Perspectives in HISTORY

ALPHA BETA PHI

CHAPTER

PHI ALPHA THETA

VOL. IV No. 1 FALL 1988

JOURNAL OF THE ALPHA BETA PHI
CHAPTER OF PHI ALPHA THETA

Perspectives
in
HISTORY

Perspectives in History is a semi-annual publication of the Alpha Beta Phi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. Manuscripts are welcome from students and faculty.

Send all articles, essays and book reviews to:
Northern Kentucky University
History/Geography Department
Highland Heights, KY 41076

CONTENTS

Perspectives in History
Vol. IV No. 1, Fall, 1988

FOREWORD

My year as President of the Alpha Beta Phi chapter of Phi Alpha Theta has been one of the most fulfilling episodes of my life. Despite the heavy workload of my other student offices, I have managed to derive a great deal of enjoyment from the Phi Alpha Theta Presidency.

This year our chapter sponsored a tour of the Northern Kentucky Civil War forts. Roger Adams, one of our distinquished history majors, led the excursion in full Union battle dress. Aside from being an intellectually stimulating event, it was an enjoyable social experience as well. In December, 1989 representatives of the chapter attended the American Historical Association conference in Cincinnati. Our book sale, newly instituted bake sale and trip to the Patton Museum at Fort Knox helped finish out a very successful year.

I am deeply appreciative of the assistance Dr. James Ramage, our faculty advisor, has provided us. Without his unending help, much of what our chapter accomplished this year would not have been possible.

I would like to further thank Ms. Shirley Raleigh, Ms. Amelia Maldonado, and Dr. W. Michael Ryan, Chair of the History and Geography Department, for their full support and assistance to Alpha Beta Phi. These people exemplify the familial spirit of the Northern Kentucky University History and Geography Department.

Finally, I wish to congratulate those students and professors whose articles were accepted for this edition of the journal. Your essays effectively represent the collective intellect of the University Community.

Sincerely,

J. Scott Kappas
Editor

Equal by Gender: An Essay

by Michael C.C. Adams

In 1776, rebels in the British north American colonies sought to justify their armed opposition to constituted authority by issuing a list of grievances which included a statement of principle about basic human rights which the British authorities allegedly were violating. This statement asserted that mankind are created equal and have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This statement was not an accurate reflection of the political situation in the rebel-held areas at the time and its primary author, Thomas Jefferson, did not intend it as a literal representation of reality. Rather, he meant that gentlemen of property and standing like himself should have been included in the British ruling clique. However, this is not what he said because such a statement would have failed to rally the support of the common people needed to win a revolution.[1]

What he said was that all people are created equal. In the decades after the revolution, common white men, coming economically and socially into their own in the wide-open new states, insisted that the Declaration must apply to them. They rioted in the major cities and otherwise made it clear that they expected the rights to vote and hold office, and that the door of opportunity must be open to them. So that in 1828 a gentleman of property and breeding, John Quincy Adams, was turned out of the White House in favor of a self-made man, Andrew Jackson, carried into office on a surge of upstart white-male democracy. By the time of the Civil War most white men had claimed their full political rights and social opportunities under the Declaration.[2]

But then the process of extension of equality drastically slowed down. These same white men, themselves recipients of rights under the new American principles, were reluctant to extend equality to others. Blacks, for example, were denied not only their civil but their human rights and eminent jurists were employed to explain that Afro-Americans had not been deemed people by the Founders and thus could not be included in American liberties. It took the courage of black and white abolitionists and a bloody civil war to establish the humanity of Afro-Americans. But their equality remained in the future. For example, there still has not been a black head coach in the National Football League.[3]

According public rights to white women was almost as begrudged as it was to blacks of both sexes. It was not until 1920, after a sixty year struggle, that women finally received constitutional acknowledgement of their right to vote, again after much suffering and abuse of those who pioneered the women's franchise movement. But the end was not yet. Discrimination in employment, economic compensation, social and political activities, even the military, continued to handicap all blacks and white women. In 1982 sufficient states failed to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment that they blocked the statement that it is illegal to discriminate

---

Dr. Michael C.C. Adams is Professor of History at Northern Kentucky University and is a member of Phi Alpha Theta.

on sexual grounds.[4]

It is difficult to see that legal discrimination is compatible with the concept that all citizens have certain inalienable rights and it sometimes appears that the dominant political majority has spent much of the last two hundred years repudiating the sentiments embodied in the Declaration. At the same time, the opponents of gender equality (which is what the women's rights movement is about in the end) sincerely believe that basic values crucial to the welfare of society are at stake. They believe that the cultural health of America relies on gender discrimination. Why?

Crucially, all arguments against gender equality ultimately contend that the maintenance of the traditional family structure is at stake. Take women out of the home and an institution which has remained unchanged for thousands of years and which is at the basis of stability in western culture will crumble. This argument rests on several profound misreadings of current reality and western history. The majority of middle-class women work outside the home today as their sisters in the industrial working class have done for two hundred years. They do this partly because of economic dictates and the family has not collapsed as a result of it.

The family has not collapsed because it is based, not on the presence of a woman by every kitchen sink, but on links of kinship which have proved stronger than massive change over the course of history. It is a myth that relationships and roles in the family have remained static over centuries. Family roles have altered with the changing circumstances of the community. Thus in Puritan circles, confronted by a generally alien and hostile environment, including the American wilderness, the family seems to have drawn closer and to have been based more on love, a shared bonding, than on the business ties and legalities which dominated the view of marriage and family in much of Europe.[5]

It is also a myth that the strength of the family has always been based on women staying at home to look after children. Until the very recent past there was not such a thing as childhood. Children were put to work as soon as they were able and, in upper-class families they were farmed out into the households of relatives or well-placed friends where they were trained for their roles in life away from the distracting love and friction inherent in the child-parent relationship. In Britain this upper-class apprenticeship developed into the elite public school system whereby children before puberty are still sent away for most of the year to live in single-sex boarding schools. It is yet to be shown that the products of this system are any less well-adjusted for life or success than are the products of the bourgeois nuclear family.[6]

The image of the middle class mother at home devotedly raising her children comes to us from the very recent past, from the Victorians in fact. It was the Victorians who invented childhood and then invented middle-class motherhood to go along with it. As with so much change in our society, these Victorian roles were technology-driven. It is a peculiarity of our culture to assume that we can have massive daily technical change without radically altering our social norms and basic values. It is estimated that the introduction of every tractor on the land made ten farm workers redundant, driving the bulk into the city to labor in non-traditional ways which were alien to them. Again, we fail to realize that the telephone and computer

have not only revolutionized the way in which we communicate but have robbed us of essential privacies which only a few years ago were deemed vital to our personal security and sanctity. The computer and traditional ways are incompatibles.[7]

