentivize the learning of Indigenous language and culture.[6] Educational reforms are essential to the fulfillment of Call to Action 14, which requires that there be language policies enacted into law to help protect and promote Indigenous languages.[7] For young learners, early immersion programs instructed in Indigenous languages can result in more fluent individuals.[8] By providing safe spaces for learners to acquire knowledge of their ancestral language and culture, educational institutions have a major role in assisting with the revitalization of Indigenous language and culture. The establishment of safe spaces in schools is a real-world example of what positive peace can look like: the creation of new cultural systems that replace those destroyed by colonialism.

Beyond localized education, it will be necessary to foster greater inclusivity in national policies that provide equal status to Indigenous languages, with English and French, in terms of providing mediums of instruction for students in schools across Canada.[9] The inclusion of Indigenous languages in the national curriculum would allow for better learning and contribute to the elimination of past stigmas and fears regarding the use of Indigenous languages in Canada.[10] The TRC states that to achieve the goal of establishing Indigenous language programs that are truly successful[11] In the area of funding, the TRC calls for a dedicated funding stream for Indigenous language programs, and for the funding to reflect the diversity of

[4]McIvor et al., 14.
[5]McIvor and Ball, 15.
[6]Khawaja, 8.
[7]*Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*, 2.
[8]Khawaja, 7.
[9]McIvor and Ball, 16-17.
[10]Khawaja, 6.
[11]Khawaja, 6.

Indigenous languages and culture. Consequently, to achieve language revitalization, the power and decision-making authority must be returned to the Indigenous communities that were impacted by colonialism's suppression of Indigenous culture, along with support and reparations from the government. By shifting the focus toward community-based autonomy, a foundation for language revitalization by those with lived experiences and Indigenous cultural values can be ensured and strengthened.

Canada's actions in response to the TRC Calls to Action have been inconsistent and hampered by structural and economic barriers. The Canadian government only issued its formal apology for residential schools in 2008, after more than a century of the schools' operation.[12] Desiree Louis, in her article "Peace-Building in Canada," argues that "[s]ettler violence against Indigenous peoples is woven into the fabric of Canadian history in an unbroken thread from past to present that we must now unravel."[13] Thus, the passage of the Indigenous Languages Act in 2019 was a major step toward reconciliation; recognizing Indigenous languages as deserving of federal support and establishing new mechanisms to facilitate national coordination among Indigenous language authorities.[14] The creation of an Indigenous Languages Commissioner's office was a positive movement toward the Calls for accountability and promotion, fulfilling the request of Call to Action 15.[15] However, while these initiatives are symbolically important steps toward reconciliation and recognition of Indigenous rights, they do not entirely achieve the level of goal attainment expected from them. McIvor and Ball assert that "there is currently no formal infrastructure to support the creation and maintenance of Indigenous language education programs countrywide."[16] Canada is currently a signatory of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP): a United Nations act to formally recognize and support Indigenous self-determination, territorial reclamation, and culture revitalization. Nonetheless, it had taken more than a decade of opposition and endorsement for UNDRIP to receive royal assent.[17] While there have been numerous examples of Indigenous language community groups and programs, Canadian funding and investment fall short of what is needed to provide and maintain these services.[18] These instances of under-funding and delayed acknowledgement make it difficult to establish sustainable planning and efforts toward language and culture revitalization. Unless there is enough funding to support a new structure of positive peace, the government will only reach negative peace. It will not establish the needed structure of positive

[12]Khawaja, 8.
[13]Louis, "Peace-Building in Canada."
[14]McIvor and Ball, 18.
[15]Khawaja, 8.
[16]McIvor and Ball, 24.
[17]McIvor and Ball, 18.
[18]McIvor and Ball, 18.

peace that would allow for full cultural and linguistic resurgence. Therefore, while Canada has moved legislatively to respond to the TRC Calls to Action, it has not established the conditions necessary for greater Indigenous language and culture revitalization.

Canada's attempts to fulfill the TRC's language and culture Calls to Action exhibit how difficult it is to amend and improve the damage toward Indigenous peoples caused by years of cultural assimilation, displacement, and abuse. Language loss continues to have negative effects on Indigenous peoples' communities. It prevents them from passing down traditional knowledge, contributing to quantifiable harms to their overall emotional and social well-being. However, revitalizing Indigenous languages and culture can be accomplished through long-term programs that support and promote language and cultural education. Although Canada has made some progress toward the acknowledgment of Indigenous linguistic rights, its progress is limited and ultimately constrained by colonialist structures and underfunding. Reconciliation is not only about recognizing historical injustices: it is about ensuring that Indigenous peoples are given the means to express their language and traditions. It is about affirming their identity and providing them with the resources to achieve greater connections with themselves, their communities, and their land.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

KHAWAJA, MASUD. "Consequences and Remedies of Indigenous Language Loss in Canada." *Societies* 11, no. 3 (2021): 1-12. DOI: 10.3390/soc11030089.

LOUIS, DESIREE. "Peace-Building in Canada." Medium. July 27, 2021. https://medium.com/@desireehana.louis/peace-building-in-canada-19adfa67239e.

MCIVOR, ONOWA, ART NAPOLEON, and KERISSA M. DICKIE. "Language and Culture as Protective Factors for At-Risk Communities." *Journal of Aboriginal Health* 5, no. 1 (2009): 1-25. DOI: 10.18357/ijih51200912327.

MCIVOR, ONOWA and JESSICA BALL. "Language-in-Education Policies and Indigenous Language Revitalization Efforts in Canada: Considerations for Non-Dominant Language Education in the Global South." *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education* 5, no. 3 (2019): 12-28. DOI: 10.32865/fire201953174.

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION OF CANADA. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action.* Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015. www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/indigenous-people/aboriginal-peoples-documents/calls_to_action_english2.pdf.