Technology has wrought massive changes in our value system. Thus, in the medieval period, the introduction of the stirrup, an increase in the output of iron mines, the development of the mold-board plough and the three-field system of agriculture together led to the rise of the mounted knight. His triumph at Hastings in 1066 not only overthrew the ruling Saxon dynasty of England but led to a diminution in the status of women. For knightly society was a warrior society and women were not respected. The term *man*, which in Anglo-Saxon meant a person or human being, was narrowed by the Norman conquerors to mean a male, specifically a man-at-arms. Women, who were not warriors, were stripped of their right to own land, their rank as counsellors of state, their positions in the Church which was dominated by males, God's spiritual warriors in the war on sin. And all this because of the stirrup.[8]

The invention of the chimney in the twelfth century also changed family relationships, particularly between spouses. Before the chimney, all members of a household, including servants, slept together before the big fire in the Great Hall, huddled close for warmth. The introduction of the chimney meant that private chambers could be individually warmed by a fireplace. Here man and wife could lie together, enjoying a new privacy and intimacy. But, of course, there is little good without bad. So that the introduction of private chambers meant a large increase in political conniving and backstairs intrigue, sometimes called diplomacy. And there could also be extra-marital liaisons or affairs, sometimes called courtly love.[9]

The Victorians lived through the greatest technical innovation of all times: they lived at the height of the industrial revolution. The steam engine harnessed to the machine capable of producing interchangeable parts gave us the world of mass-produced material abundance in which we live. The industrial revolution brought massive, unrelenting social change. Much of this was good. People lived better than they ever had. They could afford to read mass-produced books and magazines as they sat on machine-tooled furniture in homes built of factory-ripped board with popular prints on the walls and on the table a meal of commercially-processed foods and fresh produce rushed to the city by steam engine. And the whole scene was gloriously lit by gaslight, another modern marvel. But even good change is stressful and there was plenty in the Victorian situation to be stressed about. Man began to live by artificial time, going to work not with the sun but at the sound of the factory bell, taking journeys which began and ended not at his convenience but on railroad time. Most importantly, paid labor was taken out of the home. If ever a huge blow was struck at the traditional family it was when industrial capitalism put work in the artificial world of the factory and the office.[10]

Until this time, most people had worked at home, farming, and engaged in the many cottage industries or crafts carried on by families under their own roof. With the factory system, hundreds of thousands were forced to leave home in the morning for their shift at the plant. And small care there was for the working parents forced to leave their children along with tens of others in the charge of some oldster who

of necessity drugged the youngsters with opium to keep them docile. This change led to a gender gap in the middle class, for the bourgeois male was increasingly away as a manager or owner in the industrial city while his wife stayed home. Why? We are still not fully certain but this much we do know: the new wealth produced by the factory meant that middle class women and children did not have to work. And so they did not, partly because, as Thorstein Veblen said, a man increasingly wanted to show his financial success, the extent of his possessions; and his wife and children, decked out as unproductive ornaments, showed how much he could afford and how little he needed their productive labor. In short, women and children became victims of conspicuous consumption.[11]

But there was more to it than this. Exciting as material growth was, it also had the drawback of making everyone greedy; the more you had, the more you wanted. It seemed that males, deeply involved in the competition of the marketplace, were becoming hard and ruthless, immune to the traditional values of charity and compassion. Spiritual life was strangling in a welter of materialism. Henry David Thoreau sounded a warning note to Americans in *Walden* while across the Atlantic Charles Dickens lashed out at the insensitive capitalist in *A Christmas Carol*. Who could save middle-class man from himself? Well, woman, of course. Safely at home, out of the dog-eat-dog competition of the marketplace, she had preserved intact traditional values. She would raise the children in caring ways, she would soften man's aggressive demeanor, take the rough edges off his animal nature. Thus the woman as wife and mother came to be seen as the light of the home, the angel in the house.[12]

The role worked to a degree. Many Victorian and post-Victorian middle-class women operated as first-rate home managers, providing a clean, well-lit, well-run haven in a heartless world of soot, sweat, and competition. They preached gentleness and caring, they raised their children in manners and civility. But the role was built on a profound contradiction: woman could not operate effectively as man's moral mentor when she was legally and in fact under his domination, bound to his will. Moreover, the artificial division between outside labor and the home left many women desperately short of intellectual stimulation. Some went mad, a situation brilliantly evoked by Charlotte Perkins Gilman in her autobiographical short story, *The Yellow Wallpaper*.[13]

It is this role of women as guardian angels of traditional morality which many people nostalgically hearken back to today and which they incorrectly believe has been at the base of our civilization for thousands of years. The role began to collapse not so much because women resented it as because the technology which created it then undercut it. Labor-saving devices took servants and home-management out of the middle-class house, leaving only bridge parties and coffee klatches. The car and the television robbed American parents of whatever moral authority they had once had over their children: you could do what you wanted in the back seat of a Model T or a Volkswagen; Mom had no chance to compete with television programs and commercials which actually dominate juvenile behavior. Finally, materialism won in American life. Owning things is crucial. So that most middle-class families assume that they are deprived if they do not have at least two color television sets,

a VCR, cable, stereo, microwave and conventional ovens, three to four cars, and enough money to do whatever they want in their spare time. To help buy these goods and services, woman's income is increasingly needed from work performed outside the home. And her presence within the family is less important, save as a taxi driver for the enormous round of children's outside activities, because technology has rendered such institutions as the family dinner and the evening of shared conversation virtually extinct.[14]

What is most damaging about the angel in the house role was that it divided up human qualities on gender lines, so that none of us were allowed the full range of normal human feelings and abilities. It is the reintegration of the human personality that gender equality is all about. There is no scientific evidence to show that all women inevitably make better parents than men or that women have a more developed moral sense. Until the Great Awakening and the industrial revolution, it was generally assumed that woman was more sensual, more alert to animal appetite, than man. Similarly, it is not true that all men are tough by nature, instinctively reject overt expression of emotion, or wish to be competitors. By dividing up attributes along gender lines, we have denied many women legitimate careers in the public sphere and many men meaningful roles in their homes and families. Those who still accept the rigid distribution of role by gender can find that the trade-offs are costly. Women accept male protection at the expense of staying dependents unable to provide for themselves. The all-providing male can expect to keel over considerably before his wife. Sexual, like racial, discrimination harms all of us. Thus many men refuse to pay child support because they leave court outraged by a system which is still Victorian and therefore assumes that their primary relationship to the child is financial and that all indispensable emotional links are to the mother.[15]

Division of human abilities along gender lines continues to deny the United States the services of women at the highest leadership levels. Women, it is intimated, are not tough enough for top command. So often, Americans seem to describe the Presidency as though the incumbent were a security guard at a raucous public event, always expecting to have to bully up to a rowdy. It is part of the peculiar paranoia incumbent upon America's superpower role that the President's function is conceived as being to fight the first and last nuclear war against Russsia. Actually, the role of the President is to head a complex, industrially-advanced nation with a myriad of domestic and foreign problems, each of which requires intellectual nuance and human subtlety for solution. There is no reason to suppose that the female intelligence is less apt for this work than the male. Moreover, even if we were to accept the tough guy scenario, women leaders around the world have shown no less ability to play hardball politics than have males. I instance Margaret Thatcher in Britain, Golda Meir in Israel, and Indira Gandhi of India. Again, it is part of the myopia which usually afflicts great powers that Americans see no precedent for themselves in the lives of these women.[16]

Myopia also bedevils the debate concerning women and the military. A powerful argument against the ERA was that it would mean the drafting of women and the placing of them in combat roles. This in turn would lead to America's

military ruin. The argument is flawed. To begin with, no major nation should make crucial social decisions on the basis of hypothetical military considerations. Nineteenth-century Prussian culture became dominated by obsessive military concerns with obvious consequences in the twentieth century. Second, the question of a military draft is highly complex and would merit a whole article in itself. But the efficiency of the draft, as well as its morality, is not primarily a gender issue. The all-male draft used to fight the Vietnam war proved to be far from fair or effective. Many specialists would like to see the United States abandon altogether the concept of a draft and embrace an all-professional army like Britain's, on the grounds of greater morale and efficiency. In this case, the United States would need to accept all potential female volunteers in order to meet minimally acceptable numbers for personnel in the defence establishment. As Major General Jeanne Holm put it: "the ability of the President to keep his commitment to build the nation's defences without conscription may very well turn on the question of women."[17]

We should not ignore the fact that women have faced combat all around the world in the twentieth century, from resistance fighters in France, Italy and Poland during World War II, to Russian marines, Israeli commados, Salvadoran and Vietnamese guerrillas. British women in RAF Fighter Command were on the front line during the Battle of Britain and British and American nurses have served in battle zones throughout the twentieth century. Will male soldiers be distracted in battle by their felt need to protect their female colleagues? The problem here lies not with the soldierly qualities of the female but in the attitude of the undisciplined male whose benevolent condescension would be misplaced in the front lines. Nobody has yet suggested that the love and care between male soldiers, a bond often stronger than that between men and women, has stopped men from doing their duty. Rather, the buddy system is thought to increase combat cohesion in a unit. The argument of male distraction was used to try to keep women out of the military nursing system (doctors' knives would slip) but this has not proved to be a problem.[18]

If we are really concerned about injury to women, we should do well to concentrate on peacetime reality rather than on wartime fiction. American women face astonishing levels of violence. Between 1975 and 1977, more than one million American women *reported* being beaten by the men they lived with (many others dare not seek assistance). One in four American women will be raped by American males. Until recently, both police and courts have shown a deeply cynical disregard for the victims of what amounts to a war between the sexes. This hatred shows the real danger inherent in a radical division between the sexes. Since the Victorian period, we have overloaded the emotional circuits between men and women, particularly between mothers and their male offspring who not only give their mothers their primary love but also their hate as the first and often most memorable authority figures in their lives.[19]

To lessen the gender gap might ease some of these problems. At the same time, gender equality is not incompatible with common sense. It does not mean that we must all go to the same restrooms or that every other NFL quarterback must be female. When slavery was under attack, opponents of freedom said that every black

man would demand to marry a white woman if given civil rights. The theme still had crowd appeal when D. W. Griffith used it to aid racial intolerance in his film *The Birth of a Nation*. Are we still prone to bugaboos or have we matured since then?[20]

Change is inevitable, especially in a society as fast-paced and technologically-oriented as the United States. The question is whether we can understand what is happening to us and sift out change that is beneficial from change that is not. Charles Darwin noted that those species most likely to survive are those which best adapt to alterations in their environment. The society which has clear goals by which to judge change is probably likely to adapt well to shifting circumstances. The United States was fortunate in that at its inception it had a document which could be used to guide progressive development for the good of all. The Declaration of Independence pointed the way toward an American dream which was inclusive, large-hearted, generous. Today, American public postures can suggest that there is a loss of faith in Jefferson's truths, that Americans are becoming insecure, afraid of losing what they have, prepared to pursue an exclusive vision, shutting out the aspirations not only of many of their own citizens but struggling peoples around the world. The United States shares with South Africa the distinction of being the only other western nation to have no comprehensive national health-care program. Can it be that all America's allies have gone "communist," "liberal?" Or is it that Jefferson's right to life can be reasonably restated in the late twentieth century to mean the right to basic medical attention irrespective of class or caste? Is it possible that a strong nation is a healthy nation? Can a nation which is not equal continue to be strong as we approach the twenty-first centruy? America's military leadership of the western world is undisputed but America's moral leadership is less certain of universal acceptance today. Is it possible that in the United States the Declaration of Independence has become just an historical document, an arcane instrument once used to help win a long-gone rebellion?[21]

Endnotes

1. Contrary to popular myth, the bulk of men who fought the revolution were not middle-class militiamen but rank and file commoners of the Continental line. As the British paid more to private soldiers, the rebels had to make additional appeals. See James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, *A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic* (Arlington Heights, Ill., 1982) on the nature of the rebel army.

2. A good local study of upsurging white-male democracy is Dixon Ryan Fox, *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York* (New York, 1965). On Jackson's election see Robert V. Remini, *The Election of Andrew Jackson* (Philadelphia, 1963), and on Jackson as a representative man, John William Ward, *Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age* (Oxford, 1955).

3. On violence against abolitionists see Leonard L. Richards, *"Gentlemen of Property and Standing": Anti-abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America* (New York, 1971) and Michael Feldberg, *The Turbulent Era: Riot and Disorder in Jacksonian America* (New York, 1980).

4. On continuing discrimination see, for instance, Lois W. Banner, *Women in Modern America: A Brief History* 2d. ed. (San Diego, 1984), 267 & 269. The women's suffrage movement is described in Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggle: The Women's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).

5. See Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family* (New York, 1966), esp. ch. 2.

6. On upper-class apprenticeship see, for instance, George Duby, *William Marshal: The Flower of Chivalry* (New York, 1985), 68ff. A good introduction to the rise of the English public school is John Chandos, *Boys Together: English Public Schools 1800-1864* (New Haven, 1984). For a similar study of the United States see James McLachlan, *American Boarding Schools: A Historical Study* (New York, 1970). When looking at sex roles we often make the simplistic assumption that since the dawn of pre-history men have brought home the bacon and women have cooked it. For a brief discussion of anthropological findings on the origin of roles see Carol Tarvis and Carole Wade, The *Longest War: Sex Differences in Perspective* 2d. ed. (San Diego, 1984), ch. 8.

7. For basic insight into the factor of technology as an agent of social change I am indebted to Gary Wills, *Reagan's America: Innocents at Home* (Garden City, N.Y., 1987), esp. ch. 40. On the Victorian invention of childhood see Barbara Kaye Greenleaf, *Children Through the Ages: A History of Childhood* (New York, 1978), 102ff.

8. Lynn White, Jr., Medieval Technology and Social Change (Oxford, 1964). The stirrup allowed for the couched lance with tremendous shock power, iron was made into chain mail to protect the knight, advances in agriculture meant that there was a sufficient surplus (especially of oats for the horses) to feed the warrior and his retinue. Doris Stenton, *The English Woman in History* (London, 1957), esp. pp. 1-28, and Christine Fell *et. al., Women in Anglo-Saxon England and the Impact of 1066* (Bloomington, 1984), esp. chs. 1, 8, & 9.

9. James Burke, *Connections* (Boston, 1978), 155-162.

10. There are many works which explore technology and nineteenth century social change. The best include Leo Marx, *The Machine In the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York, 1964), H. J. Habakkuk, *American and British Technology in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1967), Richard D. Brown, *Modernization: The Transformation of American Life* (Prospect Heights, Ill., 1976), John F. Kasson, *Civilizing the Machine* (New York, 1977). On the stress created by the railroad, see Gerald B. Cauvar and Gerald C. Sorenson, eds. *The Victorian Mind* (New York, 1969), 109-119.

11. Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York, 1953), esp. 41-79. First published 1899.

12. *Walden* was first published in 1854. See esp. ch. 1. *A Christmas Carol* was published in 1843. There are many works which discuss the angel in the house role. A good introduction is Harvey Green *The Light of the Home* (New York, 1983), esp. chs. 1 and 2. The southern belle represents a distinctive variant of the nineteenth-century female image and differs somewhat from the pattern I am suggesting in the text. Most obviously, the south was largely rural, not urban-industrial. Yet there are many common factors. The changes which created the cotton south were technologically driven, including the invention of the cotton gin, and the planters soon acquired an unsavory reputation for rapacious exploitation of people and the soil. Southern men were also assumed to exercise their animal passions on slave women. Thus the planter's wife was expected to exercise a moderating influence on the economic and sexual excesses of the male. Joseph G. Baldwin, *The Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi* (New York, 1957), esp. 59-64 on southern economic rapacity. On the woman's role D. R. Hundley, *Social Relations in our Southern States* (New York, 1860), 73-74, and Catherine Clinton, *The Plantation Mistress* (New York, 1982).

13. *The Yellow Wallpaper* in Ann J. Lane, ed., *The Charlotte Perkins Gilman Reader* (New York, 1980), 3-20.

14. A good discussion of domestic technology is Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of Housework* (New York, 1981).

15. On earlier views of women's sensuality see, for instance, Joseph Klaits, *Servants of Satan: The Age of the Witch Hunts* (Bloomington, 1985), 51-59. Klaits points out that women, not men, were distrusted for their sexuality and accused of having physical relations with evil spirits in their sabbat meetings. Even in the Victorian period an undercurrent of belief in woman's uncleanness continued. See, for instance, Bram Dijkstra, *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-De-Siecle Culture* (New York, 1986).

16. There are almost no scientifically verifiable basic differences between men and women save in their ability to give birth. See John Nicholson, *Men and Women: How Different Are They?* (Oxford, 1984), esp. 1 & 68. On paranoia in public policy see Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York, 1967). On the macho tradition, Rupert Wilkinson, *American Tough: The Tough-Guy Tradition and Ameri-*

can Character (New York, 1986).

17. Holm is quoted in Martha A. Marsden, "The Continuing Debate: Women Soldiers in the U. S. Army," in David R. Segal and H. Wallace Sinaiko, *Life in the Rank and File* (Washington, 1986), 75.

18. A good start on finding out about women in combat can be made by reading Shelley Saywell, *Women in War* (New York, 1986). On sex as a distracting factor in military medicine see, for instance, Vera Brittain, *Testament of Youth* (London, 1933), 327, and Enid Bagnold, *A Diary Without Dates* (London, 1978), viii, 15, 30. Typical experiences of a nurse in Vietnam are recorded in Lynda Van Devanter with Christopher Morgan, *Home Before Morning: The Story of an Army Nurse in Vietnam* (New York, 1984).

19. Ulku U. Bates *et. al., Women's Realities, Women's Choices* (New York, 1983), 466-469. On November 21, 1988, *Time* reported, "At what point does the love game turn into a war game, whose body count is one rape reported every six minutes in the U.S. and one rape in four involving multiple attackers" (127). The hatred engendered between the sexes by women being the primary care givers is explored in Dorothy Dinnerstein, *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise* (New York, 1977) and Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley, 1978).

    Women are often reluctant to give up their special relation to children because it has given them immense direct power to mold society, but genuine equality implies equal parenting and a balanced role for men. This point is made by Betty Friedan in *The Second Stage* (New York, 1981), esp. 91-93.

20. *The Birth of a Nation*, based on Thomas Dixon's novel *The Clansman* (1905), was released in 1915.

21. On other nations' involvement with the American Revolution see Richard B. Morris, *The Emerging Nations and the American Revolution* (New York, 1970).

Jennie Davis Porter: A Leader of Black Education in Cincinnati

by Lesley Robinson

Jennie Davis Porter was a native Cincinnatian who deserves much more recognition than she has received. She was born in Cincinnati in 1876 to William and Ethlinda Davis Porter. Her father was one of Cincinnati's first black undertakers while her mother, who influenced Jennie Porter, was one of the city's first black teachers. Jennie Porter founded schools for black students and established a curriculum to equal or surpass that of white schools, making her a significant figure in the development of black education in Cincinnati.[1]

In 1893, Porter graduated from Hughes High School. Four years later, she pursued her mother's profession and began teaching at Frederick Douglass School in Walnut Hills where she remained until 1914. Although occupied with a full-time career, Porter responded to the needs of black children who flocked to Cincinnati in 1910. Many black families abandoned the South in hopes of securing a better way of life. She declared that "the majority of the migrants came from the poorest and least successful of the Negro race, who, because of their economic and social condition often suffer from insufficient food, clothing, and housing."[2] In 1911, Porter established a private kindergarten for blacks in the West End and was assisted by Annie Laws, a white benefactor, "who paid the salary of the kindergarten teachers."[3] In the beginning of the first year, the kindergarten housed seventy-two students and at the end of the year, the number of students had increased to one hundred and twenty-five.[4]

Attending college in 1918 was not an easy task as a minority student, particularly for a "mature" minority student. Porter began her college career at the age of forty-two by enrolling in the Universtiy of Cincinnati's College of Education. Black students constituted approximately three percent of the population and black faculty did not exist.[5] Coupled with this adversity was the fact that few would associate with the black students who met with discrimination in one form or another. Besides not being permitted to attend the Junior Prom, black students could not use certain recreational facilities at their own discretion. An example of this discrimination was the campus swimming pool. Black students were entitled to use the pool only on Friday nights when the water was at its filthiest.

Undaunted by the prejudice surrounding her, Porter received her Bachelor of Arts Degree in 1923. Two years later, in 1925, she acquired her Masters of Arts Degree. She also holds the prestigious honor of being the first black woman to graduate with a Doctorate of Philosophy which she achieved in 1928 at the University of Cincinnati.[6]

Believing that blacks were equal to whites, Porter felt that education was an instrument that could enable blacks to improve their living conditions. If blacks

---

Lesley Robinson is a Junior at Northern Kentucky University majoring in English.

were on the same educational level as whites, competition for jobs would be more favorable. Porter also suggested that black schools needed black administrators. "She believed that segregated schools would offer greater job opportunities for Black teachers, greater inspiration for Black youth and better preparation of Black students for the world."[7] Not only did the schools provide something for the youth, but they assisted black teachers that otherwise would not have been employed by white schools. Porter asserted that "black teachers had no chance to be hired in integrated schools."[8] Porter also demanded that in the field of education one needed "hands on experience" which led to student teaching within the Harriet Beecher Stowe School. Porter obtained her student teachers from the Universtiy of Cincinnati's College of Education and "after completing a four year university course, students were accepted as fifth year student-teachers under the observation and direction of cooperating teachers who were recommended by the University for this special work."[9]

Porter's motto was "we must lift as we climb," and she made an effort to expose children to great blacks such as George Washington Carver, Mary McCloud Bethune, and Marion Anderson.[10] Her educational techniques were successful since she could boast of such exceptional graduates as Theodore Berry, who became the first black Mayor of Cincinnati, and Dehard Hubbard who went on to become an Olympic Gold Medalist.

In 1913, because of flood, 147 black children between the ages of nine and fourteen were unable to attend school.[11] Porter reacted to the unfortunate situation by obtaining permission to have summer school for the flood victims. The school was held in the old Hughes High School building on West Fifth Street. They eventually moved to Douglass in the fall.[12]

Perhaps the establishment of the summer school led Porter to envision and later organize the school which would become the center of her life. In 1914, she established the Harriet Beecher Stowe School and was named principal; making her the first black woman to become principal of a public school in Cincinnati. Again, she was aided by the funds of Annie Laws.[13]

The Stowe School was a landmark achievement for black education and grew rapidly as a result of the Great Migration of blacks from the South . In 1914, Stowe School had 350 students and by the end of 1922 enrollment had increased to 1300 students.[14] It had a total of twenty-eight classrooms. There were two open rooms for anemic children, a kindergarten, two science rooms, two art rooms, a catering department, a laundry room, a sewing room, a print shop, a house construction room, a cabinet-making shop, a wood-working shop, a library, a swimming pool, two shower rooms, a doctor's office, a pre-natal clinic, a cafeteria, a gymnasium, and an auditorium.[15] Along with academics, vocational training and an agricultural program were offered to the student. Porter supervised the operation of the "Colored Farm," located in College Hill, where students took agricultural courses.[16]

Catering to the abilities and expectations of the children, Porter utilized I.Q. tests to place students into programs suited to their needs. Students most likely to withdraw from school after the ninth grade composed a group of average and above average I.Q.'s. The second group consisted of those with high and normal I.Q.'s

"expected to continue studies." Children with below average abilities were not forgotten. Sensitive to the demands of the mentally handicapped, Porter included special programs of study and activity. She maintained that "individuals of inferior intelligence are not neccessarily undesirable members of society."[17]

Porter tried to incorporate all aspects of life and expose the children to as many experiences as possible. Acquainting children to foreign language, music, reading, exercising, job training, socialization, and building of a high self-esteem were part of the Stowe school environment and important ideals of Porter.

Soon after founding Stowe school, Porter began a program "to mould public sentiment favorably."[18] She organized students and faculty into entertainment committees, such as band and choral groups, to play for churches, lodges, and various functions and meetings all over the city. She managed to build her school system based on the prejudice of whites on the school board who disliked the idea of blacks integrated with whites. Involving students and teachers in preparing meals for school board members was another device for attaining approval from board members. Because of her obsequious behavior toward school board members, Wendell Phillips Dabney dubbed her "Jubilee Jennie."[19] Jennie Porter and Francis Russell, also a black principal, contended "that segregated schools were crucial to the formation of black identity, could insulate Black children from White abuse, and could become vital unifying community centers."[20] Since Porter played off the prejudices of the school board, she "drew the fire of black leaders who felt her acceptance of segregation doomed blacks to inferior status."[21]

The black community began to protest segregated schools following the establishment of the Harriet Beecher Stowe School. Wendell Phillips Dabney was particularly opposed to Porter's methods. He was leader of the Black Republicans, organizer of the Douglass League, and publisher of Cincinnati's most important black newspaper, *The Union*.[22] On the subject of Stowe school, he proclaimed, "The Colored School on Fifth Street is next door to a 'white' school in which the same grades are taught, and the population of that section is mixture of all races and possesses the smallest amount of race prejudice. There is no excuse for its establishment that is worthy of acceptance."[23]

The Cincinnati Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), organized by Dabney in 1915, also spoke against segregation since they feared this policy would be applied to other situations concerning blacks, such as housing. Many prominent black leaders, in addition to Dabney, saw segregation as a step backward. Dabney, an ardent supporter of integration argued, "the whites generally favor separate schools. Regarding the Negroes as being inferior, they deplore any association with them except upon the basis of master and man, employer and servant. They are wise enough to realize that the doctrines of subserviency cannot be enforced if white children are schooled with colored, since school association and competition breed a spirit of equality, genders a feeling of respect for those who are mentally or physically superior regardless of their race or color."[24]

Citizens opposed to the construction of Harriet Beecher Stowe School held many heated debates which occurred at the Board of Education meetings. At the Board

meeting on December 8, 1919, petitions were presented which objected to the building of the Stowe School and four speakers, on behalf of the NAACP, protested segregated schools for black children. At a previous meeting, November 24, 1919, Porter had given petitions to the Board thanking them for the construction of Stowe School.[25]

Despite the fierce opposition to segregation, Porter strived to maintain the Harriet Beecher Stowe School as a functioning agent of instruction. Her dedication to advancing education for black children could not be quelled. Not only did the school provide for the exigency of education for black children, but sustained black teachers who otherwise would have been unemployed. Finally, the school acted as a socialization center for the community since many enjoyed the entertainment supplied by Stowe's choral and musical groups.

Although her life was short, Jennie Davis Porter made great strides in the field of black education. She taught public school for a total of thirty-seven years and claimed the Harriet Beecher Stowe School as "the greatest interest in my life."[26] In order to sustain Stowe School as an operating institution, Porter was not above using gratuitous tactics to serve her purposes. She adroitly dealt with the discrimination she faced from the Cincinnati Board of Education and cleverly used this prejudice to aid her students and her school. Even though some questioned her methods, none could refute her success in graduating educated and skilled black youths.

A courageous and determined individual, Porter burdened herself with the struggle of improving education and equal opportunities for blacks. On July 3, 1936, Jennie Davis Porter died at the age of fifty-eight. Undoubtedly, her presence was missed within the community. In 1953, Jennie Davis Porter High School was named in her honor in the West End.[27]

Endnotes

1. Ruth Neely, *Women of Ohio* (Cleveland, 1939), 178.

2. Michael Washington, "The Black Struggle for Quality Education and the Development of the Neighborhood School Policy: Cincinnati, Ohio, 1887-1954," (Unpublished thesis University of Cincinnati, 1988), 13. Hereinafter referred to as "Neighborhood School Policy."

3. Lyle Koehler, *Cincinnati's Black Peoples: A Chronology and Bibliography, 1787-1982* (Cincinnati, 1986), 105. Hereinafter referred to as *Cincinnati's Black Peoples.*

4. Washington, "Neighborhood School Policy," 11.

5. Truddelle Thomas, "Emeritae: Women Leaders of the University of Cincinnati," *Queen City Heritage*, 42 (Number 4, 1984), 84. Hereinafter referred to as "Women Leaders."

6. Neely, *Women of Ohio*, 178.

7. Daniel Hurley, *The Queen City Heritage* (Cincinnati, 1982), 88.

8. Koehler, *Cincinnati's Black Peoples*, 108.

9. Washington, "Neighborhood School Policy," 17.

10. Thomas, "Women Leaders," 41.

11. Koehler, *Cincinnati's Black People*, 106.

12. Washington, "The Black Struggle for Segregated Quality Education: Cincinnati, Ohio, 1954-1974" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 984), 82. Hereinafter referred to as "Quality Education."

13. Koehler, *Cincinnati's Black People*, 107.

14. Dolores Thompson and Lyle Koehler, "Educated Pioneers: Black Women at the University of Cincinnati, 1896-1940", *Queen City Heritage*, 43 (Number 4, 1985), 26.

15. Washington, "Neighborhood School Policy," 12.

16. Washington, "Quality Education," 84.

17. Washington, "Neighborhood School Policy," 14-15.

18. Koehler, *Cincinnati's Black People*, 108.

19. Washington, "Quality Education," 90.

20. Koehler, *Cincinnati's Black People*, 108.

21. Hurley, *Queen City*, 88.

22. Ibid.

23. Washington, "Quality Education," 83.

24. Ibid., 89.

25. Ibid., 86-87.

26. Neely, *Women of Ohio*, 178.

27. Ibid.

" Kid Stuff ": The Development of the Adolescent through American Literature

by Roger C. Adams

Historians have long pondered the rise of the middle class. To sociologists, psychologists, and historians alike, the rise and development of the family in Western society has been linked to politics, economics, and religion. One facet of the family, which until recently was largely ignored, is the child. It has been long held that children were mirror images of adults. Numerous studies have attempted to prove exactly when childhood or adolescence developed - a monumental task at best. Though no one can agree as to exactly when adolescence became a perceivable stage in human development, most can agree that it at least developed in the United States shortly after the Civil War. Perhaps the best evidence for this argument is the development of the toy industry. This is not to say that children hundreds, even thousands, of years ago did not have toys. In America at the height of the Victorian Era, we see the symptoms of a capitalistic "virus" feeding on the newly found market. Periodicals abound with toy advertisements aimed at youths. (But what does all of this mass marketing have to do with youth in American literature?) The development of adolescence in the United States can be followed through literature of the period.

Undoubtedly, authors in the period from 1865 to 1900 recognized a discernible difference in their own adolescence from that of the "new adolescence." Similarly, authors who were a part of this "new adolescence" during the period from 1900 to 1945 treat the subject of youth much in the same manner as their predecessors. It is not until the era of post World War II America that we see writers treating children in a style clearly devoted to adolescence. In comparing authors from both periods the roles of adolescents are strikingly similar.

In analyzing Mark Twain's literature we are aware that he used adolescents as integral characters in his stories. It is the period in which Twain grew up, though, that is the key to understanding his treatment of adolescents. Born in 1835, Samuel Clemens grew up in preindustrial America. (Twain had passed his adolescence by the time the effects of the Industrial Revolution were being fully felt.) John R. Gillis, a noted historical psychologist, points out the stages of human development in any preindustrial society from his own model which states that people like Twain went through four phases: age 0-10, childhood; age 11-20, youth; age 21-50, parenthood; and 51-on, death or retirement.

Clearly, in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885), his main character, Huck, fits the above mold. Throughout the novel Huck is thrust into parental roles, though he is only a youth. By our standards it is odd to shove children into adult roles. Today, we have expanded the model to an industrial perception: age 0-5, infancy;

Roger C. Adams is a Junior History major at Northern Kentucky University.

age 6-10, youth; age 11-21, adolescence (even higher in some models); age 22-50, parenthood; and 51-on, death or retirement. This is not to say it is unusual to see youths shoved into adolescence and adolescents shoved into parenthood. Again, Huck's experiences are a direct reflection of the period in which his creator grew up.

Huckleberry Finn represents to Twain not only experiences of his own, but a social comment of Twain's. In the industrial 1880s, when childhood was developing, attitudes and values were changing. Twain showed the difference in the youths of the two periods. Huck, who is a preindustrial youth, must look, act, and think like an adult. By the time of the book's publication society was saying, "It's okay to behave like a child to a certain age, then you progress to adolescence where you are guided and prepared for adulthood." In Twain's youth no time for preparation was permitted. The rule when he was a child was, "You're a child to this age and then you're an adult." Very little room was given for a trial and error period.

However, when we analyze one particular work of William Faulkner's (who was born in 1897 near the height of the Victorian Era) we see much of the same methods as Twain. "Barn Burning" is the story of a Civil War veteran, his inability to grasp society, his family, and his youngest son's reaction to his world. The boy, Colonel Sartoris Snopes (Sartie), faces regular abuses from his father, Abner. Sartie's abuses range from physical beatings to psychological terror (his fear of the beatings). This may seem unusual from a man such as Faulkner who grew up in America at a time when the focus was on the adolescent. The focus *was* in the right direction, but "moral fashion" of the period was dictated by Progressives led by Upton Sinclair, Lincoln Steffens, Theodore Roosevelt, and Jane Addams. They did not want to glorify the 'haves' from the 'have nots'. Rather, they fought for lower class children in sweatshops— new immigrants" as they have been referred to in the industrial North. It has also been suggested that Faulkner and many other post-Civil War southern authors neglected youths based on the vanquished South theory. This is a valid point which should be pursued in itself. However, lumping northern and southern adolescents together is not blasphemous. Most Progressives fought for children's rights whether they were in sweatshops or cotton fields. It was simply far more fashionable for authors to produce works in the style of Horatio Alger's "poor boy makes good." Therefore it is logical to assume that Faulkner and several of his contemporaries were affected by the Progressive movement to some extent.

We have seen the rise of the adolescent, historically, and noted its growth since the turn of the century, but why does not American literature from the period reflect this change in human development? It is possible that two world wars interceded by a depression are fundamental reasons. While contemporary scholars are tying to prove that the 1920s were *not* as decadent as previously believed, they are arguing that, yes, World War I did produce anti-Victorian, anti-conservative sentiments. But facets of this era were exploited by the media (radio, the press, and Hollywood) because the new generation strayed so far from President Harding's "return to normalcy." These counter-culture tendencies were professed by young, educated people. Men such as Eugene O'Neill, Ernest Hemingway, and F. Scott Fitzgerald subscribed to hedonism and to some extent, the surrealist movement. The Great

War caused profound disillusionment (Dadaism being the extreme) which in turn forced the subject of children in American literature to the back burners.

Further, the Great Depression and the United States' entry into World War II also delayed adolescent recognition. It was not until after 1945 that a preponderance of literature appeared dealing with *adolescent* themes and *adolescent* settings. Two outstanding authors and their works are prime examples of true American adolescent literature: Harper Lee's *To Kill A Mockingbird* and Richard Wright's *Black Boy*, though it can be argued that both novels have adolescent characters who are thrust into and forced to deal with adult situations. In Wright's novel the main character is exposed to brutal acts of racism and must deal with an extremely short adolescence while drawing on childhood and pre-adult beliefs and ideals. Similarly, Harper Lee uses her adolescent characters in adult situations, but they handle their situations like children—unlike Twain, Faulkner, and others who forced their adolescent characters to handle adult situations like adults.

In conclusion, it cannot be said that American authors have totally ignored the rise of adolescents. Nor can it be said that they grasped the ideas of youth and attempted to present them fairly; at least no attempt was made until after 1945. Today though, authors such as J. D. Salinger and Judy Blume are, and remain popular because they have grasped the ideas of youth and their highly visible and highly fluid roles in American society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Faulkner, William, "Barn Burning", from *The Faulkner Reader*, (New York: Modern Library), 1959.

Gillis, John R., *Youth and History*, (New York: Academic Press), 1974.

Kagan, Jerome and Coles, Robert, eds., *Twelve to Sixteen: Early Adolescence*, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.), 1972.

Larkin, Jack, *The Reshaping of Everyday Life in America: 1790-1840*, (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers), 1988.

Lee, Harper, *To Kill A Mockingbird*, (Philadelphia: Lippincott), 1960.

Plumb, J. H., "The Great Change in Children," from *Perspectives in Western Civilization, Vol. 2*, William L. Langer, ed., (New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc. New York, Evanston & London: Harper and Row, Publishers, Incorporated), 1972.

Twain, Mark, *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, (New York: Modern Library), 1885, 1985.

Wright, Richard, *Black Boy*, (New York: Harper & Brothers), 1945.

The Afro-American Experience during the Vietnam War

by Edward Fahlbush

Many blacks found themselves in Vietnam because of the inequities in the draft and because of the lack of opportunity in the United States. The Pentagon sent a higher percentage of blacks to Vietnam, thus over-representing their race. Martin Luther King, Jr. reported that "black men were being sent to Vietnam in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population."[1]

As L. Deckle McLean noted, "like many other chilly and uncompromising breezes, the military draft blows strongest through the worn brick and stained clapboard of America's black ghettos. It packs off the best the black communities have to offer. The draft is being challenged by a small but growing opposition akin to that of white protestors but nevertheless unique, based on the logic that a man should not pay the premium when he cannot get the policy." McLean wrote: "today's black draftee will be likely to find himself with a rifle in a rice paddy in Vietnam."[2]

Despite the inequities of his military service, the black draftee found life in the military less abusive than life outside. Moreover, black reenlistment rates were far above those of whites.

Black critics have argued that the draft was applied inequitably to Negroes and this is supported by facts. Hanson Baldwin of the *New York Times*, who favors the draft, suggests that "the inequities stem from the black man's civilian experience and constitute a problem which the draft can't cure, and for which it should not be blamed."[3]

The rate of black induction appears to be twice that of whites. A 1967 report by United States Representative Robert Kastenmeier, Democrat, Wisconsin, and his research assistant Stuart Applebaum, indicates that of the acceptable black men available for the draft, 64 per cent were drafted compared to 31 per cent drafted of acceptable whites.[4]

As of December 1965, Army statistics show 26.9 per cent of black men in the Army were assigned to combat units compared to 17.3 per cent for whites.[5] Jesse M. Lewis, a *Washington Post* reporter who toured Vietnam, reported that "there appeared to be a higher concentration of Negroes in airborne, infantry and cavalry units (front-line troops) than in artillery (rear-line troops). In many of the smaller combat units in Vietnam, like platoons and squads, Negroes seem to make up 60 to 70 per cent of the strength."[6] In 1967 the Scientific American reported that: "Soldiers from the lowest income groups had four times the casualty rate of those in the highest income group. Moreover, the casualty rate among Negroes was twice as high as it was among whites."[7]

An example of refusing the draft can be seen in the case of David Bell, a Student

---

Edward Fahlbush is a senior, majoring in psychology. He is a member of Alpha Beta Phi Chapter.

Noviolent Coordinating Committee official, who went to jail for two years at the Danbury (Connecticut) Federal Correctional Institute. One reason for the inequities of the draft was the lack of black representation on draft boards. Moveover, there was much bigotry among the all white staffs of draft boards. An example would be the chairman of Atlanta's draft board saying: "This nigger Julian Bond (a former SNCC officer, now a Georgia state representative), we missed him, I've always regretted that."[8]

During the 1960's, proportionally more blacks (30 per cent) than whites (18 per cent) from the draft-qualified age group were drafted. While blacks were generally no more than 11 per cent of the total enlisted personnel in Vietnam, they comprised nearly 15 per cent of all army units, and in army combat units the proportion was appreciably higher.[9] Thomas A. Johnson, a reporter for the New York Times, reported: "There were some 37,000 non-white youths drafted during that year 1967 and they represented 16.3 per cent of all men drafted during that year."[10]

There are numerous reports of mistreatment of black soldiers in Vietnam. Here is a random excerp written by a black Private First Class: "You should see for yourself how the black man is being treated over here, and the way we are dying. When it comes to rank we are left out. When it comes to special priveleges we are left out. When it comes to patrols. . . we are first."[11]

In 1966, "Black combat fatalities had dropped to 14 per cent, still proportionately higher than the 11 per cent which blacks represented in the American population."[12] Blacks faced discrimination on the battlefield in decorations, promotions and duty assignments. They endured racial insults, cross burings and Confederate flags. "The war became a double battlefield, with American soldiers against American soldiers."[13]

Wallace Terry's book, *Bloods*, includes interviews with twenty black servicemen who served in Vietnam. These relate examples of toleration, friendship and unselfish heroism, but the general trend was one of racial discrimination against blacks. Private First Class Reginald Edwards told of having to endure racial slurs from Marine Corps drill instructors. Racial slurs such as "chocolate bunny", "brillo head" and "nigger" were common. Edwards was involved in a fight with a group of whites and was sentenced to five months in the brig. He was eventually discharged from the Corps with a Bad Conduct Discharge. He claimed that if he had been white he would never have gone to the brig.[14]

Specialist 4 Haywood Kirkland reported that blacks would be sent into the field and whites would replace them in the rear. Moreover, when blacks returned from the field, they were given the worst jobs while whites got the better jobs.[15] Staff Sergeant Don Browne reported that more blacks were dying in combat than whites proportionately because more blacks were in combat-oriented units proportionately than whites. He stated that sometimes the Viet Cong would shoot a white soldier, let the black soldier behind him go through, then shoot the next white man to play on the sympathy of the black soldier. This caused the creation of all black or nearly all black units. Moveover, he reported that black units did not get credit for much of what they did.[16]

Lieutenant Commander William Norman was doing well in the Navy but decided

to get out because he was frustrated by the role of blacks in the Navy during the Vietnam War. The Navy was asking blacks to take part in the war while subjecting them to institutional racism. At the time, aboard ships the majority of blacks had the lowest level of jobs and the dirtiest of jobs. He felt the Navy system was set up to perpetrate racism.[17] After Norman submitted his resignation and it reached Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, he asked Norman to stay on as his special assistant for minority affairs. Admiral Zumwalt was committed to equal opportunity and treatment. In three years Zumwalt and Norman instituted over two hundred programs promoting equality in the Navy.[18]

According to *Newsweek*, black Americans were suffering proportionally more casualties than white youth by a margin of two to one.[19] Martin Luther King, Jr. reported: "there were twice as many Negroes as whites in combat in Vietnam at the beginning of 1967, and twice as many Negro soldiers died in action (20.6 per cent) in proportion to their numbers in population." Moveover, "the black community in the United States was also very sensitive to charges that blacks were being forced to take on the most dangerous assignments within combat units, that they were being sacrificed."[20]

A Negro field grade officer reported that: "the brother does all right here. You see it's just about the first time in his life that he finds he can really compete with whites on an equal—or very close to equal basis. He tries hard in this kind of situation and he does well."[21] He added: "many Negroes will extend the stay longer in Vietnam than the normal twelve months—I will."[22]

"Front line statistics show that while Negroes made up about 9.8 per cent of the total American troops in South Vietnam, they came close to 20 per cent of those on the front line."[23] This high percentage of Negroes on the front lines reflected in the Pentagon's figures of Negro deaths at 14.1 per cent of total American fatalities in Vietnam.[24] In 1965, the black death rate soared to close to 25 per cent at which time the Pentagon ordered a cut back in participation of black troops.[25]

Black Vietnam veterans hoped to come home to more than they had before, but they came home to less. Unemployment among black veterans more than doubled the rate for white veterans.[26]

Specialist 4 Arthur E. Woodley, Jr. said: "I can't speak for other minorities, but living in America in the eighties is a war for survival among black folks. And black veterans are being overlooked more than everybody. We can't find jobs because nobody trusts us. Because 'we killers,' 'We crazy.' We went away intelligent young men to do the job of American citizens. And once we did, we came back victims."[27]

The black veterans returning from action in Vietnam felt they had paid their dues and were ready to collect from American society. For many returning black veterans the outlook was bleak for education and housing. One such returning veteran commented: "some people discriminate against you whether you are a Viet vet or not, but you resent it more if you have given blood and sweat."[28]

Vincent Malveaux, a senior veteran counselor with the New York City Division of Veteran Affairs, noted: "if the Armed Forces can take disadvantaged, unskilled young men and train them to do vital and skilled jobs in the service, then private

industry can and must take these same young men in civilian life and train them for meaningful jobs.''[29]

''Despite the cautious optimism expressed by officials regarding the job situation, some veterans appeared more skeptical. One veteran said he has not experienced outright discrimination. They are more subtle than that and you get the classic runaround like, 'we have a number of applications for the job'...or, ''we'll get in touch with you'...or 'we'll keep you on file' ...so we're just kidding ourselves when we say the doors are wide open.''[30]

Endnotes

1. Robert W. Mullen, *Blacks and Vietnam* (Washington, D.C., 1981), 26.
2. L. Deckle McLean, "The Black Man and the Draft," *Ebony* (August. 1968), 61.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 62.
5. Ibid., 61.
6. Ibid., 62.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., 64.
9. Robert W. Mullen, *Blacks in America's Wars* (New York, 1973), 77.
10. Thomas A. Johnson, "Negroes In The Nam," *Ebony* (August, 1968), 38.
11. Mullen, *Blacks and Vietnam*, 57.
12. Wallace Terry, *Bloods* (New York, 1984), xvi.
13. Ibid., xvi, xvii.
14. Ibid., xvii, 7, 13.
15. Ibid., 103.
16. Ibid., 172, 175.
17. Ibid., 191, 192.
18. Ibid., 192, 202.
19. Mullen, *Blacks in America's Wars*, 77.
20. Ibid.
21. Johnson, "Negroes In The Nam," 31.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., 33.
24 Ibid.

25. Ibid.

26. Terry, *Bloods*, xvii.

27. Ibid., 264.

28. Ponchitta Pierce and Peter Bailey, "The Returning Vet," *Ebony*, (August, 1968), 145.

29. Ibid., 146.

30. Ibid., 147.

Officers
of
Alpha Beta Phi
Chapter
1988-1989

John Prescott Kappas. . . . . President

Michael K. G. Moore . . . . . .Vice-President

Nancy Lynn Willoughby. . . . . Secretary

Debra Beckett Weigold. . . . . .Treasurer

David P. Anstead . . . . . Historian

James A. Ramage . . . . . .Faculty Advisor

Charter Student Members

Joy M. Baker
Ann C.Cahill
John P. DeMarcus, Jr.
Scott K. Fowler
Bennie W. Good
Matthew W. Hornsby
Kenneth E. Hughes
Shonda S. Kinman
Douglas K. Meyer, Jr.
Grace M. Murimi
Dick Wolfe
Christopher P. Burns
David R. Caudill, Jr.
Daniel M. Driscoll
Mark K. Gilvin
Joseph S. Guilyard
Todd P. Huff
Jeffrey Junto
Andrew O. Lutes
S. Wayne Moreland
Elaine M. Richardson
Rudiger F. Wolfe

Members Initiated
April 15, 1986

David P. Anstead
Richard T. Dedman
James R. Eilers
Michael P. Holliday
Betty R. Letscher
Darlene S. Miller
Linda M. Ruh
Joseph T. Shields
Harold A. Stephens
Shelley L. Stephenson
Deborah S. Trego
Edwin L. Vardiman
Shawn T. Young

Members Initiated
April 14, 1987

Kristen H. Breen
Laura A. Butcher
Lynn David
Cheryl L. Grinninger
Linda Kay Hon
Judith F. Hutchison
John Prescott Kappas
Martha Pelfrey
Julie Ann Prewitt
Edna L. Stracener
Verna L. Vardiman

Members Initiated
April 12, 1988

Susan M. Burgess
Lori Ann Dinser
Stacey L. Graus
Timothy Craig Grayson
Jeffrey Hampton
Derick Rogers Harper
Christopher Gary Holmes
Virginia Johnson
Sarah Suzanne Kiser
Joyce Borne Kramer
William H. Lowe
Michael K.G. Moore
Jennifer A. Raiche
Debra Beckett Weigold
Nancy Lynn Willoughby

New Members
April 11, 1989

Roger Craig Adams
James Lee Breth
Edward R. Fahlbush
Linda Holbrook
Christopher Iannelli
Tracy Ice
Elizabeth W. Johnson
Wylie D. Jones
Mary Elaine Ray
Rebecca Rose Schroer
Jeffery A. Smith

Faculty

Michael C. C. Adams
Lawrence R. Borne
John P. DeMarcus
J. Merle Nickell
W. Michael Ryan
Louis R. Thomas
H. Lew Wallace
Michael H. Washington
Leon E. Boothe
James C. Claypool
Tripta Desai
James A. Ramage
W. Frank Steely
Robert C. Vitz
Richard E. Ward
Jeffrey C. Williams

This publication was prepared by Northern Kentucky University and printed with state funds (KRS 57.375). Northern Kentucky University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution. 11M069